
From: Noam Chomsky <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, May 19, 2018 9:26 PM
To: Harry Chomsky
Cc: Avi Chomsky; Diana Chomsky
Subject: Re: Marital Trust

I'm glad that you find the idea interesting and think =hat you might consider it, though you have to consult lawyers first.
=div style="color:rgb(34,34,34);font-family:arial,sans-serif;font-size:12=8px;font-style:normal;font-variant-ligatures:normal;font-variant-caps:norm=l;font-weight:400;letter-spacing:normal;text-align:start;text-indent:0px;t=xt-transform:none;white-space:normal;word-spacing:0px;background-color:rgb=255,255,255);text-decoration-style:initial;text-decoration-color:initial">=br>

My own view is different. To me the proposal I suggested se=ms to be a very simple way of settling this matter, which to me is extreme=y troubling. I realize that this is just another case of a longstand=ng difference in the way we approach these problems, a difference that has=been clear ever since we were discussing the interest on the loan from the=Trust and found that we could not communicate because I mistakenly assumed=that it was a discussion among family members while your letters made it v=ry clear and explicit that you saw it as a legal issue to be settled among=lawyers and Bainco, perhaps with a mediator in the adversary proceeding.=C2◆ All matters I find it very hard to comprehend, and to live with, but=so be it.

So by all means consult with your lawyer, or perh=ps a battery of lawyers, to make sure that your interests are properly pro=ected. I don't need any lawyer's advice. The matter is=perfectly clear and straightforward. So there is no reason for me to=hire a lawyer to deal with the question and to have a lawyer contact yours=and initiate a discussion in which we all participate.

The =atter is very simple. We can proceed without delay if you agree to s=tle the issue in the simple manner that I suggested.

As fo= your proposals in your letter of March 29, as I wrote you, the letter was=so shocking that it was hard for me to bring myself to respond, but I did,=in detail, but decided not to send it. Perhaps I should. Will =hink about it.

As for your proposals, my response was the o=vious one. I'm sorry for the stress you had to endure, but your =fforts were a waste of time for reasons I had already fully explained befo=e you undertook them. As I'm sure you recall, a few years ago, I=requested tax payments from the marital trust when my IRA was being rapidl= depleted by my advisers who were distributing half to family and using th= other half to pay management fees and taxes for the entire estate, so tha= to pay Alex's medical expenses and the expenses for Wellfleet I had t= withdraw excess funds with exorbitant taxes, all that before withdrawing =even a cent to live on again with exorbitant taxes. Your response was=to refuse the request unless I agreed to intrusive and insulting financial=investigations -- of a kind I never considered when providing funds to you=for something you needed. I made it clear and explicit at the time t=at I would not submit to this procedure. Since your efforts and prop=sals simply repeat the same procedure, they were a waste of time.

There were some things in your letter that were correct. You&#=9;re right that despite what has happened, I'm still a "wealthy m=n," with income well above the median, though lacking a pension and a=cumulated property, not at the level of my peers. Furthermore, I can=supplement my income by teaching large undergraduate courses, something I&=39;d never done and that is not that common for people approaching 90, but=something that I enjoy. And you too are a wealthy man, for the same =asons: the reasons are that I've worked hard all my life, lived fairl= simply (and live even more simply today), and was therefore able to put a=ide enough money to ensure that my children and grandchildren are very wel= cared for, indefinitely.

But I again suggest that we put all of this aside, and deal quickly and simply with what appears to be the one outstanding issue: dividing the Marital trust and then dissolving it, all very simple, needing no lawyers, at least on my part.

D

On Fri, May 18, 2018 at 1:44 PM, Harry Chomsky & I <[REDACTED]> <a><mailto:[REDACTED]> wrote:

This is an interesting idea. We could consider it further, but I would need the advice of my lawyer — and I assume you would want your own lawyer's advice as well — to ensure that any agreement we reach is consistent with Massachusetts law and satisfies the interests, needs, and obligations of everybody involved. Perhaps, as a next step, you could ask your lawyer to contact mine and begin a discussion in which we all participate.

I'm also curious to hear your thoughts about the proposals I suggested in my message on March 29th.

On Thu, May 17, 2018 at 10:05 AM, Noam Chomsky <[REDACTED]> <mailto:[REDACTED]> wrote:

As I wrote a little while ago, I did write a long response to your last -- deeply depressing -- letter, but decided not to send it. I may return to that letter later but will keep to some factual matters that ought to be cleared up.

But now I'm writing just about one point, which seems to be the core of the problem -- a problem, which, again, I don't understand. But let's put that aside, though I hope we can clear it up soon. All of this is a painful cloud that I never would have imagined would darken my late years.

The core issue seems to be the marital trust. I've explained how M and I actually set it up with Eric which seemed to us just plain common sense. I've also explained Max's different interpretation. I've asked you for yours, but haven't heard it. But let's put that aside too, and just resolve the matter, as can be done very simply -- with no need for lawyers to explain the fiduciary responsibility of the trustee I appointed years ago to replace me, something I never paid any attention to before.

The simple solution is to divide the trust into two parts. One part will go to you, to use as you wish. One part will go to me, for me to use without any investigations of my financial situation and whether such intrusions that I won't accept. Then the trust can simply be dissolved, and it is all over.

So I suggest that we proceed this way, and end the whole matter -- at least, whatever it is that I understand about what is of concern to you.

D