

**From:** Valeria Chomsky <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@gmail.com>  
**Cc:** Noam Chomsky <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** My view of the situation  
**Date:** Sat, 07 Jul 2018 18:01:16 +0000

---

The three children believe that all Noam's money, not only from the marital Trust, but also from the IRAs belongs to them, because it was made when Noam was married to their mother.

But not only from the time their marriage lasted, because after Noam and his second wife had been married, Harry once flew from California to complain that royalties even of a new book that Noam wrote after being married to his second wife should NOT come to the second wife). And the book publication was delayed and all sorts of legal difficulties and pressure from Max to have the book only under Noam's name -- with Deborah's endorsement, until Gene Landy stood up in the case.

Therefore, in their minds, all the money should be inherited by them.

In the will that Max proposed, the second wife would receive \$25,000, and even the remaining money from bank accounts should go to the Noam Chomsky Revocable Trust. At the time the bank account was being used only as an account for making payments. So it had only the exact amount for payments.

At the time, before Noam and his second wife sold the apartment in Cambridge (that was bought after Noam and his second wife had been married -- btw that it was not allowed by Max to be bought jointly in Noam's and his second wife's name) and all the tangible assets including, sheets, pillowcases, glasses, silverware, books, objects, rugs, furniture and all its content, as Max wrote, would also go to the NCRT. Therefore, including things that Noam and his second wife had acquired together.

The document stated that then all tangible assets would be sold and the money would be reverted to the NC Revocable Trust, that would have become at that point irrevocable. The NC Revocable Trust has the three children as its beneficiaries.

Harry was nominated trustee of the marital trust. He now controls the other trustee, Max.

The IRA has been the main source of income and Noam's children want it to be the only source of income, preserving the marital trust intact for themselves.

After Noam realized that the gifts to his children and payments of their expenses from the IRA, plus our own expenses were depleting the IRA in taxes that are being paid also from the IRA, he stopped the gifts to 10 family members.

The idea is that Noam uses only the IRA for all expenses and taxes, since Noam designated one of the IRAs as the inheritance to his second wife. Interestingly they want to make sure that there are no current gifts to the second wife. Maybe because they want to be able to contest the will, saying that they -- Noam's children -- were excluded from Noam's inheritance. The only reason I can see why they would care if there are gifts being made to the second wife is that this would diminish their portion in the inheritance that they can claim from the IRA. Otherwise, what difference would it make if the second wife receives it now or later? And a possible claim for the IRA is the same reason to control our expenses, requesting financial information.

The main purpose of all this is to collect Noam's and his second wife's financial information to construct their own stories/cases. Therefore, if even Noam provides all the financial information, they won't release more

money from the marital trust than what they have already decided, and this, only if the conditions they established, such as signing releases for them for their wrongdoing will be satisfied.

The whole thing is about having control of our lives and see how much we spend in the market and be able to denounce that we are spending too much here or there and that we are not living according to the "family's standards" and that they have to intervene.

Crazy!

Valeria

PS: Please correct me if I am wrong.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **jeffrey E.** <[jeevacation@gmail.com](mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com)>

Date: Sat, Jul 7, 2018 at 9:07 AM

Subject: Fwd: Marital Trusts

To: Noam Chomsky <[REDACTED]>, Valeria Chomsky <[REDACTED]>

the gifts to third parties are a refence to valeria AGAIN!!! . he should not be allowed to slip away . and abdicate his past or present responsibilites. you need to send a strong response. . You are trustee and have been for many years. I believe that trying to avoid fufilling those responsiblites by delay , and repeated questions re gifts , which we have answered a numner of times is unacceptable. . there is over 2 million dollars in the trust . so pretending that the concern is for my future , is clearly untrue. having the trust income payouts being less than 10k per year as you and harry have paid expenses to which i was never consulted is outrageious ,

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Richard Kahn** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Jul 7, 2018 at 7:46 AM

Subject: Fwd: Marital Trusts

To: Jeffrey Epstein <[jeevacation@gmail.com](mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com)>

Richard Kahn  
HBRK Associates Inc.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Max Kohlenberg <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** July 7, 2018 at 7:43:24 AM EDT

**To:** 'Noam Chomsky' <[REDACTED]>

**Cc:** 'Richard Kahn' <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Marital Trusts

Noam –

Thank you for your reply. As you indicate that you are not being represented by counsel I will reply directly to you, with a copy to Rich (as you suggest). Please consider:

1. As a starting point, let me note that I think you and Rich may have misunderstood (at least initially) the terms of the settlement that Harry proposed through his attorney. Rich and I discussed this in a call about 10 days ago and I'm hoping that misunderstanding has been cleared up, but as I'm not a party to your exchanges (and Rich's exchanges) with Harry's attorney I can't be sure. I'm also not certain whether the terms of the proposed settlement have changed. All I can say for sure is that characterizing the offer as one in which distributions to you cannot exceed \$100K per year is not consistent with my understanding of what has been offered.

2. As you know, Harry's attorney has commenced a legal action that is intended to facilitate my resignation and the appointment of a successor trustee to take my place. Since you've wanted me removed for some time and since I've said (from the first time you and I met) that I only wanted to serve as trustee if all the family members wanted me to serve, I'm looking forward to resigning as soon as the court determines how I am to do so and how my successor is to be selected.

3. Given that my replacement is impending, it might be worth waiting until my successor is in place before responding to my requests for financial disclosure, as it's possible that my successor won't share my views as to what the trustee of the trusts needs to know before making decisions about distributions. Likewise, if my successor will be identified soon it might make sense for me to hold off on any distributions and leave it to the new trustee to work with you on figuring all of this out. In this regard I'm kind of a "lame duck" trustee, wouldn't you say?

4. To the extent that you want to push forward while I remain the trustee, let me again state the basis for financial disclosure by you. It is that, as trustee, I owe a duty to you and I owe a duty to your children (as the remainder beneficiaries of the trusts). For the present my primary duty is to you and it is to distribute to you all income earned by the trusts, net of expenses, and to distribute to you (or pay on your behalf) additional monies as reasonably needed *to the extent that your income from other sources is not sufficient to support your reasonable expenses*. Notwithstanding your statement that "As for the claim about concern for my later years, that has been thoroughly refuted" it has not been refuted in the context of my trusteeship and it remains my duty to consider distributions in light of the possibility that you will have a reasonable need for distributions from the trust for many more years, and perhaps in increasing amounts, depending on your circumstances in the future.

5. As for the specifics of disclosure, what I need to consider is (a) what your income was in 2017, since that was the basis for the tax payments you seek to have reimbursed, (b) what your income is likely to be this year and going forward, (c) what your expenses were in 2017 and are likely to be in 2018, and (d) whether any of your income (or other resources) are being used for purposes that the trust cannot support (such as gifts to third parties). So far, Rich has provided me with some rough information about your 2017 expenses. There are some gaps in that information, but nothing that can't be cleared up pretty easily (I think). Rich has also assured me that you have not made any gifts that have diminished your resources and I assume you would confirm that to me. What I don't have at this point is enough information about your income, so that I can consider what the gap is between your expenses and your income, which is the gap the trusts might help to close up. With respect to your income in 2017, all I can see is that your income tax obligations seem to be much higher than they were previously. I'm assuming that reflects a jump in income from (i) the profit made on the sale of the condominium, and (ii) large withdrawals from your IRA. If you want to provide me with

more information (bearing in mind what I noted in item #3, above) then information about your 2017 income and what your income is likely to be this year is what I most need.

I hope this is helpful and will wait to hear more from you and/or Rich.

Max

A. Max Kohlenberg

Howland Evangelista Kohlenberg Burnett, LLP

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Direct: [REDACTED]

Main: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

This email and any attachments thereto are intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify me by return email and permanently delete the original and any copy of this message or attachment. Thank you.

**From:** Noam Chomsky [mailto:[REDACTED]]

**Sent:** Friday, July 06, 2018 8:53 PM

**To:** Max Kohlenberg

**Subject:** Re: Marital Trust

I am not represented on this issue, so you can send the information to me directly, copying Richard Kahn.

Noam

On Fri, Jul 6, 2018 at 4:24 AM, Max Kohlenberg <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Noam –

Thanks for your message and your inquiry. I would like to reply in some detail, but before I do so please tell me whether you are now represented by legal counsel. If you are then I believe I'm obliged to copy your counsel on our exchanges. I would also plan on copying Rich Kahn, since my last communications about distributions to you from the trusts have been with him.

Please also bear in mind that since (according to Rich) you are preparing to bring a legal action against me, I have been in contact with my firm's malpractice insurance carrier. As my exchanges with you may also need to be reviewed with our carrier that may delay (and/or limit) my responses.

Max

A. Max Kohlenberg

Howland Evangelista Kohlenberg Burnett, LLP

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Direct: [REDACTED]

Main: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

This email and any attachments thereto are intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are hereby

EFTA01036576

notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify me by return email and permanently delete the original and any copy of this message or attachment. Thank you.

**From:** Noam Chomsky [mailto: ]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 05, 2018 7:53 PM  
**To:** Max Kohlenberg  
**Subject:** Marital Trust

Max,

I presume it is clear that the recent proposal transmitted by Harry's lawyer that I should be satisfied with a handout of 100k a year from the Marital Trust is too disgraceful for comment. I would like to know what further information you require for reimbursement for tax payment. We have previously transmitted a great deal of financial information in order for you to reimburse our taxes, including proof of payment and more. Exactly what more do you require, and with what justification? We see little reason that you cannot act on the information already provided. As for the claim about concern for my later years, that has been thoroughly refuted.

Noam

--

please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to [jeevacation@gmail.com](mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com), and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved