

New Paltz Times, January 8, 2009

My final answer

In my recent letter I took Mr. [Harry] Tabak to task for not revealing that he had financial and business relationships with the Rivendell Winery. He has responded by making two corrections "on a couple of important items."

I stated he was the broker in selling the Rivendell property. As he points out, he was the listing broker and not the selling broker. I think this is a talmudic distinction, as the main point is the same. Mr. Tabak had a financial stake in the sale, Rivendell was a customer, and he benefited from the transaction. Full disclosure was warranted in this area when he wrote a letter of support. Whether you go to a theatre or a theater, you see the same play.

I also stated that Mr. Tabak leased ten acres of his land to Rivendell. His important correction does in no way dispute this, it only adds his motivation for the lease. My statement about the appearance of being a winery was directed at Rivendell's project and did not refer to Mr. Tabak. The leasing is another business relationship, one of tenant in this case, and Mr. Tabak should also have revealed that in his initial letter.

Mr. Tabak is free to support whatever project he chooses. However he is not a neutral observer regarding Rivendell, and should have disclosed his network of business relationships with them.

Alan Kraus

New Paltz