

EXHIBIT 2535

From: William Langewiesche [WLang@vf.com]
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2007 9:33 AM
To: Steven Donziger
Subject: FW: Vanity Fair Questions

Steve, what say? Personally I don't want to waste time on this meeting. As for the time I spent with the Plaintiffs, the argument can be made that it was primarily with Pablo, and that when I pursued the equivalent with Callejas, Chevron policy precluded it.

Anyway, lets talk when you have time. Call me on my cell 916-801-1291, or I'll call you after I've given you time to read this.

W.

----- Forwarded Message

From: "Robertson, Kent S" <KRDQ@chevron.com>
Date: Fri, 23 Feb 2007 09:26:51 -0800
To: <WLang@vf.com>
Cc: <Keenan_Mayo@condenast.com>
Conversation: Vanity Fair Questions
Subject: Re: Vanity Fair Questions

Dear William,

Thanks for you e-mail. Given the complexity of the Ecuador litigation, and the fact that you've clearly spent some time with the plaintiffs and their attorneys, and that the contours of your story are still forming, we have to insist on a face-to-face meeting with you to provide the historical, legal and technical context of the case from Chevron's perspective.

In the course of the meeting, I'm sure we'll be able to answer many of the 45 questions you submitted to us. However, it's important to us, and to our shareholders, that you provide Chevron with the same kind of time and access that you have apparently given to the plaintiffs. Chevron takes the Ecuador litigation very seriously. It is a matter of principle to us and we believe the integrity of your story will be diminished without the opportunity to speak directly to us.

At this point, your questions read more like an interrogatory than an interview. We insist on the opportunity to provide the right context for the case, as the plaintiffs have done from their perspective, before answering specific legal and technical questions.

What I would like to propose is that we arrange an opportunity for you to meet with Ricardo Veiga, who has been the lead in-house attorney managing this matter on a day-to-day basis (and who has vast knowledge of all related issued given his 10+ years of involvement), and either Sara McMillen or Renae Magau (depending upon schedule). who lead our technical team and can address the many technical questions you have raised. I'd like to suggest we meet in Houston the week of March 5. Both Sara and Renae (who are normally located in Richmond, Calif.) will be in Houston for a conference. And Ricardo Veiga, who's office is in Coral Gables, can fly in to Houston for the meeting.

Alternatively, we'd have to arrange a date/time for our people to fly to New York to meet with you there. In the interim we will be proceeding to gather the information to respond to your questions. If you would like to suggest alternate dates, please let me know.

Thanks
Kent Robertson
Media Relations Advisor

Policy, Government and Public Affairs
Chevron Corporation
6001 Bollinger Canyon Road
San Ramon, CA 94583-2324
ph: 925-842-1695
mobile: [REDACTED]
krdq@chevron.com

-----Original Message-----

From: William Langewiesche
To: Robertson, Kent S
CC: Keenan Mayo
Sent: Tue Feb 20 18:52:36 2007
Subject: Vanity Fair Questions

February 20, 2007

Mr. Kent Robertson
Media Relations Advisor
Policy, Government and Public Affairs
Chevron Corporation
6001 Bollinger Canyon Rd.
San Ramon, CA 94583

Dear Kent,

Thank you for your prompt response. To answer your question about the piece, the contours are still forming, and will rely to some degree on information from Chevron, much of which I have gleaned from public court documents in Ecuador, from your website, and from other Chevron materials. As for my stay in the Oriente, I was there autonomously, using Vanity Fair resources, speaking to a wide variety of longtime residents, observing the scene independently as I do elsewhere in the world, and keeping strictly in mind that oil operations have continued in the region since Texaco's departure in 1992. I do not believe that my explorations of the former Texaco concession area resulted in confusion, or in an obscuring of the realities on the ground that would require immediate interpretation by Chevron; my only disappointment there was that your chief Ecuadorian attorney, Dr. Adolpho Callejas, politely declined to speak to me, though we were staying in the same hotel in Lago Agrio, and I would gladly have set aside unlimited time for him upon my return to Quito.

That having been said, I am eager to hear further from Chevron, and as I said to you at our meeting in Quito, I am open to your point of view on any subject whatsoever. For now I would like to keep our exchanges to writing via email in order to avoid any possible confusion, and to allow Chevron's position to be as clear as possible. Please do not feel the need to gather all the answers to the questions of 2/17/07 before responding to those which do not require significant research. To assist you, I suggest that we might divide my questions into three categories: (1) those which, it would appear to me, have answers requiring little or no preparation at Chevron headquarters, many of which must already inform your document "Addressing Plaintiffs' Attorneys' Big Lies"; (2) those which, it would appear to me, have answers which your lawyers in Quito and the United States should have readily at hand; and (3) those which may require more extensive inquiry by company specialists in order to answer, including searches for documentation.

I would break it down as follows:

In Category 1: questions, 1, 2, 4, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 35, 43, 44, 45.

In Category 2: questions 11, 13, 14, 15, 31, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42.

In Category 3: questions 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 24, 34.

As I believe the questions make clear, I would like to avoid responses that amount to unsourced assertions. In other words, I would ask that you make every effort to respond to the questions with narrowly bounded answers,

linked to specific documentary sources, and to named individuals who have firsthand knowledge of the facts, and with whom I could follow up if necessary. To the extent possible I would like to receive answers to the questions in all three categories within a week. This would seem to me to be a reasonable time frame, given the simplicity and specificity of the questions, and the number of lawyers and technical staff, both inside and outside Chevron, who are involved in this case. If one week does not provide enough time to answer all of the questions, I would appreciate it if you would please let me know now, perhaps listing those questions which you anticipate cannot be answered in time, so that I can find other solutions.

I trust that your written responses will form a factual basis for further conversations and clarifications of Chevron's position, and will possibly then lead to an efficient and productive visit to your company in California--a prospect that I look forward to. Depending on the speed with which we can establish the facts in writing, on our mutual schedules, and on travel logistics, I would be happy to discuss possible dates at that time.

Thank you again for your consideration and prompt response.

William

--

William Langewiesche
International Correspondent
Vanity Fair
4 Times Square (22nd Floor)
New York, NY 10036

wlang@vf.com

US Mobile: [REDACTED]

Europe/World: [REDACTED]

----- End of Forwarded Message