

Richard Nixon Presidential Library
Contested Materials Collection
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
53	37		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Personal	Letter	From Dean to Ehrlichman RE: "Estate Plan" 3pg

DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD [NIXON PROJECT]

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE OR CORRESPONDENTS	DATE	RESTRICTION
N-1 [Doc #93]	Memo	From Dean, To: Ehrlichman, Re: Estate Plan	6-13-72	C

FILE GROUP TITLE STAFF SECRETARY	BOX NUMBER 126
-------------------------------------	-------------------

FOLDER TITLE
Papers Project [VI]

RESTRICTION CODES

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>A. Release would violate a Federal statute or Agency Policy.</p> <p>B. National security classified information.</p> <p>C. Pending or approved claim that release would violate an individual's rights.</p> <p>D. Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy or a libel of a living person.</p> | <p>E. Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information.</p> <p>F. Release would disclose investigatory information compiled for law enforcement purposes.</p> <p>G. Withdrawn and return private and personal material.</p> <p>H. Withdrawn and returned non-historical material.</p> |
|--|---|

Presidential Materials Review Board

Review on Contested Documents

Collection: Staff Secretary
Box Number: 126

Folder: Paper Project [VI]

<u>Document</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
93	Return Private/Personal

June 13, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: JOHN EHRLICHMAN
FROM: JOHN DEAN
SUBJECT: Estate Plan

Attached is the latest draft by DeMarco of the Estate Plan. You will note from the summary (Tab A) that it has been re-designed to minimize the tax problems and maximize the control factors we discussed at our last meeting with Frank, Gordon and Bob. In fact, the DeMarco plan is now virtually indistinguishable from the Ritzel plan. You will note from the correspondence from DeMarco (Tab B) that copies were also forwarded to Ritzel. Gordon has had an off-the-record conversation with his former associate in the firm who has been working with Ritzel on the plan and apparently they also find the latest DeMarco draft virtually in accord with their earlier recommendations.

It seems we are at last getting close to an agreement with all outside counsel as to what the plan should be, although we have not yet had an "official" response from Ritzel and Alexander. You will recall that on May 23rd John Alexander wrote you a rather blunt letter (Tab C) asking you to put them back in the ball game. Tod forwarded that correspondence to me to handle, but I have deferred action because I was aware of the imminent DeMarco plan and its similarity to the Ritzel plan.

Where do we go from here to get this saga ended and a plan for our client? I recommend the following actions:

- (1) That you send the letter at Tab D to John Alexander.
- (2) That I follow up the letter with a call to Ritzel, and seek to get their recommended changes and general blessings.
- (3) That I either get Ritzel and DeMarco together or discuss any changes with DeMarco to resolve matters of difference.

(4) That if we have a problem with Ritzel and Alexander, we ask John Mitchell to intercede and put the matter to rest.

(5) That we plan a meeting (hopefully of the love feast variety) with you, IRL, DeMarco, Ritzel, Gordon and myself to nail the matter down.

(6) That we arrange for signing by the client and plan to have Ritzel and DeMarco (possibly Alexander also) present.

Agree _____

Disagree _____

Comments _____

DRAFT

Dear John:

I regret that a rather hectic schedule has made it impossible for me to focus on the development of the President's Estate Plan during the past weeks, but hopefully matters have progressed without me. I understand that Frank DeMarco has prepared a revised draft and forwarded to you for review. While I have not reviewed the DeMarco draft in detail, it appears to be consistent with your earlier recommendations.

I know I speak for the President when I say that he feels your concurrence in any recommendation is essential and, while much of the mechanical phases of developing the plan have been handled by the President's California counsel, he is relying heavily on your counsel as well. Accordingly, I am hopeful that you will be able to complete your review of Frank DeMarco's drafts and that we can resolve any differences without delay.

With best regards and much appreciation, I am

Sincerely,

John Ehrlichman