

# 4 more enter guilty pleas in Watergate case

1/16/73

By MURIEL DOBBIN  
Washington Bureau of The Sun

Washington—Four more of the Watergate defendants pleaded guilty yesterday as the political bugging trial entered its second week. But despite defense protests, Judge John J. Sirica refused to declare a mistrial.

Since the men charged with raiding Democratic national headquarters went on trial a week ago, five have pleaded guilty to counts of conspiracy, burglary and illegal eavesdropping in the course of what the prosecution has termed a Republican election-year espionage campaign against Democratic candidates.



G. GORDON LIDDY  
... ex-White House aide

**Two defendants remain**

Of the original seven defendants, only two remain—G. Gordon Liddy, a former FBI agent and former finance counsel to the Committee for the Re-election of the President who has been described as the boss of the GOP operation, and James W. McCord, Jr., a former FBI agent and an ex-CIA employee who was the security coordinator for the re-election committee.

Defense attorneys contended that the likelihood of a fair trial for Mr. Liddy and Mr. McCord would be considerably diminished when the jury, which has been absent during the recent developments, realized the "attrition rate" in defendants, and possibly inferred that the others had



JAMES W. McCORD, JR.  
... former campaign official

pleaded guilty. It was the defense suggestion that a mistrial be declared and a new jury empaneled after a "substantial" delay to permit the impact of the latest publicity to die away.

### Followed Hunt's lead

The four who offered guilty pleas yesterday—Bernard L. Barker, Frank A. Sturgis, Eugenio R. Martinez and Virgilio R. Gonzalez—were following the example of E. Howard Hunt, a former White House intelligence consultant, who pleaded guilty last week.

There had been speculation that Mr. Hunt had urged his co-defendants to emulate his action in court, and although they denied it, their attorney, Henry B. Rothblatt, said he thought such speculation was "reasonable."

Also like Mr. Hunt, the four defendants were ordered by Judge Sirica to raise \$100,000 bond each in order to stay out of jail while their presentencing investigation is being completed. They went to jail until See WATERGATE, A2, Col. 5

### WATERGATE, from A1

they succeed in efforts to raise the money.

The many questions about the Watergate raid remained unanswered by the four accused, despite interrogation by Judge Sirica, who at one point announced flat disbelief of Mr. Barker's professed ignorance of where his funds for the Watergate operation had come from.

The judge revealed that the four defendants had dismissed their attorney, Mr. Rothblatt, Friday, in a letter to the bench in which they said his defense was "not acceptable" to them.

They said they had been asking Mr. Rothblatt to enter guilty pleas for them since the

day before the trial began.

Urging the defendants to be "frank and straightforward" in telling him the background of their role in the Watergate raid, Judge Sirica said:

"I don't care whom you hurt or help. Don't pull any punches. Give me frank answers. Any people involved who shouldn't be involved, I want to know about it. And the grand jury will want to know."

### Fighting Red "conspiracy"

What Judge Sirica got in the way of "frank answers" were denials from all four defendants that they took any pay, beyond expenses, for their espionage activities and assertions that they were trying to



Eugenio R. Martinez (left) and Frank A. Sturgis, former defendants in the Water-

gate bugging trial, flank their attorney, Henry Rothblatt, as they arrive at court.

UPI

protect the United States from a "Communist conspiracy."

Mr. Sturgis, Mr. Martinez and Mr. Gonzalez, all Cuban-born and apparently fervent anti-Communists, contended they had received the impression—apparently from Mr. Barker—that there was a parallel between the 1972 political situation in America and the problems in Cuba.

"When there is a threat of a Communist conspiracy against the United States, I will do anything to stop it. Anything," Mr. Sturgis said in explaining why he had "asked no questions" when approached to become involved in the Watergate raid.

Mr. Gonzalez, a locksmith allegedly hired as the "key man" at the Watergate, said he knew he was violating the law.

"Who paid you? Who was the money man?" the judge demanded.

"None paid me. I did it because I believed it was the right thing to do," the defendant replied, launching into a recollection of how his people were suffering in Cuba.

"What does Cuba have to do

with breaking into the Watergate?" Judge Sirica asked in a voice betraying exasperation.

The sharpest exchanges took place between the judge and Mr. Barker, especially on the subject of \$114,000 in checks that he had received "through the mail, in blank envelopes" before the Watergate operation.

Mr. Barker was willing to admit he was "the one that motivated these men for the motives they have stated." But he became determinedly vague on the source of money sent to him.

"I want to know where that money came from—all those \$100 bills floating around like coupons," Judge Sirica said.

Mr. Barker insisted that all he knew was that the money came in the mail. "I have been involved in other operations that took the strangeness out of that," he added.

Mr. Gonzalez said Mr. Barker had told him, "it was like the Cuban situation."

He had assumed, the defendant said, that the money was "related to the operation I was executing. . . the operation against the tenants of the Wa-

tergate."

Asked who had first talked to him about the Watergate project, Mr. Barker said, "I don't know. . . it was part of the conspiracy."

#### Admitted knowing Hunt

He admitted he was working with Mr. Hunt, whom he observed, he had "the honor and privilege to know." And as far as he knew, Mr. Hunt was "the only one involved."

Again, the judge asked where the money with which Mr. Barker had paid hotel bills and other expenses had come from.

"I got it in the mail, in a blank envelope," Mr. Barker said.

"I don't believe you," the judge retorted.

"All right," Mr. Barker said.

The four Miami defendants were warned by Judge Sirica that they faced a maximum of 55 years in prison and fines of up to \$50,000 on the seven counts against them.

Gerald Alch, attorney for Mr. McCord, and Peter Maroulis, representing Mr. Liddy, both asked that a mistrial be declared.

They suggested that not only would the jury be likely to conclude the other defendants had pleaded guilty but that the judge might also be prejudiced in his attitude toward the remaining accused.