

NYTimes DEC 21 1974
**JURORS HEAR DEAN
TERMED PERJURER**

**Haldeman's Lawyer Asserts
Witness 'Sowed the Seeds'
of Watergate Affair**

By **LESLEY OELSNER**
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Dec. 20 — H. R. Haldeman's chief defense lawyer told the jury at the Watergate cover-up trial today that the prosecution's chief witness, John W. Dean 3d, was a "mastermind of chicanery" and a perjurer.

The lawyer, John J. Wilson, told the jurors in closing argument not to believe the testimony that Mr. Dean, once the White House counsel to President Nixon, had given against Mr. Haldeman, once Mr. Nixon's chief of staff.

He told the jurors, too, that Mr. Dean was the one who could have cut the Watergate affair off, but that instead he "stirred up this whole thing" and was "the one who sowed the seeds and helped it grow."

Sees Charges Proved

Earlier today, the chief prosecutor in the case, James F. Neal, completed his summation, telling the jurors that the Government had "fulfilled its pledge" to prove each of the charges against the five defendants in the case.

Mr. Neal said that each defendant "blamed John Dean"—and that trying to discredit Mr.

Continued on Page 11, Column 2

Continued From Page 1, Col. 4

Dean was in fact part of the cover-up.

He said that Mr. Haldeman in particular, when he was testifying before the Senate Watergate committee in 1973, had "he job up there at the Senate" of trying to discredit Mr. Dean.

Mr. Neal said that Mr. Haldeman and others wanted to discredit Mr. Dean because the latter was telling the truth. He said that Mr. Haldeman and the others had considered him "good John Dean" for most of the months of the cover-up, because he was "doing their dirty work" in containing the scandal.

But Mr. Dean began to cooperate with the prosecutors in April, 1973.

"Suddenly," Mr. Neal said, "good John Dean becomes mean John Dean."

He reminded the jurors that

they had heard the voices of three of the defendants—Mr. Haldeman, John D. Ehrlichman, Mr. Nixon's chief domestic affairs adviser, and former Attorney General John N. Mitchell, on the tapes.

"You've heard them talk as the cover-up begins to crumble," he said. "You've heard them scramble for position and develop lines and scenarios."

"Members of the jury," he went on, "tragically these conspiratorial conversations have happened in the hallowed halls of the White House of the United States, where once strode such giants as Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, the two Roosevelts, Eisenhower, Kennedy."

"Can you compare the White House, perhaps when Jefferson was drafting his second inaugural, or Lincoln writing 'with malice towards none, and charity for all,' with tapes you've heard in this courtroom—or Roosevelt saying 'we have nothing to fear but fear itself'—with the statement, 'Give them an hors d'oeuvre and maybe they won't come back for the main dish?'"

'Out of Context'

Mr. Wilson, on the other hand, contended that the Government, in presenting the tapes, had taken "sections out of context" and presented them to the jury "with the aura that they have a conspiratorial status."

He told the jurors that they should consider the tapes instead in view of their own personal experiences of dealing with a family problem by sitting around the dining table and discussing it.

"We have a brother, we have a sister, a husband who's in trouble," said Mr. Wilson, who is 73, taking on the air and tone of a wise and understanding counselor.

"The family gathers around the dining room and discusses the possibilities—are we going to get a lawyer? What are the defenses?"

Mr. Wilson paused and looked at the jurors, seated in the jury box about 10 feet from his lectern.

"I'm not talking foolishness," he told them. "This is just human nature."

Sometimes, he said, people make remarks in such conversations that they don't really mean. He chuckled, and said that he himself might have remarked in a moment of anger that he would like to shoot someone. And of course, he added, he had not really intended to shoot the person.

Mr. Wilson referred to Mr. Neal's statement this morning about great Presidents of the past.

"Without casting aspersions on any of our deceased Presidents," he said, "they would not be happy about having their conversations taped, read out in public."

Then Mr. Wilson got to his

point: That many of the conversations recorded on the White House taping system, particularly Mr. Nixon's conversation with Mr. Dean and Mr. Haldeman on March 21, 1973, about payments to the Watergate burglars, were simply attempts "in a semi-family way" to discuss problems and explore possible answers.

The March 21 conversation included a substantial segment about a demand for money by one of the burglars, E. Howard Hunt Jr. During the talk, Mr. Nixon discussed paying the burglars and giving them clemency. Mr. Nixon has always said he was just discussing options and alternatives.

Mr. Wilson gave the jury a similar explanation. He noted that Mr. Nixon had never given clemency.

"Is it a sin to talk about it?" he asked. "Is it always going to end up the bottom line of criminality if it's explored?"

The March 21 conversation has been one of the most crucial elements in the Watergate affair, both in the public debate beginning in the summer of 1973, when Mr. Dean described it at the Senate Watergate hearings, and also, as the tapes played at the trial have shown, in the private meetings and discussions at the White House as the cover-up began to crumble.

'Listen to the Tape'

According to several tapes played to the jury, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Haldeman expressed repeated concern about the March 21 conversation beginning in mid-April of that year, when they learned that Mr. Dean had begun to cooperate with the prosecution.

This morning Mr. Neal spent some time on the March 21 discussion, describing it thus:

"The President of the United States then—sitting in the Oval office—then starts to discuss how the money can be paid."

"Listen to the tape," he told the jury in a part shout, part plea. "Members of the jury, listen to the tape."

"Ten or 12 times the President of the United States suggested in the Oval Office, they better meet Hunt's demands [in order] to buy time," he said.

"The President of the United States suggested not once, not twice, not three times, not five times, but as many as 10 times, that they better pay Hunt, to

have time to consider their options."

Throughout the trial the prosecution and the defense have battled over whether the defendants believed that the money paid to the Watergate burglars was "hush money," paid for the burglars' silence, or merely a "humanitarian gesture," given to help needy men pay their lawyers' fees and support their families.

Mr. Neal told the jurors that they would have to decide why the money was paid. If it was for humanitarian purposes, though, he asked, why had it been delivered to the burglars in the secretive way it was—"Why code names?" he asked. "Why calls from phone booths? Why was it delivered in such a way as to prevent the donors from ever seeing the recipients?"

Those Who Knew

"Dean, Hunt and LaRue [Frederic C. LaRue, a campaign official] all admitted this was hush money," Mr. Neal said. "These men didn't have the capacity to understand that Mitchell, Haldeman and Ehrlichman had. If they knew this was hush money, so did Mitchell, Haldeman and Ehrlichman."

Mr. Wilson, however, seemed to brush aside the testimony about hush money. He said that Mr. Haldeman had not had any dealings with Herbert W. Kalmbach, Mr. Nixon's personal attorney and the man who raised money for the payments to the burglars in the summer of 1972, after the break-in at Democratic national headquarters in the Watergate complex.

He also noted that a great deal of the money paid to the burglars had gone for legal fees.

Perhaps the most dramatic dispute between the prosecutor and Mr. Wilson, involved their assessment of the Government's witnesses, particularly Mr. Dean.

Mr. Neal noted this morning that his major witnesses were Mr. Dean, Mr. Kalmbach, Mr. Hunt and Jeb Stuart Magruder, the deputy director of the 1972 Nixon re-election campaign—all of whom, he noted, have either served or serving prison terms for their offenses.

"They have paid or are paying the penalty for their sins," he said. "They have nothing left but to tell the truth and start rebuilding their lives."

DO NOT FORGET THE NEEDIEST!