

NY Times DEC 28 1974
**PROSECUTOR BIDS
WATERGATE JURY
'CLOSE LEDGERS'**

**Neal Winds Up Arguments,
Declaring 'People Must
Be Called to Account'**

SUMMATIONS ARE ENDED

**Sirica Will Give Case to the
Jurors on Monday After
Instructions in Law**

By **LESLEY OELSNER**

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Dec. 27—

The prosecution wound up the final arguments at the Watergate cover-up trial today by telling the jurors that it was now up to them to "balance the accounts" and close the ledgers on Watergate.

The jurors are to begin their deliberations on Monday after instructions in the law by Federal Judge John J. Sirica.

"It's no fun casting stones," the chief prosecutor, James F. Neal, told the jury this afternoon. "This Government that's represented here does not cast stones with joy or happiness.

"But to keep society going, stones must be cast. People must be called to account."

Calling to Account

If Government officials commit crimes, Mr. Neal said, if they "cover up" their mistakes, or "strike foul blows," or "assault the temples of justice," then, "when these things occur, society must call those responsible to account."

"No one at this table," he said, gesturing toward the one where six assistant prosecutors were sitting, would suggest a verdict.

"But as representatives of the people in a free society, you are the ones who must now balance the accounts and close the ledger plates of Watergate."

The prosecutor said later that he had meant "ledger," not "ledger plates."

Mr. Neal's appeal, made in the final moments of his closing statement to the jury, concluded all but the final stage of the trial—the judge's instructions and the jurors' deliberations.

It also capped a full and often emotional day, a day in which one of the defense lawyers, summing up the case before his client, wept openly and one of the prosecutors, summing up part of the Government's case, told of his pride that the country was "confident" and strong enough to have such a trial.

The defense lawyer, Jacob A. Stein, told the jury that his client, Kenneth Wells Parkinson, had been "deceived" and "abused" by an assortment of White House and campaign officials, including two of his co-defendants, former Attorney General John N. Mitchell and former Assistant Attorney General Robert C. Mardian.

This occurred, Mr. Stein said, when Mr. Parkinson, a Washington lawyer, was retained by the campaign committee for the re-election of former President Nixon in the summer of 1972 to handle the legal problems stemming from the break-in at Democratic national headquarters in the Watergate

Continued on Page 9, Column 1

Continued From Page 1, Col. 8
complex on June 17, 1972.

Mr. Stein began to weep when he told the jury, toward the end of his argument, of Mr. Parkinson's good reputation, built up over more than 20 years as a lawyer.

"What is good character worth?" he asked.

Is it to be "thrown away," he asked, "and cynically tossed out in favor of the testimony of confessed perjurers? ... Doesn't a lifetime where you built it up, grain by grain weigh against that?"

Mr. Stein was followed to the lectern by Richard Ben-Veniste, who presented the Government's rebuttal to the closing argument that had been made on behalf of H. R. Haldeman, once the White House chief of staff to Richard M. Nixon and now another of the five defendants.

Mr. Ben-Veniste, who is 31 years old and who was an Assistant United States Attorney in the Southern District of New York before joining the Watergate prosecution, told the jury that he had always felt it an "honor" to represent the Government.

But, he said, he felt the honor "particularly in this trial, which, we all understand, could not have been conducted in any but a small handful of countries"—countries with "confidence" in their legal systems and citizens.

And, he went on, he felt "especially proud" because he was one of the "youngest participants," and "young people have a stake in the suc-

cessful operation of the judicial process."

Evidence Analyzed

The jury also heard, from each of the three lawyers, differing analyses of the testimony and evidence that had been presented at the trial.

Basically, Mr. Stein argued that the evidence did not support the two charges against Mr. Parkinson, conspiracy to obstruct justice and obstruction of justice. Mr. Ben-Veniste asserted that the evidence proved the charges against Mr. Haldeman, and Mr. Neal argued that the evidence proved the charges against the four other defendants—Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Mardian, Mr. Parkinson and John D. Ehrlichman, one Mr. Nixon's domestic affairs adviser.

All five defendants are charged with the basic conspiracy count; all but Mr. Mardian are charged with obstruction of justice as well. Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Haldeman each face three additional perjury charges; Mr. Ehrlichman, two perjury counts.

Mr. Stein, speaking first and picking up where he left off yesterday, portrayed Mr. Parkinson as an "innocent" lawyer with no experience in politics who had been made into a "sitting duck" by various people on the campaign committee.

Mardian Is Quoted

He said that when Mr. Parkinson was hired by the committee a few days after the break-in, he was told by Mr. Mardian, the committee official who had retained him, that there was no connection between the break-in and the committee.

Mr. Stein said that committee officials continued to give Mr. Parkinson this account even after Jeb Stuart Magruder, then the deputy director, told him on July 13, 1972, that the committee had in fact been involved.

After this, Mr. Stein said, it was decided that Mr. Parkinson had "to be put back on the tracks, to be useful as a tool" and to be given "another dip in the dye."

So, he said, Mr. Mitchell himself told Mr. Parkinson that the Magruder account was false.

Mr. Stein said Mr. Parkinson had had no reason to suspect Mr. Mitchell or the others—they were at that time "important people," "the kind of people you'd want to meet, you'd like to drop their names."

So Mr. Parkinson proceeded, trusting in them and acting simply as a lawyer, "giving his all" to his client.

Avoiding Emotion

Mr. Stein gave most of his summation in a quiet voice, voice, occasionally taking on a tone of wonder or indignation to stress a point, but generally avoiding the emotion that some other lawyers in the case have shown.

About noon, though, the time he had told Judge Sirica he

would finish, Mr. Stein's manner changed.

He told the jurors that he had until then "completely left out" one subject. It was, he said, a subject that "moved him very much," though he could understand that it might not move him. The subject was the testimony of Mr. Parkinson's character witnesses.

Cites Democrats' Lawyer

Mr. Stein began to recite the list of judges and lawyers who had taken the stand to testify that Mr. Parkinson had an outstanding reputation in the community for "truth and veracity"—the standard phrase used in questioning character witnesses.

Mr. Stein's voice cracked. His eyes appeared to fill with tears. He paused midway through the list and wiped his face with a white handkerchief.

Then he went on, reaching, finally, the name of Maurice R. Dunie, the lawyer who represented the Democratic National Committee in the lawsuit that the Democrats brought against the Nixon re-election committee immediately after the Watergate break-in—the lawsuit that

Mr. Parkinson defended for the Nixon committee.

"Now if you want to know someone—if you want to know if they're dealing with you honestly, lawfully get in a lawsuit with them," Mr. Stein said.

"That gives us an insight into Mr. Parkinson in his most unguarded moments," he went on, his voice quivering as he spoke. Then, louder, he said, "If Mr. Parkinson were converting this lawsuit into something illegal or unethical, who would know it more than Mr. Dunie?"

Mr. Stein turned to the significance of the judges who had testified for Mr. Parkinson.

"They know what a lawyer is," he said. "He gives his all to the client."

He paused, then shakily he added, "Perhaps that is why, in spite of what happened, they came forward in such numbers."

Over 20 Years

He told the jurors that the judge would tell them on Monday, in his instructions about the law relating to the case, about the importance of testimony by character witnesses. Sometimes, he said, "there is no other defense than what you've built up rock by rock over 20 years."

"What we're putting on is what he's accumulated over a lifetime," he added.

Mr. Stein told the jurors that "the scales are already tipped" in favor of his client.

He told them that "Mr. Parkinson is a courageous man," and that if they returned a guilty verdict, Mr. Parkinson "can take it."

"But there are some principles at stake," he continued. One, he said, is "should an attorney be penalized for what his profession, his training,

have taught him." The second, he said, is "What is a good character worth?"

Last Summation

Mr. Stein's summation was the last of those presented for the defendants.

Mr. Neal gave the Government's summation before the defense summation began. The statements that Mr. Ben-Veniste and Mr. Neal gave the jury later were "rebuttal arguments," designed to rebut the various defense statements. The Government is allowed to present a rebuttal argument be-

cause it carries the burden of proof in a criminal case.

Mr. Ben-Veniste spoke briefly. He argued that Mr. Haldeman had the "jam" of the \$429,500 that had been paid to the Watergate burglars "all over his face and his hands." He said, too, that Mr. Haldeman's lawyers had raised in their summation a lot of "dust," as in cowboy movies, he said, but little substance.

He gave some examples of what he called "dust." One of the Haldeman lawyers said, he recalled, that Mr. Haldeman had been so busy doing such things as preparing for Mr. Nixon's trip to China that he had no time for Watergate.

On F.B.I. Inquiry

The trip to China, Mr. Ben-Veniste said, was in February, 1972, several months before Watergate.

He also quoted a remark made by John J. Wilson, Mr. Haldeman's chief counsel, that the Government was making a "mountain out of a molehill" with its concentration on the several weeks' delay in the F.B.I. investigation of Watergate that resulted after Mr. Haldeman asked an official of the Central Intelligence Agency to intervene in the F.B.I. inquiry.

Sees Inconsistency

What would have happened if the C.I.A. and F.B.I. officials had succumbed totally to the White House pressure? he asked. "Would we have a trial? What would we have had in this country? Some molehill."

Mr. Neal, answering the points raised in the summations

Prosecutor Trips Up Over a 'Ledger Plate'

When James F. Neal, the chief Watergate prosecutor, used the term "ledged plates" in his final argument in the cover-up trial yesterday, he sent amateur etymologists to their dictionaries.

The jurors, Mr. Neal declared, must "now balance the accounts and close the ledger plates of Watergate."

Neither accounting nor legal dictionaries contained "ledged plates." Did Mr. Neal mean a wooden strip used in carpentry, or a part for an agricultural implement, definitions offered by general dictionaries?

He did not, he said when he was reached by telephone.

"I don't know how it slipped out between my teeth," he said. "All I meant to say was, we must now balance and close the ledger."

given on behalf of the other four defendants, was also relatively brief.

He appeared, however, to make substantial points against each of the four. Regarding Mr. Mitchell, for instance, he noted that no witness had backed up Mr. Mitchell's account that he had rejected the plan for the Watergate break-in at a meeting on March 30, 1972. He also referred the jury to testimony from a friend of Mr. Mitchell, Frederic C. Larue, that Mr. Mitchell had discussed in May, 1972, bugging the hotel room of Senator George McGovern of

South Dakota, then a Democratic Presidential hopeful.

If Mr. Mitchell had rejected the intelligence gathering plan on March 30, Mr. Neal asked, why was he then discussing bugging Mr. McGovern the following May?

As for Mr. Ehrlichman, Mr. Neal noted that one of the basic claims of the Ehrlichman defense was that the defendant wanted to "get the truth out" about Watergate.

But, he said, Mr. Ehrlichman saw the then Attorney General, Richard G. Kleindienst, a few days after the break-in, and told him nothing of what he already knew about the matter; he was interviewed by the F.B.I. a month or so later and told the agents that all he knew about Watergate was what he read in the newspapers; he also said in a tape-recorded conversation in the spring of 1973, that the White House should make a "limited hang-out" about Watergate.