1873 NYTimes JUN 2 8 15. 16

COURT REVERSES BERRIGAN RULINGS

It Rejects 6 of 7 Convictions Against Priest and Nun

By WAYNE KING

Special to The New York Times PHILADELPHIA, June 27-Federal Court of Appeals here has reversed the conviction on has reversed the conviction on six of seven counts of smug-gling letters into and out of a Federal prison levied against the Rev. Philip F. Berrigan and Sister Elizabeth McAlister — who is now Mrs. Berrigan— in 1972. The three-judge court upheld one conviction against Father Berrigan, rejecting the others o the ground that the law under which the antiwar Catholic priest and nun were convicted stipulates that letters cannot be

stipulates that letters cannot be sent into or out of a Federal prison without the "knowledge and consent" of the warden or

and consent of the warden of supervisor. Ruling on the counts against Father Berrigan and Sister Elizabeth, the court said that the warden at Lewisburg Pris-on, where Father Berrigan was concurrent contervent on, where Father Berrigan was serving concurrent sentences for two raids on draft boards in the late sixties, was aware in all but one case that the let-ters were being sent and re-ceived, since the letters were carried by an inmat ewho was an informer an informer.

Courier Acted on Order

Courier Acted on Order The inmate, Boyd Douglas, was acting on orders from the warden to go ahead with his role as courier for the letters, which discussed various anti-war activities, including a sug-gested plan to kidnap the Pres-ident's adviser on national se-curity, Henry A. Kissinger, and subjtct him to a mock war-crimes trial.

crimes trial. In the count that was up-held, the court decided that the attempt was made to smug-gle a letter, and no officials knew about it, thus there was no "knowledge and consent of the warden," as required by law

Sister Elizabeth, who re-signed from her religious order when the two were mar-ried, was involved because she had written and received some of the letters. Father Berrigan was convicted on four counts of smuggling letters, ^Sister Elizabeth on three. The origi-nal trial was held before the

nal trial was held before the United ^States District Court for the Middle District of Penn-sylvania in Harrisburg. In Father Berrigan's case, the reversal on three of the four counts was only a moral vic-tory — and a technical one at that — while the rtversal of Sister Elizabeth's conviction on all four counts will mean she will not have to serve a one-year term levied against her, nor live under the threeher, nor live under the three-year suspended sentence that was to begin after the im-prisonment ended.

Father Berrigan was paroled from the Federal correctional institution atDanbury, Conn., last December after having served 39 months for antiwar activity

Had he not been paroled, he could have been behind bars until 1975. He would have bars until 1975. He would have had to serve concurrent sen-tences of six years for having poured blood on records at a Baltimore draft board in 1967 and threee and a half years for having burned records at a board in Catonsville, Md., in 1968, and four consolidated concurrent two-year terms for concurrent two-year terms for the letter smuggling, had those

convictions not been reversed.

Entrapment Denied

The letter-smuggling convic-tions, had they been upheld, would not have added new time to the previous convic-tions and Father Berrigan would have remained free in any case

would have remained free in any case. He and Sister McAlsiter are living in an antiwar commune they formed in Baltimore. They were married in 1972 in what was described as "formalizing their union before friends" at the prison in Danbury. Paul O'Dwyer, who along with Ramsey Clark, a former Attorney General for the Unite States, served as lawyer for the appellants, said in a tele-phone interview from New York that while he was hear-tened about the decision, which was what he had expected, it was a reversal on clearly tech-nical grounds. The court took pains to

was a reversal on clearly tech-nical grounds. The court took pains to point out that it did not con-sider the convictions the out-growth of entrapment—in this case a possible plot by Federal officials to draw the defend-ants into illegal activity through the use of an infor-mant who would encourage breaking the law—nor did it countenance arguments that proceedings against the appel-

countenance arguments that proceedings against the appel-lants had been discriminatory and designed to save face for the director of the Federal Bu-reau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, who died last year. Mr. Hoover, in a rare public outburst, had accused Father Berrigan, his brother, Dan, also a priest, and others of a dan-gerous revolutionary conspir-acy to bring down the Govern-ment by violent means. At the time no formal charges had been brought to back the al-legations.

been brought to back the ai-legations. The court, however, rejected that argument as well as others contending discrimina-tory treatment and other legal) abuses. "Appellants' scheme," the court said, "was bizarre in concept and purposefully dramatic [and] unique. There is no historical precedent for kidnapping of an American presidential advisor for dem-onstrating political or moral op-position to a given war."