

18 San Francisco Chronicle ★★ Thurs., Oct. 19, 1972

SFChronicle
Jury Probe

Witness Talks --To the Press

By Harry Jupiter

One of the three subpoenaed witnesses who refused to talk to the federal grand jury about the bombing of the Park District Police Station in 1970 told newsmen yesterday he had nothing to do with the explosion but he dislikes the idea of having to answer questions in the dark.

"I had nothing to do with Park Station and I know nobody who did," said Daniel R. Rosenberg, 31, in the corridor outside U.S. District Court, in the Federal Building. That, apparently, is more than he told the grand jury or federal interrogators.

CITED

Rosenberg, a conservationist who formerly was employed by the Sierra Club, has been cited for contempt for refusing to answer questions regarding activities of the militant Weatherman organization in a secret grand jury session two weeks ago.

Also cited, for the same reason, were Howard J. Berg, 23, a Minneapolis engineer, and Dr. Phillip Craven, 28, a physician serving with the U.S. Public Health Service. Dr. Craven, now stationed in San Juan, Puerto Rico, worked at hospitals in San Francisco between 1969 and 1971.

U.S. District Judge Robert F. Peckham, who has listened to two days of legal wrangling on the contempt of court citations, may have a ruling on them today when court reopens at 10 a.m.

ACCUSATION

Norton Tooby of Menlo Park, one of a large battery of attorneys representing the three cited witnesses, accused the government yesterday of distorting the function of the federal grand

jury and "turning it into an activist bloodhound on the trail of fugitives."

Rosenberg, talking to newsmen during an afternoon recess, said he was not a revolutionary in a bomb-throwing sense.

"I've played by the rules," he said, "enjoyed the game and I'm proud of my accomplishments. I think I've had something to do with a variety of changes that the Sierra Club helped accomplish, and all legally, following normal legislative channels.

"It so happens 'Weather' activities don't appeal to me. It's not my style.

"I just don't like the idea of having to testify when you don't know what or whom you're testifying about. I don't want my testimony to indict an innocent person."

Much of the day's arguments were centered on whether the government had tapped telephone lines illegally in gathering information for the grand jury.

Federal denials of illegality came from David Bancroft, assistant U.S. Attorney here, and Robert Dierker, an attorney for the Justice Department's Internal Security Division in Washington.

QUIZ

Bancroft withstood the combined barrage of the witnesses' attorneys — there were eight of them in court yesterday — who were dissatisfied with the denials. Then, after court adjourned for the evening, he answered a reporter's questions.

His patience, obviously, was starting to wear thin.

"Use a little common sense, will you," he said.

"Do you think we'd have any of these people up before the grand jury if we didn't have reason, supported by evidence?"

"We didn't just draw these people's names out of a hat."