

MAR 6 1972

Hardship Excuse For Angela Juror

By Stephen Cook

Examiner News Staff

SAN JOSE — One of 12 jurors who had been tentatively seated for the trial of Angela Davis was excused today on grounds of financial hardship.

The prospect, an assistant manager of corporation taxes for the Southern Pacific Transportation Company, told the court his employer would not guarantee to pay his salary during a trial of the length contemplated — six to eight months.

He said that worry about financial problems would take his mind off his duties as a juror.

Quibble

Questioning of other members of the prospective panel lapsed at one point this morning into a quibble over the question of whom the prosecution represents.

The issue arose when Deputy Attorney General Albert Harris, quizzing the second of 12 jurors tentatively seated, referred to himself as representing "the people of the State of California."

Leo Branton, one of Miss Davis' battery of defense attorneys, promptly asked the prospective juror, a young woman, whether she didn't realize it would be just as well to say Harris represented "the Attorney General of the state."

Response

Harris promptly responded that the indictment charging Miss Davis with kidnap, conspiracy and murder was issued in the name of "the people" of the state, and said he represents 20 mil-

lions of people. He said he represents 20 million of them.

lion of them.

The dispute was the highlight of a morning in which both attorneys questioned the juror, wife of a Stanford University graduate student, about her possible prejudices or actions under pressure.

Harris bore down hard on questions as to whether she had any quarrel with the law that Miss Davis could be found guilty even though not physically present at the scene of the crime.

Miss Davis is charged with providing the guns used in an attempted courtroom escape in Marin County in August, 1970, in which a Su-

Hypothetical Case

Harris cited a hypothetical case in which he told his trial assistant, Clifford Thompson, to rob a bank and give him a gun, money to get a car, and advice as to how to go about the robbery.

Would she object, he asked the juror, to finding him, Harris, equally guilty with Thompson?

She said she would not, and that she had no objection to the state's conspiracy laws.

Considerable emphasis was placed by the defense on how she would react if it turned out that she held one opinion and the 11 other jurors opposed her.

Could she hold out for acquittal under such circumstances even if it caused her later ostracism or hindered her husband's chances for his doctorate in geology?

"Yes," she answered.

Yes and No

Her answers consisted almost entirely of "yes" and "no" to such questions as to whether she would be prejudiced against Miss Davis because of her intellect, or because she was participat-

ing in the trial as her own attorney; whether she owned guns or objected to persons who do; whether she was prejudiced against Negroes or Communists, and whether photographs of "unpleasant scenes" would prejudice her against the defendant.