

FEB 29 1972

'Dropouts' On Angela

Jury List

SF Examiner

By Stephen Cook

Examiner News Staff

SAN JOSE — The 12 fair and impartial Santa Clara County residents who will try Angela Davis are not going to be easy to find.

That was clear today as attorneys in the murder, kidnap and conspiracy trial finished preliminary questioning of the first 12 prospective jurors and found only five of them tentatively acceptable.

Four jurors were eliminated today. Three others had been eliminated yesterday. Among those questioned and tentatively passed today was a woman who said she had never heard of Angela Davis until four days ago.

Not Interested

She doesn't take a newspaper or watch television news, she said, because they "just don't interest me." She does read news magazines but guessed she had "just gone over" anything related to Miss Davis or the Marin County Civic Center shootout from which the charges stem.

Eliminated today were two prospective jurors under 21. One, a 20 year old San Jose City College student, said he could defer his education but he had received a kidney transplant a year ago and feared medical complications might occur during the long trial.

A 19 year old Stanford sophomore asked to be excused because she did not want to give up a year of her education. Two 18 year

olds were dropped yesterday for the same reason.

Only One Black

The Angela Davis Defense Committee says there are only six or seven persons under 21 among the first 150 veniremen called. So far, four of them have been called and four have been eliminated. There is only one black among the first 150, the committee said, and 10 with Spanish surnames.

A black woman was among the seven veniremen called

—Turn to Page 8, Col. 1

—From Page 1

to replace those who were dismissed.

Also dismissed today was a man who said he was getting married soon and did not want the trial to interfere with his private life. He also doubted he could give Miss Davis a fair trial.

The fourth venireman dropped was a woman who runs a home for emotionally handicapped children.

Under the rules set by Superior Judge Richard E. Arnason yesterday, the first dozen sat together in the jury box of the small brick and wood panelled courtroom while the judge asked them about their personal histories.

Questioning

Then the true testing began, as each venireman sat alone in the jury box and answered questions regarding personal hardship which might make jury service difficult and prejudices which might have set in because of the massive pre-trial publicity surrounding the controversial case.

One possible hardship of special nature appeared to have been eliminated, meantime. Prosecutors quoted the judge as saying he does not intend to sequester the jury, though he reserved the right to do so if it becomes necessary.

First came juror No. 1, a

young svelte blonde who supplements her computer technician husband's income by working full time as secretary for an insurance company.

She told attorneys she feared four to six months of jury duty would hurt her income and might cost her her job. She came back today, however, and said her company was willing to keep her on the payroll and was tentatively accepted.

Jury No. 2 was the first to go. The wife of a retired tractor repairman told defense lawyer Leo Branton that the Regents of the University of California were right—that Miss Davis, as a Communist, had no right to teach philosophy at UCLA.

Then she admitted her belief that Miss Davis is guilty, adding "I've read so much about it, I don't think I could grant her a fair trial."

Excused

Branton thanked her for her candor. Judge Arnason excused her, as prejudiced.

Juror No. 3, a housewife and avid bowler, survived the questioning, even though she remembered Miss Davis being fired "for being a Communist and the riots and things."

Actually, said the lady, she'd had little time to be prejudiced by news stories since she was an active participant in three bowling leagues and usually just glanced at the paper "to see who's wrestling or bowling."

The woman was dismissed by stipulation from both sides after they met with Judge Arnason in chambers. No reason for the dismissal was given.

Jurors 4 and 5 were the first 18 year olds encoun-

tered. The girl, a freshman at the University of Santa Clara, was excused for hardship when she complained that her finals were just two weeks away. The young man, a freshman at De Anza College, was excused when he complained of the possible loss of two quarters of school.

'Too Much'

Juror No. 6, a 21 year resident of Santa Clara County, remained on the panel after saying he rarely reads newspapers, gets his information from television news shows and holds only one opinion on the case: "There's been too much publicity."

The seventh and final panelist questioned yesterday was an IBM manager who expressed hostility to all Communists because they are "against the government of the United States."

Attorneys for Miss Davis, an avowed Communist, urged Judge Arnason to excuse him as prejudiced when he expressed doubt he could give a "fully fair trial" to a party member.

The man later seemed to reverse himself and said he would decide guilt or innocence only on the facts.

Arnason today denied the defense challenge for cause.

TV on Hand

The jury selection process takes advantage of the latest technological advances, with the bulk of the prospective jurors watching the proceedings over closed circuit television in an upstairs assemblyroom.

When court clerk Arthur Vaneck administered the juror's oath, only the first 12 veniremen were in the courtroom. The rest stood before a television set with hands raised and swore to do their duty.