2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2:00 P.M.

FRANCIS JOSEPH HUEN, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

MR. McKAY: The New York State Special Commission on Attica is now at the halfway point of the public hearings.

That is, we are now at the afternoon session of the seventh day of the hearings scheduled in Rochester, New York. Judge Willis, who questioned our witness this morning, will recapitulate briefly for those who are joining us now for the first time what has gone so far and then we go on questions by members of the Commission of Mr. Huen.

JUDGE WILLIS: Mr. Huen testified that he was one of the inmates in D-Yard during the days of the Attica incidents of September. He briefly testified as to his impressions of Attica generally, some of his own personal background and impressions of the institution, of his observations on the morning that the uprising took place, his observations in the yard, his observations concerning the inmates, the observers, his obvious feelings and impressions of what was being accomplished and what wasn't being accomplished.

Initially it was understood that 879 Mr. Huen would only testify as to these items and that his experiences and his impressions of the assault and the activities and what happened after the assault would come at another time in the hearings when we reached that phase of our investigation.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, if the Commission has any questions, I turn him over to you.

MR. McKAY: Thank you. Mr.--Bishop Broderick has questions.

BY BISHOP BRODERICK:

Q Mr. Huen, amnesty seems to be one of the major issues if not the major issue in the negotiating, negotiations if we can call it that. What was your understanding of amnesty as you stood there in the yard?

A Well, the most far-reaching impression I had was that no amnesty that was granted, this is my personal opinion, that no amnesty that was granted under the conditions of the riot would have been honored by the staff, by the administration or by the legal enforcement people or what have you.

Q Do you think everyone in the yard, the inmates, had clear understanding that amnesty was not a complete abrogation of their sentence, it was merely no punishment for work done, for any alleged crimes? A I don't think there was any confusion ⁸⁸⁰ about that.

Q No one thought he was going to be able to go free and leave the institution tonight?

A No.

Q That was pretty clearly understood by the inmates?

A Very clearly. In fact you have the difference there between that and the importance that some inmates felt that the transfer to a non-imperialistic country, there was the difference between the two. Obviously you wouldn't have needed the one if you could--

Q Of course, if you were transferred to a nonimperialistic country you would be getting complete amnesty, wouldn't you?

A Yes.

Q That would be outside the walls?

A Yes.

Q The second question is, I am interested in your reaction to the question, were you free to leave the yard? You did say something about it would be difficult to leave there. I understand that psychologically because you would give the appearance of trying to destroy any attempt at unity in the yard--

A That was one of the factors.

881 The impression of disunity or that the 0 inmates had no united front. And it also, I suppose, would in some way give, kind of show that you lacked courage. Here is the question I have. But suppose some inmate felt he did not want any part in that. Maybe it was just out of the basic pure fear, would he be able to get out of there unmolested?

There were some inmates who did leave the А yard, very few.

We heard of a few who left because they were 0 sick. Or they said they were sick.

Α I know one individual that I saw in the yard the first day who wasn't there the next day. There was quite a bit of conversation about that. Where did he go? He definitely wasn't there.

0 Are you asking me?

No, I am saying, this was a question in the Α minds of inmates in the yard. Where did this guy go. There was quite a bit of discussion about it. There was no doubt in my mind that he did leave the yard.

That would be like Judge Crater, I suppose. Q

I am not asking that question of you. А

I would still like to have an answer to the Q question, could you freely get out of the yard unmolested?

You are speaking about unmolested--А

Q

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

~23

24

25

By you or the other inmates.

A Divorced from--there was also the question could I have physically left and been accepted by the--

Q I am not talking about the psychological--A I am talking about the reaction of the troopers--

Q Could you walk out of there and say in effect, "I want to go into my cell, I don't want any part of this?: What would be the walk-through process of leaving the yard back to where you came from?

A It would have been difficult.

Q Why would it be difficult?

A Because there were--there was some inmates who would have felt that you were a traitor, you might say.

Q This I would put in the general heading of psychological deterrent but suppose you just wanted to get out of there. Could you get out of there? Would there be anyone who would prevent you from getting out? Would there be any process you would have to go through to get out of that yard?

A I am having difficulty with this question because I know that there were individuals in that yard who would have violently disagreed with anyone's right to leave that yard. I know that whether there was one

1 883 individual or whether there was 50 individuals, 2 I'm not really in a position to say . 3 MR. McKAY: How about those who were 4 the keepers of the gates? 5 THE WITNESS: I think that was more of a 6 traffic problem. I don't know, really, what would 7 have happened if an individual had tried to leave--8 just said, "I am leaving here," and went through 9 that way. I think--10 Let's put it this way: Let's put it very Q 11 frankly. Were there any security guards at the gate, 12 inmates? 13 А Well, there was what was called a security 14 guard. 15 Did they act as security guards? Q 16 Well, initially there was a security guard А 17 around the negotiating table because it was felt that --18 I mean at the gates, at the exits. Q 19 They were the same individuals. It's diffi-Α 20 cult for me to say whether they were acting as--acting to prevent people from leaving or whether they were just serving as traffic policemen. Do you know whether they would ask for a pass to Q get out? Yes, sometimes they did. А

21

22

23

24

Q

Do you know what kind of pass that was?

884

A I never saw one. I don't know. I really can't say. What do you mean by what kind of pass? I'm not sure if I understand that question.

Q Well, it's our understanding that the past the inmates required from another inmate, it was the same pass that the guards, the correctional officers required.

A Oh, in many respects there was a similarity there. It did seem in many respects the inmates were only copying the procedure of the guards.

Q This kind of brings out what we heard very eloquently yesterday from Dr. Wa-ren Hanson who said the inmates were playing a role.

A In many respects they were.

Q What to him was very ironic, the very society they were trying to overthrow, they were using the same structure. That is why I asked.

I have no further reason for asking the question, other than to say that it would appear to me from the testimony I now have, it was very difficult for a person who did not--for an inmate who did not want to be in that yard to get out of there. Not only the psychological deterrents but also of physical prohibitions that he placed there.

885 Well, it was difficult to test that А and I know that there were inmates inside of the yard who did feel that way. It was difficult to test that because of the other half of the problem which is to be accepted by the troopers who were, I know, behind--or I have heard, I shouldn't say I know from direct knowledge, but I have heard over and over again and I have heard from guards since the riot, that there were a bunch of troopers behind B-Block, not visible to us in the yard but there were men inside of B-Block that were being taunted by them and the troopers threw rocks to the inmates trying to excite them enough to respond in some way to come out from behind, so you would have a physical problem of getting past them or into them without being perhaps shot, certain beat up, so there was that problem also.

Q You say that the State Police would in effect prevent anyone from coming in who changed his mind about being there?

A Just as Mr. Carpenter testified yesterday, when he had hostages in his hand and brought them down to A-Block, the administration, there was no question, the initial reaction of the staff down there was to drive them back with guns, that he was a threat, and there was always the possibility that you would be considered

25

a threat to the troopers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, without that, possibly, some of the men who felt, and I don't know how many these were, but some of the men that felt that they were--would be in danger from the inmates, without the difficulty of passing through the lines, we will say, might easily have slipped, over the wall and over that catwalks and done this. With the necessity of going through the pass as you have been speaking of, they might have felt while they were going through and while they were asked while they were going through, even though the security guards themselves might not have objected, there would have been a certain amount of discussion and maybe some hothead might have given them a physically hard time.

But we don't know because there was that problem of the troopers.

BISHOP BRODERICK: Thank you.

MR. McKAY: Mr. Wilbanks.

BY MR. WILBANKS:

Q You were asked the question about whether there was tyranny or democracy in the yard. You answered that there was confusion. I am a little confused by that answer. It doesn't seem that really answers the question. Was in fact when it came down to discipline to who was to leave the yard, to who was to dig the trench,

was there one group in charge or did everyone have an equal voice? Can you be a little more specific on that?

Well, I think I mentioned before briefly one Α of the problems in the yard is that you couldn't find a direct leadership. There was an ebb and flow of direction from various people, but you couldn't find a group of people that you could say, well, these are leaders, let's discuss what we think. Let me give you this particular man who is the leader and can initiate certain things, let me talk to him and give him the benefit of my opinion. There wasn't anything like that.

Did the inmates in the yard in general know 0 that discipline was being taken against certain inmates, that certain inmates were taken away from the vard--

Rumors were rife throughout the whole thing.

If Fumors were rife, that would mean you Q didn't have a voice in discipline?

It means there were 1200 inmates in that yard А who couldn't talk together. As I said before, most of them, even though we had been locked up together, were strangers to each other because of the way Attica is normally operated. So it's--

But specifically, in a total democracy you Q

25

Α

1

2

1

would know and have a voice in discipline and ⁸⁸⁸ in votes on this type of thing. You didn't know about it--

There were too many things going on that I Α couldn't possibly know about. There were too many things going on simultaneously. I think you have to understand that in a situation like that, it wasn't a preorganized structure that everybody had a part to play. "Well, I am going to collect votes," or "I am going to speak on certain things." A lot had to be done on faith. You had to just assume that people were doing what you thought was the right thing. Sort of acquesce to things. Even one of the maddening things about it was, here is a representative that is more or less going to take control of this area, we'll say, a certain point, this business about Algeria, and going to Alheria, right or wrong, let him carry the ball on that. And it would seem the next day that he wouldn't be around talking about it. He wouldn't be interested in it any more. There was a void there.

Q Let's take the case of digging the trench. Was that a decision that was made as a detail punishment, was that a decision everybody made including you or was that a decision that two people made or three? A I don't know. It had happened, whatever

decision making was involved in that, had already 889 happened and I was too far away from it really, to judge, so I really can't say. It wasn't something that the whole 1200 people in the yard decided, well, yes, this is what we think should happen. I really, to this day, don't know exactly what did happen.

Q Another brief question. We have heard conflicting percentions and I should characterize them as that, as to whether or not in the political structure of the yard, the mood of the yard that either one perception was that violent forces were gaining control by Sunday over the more conservative forces, and the other perception was just the opposite, that the more conservative forces who were against doing anything to the hostages were gaining control. What is your perception?

A Well, this is, again, I have the benefit of hindsight.

Q

Q

Yes, I know. At that time.

A At that time some of the individuals who were more prone to take a violent attitude spoke a little bit more loudly, we will say.

By Sunday?

A Yes. Now, I don't know that they had any more--in fact I have no indication really that there were any more people who had become violent but simply that

1 890 some individuals who were violent by nature 2 or more violent, we will say, than the rest, becoming 3 weary and emotionally tight and drawn, became more vocal, 4 we will say, but I don't think there was any increase in 5 the number of individuals who were in favor of violence 6 on Friday or on Sunday rhather than Friday. 7 MR. WILBANKS: That is all. 8 MR. McKAY: Mrs. Guerrero. 9 BY MR. GUERRERO: 10 Mr. Huen, you were not forced to go to D-Yard Q 11 as you told us before? You went by yourself to see 12 what was going on, is that so? 13 Α Well, I was forced in this respect, that I was 14 locked in within the walls of Attica. Within C-Block. 15 I couldn't leave C-Block. If had had an oppor-16 tunity at that time to pass out unmolested by the 17 troopers, I certainly would have done that. 18 By the troopers but not by the inmates, you Q 19 were not for æd to be there by the inmates, were you? 20 I wasn't physically forced, no. Α 21 So in other words, I understood, anyway, that Q 22 you were shocked about everything that happened. 23 Α Right. 24 Q And you were there to find for yourself what 25 was going on. So that I wonder if you--at least you

891 made me feel that you knew this was not a pre-2 meditated act, that this was not premeditated, this was 3 not all worked out to have this uprising by the inmates. 4 No, but there are a number of things that you А 5 said in that one sentence, I believe, that cover a few 6 areas. 7 I said first that you--I thought that you would Q 8 rather not be there, of course. 9 I didn't want to be there. Α 10 Then you were forced to be there by the guards Q 11 because you couldn't go to your own home, right? 12 Right. А 13 Now, you were in shock, when you were there and Q 14 saw what was going on and there was so much confusion 15 and goings on there that I am asking you, did you feel, do 16 you feel that this thing was premeditated, that it was 17 all arranged weeks before that this day or some day soon 18 they were going to go and do this? 19 It was my--I saw indications of some prior Α 20 arrangement but let me say this: The closest analogy I 21 could find to that is, I think a lot of us have sat down 22 on Sunday afternoon and watched the football game and 23 perhaps second-guessed you Johnny Unidas. None of us 24 ever think we are going to be out there throwing that 25 ball around. I think it was something like that. I guess

T

every inmate within the prison, I had this thought, 892 every inmate within the prison thinks about escape and I said to myself, if I knew it was going to be that easy to push them over, that is what I--I should have tried to take advantage of. I thought about that and I thought about escape before and since.

I never really thought in my own mind that I would ever escape and I think there were an awful lot of people for years and years have said, boy, we ought to start a riot and played a little mental game with themselves, boy, if we ever started a riot, we will go into D-Block, we will take so many hostages. It was just a game playing in their head. I don't think anybody could really say, well, on such and such a day we're going to do this.

Q So it wasn't premeditated that way, except every prisoner, as soon as you walk in the prison, you start to think how you can get out?

A It was more or less like that. But I am saying it was an abstract problem in your mind. It wasn't, this is what I am going to do.

Q I want to ask if you were talking about the pressures and the weariness of everybody. Do you believe now, of course it is hindsight, that the combined pressure of time, emotions and weariness would have saved the situation for everyone, inmates, hostages 893 and administration if more time had been granted?

A Well, of course, now we know that it couldn't have been much worse. We know that. There were 43 people dead and I don't know how many others are seriously hurt and there has been a lot of discomfort. We know that. So it's easy to say now--

Q But at that time you--

A At that time--at that time--it's too much hindsight involved really for me to give you an intellectually honest answer. I didn't think at that time, this would be a good idea for them to come in and start shooting everybody up. Certainly I didn't think that.

Q I know, but at that time you probably thought everybody was so tired it would be nice if they just let you go back to your own--

A We knew that wouldn't happen. I did think that it was inevitable that we would get beat up or individuals would be singled out indiscriminately and Judge Willis asked me not to go into what happened afterwards but my own experiences bore that out.

You knew that was going to happen. You also knew it was inevitable so there was a sort of feeling to get things over with, whatever is going to happen, let it happen. But if you think about should we not do

T 894 this or should we not invite the repression, 2 you might say and hope that something could be worked 3 out by the people that are outside trying to work things 4 out, everybody would have been in favor of that. Every-5 body was in favor of that, of course. 6 MR. LIMAN: So there is no misimpression 7 for the television audience which has just come on, 8 we asked you not to go into the aftermath at this 9 session but that we are going to be covering the 10 assault and what happened afterward, including to 11 yourself next week and you will be back. 12 THE WITNESS: Yes, I believe that will be 13 Monday . 14 MR. McKAY: That way we hope to assure 15 continuity to the viewing audience. 16 Mr. Huen, let me pursue the question that 17 Mr. Wilbanks asked about division of labor in the 18 yard. Were you ever given an assignment of work 19 to do while you were in the yard? 20 THE WITNESS: I never participated. 21 BY MR. McKAY: 22 Q You said you did construct a tent? 23 А Yes. 24 But that was on your own initiative? Q 25 Α Right.

Q Did you ever volunteer to do work that might be necessary to be allocated for the advantage of all?

895

A The next day that I was in there, some time in the afternoon, food was being brought from, I believe the commissary. I still had it in my head it would be a good idea to avoid any of this if I possibly can.

Someone asked me, made a general statement, they need more guys to bring food down from the commissary. Me and another fellow said, what do you think, maybe we can find a hole down there to get out of this thing. And, of course, things are disorganized, it took a while for things to get together. Somebody said, well, the fellow I was talking to, the fellow I knew well, he said "You're not going to get out anyway. You're not going to be able to get food down there." I am talking about down at B-Block area.

So when it was decided that there were enough individuals in that particular--to do that particular job, we didn't press it too much. More or less we gave up on it.

Q Would it be fair to say then that a person who did not want to participate in the work assignments or in the general activities in the yard, could pretty well stay out of the action just by hanging back?

A The work I suppose so I know I 896
A me work, i suppose so. I know i
didn't feel I wanted to take any part of that and I
didn't. Some others might have felt that way. I don't
know.
MR. McKAY: Thank you.
Mr. Henix?
BY MR. HENIX:
Q I only have one question to ask you, Mr. Huen.
I know in most institutions someone reaches
the expiration of that parole date or they are right up
on their parole date or, you know, they're ready to be
released because they have done their time.
A Yes.
Q What happened to these guys? I would imagine
out of 1200 guys at one place there must have been some
who was readywho was actually legally ready to leave
according to the law.
A Who were caught up in this in D-Block yard?
Q What happened to these people?
A I don't thinkI know there was one individual
I seen the first day that was up the following day.
His sentence was up the following day. He didn't seem too
optimistic about being released, about getting out
under these conditions. I don't know what happened to him.
I know that there were a number of individuals in that

category that you speak of. I don't know that 897 any of them went out until, at least until the 13th.

Q Could you describe in any way their attitude? I would flip out, man, to find myself caught up in these kind of events and here I am in the penitentiary with the possibility of being killed the next day and I should have been going home yesterday.

A This one individual I spoke of, like I said, there was a note of unreality in this whole thing and it was just, well, here is something else. It didn't seem to affect them that much. I think that I would have been a lot more upset than he was. But as I am sure you are well aware, there is an awful lot of guys that are convinced, I am sure you had this experience, you talk to guys that have dates, they're going out and yet they're convinced something will happen, I ain't going out.

That was more or less this man's attitude. He knew something would happen.

(Continued on page 898.)

1

It's always like that?

A Yes.

VOT

Q

Q

I was curious about that--

A I didn't press it too much because I didn't want to get the guy upset about it. I wanted to ask him, "Man, what's the matter with you? You should be bugged out."

898

I didn't want to upset him. I didn't press it.

Q Do you think if one of these individuals said if there was any type of security that surrounded the yard and made it difficult for a man to leave, do you think that the inmates would be inclined to let this guy run his risk, if he said, "Man, I'm going out of here, I'm going home today and I'm supposed to get out of here today and if they shoot me on my way to the gate, they shoot me on my way to the gate"?

Do you think the attitude of whatever security forces were there or the men that could restrain them would have done it or would they have been sympathetic?

Α

I should have asked--

Q It's a hell of a question to ask, but it seems to me to be a very real one. You know, having--

A I know it was real for at least four or five individuals and I can't remember the question coming up.

2	I can't remember anybody that did go out. I 899
3	can't even remember the question coming up.
4	Q Except this one guy that disappeared.
5	You don't know how he got out?
6	A He wasn't in this category. And there were
7	others. There was this individual that I know that
8	left the yard.
9	I've heard there were other fellows. This
10	guy was here and he got out somewhere. But this is
11	one I know of. There were others, I'm sure.
12	Q Did you ever find in hindsight, did you ever
13	find out how any of these guys did it?
14	A No, I didn't.
15	MR. HENIX: Thank you.
16	MR. McKAY: Mr. Rothschild.
17	MR. ROTHSCHILD: No questions.
18	MR. McKAY: I have just one other question,
19	then.
20	BY MR. McKAY:
21	Q This is just to check my understanding of
22	the testimony of you and of Mr. Wicker.
23	You heard Mr. Wicker, I think.
24	A I heard part of his testimony.
25	Q You heard the part in which he said it was
	his perception and that he believed other observers on

Sunday night that the general understanding 900 in the yard was that the troops would come in the next day and with force.

Your perception, if I understand it, was different, that you somehow thought or you believed that others thought that that really would not happen.

Did I correctly understand you?

A Right. That's pretty accurate. I don't think I could elaborate on that too much.

Q If you and others in the yard had really known what some of the outsiders thought they knew that armed force was imminent, would that have changed the vote of the inmates on Sunday night?

A I am having difficulty in my own mind imagining circumstances under which the worst--this is what it is: Basically that the administration says, "We're coming in. I'm trying to imagine circumstances that would allow the inmates to believe anything they say.

This is what it is. Even something like that, we're going to shoot you. They say so many things time and time again that turn out not to be true and even something like that isn't believed.

If it had been--if everyone in the yard had really felt, yes, they are going to come in and they're going to shoot like mad, the way they did, I think possibly the vote would have been different. 901

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q But you think there was no practical way to persuade those in the yard that that was the case or that that might likely be the case?

A I said before I think it--possibly if Governor Rockefeller had come, possibly, and it's only a guess on my part, that I think he would have been listened to a little bit more--not that his credibility is any better, but except he is the las one on the chain of command. Possibly that might have had some good.

MR. McKAY: I think you understand, Mr. Huen, if you wish to make a statement of your own, not necessarily in response to any questions been asked of you, you may do so now and, of course, you will have an opportunity to do so next week, if you wish.

THE WITNESS: I spoke to Mr. David Parker about coming here in the first place and I just didn't feel that it was a worthwhile project, that your best efforts wouldn't achieve very much and I believe with a little diligence and a little more time to do so I could find reports from bodies just like this that are a hundred years old that would probably come to the same conclusion that you gentlemen and ladies are going to reach and I was hoping that someone could work 902
with people that--perhaps this group or perhaps in your recommendations that you would try to get together with people outside of the bureauracy that really are interested and there are many, of helping people that are in jail and helping people that solve these problems and--well, for instance, there are a number of bills I think that illustrate what the situation in Attica is like right now and one of them is a bill fo insure that every man is given a shower once a week.

There is a similar bill which would insure that every man is given a clean change of clothes every week.

Most inmates are given a clean change of clothes and they are given toiletries and they do get their showers, but it can happen that even this you don't get and there are many legislators that have been dealing with these problems, the practical aspects of these problems that realize that this is where you have to start.

That you have to have detailed specific legislation that the Department of Correction has to comply with. It can't evade.

And I do-I would like to say at this

1 903 time, I know I am going to be back, per-2 haps go into these things a little bit further 3 at that time, but I just hope that you people will 4 make and support people like that and open up the 5 doors, get some fresh minds into these places. 6 MR. McKAY: Thank you, Mr. Huen. 7 I am not sure I am entitled to respond 8 to your independent statement, but let me say 9 a few words that I hope will be assurances to you 10 on the points you make that I think are very 11 thoughtful. 12 In the first place, we are very sensitive 13 to the problem of yet another report filed unread 14 on the shelves and that's one of the reasons we 15 wanted to have these public hearings and we believe 16 and are now convinced that to have people like you 17 and others who have been here is a very helpful 18 in making more vivid the problems and the diffi-19 culties of the prison system. You have been help-20 ful in that respect. 21 And, on the question of continued sur-22 veillance, if you have had an opportunity to watch 23 these hearings or watch them in the future, I 24 think you will see that several members of the 25

Commission or very likely all of us are very much

concerned with the same thing and we 904 will be very much aware of the points you suggested to us. We thank you for your statement and for being with us. (The witness was excused.) MR. LIMAN: We have had testimony over the last few weeks, rather, over the last few days about amnesty from the point of view of inmates and from the point of view of various observers. To complete the equation, this afternoon we are going to hear from Mr. Louis James, the District Attorney of Wyoming County to put forward his point of view on the issue of amnesty which was presented to him by Mrs. Wicker, Tepper and Jones of the observers committee. We will also be hearing from, as our last witness, Mr. Jose G.I. Paris, who was a member of the observers committee, who is a member of the Young Lords group and who has a different perspective on the role of the observers group

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and on the negotiations.

Mr. James.

Mr. James will be questioned by Deputy General Counsel Luxemburg, Marc Luxemburg.

T	LOUIS R. JAMES, called as 905
2	a witness, being first duly sworn by Mr.
3	McKay, was examined and testified as follows:
4	THE WITNESS: I hope you have no objec-
5	tions to my bringing a cup of coffee to the table.
6	MR. McKAY: I have no objections and I
7	hope the studio will not enforce its ordinary
8	rules against that.
9	THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
10	I had no lunch on the plane so I really
11	rather need it.
12	EXAMINATION BY MR. LUXEMBURG:
13	Q Mr. James, will you state your full name,
14	for the record, please.
15	A Louis R. James.
16	Q How old are you?
17	A I am 64.
18	
19	
20	County?
21	A Approximately 40 years.
22	Q Mr. James, where did you go to college and
23	law school and when did you graduate from law school?
24	A I went to college and took my undergraduate
25	work at Cornell University. Graduated 1930 and was
	out working a year before I went to law school and I

9 1 graduated 1934 from the University of 906 2 Pittsburgh Law School. 3 And you were admitted to the Bar in New York Q 4 at that time? 5 Α I was. 6 Have you been a practicing lawyer since then? Q 7 I have been. Α 8 Have you held any public offices? Q 9 A number of small offices. I was a magistrate Α 10 for a number of years and was executive secretary in 11 my earlier years of the County Civil Service Commission 12 from the time of its inception and I was later chief 13 of the Bureau of Surplus Real Property, the Office of 14 General Services in Albany and resigned and went back 15 to private practice and was elected District Attorney, 16 the term I am now filling. 17 When did you become District Attorney? Q 18 I became District Attorney on January 1, 1971. Α 19 Q You were previously a justice of the peace 20 and a village justice in the Town of Warsaw? 21 Yes, for several years and quite a while Α 22 prior thereto. 23 Have you also represented criminal defendants Q 24 prior to becoming--25 For a number of years, throughout my practice Α

10

of law, I practiced about 35 years, I 907 would not say that I specialize in criminal work.

In fact, there is no room for specializing in most any field in a small county like ours, but over the years I have handled a number of criminal cases, usually as an assigned counsel, assigned by the court.

That was prior to the time of public defenders. Q I think you told me when I interviewed you that some of your clients unfortunately ended up in Attica.

A That is true.

Q But I take it that none of them were there at the time of the disturbance last September?

A No.

Q Mr. James, can you briefly tell us what the duties of a District Attorney are?

A The District Attorney is the first--the top law enforcement officer in the county. Primarily his work is to--no, let us not say oversee the investigative work of the police, at least I certainly don't do that.

I am not a police officer, but when a case is presented to the District Attorney, he is the next in the chain of command, let's say, in the administrative chain, processing criminal cases. The District Attorney looks over 908 the evidence in the case to determine whether the case is one that is properly prosecutable.

In our State, as you know, my job is to determine whether it is to be presented to the grand jury for a possible indictment because felony cases can only be instituted by indictment.

Q In fact, Mr. James, it's the duty of the District Attorney, isn't it, to prosecute all crimes and offenses that are cognizable in the county?

A Yes. I thought you wanted an answer in more depth. If you wanted a concise answer, that's precisely the answer.

Q You do have some discretion in carrying out this duty as to who to prosecute and the nature of the offenses to be prosecuted?

A Yes, I do have. The law does not compel me to present for prosecution every charge that is laid in my office.

Q And if I may suggest, I take it that the, to put it succinctly, the determining factor would be whether you felt it was in the public interest or in the interest of justice in any given case?

A Precisely. That's the test.

Q Mr. James, can we go to the year 1971, in

Warsaw County.

х

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Were there rumors or general knowledge concerning the state of affairs at the institution, at the Attica institution during the year 1971?

A Yes, definitely.

To begin with, Wyoming County is a rural county, a rather tightly knit one shall I say in the sense that we're all friends and neighbors, we all know pretty much the general business of other people.

We are very keenly sensitive to general affairs in Attica prison and there were many, many rumors that come about largely from expressions of the guards of the conditions there of extreme unrest such as never had been known before in the history of the old-time guards.

The story was that anything could happen. Prisoners were more sullen and--than usual; there was a sense of tenseness that the guards were very clearly aware of and in short, there was a feeling, widespread feeling of fear what might happen. Heaven knows what.

Q Were you presonally involved as District Attorney in anything that happened at Attica prior to September?

A Yes, I was. I think it was in February of the

21 22 23

	1	13
	2	same year. 910
	3	A case was presented to me
	4	Q Who presented the case to you?
\bigcirc	5	A It was presented to me by the union of the
	6	prison guards at Attica.
	7	One of the guards had been attacked by a
	8	prisoner and the guards asked me if I would consider
	9	criminal prosecution for assault against the offending
	10	inmate.
	11	Q Did you speak to Superintendent Mancusi about
	12	this?
	13	A I had conversations with him about it and
	14	Mr. Mancusi, as was his custom, extended a great deal
	15	of latitude towards me. He didn't tell me what he
	16	thought I should do.
	17	He said, "Use your own discretion, Mr. James."
	18	Q What was his attitude towards it?
	19	A He said, "Here is a case that I am not per-
	20	sonally inclined to prosecute. I don't think it's
	21	serious enough. However"
	22	Q This is Mr. Mancusi's
	23	A This is Mr. Mancusi's point of view.
	24	He said, "However, the other side of the coin
	25	is and it is felt very strongly by the guards' union,
		that perhaps an example should be made and we should

something should be done for the protection 911 of guards against similar incidents in the future."

Now, this was a simple assault, let me say, a misdemeanor assault, no grievous injury and it would have been normally a justice court matter.

Q You did present it to the grand jury? A I did, after long consideration. I was reluctant to do so, but I did so largely because I was inclined to thing that it should be brought out in the open and that it would not be right, proper and wise for prisoners to believe that they could get away with impunity for any criminal act they might want to perform so, more or less to make an example, I decided not to present the case in justice court but if I am going to try it, bring it on before the grand jury.

It was an indictable misdemeanor and I brought it on before the grand jury and got an indictment and tried the man in County Court.

Q What was the result of that trial?

A The result of the trial was an acquittal.

Q This inmate that was involved was a black inmate, was he not?

A That is true. I don't think that had a thing to do with the outcome of the case.

14

1

25

15 1 912 Q He was accused of assaulting a 2 correctional officer? 3 Α He was accused of assaulting a correctional 4 officer. 5 But he was acquitted? 0 6 He was acquitted. Α 7 There were a number of prisoner alleged 8 witnesses, so actual witness, I know, who testified 9 in his behalf. 10 Q Did you have occasion to find out what went 11 into the ---12 Decision--Α 13 Decision to find him not guilty. Q 14 А I certainly did, sir. I am very much interested 15 as I am in all cases to know the reasons behind it all 16 if there should be an acquittal. 17 This case I was doubly interested and I did 18 ask -- I did question, oh, two of the jurors whom I knew 19 personally afterwards and asked him why they decided 20 as they did and he said, "Well, Mr. James, or Lou, 21 there was conflicting testimony, as you know. We 22 felt that we did have -- we could find a reasonable doubt 23 if we wanted to, but we did so largely because we 24 thought this was a matter that should have been handled 25 through prison disciplinary means and that bringing the

ΤC 1 case on for trial was sort of like kicking 913 2 a man when he is down. 3 "This prisoner is already serving time for 4 another offense and he gets out of line and we're 5 going to stick it to him with more sentence, that 6 that didn't seem quite right. 7 "So our humane decision was, let the prison 8 handle these things in their own way." 9 That is the story and I think it accurately 10 reflected the attitude of the jury. 11 Q Let's now turn to the events of September 12 9th. 13 When did you first learn that there was an 14 uprising at the institution? 15 Α I would say within a matter of minutes. 16 How did you ---Q 17 А The grape vine. I forgot all the incidents. 18 There were so many sirens that went on. A siren makes 19 me think of moving in upon the prison. 20 I don't recall whether the sirens were 21 sounded when the insurrection first took place and 22 the hostages were seized, but at any rate, the news 23 spread like wild fire and it was common knowledge in 24 the street and people were talking about it in groups, 25 on the street corners and everywhere.

T 914 Was anybody surprised? Q 2 А No. For the reasons I mentioned before, 3 they were looking for trouble. 4 The only surprise about the thing was the 5 magnitude and the speed of what happened. 6 Q Were you called by Mr. Mancusi on Thursday 7 morning? 8 Α Let's see, that would have been--9 September 9th. The day it started. Q 10 Yes. Α 11 No-let's say I don't recall. I can't be 12 certain whether he notified me that there had been a 13 riot. 14 That could have been. My memory is blotted 15 out by other things that are more important. 16 I wouldn't be surprised if I was notified 17 that there was -- I am pretty certain that was the case. 18 I believe Superintendent Mancusi did notify me that 19 there had been a riot and hostages had been seized. 20 I asked if there was anything I could do. 21 He said, "No, your services won't be needed 22 now, Mr. James." 23 I said, "If you need me, call me." 24 He said, "We will." 25 I believe that was it.

то

Q Do you recall any other calls, 915 either on Thursday or on Friday, from members of the observers committee, or from Commissioner Oswald?

A No. I was previously asked if I recall a telephone conversation with Commissioner Oswald. I did not recall that at first for the reasons I mentioned before. It wasn't anything that would stand in my mind, but the more I think about it, the more nearly positive I am that Commissioner Oswald did call me. I believe this was Thursday or Friday it could have been.

Before, in any event, I met with the members of the Citizens Observers Committee, which would have been a Saturday morning.

Q Right.

A I believe Commissioner Oswald did call to ascertain my views on an amnesty, general amnesty against criminal prosecution.

I told him I was--it was not in my power to grant one and I would not be inclined to grant one anyhow.

And, as I recall it--now, mind you, this was all--this had to have been after negotiations were in progress and the negotiations had reached the point of this amnesty question That is what made it necessary

7.2

for Commissioner Oswald to touch base with me 916 on my views and he expressed to me that this was fundamentally his view, too.

Q Did you follow the progress of the negotiations Thursday and Friday?

A No. No. I just knew that they were going on and there were rumors and I believe there was a call that came out in the newspapers more or less a running account of it that certain things had been conceded, but then I really got into the thing, all four feet, with my meeting with the members, the Citizens Observers Committee.

Would you tell us how that came about.

A Yes. Julius--

Q

Q Julian Tepper?

A Yes. Julian Tepper called me Saturday morning. I had not got out of bed yet. Called me at my house and said that it was quite urgent that he and a small group of members of his--of the Citizens Observers Committee should meet with me to ascertain my views on an amnesty against criminal prosecution.

He said that negotiations had gone on with the prisoners and had reached the point that the negotiations were hung up on this, primarily on this one question and it became necessary for them to get my

20 1 views as the District Attorney of the 917 2 county on such an amnesty for that reason. For that 3 reason would I meet with them. 4 I said I would be happy to. Invited me to 5 breakfast and I said there was no suitable restaurant. 6 You come and have breakfast with me at my house and we 7 can discuss the thing over the breakfast table. 8 Then I take it--Q 9 They came and we did. We discussed the Α 10 thing all morning. 11 About what time did they arrive, do you think? Q 12 They must have arrived not long after the А 13 telephone call. I said to come over right away. I 14 think it would have been about 7:30. Between 7:30 15 and 8:00. 16 We had breakfast and they wanted my views and 17 we discussed it in some depth. 18 What did you tell them that your views were? Q 19 I said that the basic duty of a District Α 20 Attorney is to prosecute all substantial law in the 21 county. That's my fundamental duty. 22 I can't--I grant that I have some latitude 23 in my own discretion of deciding what cases to present 24 on the grounds of general interests and the interests 25 of justice, primarily what's in the interests of

justice, but I can't grant a blanket indemnity, an amnesty from prosecution.

I don't have the power to and if I had the power to I wouldn't grant it anyhow, because I think that that would be a dereliction of my duty.

918

Q And this is what you told them?

A This is what I told them and this led to a further discussion.

They said, "Well, now, that's find and good, but how do you feel about prosecutions in general?"

I said, "Well, I can't say you go ahead and do your darndest and do your damnedest, commit all the crimes you want and you won't be prosecuted, but I can say that I would want to prosecute fairly, impartially and I was against any mass prosecution--mass prosecutions just for the sake of reprisal. I'd have to take each case in its own merit and any prosecutions that might occur would be prosecutions for specific crimes that were committed by specific people," and that was that.

(Continued on page 919.)

1

Q In fact, this language that you are telling 919 us now is virtually verbatim what was put in your letter--

A Exactly right. The upshot of it all was they felt that my position was a fair one, all that could be expected of a prosecutor, and that it might be worthwhile, they hoped it would be, for the purpose of keeping these negotiations alive to describe my views in some depth as I described them to them, would I do it.

I said sure, be happy to.

Q And you at that time went to your office in Warsaw?

A That's correct. First I was asked if I would go back with them to Attica and meet with the prisoners. I refused. I said that would put me in a false light, put me on the defensive. I would have to explain to them and try to justify to them my views and I felt I did not have to do that and I wouldn't do it, but I would be happy to put it in writing so there could be no misunderstanding. They said fine. "I think that would be better, Mr. James. I agree with you."

So we went down and I wrote out a draft of my views and the three gentlemen, very high minded

1 2 gentlemen they all were too, suggested a word 920 2 change here, there, a little different phraseology, 3 put things in more layman language and some of them 4 I accepted, some I rejected. 5 And Tom Wicker acted as the typist and he 6 typed it out and that is my written statement that you 7 have--8 You signed it? Q 9 I signed it and that expressed my views. А 10 I think we read some excerpts from it yester-Q 11 day. You said, "I deem it to be my obligation to 12 prosecute only when in my judgment there is substantial 13 evidence to link a specific individual with the com-14 mission of a specific crime," and that you are "unal-15 terably opposed to the commencement of indiscriminate 16 mass prosecutions." 17 That is my language. А 18 Were the observers pleased with this letter? Q 19 They seemed to be and expressed themselves Α 20 as very pleased. They further said that they hoped 21 that this might give the prisoners sufficient reassurance 22 that the negotiations could be kept alive and they 23 went back with that in mind but it did not work out 24 that way. 25 Mr. James, I would like to explore with you Q

a minute this question of why amnesty couldn't be 921 given because I think it is a very important one.

A Very good.

Q Were you told by the observers or by anybody or were you aware of what the actual physical situation was at the institution at this time?

A I was aware in a general sort of way with the situation in the prison.

Q You knew that 38 State Police were being held hostage by the inmates in a portion of the prison?

I did.

А

Q Were you aware in any way of any crimes that might have been committed or any acts that might--that had to be presented to the Grand Jury up to that time that the observers came to speak to you?

A Yes. In a general sort of way, of course I could not name names. I knew that there must have been a great number of prisoners who were guilty of riot. There was some kidnapping, et cetera. There wer obvious crimes that were committee but who did what, I had no idea.

Q Assault, I presume?

A Yes.

Q You knew that one or more of the guards had gone to the hospital?

25

A I was aware of that.

Q Now, did you discuss, did the observers at any time attempt to discuss with you specifically crimes that should or should not be prosecuted? Did it get to that level?

922

A It did not get to that level. It was on a, shall we shall, a philosophic level. What's your attitude as a prosecutor?

Q And it never got to the level, for example, we have heard testimony previously that after the Auburn riot people were prosecuted for theft of keys or things of that nature.

A Theft of what?

Α

Q Theft of the institutional keys and that kind of thing. I take it that the observers did not discuss with you at that time breaking down the categories of crimes that might be involved?

A No, we didn't go into that at all.

Q It was just a general philosophical discussion?

General philosophical discussion.

Q This question of discretion, when you believe it is not in the public interest or in the interest of justice not to prosecute, you feel that you should-you have a discretion not to prosecute? A I certainly have.

Q I take it that the appeal for amnesty was in effect an appeal to your discretion not to prosecute inmates who had committed crimes in the specific case?

A It might be called an appeal to my discretion but I didn't view it as much of a sound appeal. In the first place, this was not an appeal, in effect it was a valid demand. You let us off from any criminal prosecutionand this was not said but this was implied, everything will come out all right, no harm will be done to the hostages.

Q Now, I take it there are instances, and I take it there have been instances when you have not prosecuted a particular defendant--

A There have been a number of instances.
Q One instance would be a plea bargain?
A Yes.

Q Would you describe briefly what a plea bargain is? I take it this is something that every District ATtorney commonly does?

A Yes, and I make liberal use of plea bargaining. That is the acceptance of a plea of guilty in satisfaction of a charge of more serious crime. I do that in a number of cases.

Q A plea of guilty to a lesser crime?

25

1 5

2

A plea of guilty to a lesser crime in Α satisfaction of a higher charge.

I take it that the basis for that is that Q in order to save the State and yourself the time and expense of a trial, you are willing to accept a--the inmate's or the defendant's plea of guilty to a lesser charge than one that he might -- that there is some evidence to connect him with a greater charge and you accept a plea to a lesser charge?

That is one of the many basis that is Α considered. That is one.

What would others be? Q

Another basis would be if you felt your Α case was weak and you have a doggone good chance of losing the case on a trial anyhow, I'm more willing to plea bargain then and a third and very important consideration is the general matter of the interests of justice.

For example, in the first batch of cases that I had when I took office with a number of drug cases, the first in the county. I accepted pleas and urged--well, I urged Y.O. treatment in several instances where the people would have been probably entitled to Y.O treatment, Youthful Offender, that is. There were several of the defendants who were young people, just

6

over Y.O. age, who had previous clean records and 925 I was satisfied they weren't drug pushers and we had a solid case of a Class C and Class D felonies in some instances and I took pleas, misdemeanor, drug possession in the interests of justice because I felt these fellows did not deserve a felony record. This is an example I am talking about.

Q That would be a different class of--

A That;s another instance where--another thing that enteres in when we consider or we take on plea bargaining of a lesser offense.

Q In cases where you decided not to prosecute or not to prosecute to the full extent that you might, I take it there is no way that your discretion can be examined or countermanded by some other authority?

A No. I know none.

Q There is no---once you have determined not to prosecute, that's the--

A That's it.

Q Now, in the request for amnesty or let's put it this way. In a plea bargain or in other circumstances where you might determine not to prosecute, the prospective defendant has something that you would like to obtain, either--something to offer you and you have something to offer him and there is a mutual agreement

on that, that you have the discretion to enter into. 926

That's one way of putting it and a good one. Α That covers many instances.

I take it that in the specific instance where 0 the inmates were holding hostages, the inmates had something to offer too and that is in effect the lives of the hostages that they were holding and you had something to offer them, namely, a promise that you would exercise your discretion in their behalf.

Mr. Luxemburg, because the other side, the Α defendant has something to offer, he could offer, from his standpoint, and I have something, obviously, to offer from mine, that does not automatically create a ligitimate plea bargaining situation. Much more was lacking here. The biggest elements were lacking for a plea bargaining situation.

What elements were there that were lacking? 0

First of all, this was not an approach to my Α This was a not too subtly valid demand. discretion. It was tantamount to saying, you let this defendant off or something terrible is going to happen. Maybe your house is going to be blown up. This is a demand for consideration. A demand made under duress.

Now, what they were asking for was not a decision that I should let someone off in the interests

1 of justice, decided it on its individual merits. 927 2 They're asking for a general, blanket moratorium on 3 the enforcement of law. That is not -- this is a horse 4 of a different color. It is an entirely different 5 situation. They were asking for something which, as 6 I see it, I cannot give them. I cannot give a blanket --7 When you say that there was--well, when you Q 8 say that there was a blanket moratorium, you mean they 9 were asking for you to exercise your discretion with 10 respect to a large number of crimes and not just one 11 specific crime? 12 Yes, but it boils down to a moratorium as Α 13 far as this incident is concerned. We'll forget 14 all the laws that might have been violated in the course 15 of this riot. A suspension of law and law enforcement, 16 in other words, that's what they were asking for 17 in effect. 18 It was of a much broader scope than--Q 19 A much broader scope and they're asking for А 20 something else. 21 On the other hand, they were holding 38 per-Q 22 sons hostage? 23 А True. 24 And I take it then that--well, if you allowed Q 25 them or if you warned than that the line of it

22

23

24

25

1

persons were worth suspending the prosecution of 928 law, that might have set a bad precedent?

A Would you repeat that?

Q Did you feel that to allow them an amnesty would set a bad precedent in terms of the holding of hostages?

A Oh, yes, definitely so. This is one of the many considerations that entered in. Whenever you allow an amnesty, this is an encouragement to future acts of violence in the same category.

Q Was this something that entered into your--

A Very much so. We were forced with a situation, either we had to uphold the law here or you might as well forget law enforcement. That's what it boiled down to.

Q And if I can attempt to summarize it this way, that the holding of the 38 hostages or that the offer to release the 38 hostages was not sufficient for you to, in view of the very wide-spread failure or nature of the prosecution which they were asking you to abstain from and of the bad precedential value, you felt this was simply too high a price that they were asking?

A That's a rather difficult question to answer. I don't feel as though I had made a decision excuse

1 let me start over again. It was not I who had 38 11 929 2 lives in my hand, that I could reclaim at will. 3 You didn't see it that way? 0 4 I didn't see it that way as against the Α 5 other. I didn't put these hostages there and I had 6 no assurance what they would do or would not do. So 7 this wasn't--the element was the one that we have been 8 talking about. 9 That you saw they were asking for simply a Q 10 cessation of the enforcement of the State's laws? 11 Α Exactly it. 12 Did you discuss your viewpoint with Governor Q 13 Rockefeller or anybody from his staff? 14 Not whatever prior to the time the decision Α 15 was made. 16 Did you speak to the Governor or anybody from Q 17 his staff? 18 I spoke to the Governor afterwards. I didn't Α 19 call him. he called me to thank me for the position I 20 had independently taken. 21 By afterwards, you mean after the retaking Q 22 of the--23 After the event, that's right. Α 24 Did you speak to Bobby Douglas at any time Q 25 during Saturday or Sunday of that weekend?

2	A Who is Bobby Douglas? 930
2	A Who is Bobby Douglas? 930
	Q Robert Douglas, I believe he was then the
	counselthe Governor's secretary.
	A Yes, that's right. That's right. Now I
	recall I did. We talked about it.
	Q When was that, do you recall?
	A Well, yes, that was when I was first called
	to the prison, which would have been Monday morning as
	soon as it was decided upon to move in on the prisoners,
	I was called by the prison authorities and informed
	of the fact and asked to come to the prison right away.
	Q Excuse me, Mr. James, but
	A And on that occasion when I went there, Robert
	Douglas was there.
	Q Were you informed of the death of Officer
	Quinn on Saturday evening?
	A I don't recall when I was informed of it but
	it would have had to have been soon after the event.
	Q That would have been Saturday evening?
	A Yes.
	Q Do you recall being called by Mr. Douglas
	on that occasion?
	A Not in connection with his death, I don't
	recall the conversation.
	0 Did you have any further contact with the

observer's group or with anybody concerning the course 931 of the negotiations after the observers left?

A No. None whatever.

Q And your next contact with it was when the assault had already been underway or was about to begin?

A Yes, and then I did not, as I recall, see and speak with any of the members of the citizens observers group who had met with me but I did meet with all the people who were in the command offices, the administration office.

Q One final question, Mr. James, before we take take commission questions.

Have you ever been asked to prosecute any of the correctional personnel at Attica for assaulting or allegedly assaulting inmates?

A No, wait, let's see. I may have had one or two letters from prisoners--no, complaining of ill treatment of one kind or another but I don't recall any complaining of an assault.

Q In other words, the ill treatment they were complaining of was not such as was recognizable in a criminal--

A That's right. It was not such as would be recognizable by me as District Attorney anyhow.

	MR. LUXEMBERG: Thank you very much, 932
2	Mr. James.
•	MR. MC KAY: Mr. Marshall, have you a
	question?
	EXAMINATION BY MR. MARSHALL:
	Q Mr. James, suppose the Governor had asked you
	to, or ordered you to grant amnesty in the situation,
	would he have the power to do that?
	A Frankly, I'm not positive, but I frankly
	doubt it. I doubt if the Governor has power to do that.
	He can grant clemency afterwards but he can't grant
	amnesty, so far as I know, as a lawyer.
	Q What about the Attorney General of the State?
	A The same would apply to him.
	Q Mr. James, you said in answer to a question
	that there was no way of overruling a decision made
	by you not to prosecute as against a decision to prose-
	cute. I think you said that.
	A In an individual case?
	Q Yes.
	A Yes.
	Q But there is a procedure whereby the Governor
	can supercede you?
	A Oh, yes. Very much so. That's inherent in
	his executive power and as a matter of fact, I asked

Q Apart from this, as you understand his responsibilities and his authority, he has no authority to tell you what to do, who to prosecute, who not to prosecute?

A That's correct, sir.

Q Mr. James, on the matter of plea bargaining that you discussed with Mr. Luxemberg, just in order to make it clear, I will state what I think plea bargaining is and you can either agree with it or not.

As I understand that is not a decision not to prosecute and in that sense is not a grant of amnesty at all.

A That is exactly correct, sir.
Q In fact you do bring a prosecution?
A You do.
Q And the person pleads guilty and is convicted?
A That's right, sir.
Q The only question is what is he convicted of?
A Right. That is entirely different, as you

are implying, from no prosecution at all.

Q Now, one final thing, Mr. James. It strikes me that in listening to you and I understand very clearly

25

1

what you said, that there is a gap between your 934 position, it seems to me to be a gap between your position, which I am not quarreling with at all, and what the observers understood your position to be. That is, they went back with this letter and they considered it to be something that the prisoners would accept, at least as being a great step forward.

Whereas you have described it, it is your position, as being a refusal to grant any sort of blanket amnestdy under duress. Which it was, as you have said, essentially what they were asking.

Can you explain why Mr. Wicker and the other observers thought that your letter was a move towards that whereas you rather plainly described it as a refusal to move towards that?

A Well, it is not a move towards a general amnesty but rather it was in the spirit, moved in the spirit towards an amnesty,

In other words, an indication of reasonableness and a sense of fairness on my part as against just a hard shell approach to enforcement of the law, period.

Q It was the sentence that rejected indiscriminate mass prosecutions, I suppose?

A Yes.

17¹ 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q

That could be interpreted that way.

A Yes. That could be interpreted that way, yes. Like any statement, you could kick it around and read different things into it but I tried to describe what I intended by my words. Mass indiscrimination is just hauling in everybody as a defendant whether you had evidence to link him up definitely with a definite crime before. This is what I meant by mass indiscriminate prosecution. Say the whole doggone bunch of us is guilty of something, we are going to try you for something. That's mass indiscriminate prosecution as I see it.

MR. MARSHALL: That's all I have.

MR. MC KAY: Mr. Henix?

EXAMINATION BY MR. HENIX:

Q I feel it unfortunate at this time that I don't have a legal background but, Mr. James, my question is you said that you were from that county I think 40 years and--in one way or another, and that the people in that county know each other so well that your lives are actually interwoven into one another?

A Yes, I of course meant that in the relative sense. As contrasted with living in the city.

Q Right. If you walk down the street, can say hello, how are you today, Mr. Jones and actually know

1 18	it's Mr. Jones. 936
2	A Right. Or Bill.
3	Q Or whatever. These, some of these people
4 5	are some of the people I would assume, that have
6	relatives who were being held hostage?
7	A Yes, sir.
8	Q You also said even if I could, I would not?
9	A Yes, I did, and I meant it.
10	Q I am asking you now not as a professional
11	man but as a human being, a person who is a part of
11	a community, where were your feelings at? I mean, at
13	any point that these people were questioning you, did
14	you take that into consideration that perhaps you
15	would never see any of these people again?
16	A By "these people", you mean the hostages?
17	Q The hostages.
18	A Oh, yes, sure. Sure I thought of that. Very
19	hard.
20	Q In view of that it would seem kind of hard
21	to understand the part of the statement that says if I
22	could I wouldn't.
23	A Well, sir, all right, I will try to answer
24	your question a little more fully. First of all, I
25	believe very deeply in the law. The majesty of the
	law and in fair enforcement of the law, is something

we have to have to live together at all acceptably 937 and to avoid a jungle.

Now, my concept of law enforcement, if you want to term it that, is so strong I think that that is paramount to one individual or another as his life may be effect unfortunately.

Q Yes, I understand. I guess I had it in the context that if I found myself in that situation with any power at all, outside of asking God and every other responsible person to give me some consideration, I think I would have asked for it. And I remember seeing different officers on TV asking for considerations, and of course, I guess it is a difficult question in view of your strong feelings about justice but if you were one of those guys caught up in there, do you think you would have asked for amnesty to be granted?

A No, sir, I really honestly don't.

Now, I know--I have learned this that several guards have said that they did not want the prison authorities to hold back in suppressing this riot out of consideration for them personally, that their lives weren't that important. There was much more at stake than their own individual lives. There were the lives of all the guards and all these prisoners and I've told you another thing that's involved, the law which involves this insurrection and future Atticas.

All those things are even more important than what happens to one individual. I don't mean to say that I treat individuals lightly. I believe in the importance of a human being just as you do but there are other things too that are even of transcendent importance, I think.

938

This is the situation here.

Q I can take from that statement that if it was you, that you would probably not have asked for--

A No, sir. Let me say something else. I will say it right on the line. This business of being a prison guard is a very hazardous occupation.

Q I know that.

A And any guard who becomes one does so with full knowledge of that situation. He takes his life into his hands every time he goes out into the prison population. The hazard of being seized as a hostage is one of the inherent hazards of his job. That's the same as a soldier. The chances he might get shot is one he accepts as being a soldier.

Q Before this incident, have you ever had to try a person from Attica or in that county during the time that you were the District Attorney for having killed a guard? I know you did not mention an incident where there was a simple assault.

A Simple assault.

But no murders? 0

No, I have not been a District Attorney that Α long. No, I have never prosecuted a case of that nature.

> MR. HENIX: Thank you.

MR. McKAY: Mr. Marshall? EXAMINATION BY MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. James, this is prompted because of your 0 statement about belief in enforcing the law and the majesty of the law and it goes back to Mr. Luxemburg's last question of which was with respect to prosecuting guards.

I take it to be that it follows form what you said about how you feel about the law that if a case were brought to your attention that involved an assault of any sort by a guard upon a prisoner, thatyou would have no hesitation about prosecuting that case?

No. sir. None whatsoever. Α

Mrs. Guerrero? MR. McKAY: EXAMINATION BY MRS. GUERRERO:

Q Mr. James, you are so, I mean 940 so dedicated to law, of course, which all of us I think are in a sense. Most people are because otherwise we wouldn't have the nation that we have.

A Thank you, Ma'am. I try to be.

Q Christianity believes in the sacredness of the human person and so does a republican democratic form of government.

The sacredness of the human person, should supposedly come first even when people are killing each other in the battles and war which is a ghastly thing and still everybody is concerned about prisoners and about people who have been hurt, killed and so forth.

These days we are having a dreadful thing happening all over the world, which is taking hostages. I think it's a very shocking thing because when I think that you could become sometime a hostage sometime even being completely innocent, it's going to disrupt your life, probably destroy you, probably kill you but even before you are killed you probably are definitely destroyed.

So, being a hostage is a very difficult thing. Now, the hostages in this case since these people are living there together all the time, I think that both the prisoners and the guards are in a very difficult

2 ¹

situation, both of them to each other.

Now, the hostages were taken as many of these people have said and even guards, in order to bargain for redress of grievances because their life in the prison is so ghastly. That's what they have all said. This is what we're trying to find out.

941

In view of this and knowing that perhaps much more, many, many more people would have been killed because they would have killed many more, everybody says thatthey are surprised that so few people were killed, you still would not use your, I'm sure moral conviction, and apply your amnesty? Or give them an assurance of amnesty?

A I didn't follow the last part of your question, Ma'am.

Q That in view of the fact that there would be massive killing and you knew that because the whole thing had been, you know, everybody was there to do this, to retake the prison and so that there might have been even more than 42 people killed and all those injured and many, many more killed because it really was a miracle that more weren't killed.

Knowing that and you knew more perhaps than all of us now know, you still, because of your moral conviction of the law is bigger than the moral conviction

of saving lives?

4

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A You've got several thoughts here--really, to answer your question I'd have to take it all apart.

Let me, in the interests of saving time, attempt it this way. First of all, I had no way of foreseeing what would be the result of all this, the killings that would have taken place. This is hindsight. I had no way of predicting this.

There are several ways of viewing this situation. Of course, my job was only to give my answers as a District Attorney, as I have explained, one simple question. We're bargaining, negotiating with the prisoners on their various demands. Here is the one. This is the key one, they say, "How do you feel about that?" That's the only way I entered into it.

Now, I was not handling the negotiations. I was not running the prison nor running the show for the state. My own sphere is very limited but if you ask me in terms of human killings, as to what would be the result of my statement, I say that my statement had very little to do with that.

The killings were the result of the insurrection in the first place and how that was handled on the part of those who were directly in charge, what they were going to do about it.

My own thought is, well, I have 943 to tell you this because your question leads me to it. This is from the standpoint of saving lives. I have the very strong feeling that lives would have been saved if the prison authorities had moved in much sooner, before this thing blew up and the insurrection got well organized and it would have been in the interests of ultimate justice and the saving of lives to have moved firmly and more quickly.

Now, that movement still could have taken place after my statement and as I view it, my little statement as District Attorney would--should have encouraged an immediate firm stand, brought the thing to a head.

So everything I did, I think, was in the interests of saving lives as well as maintain our system of justice. As I see it. This is my problem. EXAMINATION BY MR. WILBANKS:

Q Briefly, Mr. James, in a very brief fashion, if the governor or Mr. Oswald asked, not ordered you, to grant amnesty in view of the situation, would you have done so?

A Frankly, sir, I don't think so. No. I know I wouldn't. I would have said I am sorry but I can't as I see it.

ł

MR. WILBANKS: Thank you. 944

MR. McKAY: Mr. James, you have been very helpful.

6¹

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You are entitled under our provision and our rules to make a statement of your own if you wish at this time. Is there something you wish to say?

THE WITNESS: Not really. I think my testimony has covered it and there will be others who have a broader knowledge of the whole situation than I.

MR. McKAY: Thank you very much for being with us.

(Witness excused).

MR. LIMAN: OUr next witness is Jose "G.I." Paris. If we do not finish with him today, we will make arrangements for him to come back to conclude his testimony and he will be questioned by Mr. Sackett, Robert Sackett, my able assistant and deputy counsel.

JOSE PARIS, called as a witness, being first duly sworn by Mr. McKay, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: My word is my bond. MR. McKAY: Thank you.