

relief to outlaw discrimination in jury selection, instead of depending on defendants to raise the issue.<sup>1676</sup>

A *prima facie* case of deliberate and systematic exclusion is made when it is shown that no African-Americans have served on juries for a period of years<sup>1677</sup> or when it is shown that the number of African-Americans who served was grossly disproportionate to the percentage of African-Americans in the population and eligible for jury service.<sup>1678</sup> Once this *prima facie* showing has been made, the burden is upon the jurisdiction to prove that it had not practiced discrimination; it is not adequate that jury selection officials testify under oath that they did not discriminate.<sup>1679</sup> Although the Court in connection with a showing of great disparities in the racial makeup of jurors called has voided certain practices that made discrimination easy to accomplish,<sup>1680</sup> it has not outlawed discretionary selection pursuant to general standards of educational attainment and character that can be administered fairly.<sup>1681</sup> Similarly, it declined to rule that African-Americans must be included on all-white jury commissions that administer the jury selection laws in some states.<sup>1682</sup>

In *Swain v. Alabama*,<sup>1683</sup> African-Americans regularly appeared on jury venires but no African-American had actually served on a jury. It appeared that the absence was attributable to the action of the prosecutor in peremptorily challenging all potential African-American jurors, but the Court refused to set aside the conviction. The use of peremptory challenges to exclude the African-Americans in the particular case was permissible, the Court held, regardless of the prosecutor's motive, although it indicated that the consistent use of such challenges to remove African-Americans would be unconstitutional. Because the record did not disclose that the prosecution was responsible solely for the fact that no African-American

<sup>1676</sup> *Carter v. Jury Comm'n of Greene County*, 396 U.S. 320 (1970); *Turner v. Fouche*, 396 U.S. 346 (1970).

<sup>1677</sup> *Norris v. Alabama*, 294 U.S. 587 (1935); *Patton v. Mississippi*, 332 U.S. 463 (1947); *Hill v. Texas*, 316 U.S. 400 (1942).

<sup>1678</sup> *Pierre v. Louisiana*, 306 U.S. 354 (1939); *Cassell v. Texas*, 339 U.S. 282 (1950); *Eubanks v. Louisiana*, 356 U.S. 584 (1958); *Whitus v. Georgia*, 385 U.S. 545 (1967); *Alexander v. Louisiana*, 405 U.S. 625 (1972). For an elaborate discussion of statistical proof, see *Castaneda v. Partida*, 430 U.S. 482 (1977).

<sup>1679</sup> *Norris v. Alabama*, 294 U.S. 587 (1935); *Eubanks v. Georgia*, 385 U.S. 545 (1967); *Sims v. Georgia*, 389 U.S. 404 (1967); *Turner v. Fouche*, 396 U.S. 346, 360–361 (1970).

<sup>1680</sup> *Avery v. Georgia*, 345 U.S. 559 (1953) (names of whites and African-Americans listed on differently colored paper for drawing for jury duty); *Whitus v. Georgia*, 385 U.S. 545 (1967) (jurors selected from county tax books, in which names of African-Americans were marked with a "c").

<sup>1681</sup> *Carter v. Jury Comm'n of Greene County*, 396 U.S. 320, 331–37 (1970), and cases cited.

<sup>1682</sup> 396 U.S. at 340–41.

<sup>1683</sup> 380 U.S. 202 (1965).