SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT NO. 104

HON. CHARLES H. OLDER. JUDGE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

Plaintiff.

Vs.

CHARLES MANSON, SUSAN ATKINS, LESLIE VAN HOUTEN, PATRICIA KRENWINKEL,

Defendants.



REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT Thursday, October 1, 1970 A. M. SESSION

APPEARANCES:

DONALD A. MUSICH, STEPHEN RUSSELL KAY,

For the People:

but well and the second second VINCENT T. BUGLIOSI. DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS

For Deft. Manson:

I. A. KANAREK, Esq.

For Deft. Atkins:

DAYE SHINN, Esq.

For Deft. Van Houten:

· \$ 78.000 (4.000 1.8) · \$ 12.00 ·

RONALD HUGHES, Esq.

For Deft. Krenwinkel:

PAUL FITZGERALD, Esq.

LOIS R. JOHNSON,

VOLUME 109

The Mark of the Control of the Contr MURRAY MEHLMAN, CSR., Official Reporters

to 12,453 PAGES 12351

		-
	•	
ľ		
2	, i	
3		
4		
5		
6	•	ľ
7	i.	ŀ
8		
9		
10	į	
11	,	
12		
13	-	ŀ
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	•	
20	;	
21	٠.	
22		

24

25

INDEX

	PEOPLE	S WIT	nesses	*	DIREÇT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS		
	FLYNN,	Juan					12,383	12,414 12,421 12,436	F	
•	,			•				12,421	K	

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1970 1-1 1 9:49 A.M. 2 ---0---(The following proceedings occur in chambers. 4. All counsel present, defendants absent.) 5 THE COURT: All counsel are present. 6 Do you have some matter you wish to bring up? MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. Obviously, a violation of the security order. In yesterday's Herald Express --10. THE COURT: The Security Order? 11 MR. KANAREK: The publicity order. 12 Yesterday's Herald Express, dated Wednesday, 13 September 30th, a portion of which I have here. The headline, 14 the article at Page 2, states, "Tate Attorneys Argue Over 15 Atkins' Cellmates' Story." 16 It talks about things that we talked about in 17 chambers, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: What about it, Mr. Kanarek? 19 MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I ask that those 20 statements be suppressed. ŹÍ. THE COURT: What statements? 22 MR. KANAREK: Those alleged statements that are 23 referred to in that article. 24 What is the use of having a publicity order? 25 THE COURT: Well, I agree, 26

Apparently somebody discussed what occurred in chambers, but who?

MR. KANAREK: I don't know, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't either.

MR. KANAREK: I know, but what I am saying is, what is the use, your Honor, of just having it? The idea is to protect the defendants.

THE COURT: I assure you, Mr. Kanarek, if I find out who is talking about these things, I will do something about it.

MR. KANAREK: Well, Mr. Farr wrote the article. We can have an evidentiary hearing and find out.

We are dealing with people's lives in this case.

THE COURT: Unfortunately, it isn't that simple.

Mr. Farr can simply refuse to divulge the identity of his source, and that is the end of it.

MR. FITZGERALD: If I may see the article?

(The Court hands the article to Mr. Fitzgerald.)

.2

. 3

4

.5

.6

7

,9 8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16.

17

18

19 20

21

22

23.

24.

25

26

THE COURT: But I warn all counsel that if I have any evidence of this publicity order being violated, and who is responsible for it, I intend to do something about it. You have all been told enough times so I don't have to go through that again.

MR. SHINN: I can assure the Court that I didn't divulge any information about Miss Atkins.

MR. FITZGERALD: Nor did I, your Honor,

MR. MUSICH: Nor did I.

MR. HUGHES: Nor did I.

THE COURT: So that leaves you, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: I ask to be sworn on it, then, your Honor. I didn't.

MR. SHINN: Actually, the article, I don't think -- there is no details or nothing, your Honor.

MR. FITZGERALD: Right. As I read here, the first paragraph seems to be the only — first two or three paragraphs seem to be the only material in the story that relates to the in-chambers conference and it says, and I quote, "Testimony in the Sharon Tate-Leno La Bianca murder trial was delayed today by an hour-long conference between defense and prosecution attorneys in Superior Court Judge Charles H. Older's chambers. The chambers session was devoted to legal arguments on the upcoming testimony by Virginia Graham and Roni Howard, former cellmates of defendant Susan Atkins. Mrs. Graham and Mrs. Howard are

.

4

5

6

8

ġ.

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20° 21

22

23

25

24

26

expected to testify later in the week about Miss Atkins telling them of her part in the Tate slayings," end of quote. Then --

Then the article goes on to refer to Juan Flynn, MR. KANAREK: That's a confession, your Honor.

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I think that the press, when I walked out into the hall, as I came back from the restroom at the latter part of the morning recess, knew the subject matter of the conference in chambers. And it has been known to the press that this is one of the legal issues in the case.

THE COURT: Well, all right. In any event, I don't know who divulged the information so there is nothing I can do about it. I don't consider this to be particularly prejudicial to anyone.

It is technically a violation of the publicity order, that is true. If you have any information on the subject, Mr. Kanarek, I'm certainly willing to consider it.

MR. KANAREK: I have no -- even if I had information, my purpose is not to be punitive to counsel. My purpose here --

THE COURT: Well, I can't do anything about it unless I know who is responsible, can I?

MR. KANAREK: Well, I think your Honor could conduct an evidentiary hearing and if there is some sort of a privilege, the privilege could be -- would be waived if these

conversations occurred in the presence of people who were not privileged. In other words, it's the same way as the attorney-3 client privilege is waived. THE COURT: All right. Anything else, gentlemen? 5 MR. KANAREK: I move for an evidentiary hearing, your :6 Honor. Ż THE COURT: Motion is denied. 8 MR. BUGLIOSI: I have a couple of matters. 9 I believe there is going to be a stipulation 10 that on Page 9396 of the transcript, Lines 11 MR. SHINN: What volume? 12 MR. BUGLIOSI: Volume 74, Line 7, should read. 13 14 "and a blade with a 13/16 of an inch at its widest point," as opposed to 3/16 of an inch, as it presently reads. 15 MR. FITZGERALD: So stipulated. 16 -MR. KANAREK: So stipulated, your Honor. 17 MR. HUGHES: So stipulated. 18 MR. FITZGERALD: We previously discussed this, your ŤÒ. Honor. 20 MR. SHINN: So stipulated. 21 THE COURT: You are stipulating to a change in the 22 transcript; is that right? 23 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, your Honor. That it read "13/16" 24 as opposed to 3/16. 25 THE COURT: It will be so ordered. The transcript 26

will be changed to reflect that.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Now, your Honor, about the other thing yesterday. I had Murray Mehlman, I forgot how to pronounce his last name, check Page 11,833 of the transcript, Lines 20 to 23, and as far as he can tell the transcript is accurate —

Well, these are the words that he got down, Lines 20 through 23.

MR. SHINN: What volume are you talking about? MR. BUGLIOSI: 103.

THE COURT: What page?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Page 11,833.

THE COURT: Just a second. All right, go ahead.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't recall his using that exact language. I recall him using more clear words. "The only way I can show the black man," or, "The only way I'm going to show the black man," words to that effect, "is to go down there and kill -- " blah, blah, blah.

So I would request that I be permitted to ask him again what Manson told him on that day because I don't think the transcript is clear.

As far as time is concerned, I think we consume a lot more time discussing this.

1

2

5

'6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

. 16

17

18

19

- 20

2Ľ

22

23

24

3-1

. 26

MR. FITZGERALD: We discussed it among ourselves, Mr. Kanarek, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Shinn and I, and we are not in agreement as to Mr. Bugliosi's assertion that Mr. Flynn testified as to something other than what is in the transcript.

The nature of our discussion was in the area of Mr. Flynn's peculiar grammar and syntax on occasion.

It is just as likely that that is what he said as not.

I am not attacking your assertion, but we are not willing to stipulate.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't want a stipulation. I am not asking for a stipulation.

THE COURT: What was the context in which this occurred?

MR. BUGLIOSI: There was a conversation with Mr. Manson, Clem Tufts and Bruce Davis in July of '69 on the boardwalk.

THE COURT: What is the relevancy of the conversation?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Oh, the relevancy, your Honor, is

Mr. Manson talking about showing the black man and the

pigs by going down there and killing a whole bunch of

pigs.

The relevancy is basically the motive for these murders, as alleged by the prosecution, by showing the black man by killing a bunch of pigs. That, essentially, is the motive that the People are alleging for

3-2

2.

1

Ş

4

5

Ģ

.8

9

10

11 12

Ί3

. 14

15 16.

. .: 17

18

1ġ

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

these murders, that Manson was going to show the black man how to start Helter Skelter by killing a bunch of pigs.

THE COURT: Well, he answered the question.

You asked him: What did Mr. Manson say, Juan? And he gave an answer.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

My position is that the transcript is in error, and I want to ask him again.

As I indicated to the Court yesterday, out of these 12,000 pages, there are probably 500 examples where a witness was asked the same question twice on peripheral issues which were totally inconsequential.

Also, in addition to that, not only were the issues totally inconsequential, but there was no quarrel among the prosecution and the defense as to what the witness said.

It is part of the trial. You can ask the witness the same question twice.

Now, your Honor, here there is a dispute as to the correct language, and I am certainly not going to buy what the court reporter says. And not only that, but it is not inconsequential, it is very important.

To me, your Honor, it is just standard operating procedure: If there is a question about it, just ask the person over again.

I agree with Mr. Fitzgerald, they don't have

to stipulate and agree to change it, as they did with 3-3 thirteen sixteenths. I am not asking that. I am simply 2. going to ask the question over again. I don't agree with the court reporter. 3a fls. . Ż . 19

3-4

2

L

3

4

5

ъб 7

8

9

10

11

₁12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26 MR. KANAREK: Let him make the noticed motion and put in a declaration, your Honor, and we can have an evidentiary hearing with the court reporter.

That is the way your Honor has indicated in the past --

MR. BUGLIOSI: Is that your position, Mr. Kanarek, that henceforth you can never ask the witness the same thing twice?

You have been asking Flynn the same thing -THE COURT: Gentlemen, we are not going to spend an
hour in here with colloquy back and forth.

MR. SHINN: May I ask Mr. Bugliosi one question, wery fast, a simple question?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

MR. SHINN: In what manner do you think it is a different answer? How did you come to that conclusion?

MR. BUGLIOSI; I heard what he told me several times personally and also on the stand.

MR. SHINN: You mean there are a couple of words missing there?

MR. BUGLIOSI: He got the wrong words here.

The only way I could show the black man and the pigs. The only way to get going is to show the black man and the / is to go down there.

THE COURT: I don't see any substantial difference with what he intended to say and what he, in fact, said,

Ţ

according to the transcript.

Ź

3

4,

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

. 26 MR. BUGLIOSI: My point is that I don't see what problem we are having here. If I have a desire to ask the witness the same question again -- and it is being done every day, 25, 30 times, on inconsequential matters -- I think it is just standard operating procedure. If I am questioning the court reporter, I can ask that same question twice.

I don't want to confuse what I am doing, your Honor, with asking for a stipulation. That is a totally different matter. This is not asking for a stipulation.

I don't see why either party, the defense or the prosecution, should be bound by what the court reporter takes down. They make errors.

THE COURT: It is true, they make errors, but his notes apparently reflect what the transcript said.

MR. BUGLIOSI: But their notes are in error very frequently.

THE COURT: That is what you say.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That is what any attorney would say or any judge would say, that the court reporter makes errors.

THE COURT: We are not talking about generally. We are talking about this specific question.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I agree.

3b fls.

They wouldn't be human, you know, if they didn't make errors.

I think the court reporting in this case has been very excellent, and I'd like to say that, it has been excellent, but there is just no way to avoid error by the court reporters. It is just an impossibility.

THE COURT: I am not going to allow it. I think it is unduly prejudicial.

The answer is in. I think it is responsive. I am not going to allow it.

18-I

1

_

4

.6

7

8

'9

10

11

ŢŹ

13

14 15

16

17

<u>1</u>8`

19

20

2I 22

23

24

25

26

Now, there is another matter I want to take up, and that is this conversation yesterday that Mr. Flynn testified to on the day that he and Mr. Manson started for the ice cream parlor.

I have gone back and reviewed the transcript of the earlier conversation, to which Mr. Fitzgerald elicited some statements from Mr. Flynn on cross-examination, and I have concluded that this part of the conversation, the witness' testimony yesterday, should not have gone in, and I am going to admonish the jury to disregard it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Will the Court reserve its ruling just for a brief second just for me to argue on it?

MR. BUGLIOSI: This is MO, your Honor.

THE COURT: I know. We discussed this at some length yesterday at the bench, so I am not unmindful of what your position is.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

THE COURT: All right.

I submit, your Honor, that no matter how prejudicial it is, the law is clear, People vs. Fike, and several other cases, Albertson, no matter how prejudicial it is, you can bring in evidence of other conduct of the defendant if it establishes identity, modus operandi.

I say that what Manson did on these two nights in question is so unique that it probably is unparalleled in the annals of crime. To select a home for no reason

Ż

•

5

6

7

. 8

10

11

. 12

13

14

. 15

16.

17

18

19

20

21,

22

23

24

25

26

whatsoever and send people in there, tie the victims up and cut them up. I can't think of any other case, there probably have been other cases where this has happened, but I am not aware of it. Telling Juan Flynn to do the same thing, stopping in front of a relative's house, no reason in the world, going in there, tie them up and cut them up.

THE COURT: Of course, what we are talking about is not conduct but a conversation.

Nothing was done to implement what was said, if it was said.

MR. BUGLIOSI: If anything, that is all the more reason why the prosecution should be able to bring it in, because it is not as harmful to the defense as it would have been if Flynn had accepted the proposal and gone in there and actually killed.

We are concerned with Manson's state of mind.

Asking someone else, before these murders, to go into a home, tie the victims up who he felt were pigs, and cut them up.

This is so unique. I mean, it comes under MO.

I have had cases where you can bring in
evidence of other crimes where there is nowhere near the
similarity that we have in this situation here.

I defy the defense, your Honor, to come up with another example in any of the cases in California or anywhere in this country where you had a situation like

26,

b

that, where you stop in front of a virtual stranger's home and say, "Let's go in there and tie them up and cut them up."

1-1

6.

8.

10 ·

8

.23

If they can come up with some other case, then I would say this is not MO. But I can't think of any.

To me, this is so unique that the jury is entitled to hear this, to help them decide whether Manson, on these two nights in question, actually commanded these people to go into strangers' homes, tie them up, as they were in both Tate and La Bianca, and cut them up.

They are entitled to know about this because when they hear what he did with Flynn, they can draw the inference: Yes, this is the exact, precise type of individual who would have done what the prosecution said he did on August 9th and 10th, because here he did it on another occasion with Juan Flynn.

MR. MUSICH: Your Honor, if I might interrupt.

I think the same analogy is a solicitation to kill.

Definitely, that particular evidence would be admissible, clearly admissible, to show the intent, the MO, or whatever it may be, and I would submit that on this subject this is the same thing. It is definitely admissible.

. 1

.5

8.

MR. BUGLIOSI: If we had a situation, your Honor, where he told Mr. Flynn, "Let's go in there and rob these people and if they resist then we'll kill them." But here we do not. "Let's go in there, tie them up and cut them up because they're pigs."

THE COURT: Well, of course, that isn't exactly what it said. What it said was, "Well, why don't we?"

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, we are not going to be able to get the exact words, your Honor, and the law on modus operandi does not require the exact words. It's obvious to the defense what Manson meant by the "why don't we?" That's why they are trying to keep it out. It's pretty obvious that he was asking Flynn to go in there and Flynn declined.

But the point is, your Honor, this is so unbelievable, what happened on August 9th and 10th, that I've got to convince this jury that some human being really would be that saturical that they would do something like this. Because you just don't send people out to strangers' homes in the middle of the night, tie them up and cut them up without a reason.

Now, I'm putting on evidence that this is the exact type of person who would do that. He's done it on another occasion. He wanted Flynn to do it.

They can say, well, I tend to believe the

prosecution now because on another occasion he wanted someone else to do essentially the same thing.

I think it comes in under MO, your Honor.

I would ask this of the Court -- it's already in the record, the jury has already heard it -- I would ask the Court to think about it for a couple of days, because it is important to the prosecution, it's important to the defense.

4A

· 18·

4a

•

. 10:

. 16

In good faith I do believe that it is admissible under the modus operandi exception. I'm citing the Pike case, Albertson case. I have several other cases where the courts say no matter how prejudicial it is --

THE COURT: I'm familiar with that.

MR. MUSICH: I believe there is a case, and I'm trying to think of the facts of it; where the one particular person was solicited, or was asked, to participate in some type of conspiracy, robbery or murder, whatever it may have been, refusing, and someone else went into it, or there were other parties in the conspiracy. That testimony was admissible. He did testify.

I think the facts are quite similar. I mean, as far as the analogy. I would urge upon the Court the same analogy of soliciting someone to commit an unlawful act.

THE COURT: If you want some additional time to give me some authorities on the subject — but I don't want to delay the decision on this. I want to do something within the next — no later than tomorrow at the latest.

MR. FITZGERALD: The problem is on recrossexamination the defense attorneys are going to be faced
with a dilemma. If the jury is going to be instructed to
disregard it, obviously we will not cross-examine him on
the conversation. On the other hand, if your Honor is going
to rule that it is admissible, then we are going to cross-

25

26.

examine him on circumstances surrounding the conversation. So we are going to have to know before recross-examination takes place.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The other grounds for admissibility, your Honor, actually, the defense is the one that got into this, which just bolsters our right to go into it further.

THE COURT: No, no, that isn't so, Mr. Bugliosi. That's not so.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Mr. Fitzgerald asked him -THE COURT: Yes, I read the transcript again this
morning.

MR. BUGLIOSI: -- about directing your attention to this particular occasion. He says, "I want to ask you some questions about it." I think that's what the transcript says.

Then Mr. Flynn said, "Yes."
Then eventually he was cut off.

But Mr. Fitzgerald is the one that went into this occasion that most impressed --

THE COURT: He referred to the conversation, correct.

MR. BUGLIOSI: -- that most impressed Mr. Flynn. And then Mr. Fitzgerald also said, "I want to ask you some questions about that." That's also in the transcript.

THE COURT: That's true.

MR. SHINN: But, your Honor ---

THE COURT: The conversation was not gone into.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well --

19.

2Ì

MR. SHINN: The Court is going to also have to consider, your Honor, the fact that this is going to be limited to only Mr. Manson and it would be highly prejudicial to the other three defendants, too, your Honor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That's the same argument as to --MR. SHINN: It's not the same argument.

MR. BUGLIOSI: -- as to confessions or fingerprints or anything.

MR. SHINN: That's true. But here we have somewhat of an admission or a confession.

THE COURT: How much more redirect do you have?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Not very much, your Honor. About 15
minutes, 10 minutes.

THE COURT: Well, I think Mr. Fitzgerald has a good point. They should know before Mr. Flynn is excused whether or not this conversation is going to be allowed, or the jury is going to be instructed to disregard it.

MR. MUSICH: Let me see if I can find that case, your Honor. I know I read it. I don't know -- it might be on my desk.

THE COURT: Otherwise Mr. Flynn could be excused just temporarily. We will have the doctors coming in this afternoon, so --

But I don't want to delay it. That's the point

,

I'm trying to make to you.

2

MR. BUGLIOSI: I understand.

ż

4

THE COURT: I want to do it while it is still in the jury's mind.

5

6

MR. HUGHES: May I inquire, your Honor, what technique you anticipated referring the jury back to that statement? Because the statement said again is fairly prejudicial.

7.

8

9

10

ir

12

1t.

13

1,4

15

16

17

18

19:

2Ò

21<u>.</u>

22

23.

24

25

26

THE COURT: Well, I'll be guided by what you gentlemen say. I don't want to be ambiguous if I give them an instruction. I want them to be instructed as to

the specific conversation so that there is no question about

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think -- well, go ahead, you are still talking.

MR. HUGHES: Yeah. I was thinking perhaps just referring it back to a statement about in front of a house where he asked if there was a dog inside. I am very hesitant about those words, "cut them up."

THE COURT: Well, the conversation is contained on Page 12,265 starting on Line 23 and going over to the next page. There's some introductory statements in the answer which I think could be read and then the part about going inside or — actually, the only part that is objectionable is the part where he quotes or purports to quote what Mr. Manson said, "Well, why don't we go in there and tie them up," and so forth. That comes in the last few

2

3

ł

5. 6

Ž

8

10

9

11

12

13

14

15 ·

Ì7

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

sentences.

So the first part of it could be read to orient them and then they could simply be admonished to disregard the entirety of the conversation.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I would say this again, your Honor, before we go out: I think the People have already put on a prima facie case of modus operandi. This situation is very similar to the Tate-La Bianca situations where Manson thought these people were pigs, the victims were tied, they were cut with knives. I think it's almost incumbent at this point upon the defense to show the Court why there are substantial dissimilarities which would take it outside of the modus operandi.

I think as it stands right now, the state of the record, we do have an MO situation.

THE COURT: Well, the part that concerns me, Mr. Bugliosi, first of all, it's improper redirect because it wasn't gone into on cross. However, that, of course, could be overcome by permission from the Court to open the direct.

But that isn't really the point. The point is that it consists of what could be considered perhaps to be a rhetorical question asked by Mr. Manson if, in fact, it was said. And because of its nature and the fact that it, according to Mr. Flynn, occurred some two months before the murders in this case, I just think it's too remote,

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, your Honor, we can give you I cases on MO going back three, four, five years earlier. 2 THE COURT: Just all these things depend on the facts. 3. MR. BUGLIOSI: Right. THE COURT: Not just on time. Not just on this, not on 5 that, on the entire totality of everything. 6 MR. BUGLIOSI: That's right. But I'm saying remote, 7 .8 we are talking about two months, which is --9 THE COURT: Well, that isn't exactly the point, Mr. Bugliosi. I'm sure you can find me a case that went 10 back farther than two months. That's not the point. 11 12 MR. BUGLIOSI: How is two months remote in this case? 13. On August 8th --14 It's remote when taken together with what THE COURT: 15 was said and the circumstances of this particular occasion. 16 MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't --17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

4b.

26

4b-1

1 2

3.

4

5.

· 7

8

9

10

1<u>1</u> 12

13

14

15 16

17

_ 18

1<u>9</u>

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: It may very well be that Mr. Manson, if he said this, had precisely in mind to do what was done in the Tate-La Bianca murders, assuming that he had something to do with that. I don't know.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think that's a matter for argument, isn't it?

THE COURT: But the statement itself is not sufficiently clear and contains within itself sufficient prejudice, so I think it should be excluded.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, I can talk to Mr. Flynn about it and go into more detail.

THE COURT: He isn't going to be able to answer that question.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, I deliberately didn't go into too much detail on this because the defense was screaming to keep it out, so I just put on the bare skeleton on it.

He did say that Manson wanted him to go in there. Now, that is in the record, that "He wanted me to go in there." Now, he was there. Mr. Flynn was there with Mr. Manson. And the relationship between human beings, they know what the other party intended, even animals know that. And Flynn said, "He wanted me to go in there."

That's the word. "He wanted."

THE COURT: Well, that's a conclusion.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, I think this is up to the -they can go into this on cross-examination. It's a matter

2,

of cross-examination to say, well, Mr. Flynn, isn't it true that Mr. Manson was just joking with you, or something like that. But the state of the record is now that he wanted Flynn to go in there.

4c fls.4

6

5

8

10.

ĺľ

12

. 13

14

, 15

16

17

. 18

19

20

21

22 23

24,

25

26

3

5

·**6**,

7

•

10°

11

12

13

15

16

17

ΙŖ

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

THE COURT: Well, I'll, as I say, give you some additional time to give me any other authorities that you wish to. But, again, I don't want to delay the decision on it beyond tomorrow at the latest.

Anything else before we go back out?

All right. Again, gentlemen, the doctors, so far as I know, will be here at 2:00 o'clock this afternoon in connection with Hendricks, Michael Hendricks. I think the procedure with respect to the doctors will be simply you all have -- or will have by then -- copies of both doctors' reports.

Do you anticipate asking any questions?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Very few, if any, your Honor. I think, really, this --

THE COURT: Of course, we don't know what Dr. Abe is going to say yet.

MR. BUGLIOSI: -- is basically for the Court to determine. I'm just wondering whether any of us should ask any questions other than the Court. It's up to the Court to decide whether this man --

THE COURT: As I indicated yesterday, I will give counsel an opportunity to inquire within reasonable limits on the reports, but, bear in mind, gentlemen, the issue is Mr. Hendricks' competency. The specific purpose for which the doctors were appointed was to determine his ability to perceive and to comprehend -- when was it? a year ago

4c-2

2

3

...

\$ 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13.

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 . 22

23

24

25

26

roughly, a little over a year, in the summer of 1969.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Actually, over a year.

THE COURT: Sometime during 1969. I have forgotten the last date.

MR. BUGLIOSI: July, I think.

THE COURT: I've already determined from a previous session with Mr. Hendricks that under the strict requirements of the Evidence Code he is competent -- that is, referring now to the statements --

MR. FITZGERALD: 701.

THE COURT: 701 of the Evidence Code. The reason the doctors were appointed was because of the question raised by People vs. McCaughan as to whether or not at the time to which his testimony would relate he was able to perceive and comprehend. It's clear to me from his testimony recently on the question of competency that he was capable of expressing himself concerning the matter and that he was capable of understanding his duty as a witness.

All right. Let's go back into court and resume --

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, how do we handle it on cross-examination on this?

THE COURT: As to what?

MR. KANAREK: In connection with these matters as to the statement.

4c-3

Ģ

° 11.

THE COURT: Well, I would suggest that you stay away from the subject of the conversation at this time with the understanding that if I decide to leave it in you will have the opportunity, if cross-examination finishes this morning, that Mr. Flynn will be recalled tomorrow and you will have an opportunity to complete the cross-examination on any subject that you haven't gone into.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

I think your Honor's statement that this is not conduct, that it's words, I think that that -- I think that's the most important type of --

MR. BUGLIOSI: That's exactly what we're dealing with, with Manson's words in alleging that he murdered any of the Tate-La Bianca victims. We are talking about his words. We are not talking about his conduct.

Your Honor, on this programming, Mr. Kanarek went into quite a bit of depth as to what Mr. Flynn meant by programming, so it's completely proper redirect.

I have the page where Mr. Kanarek asked him about it, what he meant by it.

Furthermore, I would even request to reopen direct, if there is any question in the Court's mind, because this programming is very --

THE COURT: I think we are getting off into -MR. BUGLIOSI: It's not tangential, your Honor.
THE COURT: Well, I think it's time consuming,

4c-4

Ż

ĝ

4d fs₁₄

23,

confusing and misleading.

MR. BUGLIOSI: To me, who understands this case because I've worked very close to it, I'm very familiar with the word "program." I'm very familiar with the word "unprogram." These were words that Manson used frequently with his Family. And they had specific meanings to Mr. Manson.

It will be my problem to articulate these things clearly to the jury. But I know exactly what these words mean. And they go right down to his domination over the Family, to his destroying their concepts of what they have learned in school, what their parents --

THE COURT: That may all be true. What are we talking about? What is the point you are getting at?

<u>.</u>3

4

5

•

7

8

9

Ţ0

11

12

13.

14

15

16

17

18

· 19

20°

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: I want to ask him what Manson told him about programming. This was gone into by Mr. Kanarek on cross.

THE COURT: I think the specific objection was to a question as to what this witness thought the word meant, which seemed to me to be wholly irrelevant.

MR. KANAREK: That's correct, your Honor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: This is what you asked him, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, Mr. Bugliosi slides off the point. It's the same thing in connection with the conversations. He wants a conviction at any price, your Honor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: This is what you asked.

MR. KANAREK: What I'm saying --

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Kanarek, will you save your argument.

MR, BUGLIOSI: Mr. Kanarek asked about programming.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. The point of the matter is, your Honor has it exactly and he tries to confuse us all by his constant — he goes on and on for hours and hours, so to speak. After your Honor makes a very good analysis, by just the numbers of words that he uses he somehow or other gets your Honor to change your Honor's position. And the fact is, your Honor, right now he's sliding over the point.

MR. BUGLIOSI: You asked him what programming meant.

1	1
2	,
3	
4	
5	1
6	
7	
: 8 :	
· <u>Q</u>	
10	ľ
11	
12	
13	
14	
	:
TD	
17 18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	1

	·	,	MR.	Kanai	REK:	Your	Hor	10 r	has	1t	pe	rfect	Ly.	Your	. Honor
	has	1 t	100	per	cent	. It	is	his	sta	ite	of	mind	tha	t is	in
	issų	te,	not	Mr.	Mans	on's.	Aı	nd 1	t is	h:	Ls ·	state	of	mind	that
1	is r	not								•	,				

MR. BUGLIOSI: May I ask you a question? You are the one that asked him what programming meant to him.

MR. KANAREK: That's right. And you were asking about Mr. Manson. And the Court has the analysis perfectly. And the sheer weight of your numbers of your words, you keep talking and talking. You are doing it in order to just wear us out.

MR. BUGLIOSI: You know what I'm afraid of? That you make so many objections the Court will want to be fair and start granting some. I'm afraid that he will want to be fair and start granting some. He hasn't done it yet. you object to everything I ask.

(Whereupon, the proceedings were resumed before the jury in open court:)

THE COURT: All parties, counsel and jurors are present.

You may continue, Mr. Bugliosi.

25

26

JUAN FLYNN.

the witness on the stand at the time of the adjournment, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

THE CLERK: Will you state your name, please.

THE WITNESS: My name is Juan Flynn. THE CLERK: Thank you. 2 3 FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 5 Juan, directing your attention to Volume 108 of the transcript, would you read Lines 3 through 13 to 7 yourself. That's Page 12,260. 8 Have you read those lines to yourself, Juan? 9 Α. Yes. 10: MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I must object to 11 Mr. Bugliosi merely reading the record at this point. 12 is, in a sense, making argument. I gather he's just going 13 to read what he just showed the witness. I don't see any 14 that's not proper. 15 THE COURT: Overruled. 16 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: To these questions by Q. . 17 Mr. Hughes, Juan, did you give these answers: 18 Mr. Flynn, where were you on 19 the evening of August 8, 1969? 20 I can say that I was in a trailer 21. at Spahn's Ranch. 22 DII. . How do you know that. Mr. Flynn? 23 IIA. Because I was. 24 II () Who was with you? 25 II A. Johnny Swartz. And there was 26

"some people that came in the trailer, you know, and there was Tanya, you know, the little girl. And I saw Lulu in there and Sadie and Mr. Manson."

Do you remember giving those answers to those questions?

A. Yes.

Yes.

23 5a fls. ₂₄

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

2

3

-

5

6

7

8

g

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18. . 19

20

21

22

23

24

. 25

26

Q Incidentally, Juan, when you came out of the cabin at Barker Ranch, the night that you said Manson was creeping up with a knife, were you armed when you came out of the cabin?

A Yes. I had a shotgun, yes.

Q I believe you testified that you took LSD six, seven or eight times; is that correct?

A Yes. Yes.

Q Did Manson ever offer you LSD?

A. Yes.

MR. KANAREK; I object, your Honor.

Your Honor, would you ask the witness to allow me the courtesy of just the slightest pause? It is an automatic reaction.

I understand, I know that he has spoken with .

Mr. Bugliosi and all of that, but --

MR. BUGLIOSI: We have had enough of this, haven't we, Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: I ask your Honor for that protection, I request that he be told not to answer until there is a chance to object.

THE COURT: Delay your answers so that counsel may object to the question.

MR. KANAREK: May we approach the bench on this?

That subject matter was not gone into on cross-examination, your Honor.

THE COURT: The answer will be stricken and the jury 1 is admonished to disregard it. 2 MR. BUGLIOSI: I would ask to reopen direct, your .3 Honor. THE COURT: Let's proceed. 5 Did Mr. Manson ever offer you MR. BUGLIOSI: Q LSD, Juan? Α. Yes. 8 MR. KANAREK: I object. 9 THE COURT: Sustained. 10 Wait for the ruling. 11 The answer is stricken. 12 The jury is admonished to disregard it. 13 MR. BUGLIOSI: Q You testified on cross-14 examination, Juan, that silence was among the secret 15 signals of Mr. Manson. 16 Would you explain that, please? 17. Well, he had all these, you know, things that he 18 did, you know. (Indicating) 19 Could you give some examples? 20 Like this, you know. (Indicating) 21 In other words, brushing off his left shoulder 22 with his right hand? 23 Yes. Ã, 24 Without saying anything? 25 Yes. A. 26 Q Anything else?

1	A. Well, there was some more, but, you know, I
2	didn't understand them.
	Q You observed him make other types of signals?
3°	A Well, occasionally he would say that these
±. 5	signals were, you know, at times, more adequate.
	Q More adequate?
·6.	A. Yes. To talk to each other, you know.
8	Like going like this, you see. (Indicating)
9	Q Could you explain what you just did right now,
10	Juan?
11	MR, KANAREK: I object, your Honor. Hearsay and
12	conclusion. It is hearsay by conduct.
٠.	There is no foundation for it, your Honor.
13	It is ambiguous.
14,	THE COURT: He is talking about conversation, which I
16	don't understand.
17	Read the question, Mr. Reporter.
18	(The record was read by the reporter.)
19 .	THE COURT: He may describe what he did, but you
20	will have to lay a foundation for any conversation.
21	MR. BUGLIOSI: All right.
22	Q Would you describe what you just did a little
23	while ago, Juan?
24	A. Well, it was something like, you know, "Listen
25	to what is coming, you know." Something to that effect.
~~	(Indicating)

, 		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· , ·		*	12,39)1	• • • • •
•	Q.	What d	id you do	with	your	hands	· · · · · ·	, , ,
	A.	He wou	ld go (in	dicati	lng).			
. ` .	- Q	You pl	aced your	right	hand	up by	your	right
ear?					· · ·		,	
	Ai.	Yes.		,				
	Q	And yo	u went in	a cir	rele?	•		
.,	A	Yes.		<i>:</i>		,		•
	Q	And yo	u pointed	out v	with y	our r	ight 1	ndex
fing	er str	aight ah	ead?	• •				
	A.	Yes.		,		,	· . ·	* • • •
		.÷		•				,
		•	· .					
	٠.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
, ,	٠				,	,		
				**			, ` ·	
		• •						

5b-1	ı	Q Did you ever see Manson do that?
·	2	A Well, he had all these things, you know, that he
	3	talked to his people with.
	4	Q Talked to what people with?
•	5	A The Family members.
	. 6	Q Did you understand what all these signals meant?
7	7	A No. But, you know, I saw him doing them.
, · •	8	Q You saw Mr. Manson do this with his Family?
3	. 9	A I know one for sure that I know was the one
F	. 10	that went like that, (indicating), and then everybody went
	11	outside.
s*	12	Q And you saw other signals that Manson made with
	13	members of his Family?
	14	A Yes.
	15	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, that is assuming facts not
	16	in evidence as to the word "signals."
٠	17	All of us, in our human life, in our daily
	18	life, talk and make
*	19	THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
•	20	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
ξ.	21	Q You saw Mr. Manson make motions like this with
-	22	his hands in communicating with the Family; is that correct
•	23	A Yes.
٠.	24	MR. KANAREK: Conclusion, hearsay.
	25,	MR. BUGLIOSI: He was a percipient witness, your
-	26	Honor. It is a matter of cross-examination.

5b-2THE COURT: He may describe what he saw. Ì, THE WITNESS: Yes. I saw him do these motions. 2 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 3 But you didn't know what he meant by them? 4 **A** No. The only one I knew was that one. The brushing of the shoulder? Q 7 Α Yes. 8 When did you first hear the word "program," 9 Juan? 10. MR. KANAREK: Object, your Honor, on the grounds that 11 it is calling for a conclusion, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Overruled. 13 You may answer the question. 14 THE WITNESS: When I first got up to the ranch. 15 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 16 Spahn Ranch? 17 A. Yes. 18 Who did you hear the word "program" from? Q 19 Á From Mr. Manson and members of the Family. 20 Did Mr. Manson ever tell you what the word Q 21 "program" meant? <u> 22</u> MR. KANAREK: Object, your Honor, on the grounds 23 that it is calling for hearsay and conclusion. 24 It has got nothing to do with this witness's 25 state of mind. 26

.21

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: Overruled.

You may answer.

THE WITNESS: Well, programmed --

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q You can answer that yes or no.

Did he ever tell you what the word "programmed"
meant, Juan?

A Yes.

When did he tell you this?

A He told me that a lot of times, you know, since first got up there.

Q Do you remember who was present during these conversations when he discussed the word "program" with you?

A Oh, there was members of the Family there.

Q Do you remember the specific individuals present?

A Most of them, you know. Most of the members

of the Femily were, you know, at one time or other, you know,

when he spoke of these words, of "program."

Q What did he say "program" meant?

MRY KANAREK: Hearsay, your Honory

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Well, it was, you know, what you was taught by society or the system, the upcoming, the upbringing of the children, you see, of a society or a system, you see, you know, like schools and churches and, you know, all

these things that led to inhibitions, you know, and stuff like that.

•	
1,	Q What about parents?
2	A. Parents, too, you know.
3	Q He mentioned parents?
4	A. Yes. Parents have the power to program their
5	children in a very early age to go to school, you see, and
6	this program consisted of, you know, the program to have
7	the children giving their consent or accept a society or a
8	system that was approved by their parents, you see.
9,	Q Did Mr. Manson ever mention the word "un-
10	programmed" to you?
11	MR. KANAREK: Object, your Honor, Conclusion,
12	hearday and no toundarton
13	THE COURT: Overfulled.
14	THE WITNESS: Yes.
. 15	MR. BUGLIOSI: Q What did he tell you
16	"unprogrammed" meant?
17	MR. KANAREK: Hearsay, your Henor
18	THE WITNESS: Well
19	THE COURT: Just a minute.
20	Will counsel approach the bench.
21	(Whereupon, all counsel approach the bench
22	and the following proceedings occur at the bench outside
23	of the hearing of the jury:)
24	THE COURT: What is the relevancy of all this,
25	Mr. Bugliosi?
26	MR. BUGLIOSI: The relevance goes towards domination;

1

ž

3

4

5 6

7

8 9.

10.

11

12

13

15

16·

17

Ţ8

19

20

21

23.

24 25

26

that Manson is telling him --

THE COURT: Well, if there is some conversation that you are trying to get to, there is no point in getting in the definition if it doesn't lead to something.

MR. BUGLIOSIE am telling the Court right now at is leading to.

It is his domination over the Family, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, let's get to something that is admissible.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It relates ___

THE COURT: I am not interested in a definition.

I am trying to find out from you. Are you making an offer now that there is some conversation in which these words were used that is relevant?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

THE COURT: What was the conversation?

MR. BUGLIOSI: The conversation is telling Flynn that he, Manson, had to unprogram these people in the Family, get rid of all their inhibitions, get rid of all their wants, so they just had nothing left.

THE COURT: When did this conversation take place?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I will lay a foundation. I think he will say that he told him this many times.

THE COURT: You are going to have to lay a specific foundation for the conversation. Then, if it is admissible,

26

you can get into the definition. But you are doing it in reverse. I haveno way of knowing --

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am making an offer of proof.

THE COURT: -- whether the definition in the context in which you are bringing it in is relevant or not.

If there is a conversation to which it relates that is admissible, it may be.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The conversation now that he will relate is that Manson told him that he had to unprogram these people in the Family and get rid of all their inhibitions, all of their restraints.

THE COURT: Let's get the conversation first, and then you can bring in the definition.

MR. BUGLIOSI: All right.

5d-1

2

·1.

3.

4

5.

:7

8.

ġ.

10

II.

12

14.

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

MR. KANAREK: I object to the offer of proof, your Honor, and I submit that all of this as to the counts that are in the indictment, your Honor, the prejudicial value far outweighs any probative value, and it is hearsay.

THE COURT: I take it you contend that it is circumstantial evidence of the conspiracy, the domination of Mr. Manson over the Family; is that right?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

And furthermore, the argument is that in unprogramming these people in the Family, he was programming them for himself, under the guise of unprogramming them, releasing their restraints, releasing their inhibitions.

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, may this be limited to the declarant?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, if I may, I'd like to object on the grounds it really is calling for psychological and psychiatric analysis.

THE COURT: It is calling for conversation.

Let's get on with the trial.

(Whereupon all counsel return to their respective places at the counsel table and the following proceedings occur in open court within the presence and hearing of the jury:)

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q Mr. Flynn, do you remember when Mr. Manson discussed unprogramming with you?

22:

23

24,

25

26

ĭ,		A,	He	discussed	that.	He bro	ight i	up	the	subject
a	lot	o£	times,	you know	• •.		•		•	•

Q Well, did he discuss unprogramming around the same time that he spoke of programming?

A Well, I would usually bring a point out, you know, and he would bring a point out and talk about it, like --

Q Without going into the conversation now, Juan, we are trying to determine when, approximately when, Manson spoke to you about unprogramming.

A Well, in the conversations that he brought up programming.

Q All right.

So the unprogramming talk came up in the same conversations when he was talking about programming?

A Yes. Yes.

Q And he mentioned unprogramming many times; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q During the period that you were at Spahn Ranch?

A Yes.

Q And again, Juan, you don't remember exactly who was present during these conversations?

A Yes.

Q What did Mr. Manson say about unprogramming?

MR. KANAREK: Hearsay, your Honor. Improper foundation.

MR. SHINN: Hearsay as to Susan Atkins. Ĩ MR. KANAREK: Calling for a conclusion. THE COURT: Overruled. 3 You may answer. 4 THE WITNESS: He said that, you know, to unprogram 5 yourself you have to get rid of all the ego, you know. 6. BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 7 Ego? 8 Ego, you know. All the wants, you know, that you had, and give up your mother and father, you know, and 10° get rid of all the inhibitions, you know, and just blank ÌΙ yourself out. 12 MR. KANAREK: I ask that that be stricken, your Honor. 13 It appears not to be Mr. Manson's 14 THE COURT: Motion denied. 15 BY MR. BUGLIOST: 16. Did Mr. Manson say how to accomplish this 17 unprogramming? 18 MR. KANAREK: Calling for a conclusion, leading and 19 suggestive, your Honor. 20 MR. BUGLIOSI: How to accomplish it, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: It doesn't seem to relate to the offer 22 of proof. 23 MR. BUGLIOSI: Pardon? 24 THE COURT: It does not seem to relate to your offer 25 of proof. 26

MR. BUGLIOSI: I was making an offer of proof as to that limited point. Now I am going beyond that.

THE COURT: I am going to sustain the objection.

2

3

5

6

8

9.

10

11

13

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 .

22 23

24.

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: Q Did Mr. Manson say he did anything with the girls in his Family to unprogram them?

MR. KANAREK: Ambiguous, your Honor. Calling for a conclusion, leading and suggestive.

MR. SHINN: Irrelevant and immaterial.

THE COURT: Overruled.

You may answer.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Q When did he say this?

A. Well, he said that to me a lot of times.

Q At Spahn Ranch?

A. Yes.

Q Do you know who was present when he said it to you?

A Well, I can't remember the members, you know, but I know that I was there.

Q What did he say?

MR. KANAREK: Hearsay, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled,

THE WITNESS: Well, he says, you know, to get rid of the inhibitions, you know, you could, you know, just take a couple of girls, and, you know, have them lay down, you know, and have them eat each other, or for me to take a girl up in the hills, you know, and let her suck my dick all day long; something like that, you know, just lie back.

Q So, he told you then --

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may we approach the bench. 1 your Honor? 2 THE COURT: Very well. 3 (Whereupon, all counsel approach the bench and the following proceedings occur at the bench outside of the hearing of the jury:) 6 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I ask that that last answer ... 7 be stricken and the jury be requested not to consider it. 8 And mere admonishment not sufficing, I must ask 9 for a mistrial. 1Ô THE COURT: It doesn't sound responsive. I am going 11 to do this, Mr. Bugliosi. 12 I think we are just wasting time. 13 MR. BUGLIOSI: Wasting time that he had the girls in 14 the Family copulate each other to release their inhibitions, 15 to release their wants? 16 Manson is the one that made this evidence, your 17 Honor, not I. I am presenting it. 18 THE COURT: That isn't what the answer was, though. 19 MR. BUGLIOSI: That is what he was referring to, about 20 the girls in the Family. 21 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, if you take every criminal 22 defendant and go into his life and the gutter talk he may · 23. have used in his life, if you go into anyone's life, all of 24 us, perhaps, on occasions in our lifetime, use language, 25 and if the law allows this kind of garbage to damn a man, 26

then it is a very sad day for all of us. 1 It isn't the fact that it is garbage. THE COURT: 2 just don't see that the answer was responsive. I am going to strike it and admonish the jury to disregard it. 5 Now, let's get on to something else. We are 6 wasting time. You are creating more problems with your redirect . 8 Mr. Bugliosi. . 9. MR. BUGLIOSI: I think it is very relevant, your 10 Honor. 11 MR. HUGHES: I wish to join in the motion. · 12 Join in all the motions at the bench. MR. SHINN: . 13 MR. KANAREK: May I then make a motion for a mistrial? 14 THE COURT: Denied. 15 16 . 17 18. 19. 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

5f-1

2

5

6

8

ġ

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19:

20

2Ì

22

23

24

(Whereupon all counsel return to their respective places at counsel table and the following proceedings occur in open court within the presence and hearing of the jury:)

THE COURT: The last answer is stricken, ladies and gentlemen, and the jury is admonished to disregard it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: What portion of the answer?

THE COURT: The entire answer.

BY MR. BUGLIOST:

Q Did Mr. Manson discuss with you -- without going into what he said, Juan -- plans that he had to unprogram the people in the Family?

MR. KANDAEK: Leading and suggestive

MR. SUGLIGST. A am not going into the conversation

THE COURT. You may spayer.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q Were you aware of any car belonging to Johnny Swartz, Juan, other than the yellow Ford?

A Yes.

Q What car was that?

A There was a red Ford.

On August the 18th, 1970, Jum?

A Yes.

25 26

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

1	Q At the Los Angeles Police Department?
· 2	A Yes.
3	Q And he asked you some questions?
4:	A Yes.
.5	Q And you answered his questions?
6	A Yes.
7.	Q About how long did you talk to Sergeant Sartucci
8	MR. KANAREK: That is ambiguous, your Honor.
9	Are we now referring to the time of the colloquy
10 .	when it was taken down, or previous?
11	MR. BUGLIOSI: Referring to the conversation at the
12	Los Angeles Police Department.
. ,	Q How long did you talk to him on that occasion?
13	A I'd say ten, fifteen, twenty minutes. Something
14 15	Like that.
*	Q After you spoke to him, Juan, did you then come
16	over and talk to me?
٠.	A Yes.
18 ,	Q How long did you talk to me?
19	A About an hour, an hour and a half.
20	Q In my office?
21	A Yes.
22	Q . When you spoke to me, did you tell me about
23	Manson placing the knife at your throat and telling you
24	that he was the one who was doing all these killings?
25	MR. KANAREK: I object on the grounds of hearsay.
26.	ware entertransfer to and and give being the same of any of the same of the sa

MR. BUGLIOSI: This is exactly what they have gone They are the ones that raised this issue. 2 THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer. 4 THE WITNESS: Yes. BY MR. BUGLIOSI: You told me? Yes. When you told me that, did you tell me that at some previous time you had told some officer up at 10 Shoshone the same thing? MR. KANAREK: Objection, your Honor. Calling for 12 hearsay, conclusion. 13 . THE COURT: Sustained. 14 MR. BUGLIOSI: I expect a negative answer to that. 15 THE WITNESS: Yes. Up at Shoshone --16 . THE COURT: Just a moment. 17 Wait until the Court rules before you give 18 your answer. . 19 The answer is stricken and the jury is **20** admonished to disregard it. 21 The objection is sustained. 22 BY MR. BUGLIOST: 23 You told some officer up in Shoshone the 24 same thing, Juant 25 MR. KANAREK: I object on the grounds of hearsay. 26

THE COURT: Sustained. Ţ THE WITNESS: Yes. 2 THE COURT: Mr. Flynn, did you hear what I said 3. to you a moment ago? 4 Do not answer when I sustain an objection. The jury is admonished to disregard it. The enswer is stricken. Let's get on with it, Mr. Bugliosi. BY MR. BUGLIOSI: ģ Earlier in the day, when you were with 10 Sergeant Sartucci, before you had the conversation with Ϊĺ him over at the Los Angeles Police Department, what did 12 you and Mr. Sartucci do? 13 · 14 We went around to some houses that Mr. Manson had asked me about, you know. 15 This is what you and Mr. Sartucci did earlier 16 in the day? . 17 5g fls. 18 Yes. 19 20 21 **^`**22` 23. 24 25 26

g-1	1	Q You directed him to certain homes?
•	2	A. Yes.
	3	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may we approach the bench,
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4	your Honor?
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	5 :	I hate to interrupt.
	6	THE COURT: Are you making an objection?
4	7	MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.
_	8	THE COURT: Sustained.
٠,	9	MR. KANAREK: Would your Honor request the jury not to
1	0	consider those questions?
. 1	ı.	THE COURT: The answer is stricken. The jury is
	2	admonished to disregard it.
	13	MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, Mr. Kanarek is the one
	14	that brought this all up on cross-examination, what they did
· 1	ļ.5	earlier in the day.
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	16	THE COURT: Ask your next question.
1	17	MR. BUGLIOSI: My question was: What did they
· .	18	THE COURT: I don't want to hear any argument,
1	19	Mr. Bugliosi.
·	20	MR. BUGLIOSI: May I approach the bench?
	21	THE COURT: Yes. Very well.
·	22	(Whereupon, all counsel approach the bench and
> 1	23	the following proceedings occur at the bench outside of the
	24	hearig of the jury:)
	25.	MR. BUGLIOSI: I'm sorry, your Honor, but if he brings
- ,	26	up garbage on cross-examination, I am going to bring up more

24

25

26

garbage on redirect.

THE COURT: No, you are not.

MR. BUGLIOSI: If it is applicable, your Honor.

THE COURT: You are not going to if I am not going to let you.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am going to try to, your Honor.

He is the one that brought up the fact that they talk ---

THE COURT: I have a job not only to see that the defendants have a fair trial but to see that the People have a fair trial, and I am not going to let you sabotage your own case.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, he brought up this fact that Juan Flynn spent the whole day in conversation with Mr. Sartucci.

THE COURT: All right,

MR. BUGLIOSI: In conversation with Sartucci.

He brought it up.

I mean, he said that he had conversation with Sartucci all day.

Then he said: Later that night you went over and had a conversation with Sartucci, and he incorporated what you had talked about into this conversation.

Now, the inference being that if he and Sartucci spoke the entire day, surely Mr. Flynn would have mentioned to Sartucci the knife incident.

I am bringing out that they didn't have that type of a conversation; that during the day they didn't have a conversation about what Manson did to him, but they spent their time --

THE COURT: You didn't ask him that. You started off on some tangential area that had nothing to do with cross or direct.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I was leading up to the fact that they were spending their time driving around looking for homes.

THE COURT: I don't want to have constant conferences at the bench. Keep your direct within the bounds of the rules and we won't have any problem.

As I said before, you are creating more problems with your redirect.

MR. BUGLIOSI: If Mr. Kanarek hadn't made it so obvious, your Honor.

THE COURT: I didn't think it was obvious.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The context of the cross-examination is: How come, Mr. Flynn, you didn't tell Sartucci about the knife incident.

THE COURT: You are not going to get at it this way. Let's get on.

i de la companya di managara di managa	
5h-1 1	(Whereupon all counsel return to their
2	respective places at counsel table and the following
3	proceedings occur in open court within the presence and
. 4	hearing of the jury:)
5	Q Juan, you were arrested on August 16th, 1969;
6	is that correct?
7	A Yes.
8	Q For grand theft auto?
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	'A Yes.
. 10	Q And you were released shortly thereafter,
ii.	a couple of days later?
12	A Yes.
13	Q In addition to that arrest, you have also been
14.	arrested for being drunk on one occasion?
15	A Yes.
. 16	Q And also driving without a license?
17	A Yes.
18	Q Have you ever been arrested other than that?
19	A No.
20	MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions.
21.	THE COURT: Recross?
. 22	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, your Honor.
. 23	
24 .	
25	

5h-2 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 1 BY MR. FITZGERALD: 2 Mr. Flynn, you previously testified that you are six foot five inches tall and you weigh 187 pounds and you are 26 years of age; is that correct? 5 Yes. What is the state of your general physical condition? Are you in good health? Bad health? ġ. I could say good health. Were you, at one time, a light-heavyweight 10 boxer in the State of Alaska? 11 Well, I did some boxing up there, you know. 12 Do you consider yourself to be a man of rather ,13 tremendous strength, physical strength? 14 Ą Well, just as capable, you know. 15 Do you consider yourself to be a strong man, 16 Mr. Flynn? 17 Well, I have been knocked down before, you know. 18 That is my strength. I just fall like any other human. 19 Directing your attention to the summer months 20 Was there a person by the name of Bruce Davis of 1969. 21 living at the Spahn Ranch? 22 When? " 23 During the summer months of 1969. 24 What is the summer months? 25 26 May, June, July, August, September.

i .	A Was Bruce Davis there?
2	Q Yes.
3.	A I am pretty sure I saw him there. I saw him
4	there.
. 5	Q During the summer months of 1969, did you have
.6	occasion to pick Mr. Davis up by one hand and throw him on
7.	his back?
8	MR. BUGLIOSI: Trrelevant.
9	THE COURT: Overruled.
10	THE WITNESS: During the summer months?
n	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
12	Q Any time during the year 1969.
13	A I don't say I picked him up by my hand.
14	Q The enswer is no, then; correct?
15	A No, yes. No.
16	Q During the course of your military service in
17	Vietnam, did you have occasion to kill people?
6 fls. 18	A Well, I wouldn't want to discuss that with you
19	
,20	
21	
22	
23	
-24	
25	

Q No?

MR. BUGLIOSI: It's irrelevant, your Honor,

MR. FITZGERALD: I am not going to ask you any --

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. FITZGERALD: If I may be heard, I think it's relevant in terms of his state of mind in regard to the threats he's received, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. FITZGERALD: Now, without getting into the identity of the persons that came and talked to you while you were chopping wood, let me ask you these questions: Was one person a male person?

A. Yes.

Q Was he approximately five feet, six inches tall?

A. Well, I wouldn't say how high he was. I know when I looked at that person, you know, how high he is.

Q Are you able to estimate his height in terms of feet or inches?

A If I stand up.

Can I stand up and show you?

Q You may.

A About this tall (indicating).

4 He comes up to just below your shoulder, the top of his head?

A. Well, about this tall (indicating).

21

22.

. 23.

24

25

- 3		
1	Q	About even with your shoulders?
2	A.	Yes.
.3 .	Q.	Does he weigh approximately 125 pounds?
4	A.	I don't know his weight.
,5	Q.	Are you able to estimate the weight of other
6	people?	
7	A.	I'm able to describe him, you know.
8	· Q	This person had a nickname, did he not?
. 9	And that qu	estion can be answered yes or no?
10	Å.	Is this a male?
11	Q.	A male.
12	A.	Yes. Well, I just know one name, you know.
13.	Q.	Was part of his name Little? like Little Joe,
14	Little Ralp	h, something like that? Was he referred to as
15	Little?	
1 6	A,	I'm not sure.
17	Q	Directing your attention to the female person
18	who was wit	h him, was she approximately five foot one inches
19	tall?	
20.	A.	Can I stand up again?
:21	Q Q	Yes, you may,
22.	A.	About this tall (indicating).
23.	Q	Shoulder again?
. 24	Α.	No, about this tall (indicating).
25	Q	Approximately the same height as the male
26	person?	
	1	•

ľ	•	
T	A. .	Yes.
2	Q.	Does she weigh approximately 100 pounds?
3	A.	I don't know,
4	Q	You are unable to determine that?
5.	A.	(No response.)
6	· • •	How were these people armed, if they were,
7	Mr. Flynn?	
8	A ,	With knives.
9	Q	They had those knives displayed?
10	A.	Yes.
11,	, Q	Pointed at you?
12	A	Well, one was in the purse, you know, and
13	you know, th	ey had it displayed, they showed.
14	Q	And you previously testified that you were afraid
15	of people be	cause you were living at the ranch; is that
16	right?	
17	A.	Well, because I was living at the ranch?
Ĵ8	Q.	Yes.
19 :	Α.	Well, that's you know, I took my precautions.
20	, <u>Q</u>	Yesterday you testified that your state of
21	mind was suc	h that you were staying at the ranch and you
22	felt threate	ened?
23:	Α.	Yean.
24	Q.	Was there anything wrong with your legs during
25.	that period	of time, Mr. Flynn?
26	A.	With my legs?

	uron hom rege.
· Д.	I don't remember.
, Q ,	You could have walked away from the ranch,
couldn't y	ou?
A.	Yeah.
Q	Now, do you recall the dates you were given
these note	3?
А.	No.
Q.	How do you know these notes were washed?
A.	Because I was looking for them, you know, and,
you know,	the person that washed them told me.
Q.	What did that person say?
A .	Well, that, you know, I was looking for my notes,
you see.	I was looking for some long pants so I could go
out somewh	ere, you know. And they said that they washed
the pants,	you know, and found some papers in them, they
said.	
Q	Do you have the washed-out notes?
A.,	No, I don't think so. I might. I don't know.
They were	in pretty bad shape, she said, you know.
Q.	How long did you have the notes before you
had them w	ashed?
A.	Well, I can say a date, you know, that you
see, when	Mr there was an officer that came down there
to talk to	Larry Jones, you see. And then I asked about
my notes,	you know, and that was about the time that they

1	got washed, you see.
2	How long a period of time did you have the
3.	notes tefore they were washed in terms of days, weeks,
4	or months?
.5	A I just had them a good while.
. 6	% Monthe?
7	A good - months, yeah.
8	Q You were arrested by Sergeant Sartucci on
g	August 16th or 17th of 1979, were you not?
ig	A This year?
ii	Was, this year,
12	A Tean,
13	then Fr. Buglioni asked you if you were
14	arrested, when you were arrested you didn't say you were
15	arrested by Sergeant Sartucel, did your
16	A I didn't way that. I said I was arrested.
17	il Is there some reason you omitted telling us
18	about the errest by Sergoent Sertucol?
19	A. In there some reason I admit to your
20	G In there some reason you failed to tell us
21	that when you were maked the question by fir. Bugliosi
22	about your arrests?
23	A Well, I just I was just asked if I been
24	arrested.
25	Q Did you forget that arrest?
26	A You never forget when you go in jail, you know,
,	the many times and long hours that you spend in there.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

				,				
Q	And that's	your	most	recent	arrest,	Ĺş	it	not

A Yes.

Q Did the fact you were under screet have anything to do with the statement you gave to Sergeant Sartucci?

A To tell you the truth --

Q Please do.

A -- I was -- I told them to arrest me and I showed them the ticket that I had and I wanted to be arrested. Because I felt, you know, very much, you know, in need of protection, you see. I felt very much in need of protection, so I asked, you know, to be arrested. And I showed them and I says, "Look up my warrant, you know, and look up whatever books," big stack that big, you know. "But I want to be arrested because, you know, I need it, you know."

MR. FITZGERALD: Nothing --

THE WITNESS: That's why.

MR. FITZGERALD: Nothing further. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Shinn, any questions?

MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHINN:

Q Mr. Bugliosi asked you about your service.
You stated that you were in the Service for three and a
half years, three years?

1	A	Three years.
2	Q	Was that the Infantry?
3	A	Yes.
•	Q	And I believe you stated that you went overseas?
4.	A ···	Yes.
5	Q	And when did you go overseas?
<u>.</u>	A	Well, I went overseas from Alaska, I guess it
7	was in '66.	
8	Q	And from '66 to what date were you overseas?
9 .	A	Until I got back.
	Q	When was that? approximately three years,
, jr	two years?	
12	A	11 months and 29 days.
13	Q	You were overseas for 11 months approximately,
14	now; Is the	t correct?
35	A	And 29 days.
16	Q	And 29 days, pardon me.
18		Now, were you in Vietnam at this time, all the
19	time?	
20	A	11 months and 29 days. And I spent seven or
20	eight days	in China and Teipei.
22	Q	And were you in the Infantry?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	In other words, you were in actual combat?
25	A .	Yes.
26	Q	Do you know whether or not you killed any
, 20		

ia-4 _T	you, you see. I don't understand you, Mr. Shinn.
2	Would you repeat the question?
3	Q You don't understand the question, in other
4	words, correct?
	A No. No. Would you repeat it?
6	Q Okay.
3 7	Now, you went overseas in combat?
8.	A Yes.
9.	Q And you came back and you felt sorry.
10	Did you feel sorry that you went to combat?
11	MR. BUGLIOSI: It's irrelevant.
12	MR. SHINN: Goes to state of mind, your Honor, as
j a	to what he's testifying.
. 14	THE COURT: Sustained.
. 15	BY MR. SHINN:
. j 6	Q The fact that you went overseas in combat,
17	I asked you whether or not that had anything to do with
18	you testifying against Mr. Manson and the defendants in
19	this case?
,20	A Well, I cm't link Vietnam with these you
÷ 2İ	know.
. 22	Q In other words, your answer is no?
23	A. Would you repeat the question?
24	MR. SHINN: May the question be read back, your Honor
25	THE WITNESS: See, it just doesn't make sense to me,
26	you know, see.

a-5	1	MR. SHINN: Well, maybe I can clear this up, then.
	2	Q Do you recall the time that you and I and a
)	8	couple of girls went to visit Mr. Manson in jail? Do you
•	4.	recall that?
	5	A Yes.
	6	Q Well, that was approximately about, what,
* .	· - 7	August 16th or the 17th, 1970?
ę î	8: -	A By those girls, you mean Pearl?
	, ę	Q No. Those other girls. We went up I think it
	10	was Lynne Fromme or Sandy Good, you and I, went to visit
,	ir i	Charlie.
	12	A (No response.)
	13	Q Maybe I can pinpoint this a little closer.
	14	You were arrested by Sergeant what is his
	15	name? Sartucci.
, ,	16	A Would you repeat that last question that you
b fls	17	asked me?
• •	18	
, ``	19	
	20	
· •	21 ;	
	.,22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
J.		

26

THE COURT: Now, you are not answering the question, "MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may that last statement -may the jury be admonished to disregard it?

THE COURT: Matter is stricken. The jury is admonished to disregard it.

Listen to the question. You can answer that you remember the conversation or you don't.

Q BY MR. SHINN: Do you recall some or all of the conversation you had with Mr. Manson on or about August — I believe it's 16th or 17th in New County Jail while I was present?

A This is the building that you are speaking of, huh?

Q Yes. We went up to the tenth floor. It was around 7:00 o' lock at night.

Do you recall you, me, and another girl visiting Mr. Manson? Do you remember that time?

A. I remember one time that I came down here with Ruby Pearl and Miss Kwan.

Q Who?

Well, some -- just some other woman. Another woman, you know. Two women and I came down here at the request of Mr. Manson, you see, to have Pearl come down here and see him, you see. And I wasn't going to go up, you see, then, because I didn't have enough proof of I.D. And so Mr. Kanarek, you know, asked me to go, you know, and he could furnish the proper I.D. for me to go up and see Mr. Manson.

Q Well, you did go w, didn't you?

- 1	
Ĭŧ,	A Yes.
2	And I was there, too, do you remember?
3	A. Yes.
4.	Q And you talked with Mr. Manson for about
. 5	approximately one hour, correct?
6	A. I'd say about 20 minutes, something like that.
7	Q You say 20 minutes?
8.	A Yeah, 20 minutes, 30 minutes, something like
9	that,
10	Q Okay. Now, my question is do you recall a
11	conversation you had with Mr. Manson, any part of it, or
12	all of the conversation?
13	A. Well, yes, yes.
14	Q Would you relate some of the conversation
15	you had?
16	MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, if he can relate the whole
17	conversation, your Honor. "Some" is ambiguous.
18	MR. SHINN: Of what he can remember, your Honor. I'm
19	not asking him to relate word for word what he said.
20	MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you want the whole conversation?
21	MR. SHINN: What he remembers, yes.
22	MR. BUGLIOSI: Actually, your Honor, I have no
23	objection to the entire conversation coming in. But it
24	would seem to be hearsay.
25	THE COURT: Well
26	MR. BUGLIOSI: And also irrelevant.

THE COURT: Objection sustained. You may ask him about specific portions of the conversation. 3 BY MR. SHINN: Do you recall the part of the conversation you had about the Viet-Nam war? MR. BUGLIOSI: That's irrelevant. MR. SHINN: I'm asking if he remembers. THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer. THE WITNESS: Yes. I could have mentioned something, 9 10 you know, but I don't remember, you know. BY MR. SHINN: You could have mentioned some-11 thing about the war; is that correct? 12 Yès. 13 And did you also talk about a crossbow? 14 . Do you know what a crossbow is? 15 Yes. 16 . What is a crossbow? ÎŻ Well, a crossbow is something like this, you 18 see (indicating). You see, it has two ends, like that 19 (indicating), you know. And it's something like a bow. 20 you know. Only it's got an extra piece of stick like this, **21** you know. And it's got a trigger, you know. What do you use it for? to kill people or 23 animals or what? 24 It's a very primitive weapon, you know. They 25

find all kinds of uses for it, you know.

. 1	, ·
1	Q And during this conversation you had with
2	Mr. Manson, there was no discussion about these threats on
3.	your life, was there?
4	A. Well, one I think there was something, you
5.	know, about the treatment. There was a conversation.
6	Q But you visited Mr. Manson after you received
7	these threatening letters and phone calls, correct?
8	A Well, let's see. There was one threat, you know
ġ	about two weeks ago, something like that.
10	Q Well, my question is, when you visited
11	Mr. Manson in August
12	A. Yes.
13	Q on or about August 16th, 1970
14	A. Yes.
15	Q that's about a couple of months ago, month
16	and a half ago
17	A. Yes.
18	Q you made no mention about the threats to
19	Mr. Manson; is that correct?
20	A. Well, I didn't, you know. But certain points
21	were brought out, you see, on the Spahn's incidents.
22	Q And you didn't tell me about these threats
23	either, did you?
24	A. I mentioned to you and Mr. Kanarek as you was
25.	leaving, you know.

As who was leaving?

26

2: 4 5 6 7. Ŕ g. Ĭ0 11 12 ÌЗ Mr. Manson. 14 15 16 17 18 Ì9 20 21 sentence. 22 23 THE COURT: 24 25.

26

As you was leaving and Mr. Kanarek, at the bottom of the elevator, you see. Because Mr. Kanarek said that I was his friend and I says, "If you want me to be your friend ask Mr. Manson about the incident up at the Barker Ranch." You see.

You remember that, don't you, Mr. Shinn?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I ask that that be stricken on the ground that it has nothing to do with threats, your Honor. The Barker Ranch has nothing to do with what these threats are. But obviously -- that goes back to --

DEFENDANT MANSON: See, your Honor, I'm no better than this man's emotions.

THE COURT: All right. That will be enough,

The motion is denied.

THE WITNESS: And -- can I?

MR. SHINN: There is no question pending.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Wait a while. He says "and." He's going into a new clause.

MR. SHINN: Well, your Honor --

MR. BUGLIOSI: He should be permitted to finish his

MR. SHINN: He hesitated about 30 seconds.

Had you completed your answer?

THE WITNESS: No. sir.

THE COURT: Do you know what the question is?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

After going to see Mr. Manson -- would you read the answer, please?

MR. SHINN: The question, not the answer.

THE WITNESS: The question.

THE COURT: Go to your next question.

MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.

•	
	1
6b-1 1	}
2	
3	
4	Ì
	,
. 6	
7	
8	,,
ģ	
10.	}
H	
12	;
13	
14	
. 15	,
, 16.	
17	
18	-
19	
20	
21	
•	

22

23

24

26

BY MR. SHINN:

Q While visiting Mr. Manson, you were very friendly with Mr. Manson, were you not?

A Well, I don't hate the man.

Q Well, you had a friendly good conversation, did you not?

A Well, we talked.

Q Yes.

A Yes.

Q You were laughing and Mr. Manson was laughing?

A Yes. I like to smile, yes.

Q Now, you stated that you never heard the word "program" until you met Mr. Manson; is that correct?

A Well, the effect ---

Q My question is, did you hear the word "program" before you met Mr. Manson?

A Yes.

Q Do you know how to spell "program"?

A P-r-o-g-a-m (sic). And programmed, e-d. Something like that.

Q Well, I believe that when Mr. Bugliosi asked you if you knew the meaning of the word "program," or heard of the word "program," before, you said no.

A Well, the effect that Mr. Manson -- you see you see, if you say "program," you know, then you have
program, you see. It you say "program," and you show

6c-1 what you want, you see, on program, then you have program to what you want, the effect that it serves. 2 In other words, you knew the meaning of à "program," and you heard the word "program," before you met Mr. Manson, then; is that correct? 5 MR. BUGLIOSI: It's ambiguous. There are many words 6 that have 18 definitions, your Honor. And what definition 7. is he talking about? , **8** THE COURT: Overfuled. 9 THE WITNESS: May I answer? ΙÒ THE COURT: You may answer. 11. THE WITNESS: Well, I've heard of television 12 programs. 13 BY MR. SHINN: 14 And how about when you were in the Service? **15** did they ever say to you the program for the day is so and 16 80? . **17** I don't know if they used that word in the 18 Service. 19 You never heard the word "program" in the Q 20 Service? 21 Well, I could have. You see, I've heard the 22 word in the English vocabulary, you see, the spoken 23 English, you know. I've heard the word "program." 24 MR. SHINN: No further cross.

THE COURT:

25

26

Mr. Kanarek, any questions?

6c-2

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

2

1

3

4

5

7

9. 10

11

12 13

14.

15

Ì6 -

17

Ì

19

20 21

22

23

24.

25

26

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KANAREK:

Mr. Flynn, you speak English well enough. You can spell these words like "program" and so forth, right?

Well, I'm not as capable of -- to do a very good job of it, but I understand English as well as I do.

Well, then, Mr. Flynn, will you tell me, when Mr. Shinn just a couple of minutes ago asked you about threats at the time you went to visit Mr. Manson in the jail, why did you mention the Barker Ranch, Mr. Flynn? That has nothing to do -- we are talking about threats in connection with this trial and you know it.

Because we discussed that, me and Mr. Manson, when we -- when I was up there at jail. And I mentioned to him that I had -- you see, this is the conversation that Mr. Shinn was asking me, if I had any type of conversation with Mr. Manson. And I discussed, you know, the time of the Barker Ranch with Mr. Manson.

But, Mr. Flynn, you know very well, sitting there in that witness stand, that the threats that we're talking about have to do with threats since Mr. Manson's been arrested and have nothing to do whatsoever with the Barker Ranch. You know that.

> It's a compound question, argumentative; MR. BUGLIOSI:

6c-3

2

3

4

6

8

.

10 11

12 13

14

15

16 . 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26 also a misstatement, your Honor.

. THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR, KANAREK:

Q Now, Mr. Shinn asked you -- now, I'll withdraw that. I'll ask you.

At the time you visited Mr. Manson in the jail, that was later than the time that you say you got these threats, right?

A Some of the threats, yes.

Q Well, I'm talking about -- all right. Let me ask you:

After this case, after Mr. Manson was arrested, between the time that Mr. Manson was arrested and the time that you visited him in the jail, you say you got threats, right?

A Right.

Q And when you visited him in the jail you walked into jail on your own two feet, right?

A Well, I --

Q Did you walk --

A Yes, yes.

Q All right. Did you sign a piece of paper wherein you became a visitor in the County Jail?

A Yes.

Q And you knew you were coming down there to talk to Mr. Manson, right?

6c-4 A Yes, yes. And that was after the date that you say you 2 got these threats, right? Would you repeat that last question? Be glad to, Mr. Flynn. You don't understand the last question? б Would you repeat it? I didn't hear you too well. A 7 All right. Do you have a problem with your ears? Q No. ġ Pardon? Q 10 No. I just didn't hear you too well, you see. П I see. 12 Now. Mr. Flynn, is it a fair statement that you 13 consider yourself to be an actor? Right? 14 MR. BUGLIOSI: Asked and answered, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Overruled. 16 MR. BUGLIOSI: Beyond the scope of redirect, also. 17 THE WITNESS: May I answer? 18 THE COURT: Sustained on that ground. 19 BY MR. KANAREK: 20 Mr. Flynn, when you sit there on the witness 2I: stand, is your state of mind such that some part of what you are telling us here has to do with your desire to act 23 as you are sitting on that witness stand? Is that right? 24 MR. BUGLIOSI: Same objection. 25

Overruled.

THE COURT:

Do you understand the question?

THE WITNESS: No, sir.

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q You don't understand that question?

A Would you repeat it?

Q Mr. Flynn, when a question is asked of you that you think may not help the prosecution in this case --

MR. BUGLIOSI: Oh, stop arguing.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, he's interrupting.

MR. BUGLIOST: Be quiet.

THE COURT: Mr. Bugliosi, now, I'm not going to warn you again, sir.

MR, BUGLIOSI: What's he doing, your Honor? He's accusing me of something and I don't like it.

THE COURT: Approach the bench.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am not going to take it. I've had it up to here.

(The following proceedings were had at the bench outside the hearing of the jury:)

MR. BUGLIOSI: I'm not going to be accused of a capital offense by this guy day in and day out.

THE COURT: That's absurd. You interrupted Mr. Kanarek. You made outrageous statements in front of the jury after I've warned you time and time again.

I find you in direct contempt of court and I fine you \$50.

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BUGLIOSI: Would the Court read what he said that 1 caused me to make that remark? Would the Court have the 2 reporter read back what he said in front of the jury? THE COURT: That will be enough. MR. BUGLIOSI: Can I ask the Court to have the reporter ---6 THE COURT: \$50, Mr. Bugliosi, or one night in the County Jail. MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, may I ask the Court to have the reporter read back what he said that prompted that 10 remark? Would the Court grant me that? Just to have the 11 reporter read back what Mr. Kanarek said? 12. THE COURT: I don't care what he said. It doesn't 13 justify what you did. 14 MR. BUGLIOSI: If he accuses me of things in front 15 of this jury --16 THE COURT: He didn't accuse you of anything. 17 MR. BUGLIOSI: May I have that read back? Would the 18 19 Court grant me that courtesy? THE COURT: You will have a transcript, Mr. Bugliosi, 20 ŽI. of the entire proceeding. MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, your Honor. But at this particu-22 lar moment right here, would the Court have the reporter 23 read back that particular remark? 24 THE COURT: It isn't necessary. I know what he said. * 25 MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor --26

Doesn't have anything whatever to do with

2	what you said.
3	MR. BUGLIOSI: If he makes a statement like that
4	THE COURT: Mr. Bugliosi, I don't want to hear any
5	more. Do you understand me?
6	MR. BUGLIOSI: What about his making these remarks in
7	front of the jury? What am I supposed to do? let him
8	accuse me of things?
9	THE COURT: If you don't stop this, Mr. Bugliosi, I
10 😘	am going to have to find you in contempt again. I mean it,
И	now. Let's get on with this trial.
12	MR. BUGLIOSI: I want to do it, but he gets up in
13.	front of the jury day in and day out and accuses me of
14	stuff and I've got to sit there and listen.
15	THE COURT: .\$50 is to be paid before 2:00 p.m. this
16	afternoon.
17	(Whereupon the proceedings were resumed before
18	the jury in open court.)
19	THE COURT: The jury is admonished to disregard the
20	colloquy between counsel.
21	Let's proceed.
22 ,	BY MR. KANAREK:
23	Q Mr. Flynn, have you stated, Mr. Flynn, that
24	because of the incidents of the killing that you participate
25	in in the Vietnam War, that this has affected your mind so
26	that you can think you don't really have any ability to

THE COURT:

carry on your mental processes? Have you made those 1 statements, Mr. Flynn? MR. BUGLIOSI: Absurd lecture on Mr. Kanarek's part, 3 your Honor. THE COURT: Overruled. 5 MR. KANAREK: It goes to his --MR. BUGLIOSI: It's just --THE COURT: Mr. Bugliosi --MR. BUGLIOSI: That's an improper question. compound. It's argumentative. 10 THE COURT: If you have an objection, sir, you stand 11 12 up and make it in the usual legal form. I don't want any more colloquy from you or 14 comments. Now, I mean that, sir. 15 The jury is admonished to disregard Mr. Bugliosi's 16 comments. 17 Do you have the question in mind, Mr. Flynn? 18 19 20 21 22 23 25 26

7 fls.

THE COURT: All right.

25

26

MR. KANAREK: Q Directing your attention to CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

your state of mind and your thinking, Mr. Flynn. Have the events that you participated in in 2 the Viet-Nam war affected your state of mind, your thinking? MR. BUGLIOSI: Ambiguous. State of mind as to what? 4 It is too broad a question, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Sustained. 6 MR. KANAREK: Have you, Mr. Flynn, directing . 7 your attention now to the time you have been at the Spahn Ranch, have you stated, Mr. Flynn, that because of your experiences, the killing that you did in the Viet-Nam war, 10. because of those experiences, you don't know what is going ÌĮ on around you? 12 Have you made statements to that effect? 13 Well. I don't know how to answer you. A. 14 I don't understand the question. . 15 Q. You don't understand that question? 16 No. 17 MR. KANAREK: May it be read, your Honor? 18 Maybe if the reporter reads it, he will under-19 stand it. 20 THE COURT: Read the question. 21 (The question was read by the reporter.) 22 THE WITNESS: Well, I could have made statements to 23 that effect, you see. But to the length of time, you see, 24 in the length of time, you see -- can I talk? **25** When I came back from Viet-Nam, I felt -- I 26 questioned myself a lot, you know. I felt that I entered

ļ3

5

22:

another face, you know. But I don't know if I made those statements to someone at the ranch or something like that, you know.

I don't want to discuss Viet-Nam with you, really.

THE COURT: Ask your next question, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: Q Have you finished, Mr. Flynn?

A. Yes.

Q Now, when you say you entered another world, Mr. Flynn, what do you mean by that?

A I mean that you spend Il months and 29 days in a swamp where everybody is dressed green, paints their face green, lives in a green world; and then when you come back here to the States, you get off the plane and you see all these lights and all these people, you know, with blonde hair, you know. It is just hard to cope with, you know. It just hits you hard, you know. It is just totally different from what you are or have been through.

It is just like that, you know. It is hard to accept when you come back, you know. It is hard to accept when you come back.

3.

4

5

6

7

8'

g.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Mr. Flynn, is it a fair statement -- now, I am referring to your use of the words "cope with" -when you say "cope with," what do you mean by that, Mr. Flynn?

Well, to accept it, you know, and adapt yourself, you know.

It is like to accept it and to adapt yourself. Like going from here to China, you know, and sitting down, and everybody is talking Chinese. You see, it is a different world. It is two different worlds, you know.

There is no relation, Viet-Nam and these parts of the world. There is no relation, no relation between the two, you know.

- Have you finished?
- Yes.
- And you have stated. Mr. Flynn, you saw people with long hair when you came back. You saw people with long hair.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Blonde hair.

THE WITNESS: I said blonde hair.

You know, all this. When you are over there, all you see is people running around with black uniforms. you know, and people wearing green and black uniforms, you see. You see this, you know, and then when you ome back, you know, all these people, you know, they wear different colors of pants and different colors of shirts,

and different colors of lights up there. 1 There you don't see no lights except if somebody blows up a mine, you know, or something like that. The people, they smile and everything, you know. 4 Have you finished, Mr. Flynn? Á. Yes. 6 Since you have been back, is it a fair statement, Mr. Flynn, that you have been nervous and upset -- is that a 8 fair statement -- because of your experience in the Viet-Nam war? ΙÔ Well, if I think about it, you know, I can say ĮΙ that I can think about it, you know, knowing that it is 12 going to be the same, you know, if I keep thinking about 13 it. 14 So, I stay active, you know. That is why I 15 like to stay active, you know, and do hard work, you know. 16 It keeps me away from thinking about it. 17 Have you finished that answer, Mr. Flynn? 18 Yes. .19 Now. Mr. Flynn, directing your attention to 20 the time that you were at the Spahn Ranch. 21 22 Yes. 23 In this period of time, Mr. Flynn, is it a fair statement that a lot of what went on around you was 24 like it was being done in Chinese? - 25 Is that a fair statement? 26

It was more

12,448 It was a new place when I got to Spahn's Ranch, 1 you know, the environment was more suitable than the city. 2 you know, so I choosed Spahn's Ranch, you know. 3 of a western, you know, western people, good country people. 4 Nice people in Chatsworth. `5∕ Nice people at the Spahn Ranch? Yes. 10 11 12 Į3. 14 15 16 17

18

19.

20

21

22,

23

24

25

26

7b-1

2

T

3

4

5

.

8

9

11

12

ļ3 14

15

16

17,

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

Q And is it a fair statement that during this period of time while you were at the Spahn Ranch, a lot of what went on about -- that is, the words that were stated and the things you heard -- were like Chinese to you? Is that a fair statement?

THE COURT: That is ambiguous.

MR. KANAREK: Pardon?

THE COURT: It is ambiguous. Sustained. BY MR. KANAREK:

Q When you used the word "Chinese" -- you know, you used it a few moments ago, Mr. Flynn --

A Yes.

Q -- what did you mean when you used the word
"Chinese"?

A When I used the word Chinese, I used the word Chinese for coping, you know, you see, used it with coping, you know. Admitting, you know.

We used it in relation with the conversation about Vietnam. When you come back from a place like that, well, you just have to cope, you know, and you adapt yourself to the different world, the part of the world that you come to, you see. You have to adapt yourself to the different part of the world that you come to, you see.

THE COURT: You have answered the question.

Ask your next question.

/ D-Z

Ż.

4

5

77

Ö

10

11

12

13: 14.

15

16

17 18

19

20° 21

22

23 24

25

26

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q Mr. Flynn, is it a fair statement that as far as your thinking process, the things that go on in your mind, that you have had difficulty in adapting yourself since you have been back from Vietnam?

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I can answer that question in a lot of ways.

THE COURT: You don't understand the question?
THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: All right.

It is ambiguous to the witness, Mr. Kenarek. Reframe your question.

MR. KANAREK: Certainly, your Honor.

Q May I ask you this, Mr. Flynn: When did you come back from Vietnam?

A I got out of the Service in 167.

And from '67 to the present time, is it a fair statement that you have had difficulty in adapting yourself to your surroundings here in the United States?

A In a way I have, you see. I have found difficulties, you know, accepting, you see, and trying to reset my values. I just stay active, you know. I stay active. I stay active.

Q Have you finished, Mr. Flynn?

A Yes.

Q Now, your purpose in staying active, Mr. Flynn,

7b~3

2

3

4.

5,

:6

7.

8

9

10

II.

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

-22

8 fls.

24

25

26

is so that you can be occupied physically so you don't have to do any thinking; you don't want to do any thinking about what you experienced in Vietnam and all the killing that you did; is that correct?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Assumes a fact not in evidence.
THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q Is it a fact, Mr. Flynn, that your staying active, physically active, keeping your body moving and your arms moving and your legs moving, and twisting your body and doing the various things physically that you do, so that you won't have to do any thinking?

Is that a fair statement?

Well, I do thinking when I am active, you see, but what I give my thoughts to, you know, you see, to whatever has value, you see, to accept, you know. So, if I produce, you see, if I stay active, to produce, you see, to do something for me like working, you work, let's say, and you get paid, you know, so that is why I stay active. I am not, you know, thinking about things that I don't want to think about, but the things that I am doing while I am active, you see. I concentrate on the work that I do, you see.

21

22

23

24

25

26

And while you have been active you have been concentrating on the physical activity, like the bailing of hay and all of that, is that a fair statement? Your thinking is directed to these physical activities you have been engaged in?

A. Yes.

And is it a fair statement, Mr. Flynn, that you have a feeling of guilt because of the killing that you did in the Viet-Nam war?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Assumes a fact not in evidence; also irrelevant.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- Mr. Flynn, of before, before you learned that Mr. Manson was arrested I'm not now talking about August the 16th, 1969, but sometime in the latter part of 1969 thinking of that time, at some time you heard Mr. Manson was arrested, right?
 - A. Yeah, I heard he was arrested.
- Mr. Manson until the time that you heard he was arrested, like, maybe, in November or December of 1969, you had no reason whatsoever, Mr. Flynn, to remember you had no reason to put in your mind any memory of the things that you have testified to from this witness stand; is that correct?

MR. KANAREK: Too broad a question. Too broad a

12,453 question. 1 THE COURT: Ambiguous. Sustained. BY MR. KANAREK: You have told us, Mr. Flynn, 3 that from the time, certainly, that you first saw 4 Mr. Manson, until even the present time, you are engaging in physical activities to keep your mind away from other thoughts; is that right? 7 From other thoughts than what? 8 From thoughts concerning the Viet-Nam war. 9 Α. Well, could you tell me -- the only time that 10 I think about these things, you know, is when they are 11 brought up to me, you see. Like, you bring it up to me 12 and I think about it, you see. And if I was to give it any 13 thought, you know, you know, outside of this court, you 14 know, then, you know, I'd give it thought out of this 15 court and I accept, you know, whatever thought I give it. 16 You see? So --17 THE COURT: We will recess at this time. 18 Have you completed your answer? 19 THE WITNESS: Yes. sir. 20 THE COURT: All right. We will recess at this time. 21 Ladies and gentlemen, do not converse with 22 anyone or form or express any opinion regarding the case 23 until it is finally submitted to you. 24 The Court will recess until 2:00 p.m.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken to reconvene at

25

26

2:00 p.m., same day.)

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES