# 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.

No. A253156

vs.

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

Defendants.

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

APPEARANCES:

DONALD A. MUSICH, STEPHEN RUSSELL KAY,

For the People:

AARON HASSES Z and VINCENT T. BUGLIOSI, DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS

For Deft. Manson:

I. A. KANAREK, Esq.

For Deft. Atkins:

DAYE SHINN, Esq.

For Deft. Van Houten:

AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE

RONALD HUGHES, Esq. PAUL FITZGERALD, Esq.

For Deft. Krenwinkel:

LOIS R. JOHNSON,

VOLUME 110

CSR. MURRAY MEHLMAN, CSR.,

PAGES 12454 to 12522 Official Reporters

VOLUME 110 P.M. Thursday, October 1, 1970

12454 - 12522

	1	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1970
	.2	2:07 P.M.
<b>)</b> , , , ,	.3	
	4	(The following proceedings are had in open
<del>,</del> .	, <b>5</b>	court, all counsel and defendants present, the jury
•	6	absent:)
	7	THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present.
	-8	The jury is not present.
is Taring Silvan	·ð·	This was the time set, gentlemen, as you know,
	10	for the continued proceedings with respect to the inquiry
	11	into the competency of Mr. Michael Hendrix, and the Court
, .	12	has asked Dr. Abe and Dr. Meyers to be present.
• · · · • · · • · · · • · · · • · · · ·	13	Have you each received copies of the doctors!
	14	reports?
	15	MR. FITZGERALD: We have, your Honor.
,	16	MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, sir.
	17	THE COURT: Do any counsel wish to examine Dr. Abe
	18	with respect to his report?
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	19	MR. SHINN: May we have a minute, your Honor?
,	20	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, I would like to, if I may.
<b>2</b>	' 21	THE COURT: Dr. Abe, would you come forward, please.
* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	22	THE CLERK: Would you raise your right hand, please.
» ,	23	Would you please repeat after me.
	24	I do solemnly swear
	25	THE WITNESS: I do solemnly swear
· ` .	26	THE CLERK: that the testimony I may give

THE WITNESS: -- that the testimony I may give --THE CLERK: -- in the cause now pending --2 THE WITNESS: -- in the cause now pending --THE CLERK: -- before this Court --THE WITNESS: -- before this Court --THE CLERK: -- shall be the truth --THE WITNESS: -- shall be the truth --7 THE CLERK: -- the whole truth --THE WITNESS: -- the whole truth --THE CLERK: -- and nothing butthe truth -10 THE WITNESS: -- and nothing but the truth --11 THE CLERK: -- so help me God. 12 THE WITNESS: -- so help me God. 13 14 THE CLERK: Would you be seated, please, Doctor. Would you please state and spell your name. 15. 16 THE WITNESS: George Y. Abe, M.D. The last name is 17 spelled A-b-e. 18 THE CLERK: Thank you. GEORGE Y. ABE. 20 called as a witness by and on behalf of the People, being 21 22

first duly sworn, was examined and testified outside the presence of the jury as follows:

24

23

25

# DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. FITZGERALD:

Q Dr. Abe, are you a medical doctor, licensed to practice in the State of California?

A Yes, I am.

Q By whom are you employed?

A. By the State of California.

Q In what capacity?

A. I am the medical director of the Metropolitan State Hospital.

Q That is an institution for the diagnosis, care and treatment of the mentally ill and emotionally disturbed in California?

A Yes.

Are you a psychiatrist?

A. Yes, I am.

Q Would you briefly state for the Court your qualifications?

A I graduated --

MR. BUGLIOSI: I will stipulate that he is very qualified, your Honor.

I don't think we should consume a lot of court time on this.

MR. FITZGERALD: All I intended to do, your Honor, was for him to state his qualifications on the record. I would then ask him if, pursuant to court order, did he examine

10

ij

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26

Michael Hendrix, and did he form any conclusions; and if so, what are they.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor --

MR. FITZGERALD: As a matter of fact, if the Court would like to conduct the examination, I just want the report to get into the record.

THE COURT: There isn't any question about Dr. Abe's qualifications. He's testified probably hundreds of times in the Superior Court on psychiatric matters.

Can't we have a stipulation to that?

MR. FITZGERALD: Certainly.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I'll stipulate to that.

MR. FITZGERALD: I'd offer to stipulate that Dr. Abe is an expert in the field of the diagnosis, care and treatment of the mentally, emotionally -- of the mentally and emotionally ill.

MR.KANAREK: And just one step further, that he is an expert in connection with the task the Court has assigned him. That will probably cover all kinds of --

MR. BUGLIOSI: I'll stipulate that he's qualified; that he has qualified as an expert in prior trials.

MR. FITZGERALD: It is so stipulated.

THE COURT: Very well.

May we have a stipulation with respect to his report in this case? May that be received in evidence, zentlemen?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: So stipulated.

MR. FITZGERALD: Could we mark it as a special court exhibit?

THE COURT: Do you know what the next number is?

It will be marked as Special Exhibit No. 3.

25

21

22

23

## BY MR. FITZGERALD: 1 Now, Dr. Abe, were you appointed by the Los 2 Angeles County Superior Court on or about September 22, 3 1970, under Section 730 of the Evidence Code to examine one Michael Hendricks in the Los Angeles County Jail? 5. A Yes. -6 And at the time of your examination, the purpose of your examination was outlined to you, was it not? Yes, it was. And did you examine him? 10 Yes, I did. 11 And based on that examination -- strike that. 12 In addition to examining Mr. Hendricks, were 13 certain documents transmitted to you from the Clerk of 14 Court? 15 16 Yes. Did you review those documents? · 17 18 Yes. Did those documents pertain to/mental and 19 psychological history of the subject Michael Hendricks? What was transmitted to me was the testimony 21 22. of Michael Hendricks. And I came here to read the 23 Atascadero and Youth Authority records. 24 And you did read those, I take it? Q 25. Yes. As the result of interviewing and examining

Mr. Hendricks, and reviewing the material you have just referred to, did you form some opinion?

I felt that Mr. Hendricks has a schizophrenic mental illness and I felt that it was rather difficult for me to be able to determine his statements in terms of what

Was his schizophrenia manifested by vague reasoning, inappropriate affect, delusions of being able to procrastinate to future and vague auditory hallucinations

It is your opinion, then, that it is difficult for Mr. Hendricks to separate reality from unreality; is

Did you form the opinion, therefore, that Mr. Hendricks' competency in perceiving and relating events that took place during July and August of 1969 is not

I have no further questions.

I have no questions, your Honor.

May it be deemed that his report is in evidence subject to some examination for -- I don't think that's

occurred yet. 1 MR. BUGLIOSI: It's already been done, Mr. Kanarek. 2 MR. KANAREK: In evidence? I think it's in the file. It was marked for identification, THE COURT: 5 Special Exhibit 3. May it be stipulated into evidence? 6 MR. BUGLIOSI: So stipulated. 7 MR. KANAREK: So stipulated. MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, it is so stipulated that 9 Special Exhibit 3 be received into evidence. 10 MR. KANAREK: Then I have no questions in view of 11. that stipulation, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Any questions? 13 No questions. MR. SHINN: 14 THE COURT: Mr. Hughes? 15 MR. HUGHES: I believe by stipulation I was not going 16 to examine this witness in any event, your Honor. 17 MR. BUGLIOSI: Just a few questions. 18 19 CROSS-EXAMINATION 20 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 21 . Doctor, would you elaborate on what you mean 22 when you say that Mr. Hendricks' competency in perceiving 23 and relating events during July and August of 1969 is 24 not entirely reliable? It is primarily based upon --

		l
1		ŀ
2		İ
•		
ฮ		ľ
4		
.5		
6		
. 7		
8		
9		
		1
10		
11		
12		
13		
."14		
•		1
- 15		_
- 16		
17		7
18		
19		
	*	1
20		
<b>21</b>		
<b>, 22</b>		
23		
24		
25	,	
		1

Q Elaborate on what you mean by that; not on how you based that conclusion.

A It was based upon -- well --

Q Go ahead, go ahead.

A Okay. This is the way I can give it to you.

Q Go ahead.

A I asked him as to his perceptions, the things that he told me about that had occurred while he lived with the Manson Family. And he made some statements.

And I asked him, "Well, what is the basis for your statements?" And on these occasions he was -- tended to be rather vague and he wasn't able to give me any basis for his opinions or statements.

And I noticed that this was true throughout the examination in terms of other things, also. This is why I felt that whatever statements he makes he may have to be checked, because I couldn't tell whether there was any basis for it or not.

Q You didn't form a conclusion that any statement he made to you was foundationless?

A No. I had no basis for that. But in terms of his being able to -- shall we say simply back up the statements that he makes, he wasn't able to do so. He'd become very vague and evasive, as a rule.

Q Did he ever make any statement to you from which you drew the inference that he did not see what he

ŀ	•
1	purported to see?
2	A Under any circumstances?
3	Q Well, concerning July and August of 1969.
4	A Well, I asked him whether or not he felt that
5	the Tate-La Blanca incidents were a product of the Manson
6	Family. And he said, "Yes."
7	And so I asked him, "Well, what is the basis
8	for your belief?"
ģ	And all he could tell me was that, "It's
10	because Charlie had told me that they were going to cut
11	a bloody path all the way to the desert."
12	This is the only statement he would give me.
`	
13	
14	
<b>15</b> .	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	·1 ·

11 fls.

24

25

26

Q Well -- go ahead.

A. Then, eventually, it came about that it was a suspicion on his part.

Q Well, we are having a long trial here now, Doctor. I know you are aware of that — and it will have to be determined whether or not Mr. Hendrix's statement was correct or incorrect by the jury. That is not what I am concerned about.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I must object to that statement because --

THE COURT: He can frame the question the way he wants to, Mr. Kanarek. You don't have to agree with him.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Q So, it is entirely probable, in fact, that what he told you is correct; isn't that right, Doctor?

A. It could be.

Q Right.

Now, what I want to know is this: Did he tell you that he saw anything in July or August of 1969 from which you drew the inference that he did not see what he said/saw?

A Well, I can't refute those points because I don't know the facts. All I am saying is, in trying to follow through at least on a reasonable basis, I wasn't able to get any reasons for his, except rather vague, evasive kinds of answers to what he alleged to have seen.

ŁΑ

Q You felt that he didn't have a good enough explanation as to the connection between the Manson Family and these murders, Doctor?

A. No, that wasn't the point at issue.

I think, as is true throughout, whether it was the Manson Family or other areas, this kind of thinking appeared to exist. I don't know. For example, I don't know whether he actually ate glass, which he told me he did, but I asked him why he did so, and his answer was because he wanted to see what it tasted like.

Okay. That is fine. But on asking him further: What did it taste like? he wasn't able to give me any answer on this.

He said, "Well, it tasted good."

And I said, "What do you mean?"

And this is the kind of answer that I constantly got from him, where he seemed to be evasive, not because —

I don't think it was a conscious evasion or anything like that, but this is his mental capacity.

11a-1

2

Ţ.

4.

.5

6

7

<u>`</u>9

8

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

. 17

18 19

20

2I 22

23

24

**25** 

26

Q When you say his observations during July and August are not entirely reliable, you mean that they are more unreliable than reliable, or more reliable than unreliable?

A. I can't tell you that. I don't know the facts in this case.

All I can do is give you my impression in terms of what his reliability is.

Now, I don't think because of his illness and the way he thinks, the chances are that things, some things, are not reliable. Some things might be. But I can't separate what is reliable and what is unreliable for you.

Q When you say "perceive," are you including in that something other than a visual observation?

You say "his competency in perceiving events,"

A It could be touch, you know, the senses that we have which we use to perceive with.

Let's take this hypothetical situation, and I am not trying to be cute with you or anything like that, but let's assume that in July or August of 1969 someone held up a gun or a revolver in Mr. Hendrix's presence, showed it to him; and let's assume that his eyes were fixed on that revolver.

Let's assume all these things, and that he looked at it and felt it, touched it and talked about it.

Do you think there is a very good possibility

that if you or I were to ask him, shortly after that event, what he saw in front of him, that he might say . Ż something like an alligator or a bus, or something like 3 that? MR. KANAREK: I will object as an improper hypothetical 5 question, your Honor. , 7 MR. BUGLIOSI: I want to find out what he means when 8 he says his perception is not entirely reliable. I don't quite understand what the doctor means. MR. KANAREK: There is no foundation for it, and it ĺÒ is assuming facts not in evidence. 11. · 12. Is Mr. Bugliosi, in this question, saying 13 shortly after? THE COURT: The trier of the fact is not present. 14 It is a hearing out of the presence of the jury. 15 16 the example is an appropriate one for the doctor to comment 17 on. 18 Overruled. 19. MR. BUGLIOSI: Q Do you understand my question, 20 Doctor? Yes, I do. 22 No, the chances are that he would call it a gun rather than an alligator.

vis-a-vis anything else; right?

24

25

26

He would call it a gun as opposed to anything

The chances are that he would call it a gun

other than a firearm? In other words, he wouldn't call it a candy bar either, would he? So far as I know him, I don't think he would. MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions. MR. KANAREK: May 17 ĺÓ 11 12 13 14. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 . 25.

THE COURT: I will ask a few questions, Mr. Kanarek.
MR. KANAREK: Certainly.

#### **EXAMINATION**

#### BY THE COURT:

- Q. Doctor, in your opinion, did Mr. Hendricks, in July and August of 1969, have the ability to perceive an event with substantial accuracy?
  - A I believe partially he could, yes.
- Q I am talking now about his perception rather than a question of credibility in the sense of whether or not he was telling the truth when he described the event.

I am talking now purely about perception, the ability to perceive.

A Yes, I believe he could.

On the basis of the example as given by Mr. Bugliosi about if it is a gun, he will call it a gun.

Q And is it true that your doubts relate to whether or not he is now telling the truth about what you have asked him rather than his ability to perceive a particular event?

A Yes, that is what I may be saying.

THE COURT: Any other questions, gentlemen?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

22

23

24

-	
•	
•	*
11ь-2	i
• ,	2
	3
,	· 4.
•	· 5,
;	6
	7
Van	8
, <del>P</del>	9
	· 10
	n
	12
,	13
	14
	15
•	. 16
•	17
•	18
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	19
	. 20

.23

24

25

26.

#### EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. FITZGERALD:

Q Doctor, in your report, on page 3, under the section "Opinion," the second paragraph, you state as follows:

"It is difficult to separate reality and unreality in Mr. Hendricks' perceptions during the months of July and August of 1969."

Is that correct?

- A Yes, that is correct.
- Q And did you also say, in the last sentence:

"It is felt, therefore, that Mr. Hendricks' competency in perceiving and relating events during July and August of 1969 is not entirely reliable"?

- A Yes.
- Q Are you changing those two opinions?
- A Well, maybe where I am hung up here is in terms of perception and credibility, perhaps.

I know he daydreams a lot. I know that he can, most likely, feel the daydreams are true.

Q Let's substitute the term "reliable" for "believable." That would then put it into the area of credibility.

And let me ask you this: Would you believe Mr. Hendricks as to events he perceived during the months of July and August, 1969?

1.	A I myself would not. I would need further
<b>. 2</b>	substantiating evidence to corroborate what he says.
3	Q Is vagueness a characteristic of schizophreni
. 4	A Yes.
<b>5</b>	Q Is it a common symptom?
6	A Yes, fairly common.
7	Q Are hallucinations common symptomology of
8	schizophrenia also?
ģ	A It can be, yes.
10	MR. FITZGERALD: I have nothing further.
11	THE COURT: Anything further?
Į2	MR. SHINN: No questions.
13	MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.
14	
15	EXAMINATION
16	BY MR. KANAREK:
17	Q Doctor, you have stated with regard to your
18 .	opinion, you stated, you used the words "vague auditory
19	hallucinations within my head."
20	Is it your opinion that he actually hears
21	voices at the present time?
22	A I think it is possible, although I am not
23	quite a hundred percent sure.
24	This is the quotes within the statement that
25	he made to me. And I asked him further about it, and
.26	he became rather vague about this except to say that

2 3 6. .7 8. 9. IQ. <u>,11</u> 12 13 14 15 16 ĺŽ 18 19 20 21′ 24

it was just like the conversation he has with anyone else.

It is with an unknown voice within his head sort of answer.

Now, these are the kinds of things he told me about. I don't know whether he actually has them or not.

I think the basis for my reasoning is not just that factor alone, but no matter which way I turn with him I just can't get any good reasoning to substantiate his beliefs and thoughts.

Also, too, on occasions, when eating glass, for example, you know, he was smiling, and I asked: Well, didn't you cut yourself?

He says, "No, I didn't. I rounded off the corner and I ate the glass."

And all the while he was relating this he was smiling. Cutting his wrist? The same situation.

I perceived from this that he had an inappropriate affect, and these are the kinds of things that made me arrive at the diagnosis of schizophrenia.

So, there is more than just a matter of hallucination, and even his delusions, I don't know whether they are actual or not, but there were other symptoms present which were more objective. I felt in my own opinion that he was schizophrenic.

.

3

5

6

7

8

10.

11

12 .

13

14 15

16

17

18

,**19** 

20 21

Ż2

23 24

25

26

And, Doctor, as part of your diagnosis, did you take into consideration the statement by him that he saw little men at the end of the bed that he talked to?

You read that in one of the reports?

A Yes, I remember reading that, but I didn't ask him about that.

And, Doctor, directing your attention -Mr. Bugliosi's question to you had to do with his ability
to perceive in July and August of '69. Mr. Bugliosi's
question related to that. Do you recall his question?

A. Yes, I believe it did.

It had to do with whether in July and August of 169, if a gun was held up to him, would he see a gun -- would he have been able to tell in 1969 that he saw a gun?

Yes.

Now, my question is, would you say that with the passage of time, and he -- let's hypothesize that he will be asked in this courtroom whether in July and August of 1969 he saw a gun -- would his ability to perceive, as it related to people in this courtroom, would that ability be changed by the passage of time, whatever it was, in -- immediately after some kind of an object was shown to him?

A I gather what you are inquiring is what is the status of his memory? Is this correct?

Well, I don't know. Is that what I'm --?
What I'm asking, in connection with his ability

.

.3

4

5

7.

8

10

H

12

13

15

16

17

18.

19

20 21

**2**2

23

24

25

26

to relate from the witness stand his perception of something that occurred in July and August of '69. Now it's today, October 1st, 1970. Now, will the passage of time have any effect upon his ability to convey what, in fact, occurred in his presence in July and August of 1969?

A I think it's possible that the time could, since he tells me some areas where he does not remember, it's very possible he may not remember things. Also, I have noticed that there may be a conflict in his statements. I asked him how many times did he go back to the ranch to live and he said he didn't remember.

Subsequently, I found out that he apparently lived there six times.

Now, I don't know whether this is correct or not, but apparently he has some sort of figure in mind.

But when I talked to him he didn't remember how often he went back to the ranch.

So what I'm getting at is it's possible that his memory at that moment may not be sufficiently there to be able to relate his perceptions. It's possible.

Of what occurred, in fact ---

A. Yes, back in July or August.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor.

Thank you, Doctor.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. FITZGERALD: Nothing further.

MR. BUGLIOSI: No questions.  THE COURT: You may step down, Doctor. Thank you.  Is Dr. Meyers outside? Dr. Meyers?  Is a.  It a.
12A 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 18
12A 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17
12A 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17
5 6 7 8 9 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 18
6 7 8 9 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18
7 8, 9, 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18
9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18.
9, 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18
11 12 13 14 15 16 17
12 13 14 15 16 17 18
13 14 15 16 17
13 14 15 16 17 18
14 15 16 17
15 16 17 18
16 17 18
18
18
10
20
÷ 21
22
23
24
25

•	
12a-1 1	THOMAS J. MEYERS,
2	called as a witness, having been first duly sworn, was
3	examined and testified as follows:
4	THE CLERK: Would you raise your right hand, Doctor.
	Would you please repeat after me:
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	I do solemnly swear
· Ż	THE WITNESS: I do solemnly swear
8.	THE CLERK: that the testimony I may give
± 9	THE WITNESS: that the testimony I may give
10	THE CLERK: in the cause now pending
11	THE WITNESS: in the cause now pending
. 12	THE CLERK: before this court
13	THE WITNESS: before this court
14:	THE CLERK: shall be the truth
15	THE WITNESS: shall be the truth
16	THE CLERK: the whole truth
17	THE WITNESS: -+ the whole truth
18	THE CLERK: and nothing but the truth
. 19	THE WITNESS: and nothing but the truth
20	THE CLERK: so help me God.
21.	THE WITNESS: so help me God:
22	THE CLERK: Would you please be seated.
. 23	Doctor, would you please state and spell your
. 24 ·	name.
25	THE WITNESS: Thomas J. Meyers, M-e-y-e-r-s.
26	THE COURT: May we have the same stipulation with

MR. FITZGERALD: It is so stipulated. 2 MR. BUGLIOSI: So stipulated. 3 THE COURT: The report will be received in evidence, then, as Special Exhibit No. 4. 5 MR. FITZGERALD: That's right, your Honor. 6 a five-page document dated September 28, 1970. 7 THE COURT: Any questions? .8 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, so the record is clear, 9 although he is somewhat of an adverse witness, I'll, on 10 direct examination, bring out the relevant facts. 11 12 DIRECT EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. FITZGERALD: 14: Dr. Meyers, were you appointed pursuant to a 15 court order to interview one Michael Hendricks in the Los 16 Angeles County Jail for the purposes of determining 17 whether or not he was competent as a witness to testify 18 as to events that occurred during July and August of 19. 19697 20 Yes. 21 Did you perform an examination on the person 22. of Mr. Hendricks? 23 Yes. 24 Did you also read or review certain materials 25 that were directed to your attention by the Clerk of Court? 26

respect to qualifications and the doctor's report?

A,

A. Yes. İ, 2 5 Ť 8

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18.

**19**.

20

21

<u>22</u>

23

24

26

Did you find any evidence of delusions or hallucinations in your examination of Mr. Hendricks?

No. He gave no manifestations of them at the time I examined him.

Did the files of the Atascadero State Hospital and the California Youth Authority reflect any evidence of delusions or hallucinations?

There is a record that he has had auditory Yes. hallucinations.

Did the files upon which you have based, in part, your opinion contain information indicating that Mr. Hendricks on one or more occasions had attempted to commit suicide?

Yes.

Correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe on one occasion it was by way of eating glass from a light bulb and on another occasion it was as the result of cutting his wrists with a sharp instrument or knife or razor blade or something?

Yes. I'm not sure whether they had actual evidence that he ate the glass, but, at any rate, he said that he ate it.

Did your examination reveal that Mr. Hendricks was grandiose in his thinking and did he think he had powers that others didn't possess?

Did he believe that he could read other people's

I did not elicit this information from him.

Did you find that his recent and remote memory

Well, his memory was not impaired at the time at which I examined him. It wasn't the most efficient memory there was. But if you took time with him he usually could come up with an answer relative to the

In the Atascadero State Hospital file, I believe, there is a report dated July 21, 1970, purportedly prepared by a Dr. M. J. Reimringer in which the summary and diag-

> "He is cooperative with normal speech. Affectively, he is silly. He has many abnormal mental trends such as believing be can predict

23

24

25

26

arriving at a conclusion as to whether or not Mr.

Hendricks would be competent to testify as to events that
occurred during July and August, 1969?

A Well, I do now, yes.

Q And there is also contained in the California
Youth Authority file a report by a William J. Hansen,
Medical Doctor, who appears to be a staff psychiatrist.

His psychiatric diagnosis is brief and is as follows:

Personality disorder severe, schizoid personality manifested by shyness, oversensitivity, seclusiveness, avoidance of close and competitive relationships and eccentricity, tendency toward engrowthment in fantasy and daydreaming, inability to express ordinary aggressive feelings, detachment from disturbing experiences and conflicts. An underlying and psychotic thought process should be kept in mind.

"Prognosis: Guarded."

Did you read that report and did you take it into consideration in forming your opinion?

A Yes. And I think it's a pretty good description of him.

Q Is that report, the report I just read of William J. Hansen and the report of M. J. Reimringer, consistent with your analysis and opinion?

I don't there's too much divergence here. 1 probably a matter of interpretation of what everyone has 2 observed. 3. I feel that probably the sociopathic trends 4 here are dominant rather than schizophrenic trends. . 5 . Both these reports of these persons I have just mentioned indicate that his memory for recent and remote 7 events are impaired? . 8 Yes, I think they are. And I think they are 9 impaired largely because of distractions from within him. 10 Would not an impaired memory affect the competency 11 of a witness to testify as to events he must remember? 12 Well. I don't think it's impaired to that extent. 13 The tasks which are presented to him on an 14 examination do not have the interest or the stimulating 15 appeal that an actual behavior event would have. And he 16 could fail on a test, whereas he would not fail in observing 17 12b fls. the events that were going on around him. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

think

	•	
	1	-
,		2

5

Ŕ

9

10

`11

12

ĬĴ.

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now, did it come to your attention, either as the result of the result of interviewing Mr. Hendrix or as the result of reviewing the files from the California Youth Authority or Atascadero, or did it come to your attention through reading the transcript you were provided with and the declaration of myself, that Mr. Hendrix had a fixation or a fascination with firearms?

A Well, I got that from him directly.

Now, let's take this set of facts: Let's assume for a moment that Mr. Hendrix was going to testify in this trial in regard to firearms. Would your opinion as to his competency in that limited area, the area of firearms, be different than your general opinion in terms of his competency?

A Well, perhaps it would. Because in the matter of firearms he considers himself to be quite an expert. And I'm afraid he would elaborate and exaggerate to some extent.

I believe one of the reports in the files refers to some grandiose feelings on his part that he is a master criminal?

A Yes, I think that's correct.

Q Is that also related to his fascination with firearms?

A Yes. The fascination with firearms -- I think the only way you can understand it is in terms of its

1	symbolic value. I suppose it would be, yes.
2	Q Well, very briefly, what is the symbolic
3	significance of firearms?
4 -	A. This boy, and that's what he is, has a very
· 5	weak masculine identification. And firearms not only
6	represents to him fulfillment or compensation for this, but
, <b>7</b> :	also represent a power that he, himself, does not actually
<b>8</b> :	feel or have.
'n.	In other words, it's almost a grandiose
10	exaggeration to counterbalance an opposing weakness.
n	MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you, Doctor.
12	I have no further questions, your Honor.
13	MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.
14	
15	CROSS-EXAMINATION
16	BY MR. SHINN:
17	Q Doctor, you examined Mr. Hendrix at the County
18	Jail?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q And approximately how long did you take in
21	examining Mr. Hendrix?
22	A He came into the interview room at 9:00 o'clock
23	and I dismissed him at 11:05.
24	Q In other words, approximately about two hours?
25	A. Yes.
26	And did he relate any events of the months of

## July and August?

á.

-6

7.

8,

10

11

12

Tá.

14

15

16

17

·18 ·

19

20

21

22

23

.24

25

- A. Yes. I went over in detail with him as much detail as I could get out of him.
  - Q And did he tell you about telepathy?
  - A. No.
- Never stated that he could read minds by telepathy?
  - A. No.
- Q What would you call that, if a person states to you that he could read minds by telepathy? Would you call that an hallucination or --
- A. Not necessarily. Because there are a great many people who feel they can do that.
- Q Well, could you channel that into a delusion or hallucination sometimes, or a --
- A Well, you would have to have more than that, because this is almost an outgrowth of metaphysical thinking. And a great many people in our population are metaphysicists.
- And did he tell you that he was more or less the leader of the world, Mr. Hendrix, in your conversation?
  - A No, he didn't tell me anything like that.
- What if he told you that he was a leader of the world?
  - A. No.
  - Q Would you classify that as a delusion or

hallucination or what?

. 3

A. Well, if he told me that, I would certainly ask him for some elaboration as to just what the world meant to him.

Q And if this explanation was not satisfactory to you, would you classify that as an hallucination or a delusion or what?

A. If it became obvious that he felt that he literally believed himself to be the leader of the world as we know it, then we would certainly have to think that

. 9

this was an outright grandiose delusion.

**′18** 

•	, · ·	
L2G-1 .	1	And what if he told you that he could pick
	2	winners in a horse race?
•	3	A Well, I don't know as that would be a delusion.
	4.	Q What would you classify that as, if he couldn't
	5	explain how he could pick a winner of horse races?
• • •	6	A. I've had many people tell me that same thing
. , '	7	and I felt their thinking was a little their judgment
, <b>\$</b> ,	8	was bad, but I wouldn't consider it to be actually a delusion
	9	Q Well, would it be classified as something else,
94.	10:	like an hallucination?
	11	A I think it would be an error in judgment and a
	12	own, distorted idea of one's/capability.
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	13	Q Well, that could possibly sometime be called
	14	an hallucination or a delusion, is that correct, to a certain
	15	degree?
	16.	A Oh, I can imagine a context in which it might be
•	17.	yes.
**	18	Q. And, now, did Mr. Hendrix tell you that he
* , <b>€</b>	19	hears voices in his head?
•	20	A. No, he denied that he did.
<b>,</b>	21	Q Well, if he told you that he heard voices in his
	.22	head and he couldn't explain it, what would you call that?
	23	Would that be hallucinations or delusions?
	24	A If he told me that, I, of course, would have to
	25	investigate it rather thoroughly because this would suggest
	26	that he was experiencing auditory hallucinations.

•		
	Ţ	
	2	
	3	
	4	٠.
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	.9	
. ;	ΙQ	•
	Ù	
٠	12	
	13	,
;	14	
í	15	
į	16	
:	17	
,	18	•
	19	4
:	20.	
:	21	
1	22	
3	23	
4	24	

All these questions I asked you regarding your conversation with Mr. Hendrix, if, in fact, these were related to you, would your opinion as to -- your statement in this report on Page 4, stating that -- near the bottom of the page you stated that there is no evidence of psychotic process such as delusions, hallucinations or bizarre content.

You stated that, did you not?

A. Yes.

Q Well, assuming that you had a conversation with all these questions I asked you what he said, would your opinion be different?

A. See, I could not get such information from Mr. Hendrix. He would not admit it. He would not acknowledge it. He gave no evidence that he was experiencing such phenomena.

And if I were to tie the history of such experiences with other details, I'd say it was possibly another part of his elaborations. You might say a little game that he was playing.

- Q But that he would come close to hallucinations and delusions; is that correct?
  - A If they were actually true, yes.

MR. SHINN: I have nothing further, your Honor.
Thank you.

THE COURT: Any questions?

MR; KANAREK: Yes.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KANAREK:

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

·18

19

2Ò

.21

22

23.

24

Q Doctor, then, your statement is if he were experiencing auditory hallucinations, you would have to seriously consider changing your opinion and conclusions; is that right?

A If he were, yes, I would have to consider that he was undergoing a psychotic process.

of his bed, for instance, little green men, who spoke to him, if he told you that this was so, you would have to change your opinion, right?

A. Yes. Of course, that wouldn't be consistent, you see, with the picture.

Q But you would certainly have to investigate further.

A. Yes, indeed.

Now, Doctor, you have stated here he has a great need for ego enhancement and support for his masculine identification.

Would you say that his testimony in a case wherein he thought that his testimony was very important, that he was the center of attraction in a courtroom such as this, would such a setting satisfy his need for ego enhancement or tend to satisfy that?

A. Well, it would certainly contribute to it.

Whether it would satisfy anything or not remains to be seen.

But I think it would certainly be a pleasurable experience.

And is it possible, or would you say there is reasonable medical probability, that in such a setting he would be less than candid in connection with his testimony?

A. I think he would try to make the most of the situation.

And try to put it on thick, right?

A. I would suspect he would.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Doctor, in your opinion, in July and August of 1969, did Mr. Hendrix have the ability to perceive an event with substantial accuracy?

THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.

ļ

2

3

4

5

7

9

8

10

12

14

15 16

**1**7

18

19

:20

21 . 22

23 . 24

25.

26

THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Bugliosi?

MR. BUGLIOSI: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anyone else?

MR. SHINN: No.

MR. KANAREK: No.

MR. FITZGERALD: No.

THE COURT: You may step down, Doctor. Thank you.

Do any of you gentlemen wish to be heard on this subject?

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I would like to simply point out — and we have been over this matter before, and I won't belabor the Court with it at all — but I would like to point out that the files of two California institutions reveal that this witness has some mental or emotional problems; that he has attempted to commit suicide on two occasions.

He is currently in a California institution for the purpose of diagnostic studies in the area of schizophrenia and other mental illness.

We have two doctors here that are apparently split, but have testified to an essential rather aggravated mental illness.

My understanding of the testimony of this witness is that it will relate to firearms and firearms almost solely. I think that this is in the area of his grandiose feelings; it is in the area of his masculinity

13-2

1

10

11 12

13

14

15

**17**,

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

26

and inferiority and inadequacy; and I think that in this precise area, in the opinion, I think, of both doctors, his testimony would be unreliable.

And I would ask that your Honor find him not competent to testify.

THE COURT: Anyone else?

MR. FITZGERALD: I have nothing further.

MR. SHINN: No.

MR. KANAREK: I don't wish to belabor it, your Honor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think under Section 701 of the Evidence Code, your Honor, he is certainly competent to testify.

THE COURT: Well. after considering the doctors' reports and hearing their testimony. I see no reason to change the finding I made earlier as to Mr. Hendrix's competency under the Evidence Code to testify as a witness.

This, of course, does not imply any conclusion on the part of the Court as to the credibility of such testimony, but only as to his bare competency to testify.

Accordingly, I find, again, that he is competent to testify as a witness.

Are you prepared to proceed now with Mr. Flynn?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: We will take our afternoon recess at this time and then we will resume with the jury and Mr. Flynn.

(Recess.)

2

1

3°

. . 5

6

·9'

10

11 12

13

. 14 15

> 16. 17

18

19 20

2Ì

23

22

24· 25

26

(The following proceedings were had in open court, all defendants, counsel and jurors present.)

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

You may continue, Mr. Kanarek.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Oh, the old gray mare, she ain't what she used to be, she is a judge now.

You are a woman, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Manson --

DEFENDANT MANSON: You don't have the authority. You are a woman.

THE COURT: Mr. Manson, I will have to remove you from the courtroom if you don't stop it.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Stop what?

Why don't you stop doing what you are doing.

THE COURT: I order you to stop talking right now.

DEFENDANT MANSON: You have ordered me to stop living. You won't let my lawyers visit me. You won't let me have my mail. I can't get any action in the attorney room. My lawyer can't even come in the lockup. I am allowed to talk to him at the bench for five minutes a day.

How am I supposed to prove a case and prove anything to these people?

THE COURT: All right, remove Mr. Manson from the courtroom.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, may we approach the bench

2. 1

3

4

6

7

٠

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26 on this?

THE COURT: Very well.

(Whereupon all counsel approach the bench and the following proceedings occur at the bench outside of the hearing of the jury:)

MR. BUGLIOSI: I agree with the Court, your Honor, that if he is going to continue talking, he has to be removed. However, he may have been at the end of his comment. If he was, I would prefer to have him in court throughout all of the testimony of Mr. Flynn.

THE COURT: Well, I agree. I would too, Mr. Bugliosi.
But he didn't stop when I ordered him to stop and he
continued talking.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I agree with the Court, but I wonder if we could take a little short recess ---

THE COURT: I don't have to wait forever to take action.

This is what I am going to do. I am going to permit Mr. Kanarek to see Mr. Manson in the lockup and discuss the matter with him, and if he is willing to come back into court and conduct himself in accordance with the rules, and remain silent and not speak out as he has, then we will be able to continue with him in the courtroom.

And I certainly will admonish the jury to disregard his remarks, whatever they meant.

Do may of the other counsel have any suggestions?

**2**.

Ţ

3

5

. 6

8

ģ

10

11· 12

13

14 15

13b fls.

. 17

18

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

. 26

I don't want to remove Mr. Manson from the courtroom, but obviously we can't continue a trial if he is speaking out and making remarks of various kinds in front of the jury.

MR. FITZGERALD: Let me say this, your Honor, to put this statement that he made to the Court somewhat in perspective.

When we attorneys came back into the courtroom from the rest-room, we were informed by the two bailiffs in the court that there had been a change in procedure, if not a change in the rules, and that, henceforth, no attorney, other than Mr. Kanarek, would be allowed to go into the lockup; and my understanding was that Mr. Kanarek also would not be allowed to go into the lockup to speak with Mr. Manson that all conferences between clients and their attorneys would have to take place in open court at the counsel table.

22

24

25

26

The two bailiffs also informed us -- I was somewhat unclear -- but they informed us about materials being cleared through Mr. Kanarek before they were transmitted to Mr. Manson.

I think that is what Mr. Manson was reacting to, this problem; and this, of course, has been a source of irritation to Mr. Manson, his treatment in jail vis-a-vis his attorneys.

Now, I am certain that your Honor will not argue with the statement that I am about to make.

T think that Mr. Manson, when he addressed the Court, was seated. He was not standing. He addressed the Court in a voice that could be heard by your Honor and could be heard by me, and I am sure it could be heard by the spectators, but it wasnot in a loud, screaming, yelling voice.

That is all I want to say.

THE COURT: All that is true.

Of course, when a defendant persists in talking directly at the Judge during the trial, it is disruptive, whether he is talking in a conversational tone which is heard by the jury or whether he is shouting.

As I say, I am perfectly willing to have you talk with him, Mr. Kanarek, and try to persuade him that he can accomplish nothing by this except to have himself removed.

1

2

4

5

8

9.

11

.13

14

15 16

17

: 18

19

20 21

22

23

25

24

26

I am perfectly willing to have him come back if he is willing to behave himself.

MR. KANAREK: May I go into the lockup and tak to him, then?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: As long as we are here at the bench, your Honor, just briefly.

Would the Court admonish Mr. Kanarek to cease and desist with his accusatory remarks in front of the jury.

If I did this, it would be highly improper.

If I were to ask the witness: "Isn't Mr. Kanarek programming you?" And, "Are you trying to please Mr. Kanarek?" I could never get by with it.

I am not concerned with what he says on the record, but I don't want him to imply something to the jury without showing indignation. I have to show my indignation to the jury or else it is kind of an acquiescence.

I can object in a gentlemanly tone, and the Court will probably sustain the objection, but I have to show to the jury that I am very upset and very disturbed, and I have to act the way I am, innocent.

THE COURT: I don't agree with you.

If Mr. Kanarek, or any other counsel, says anything that I think is improper, depending on what it is, he is going to be admonished in front of the jury, and it doesn't require any reaction of a like kind or some other

conduct on the part of other counsel.

If I seem not to see it, you can certainly call my attention to it. But I don't see how I could not see it or hear it.

.

, ,

.7

IJ

. .

٠Ļ

13c-1

·6 

18.

 MR. BUGLIOSI: This your view, your Honor, and I am a pretty experienced, capable trial lawyer and I have my own view as to what the jury is thinking about.

My view is that it is harmful to me when he does these things.

I would just ask the Court to tell Mr. Kanarek to try the lawsuit without trying me.

He does this with every witness, your Honor. He did it with Linda Kasabian, he has done it with Juan Flynn, he did it with Danny DeCarlo. The other attorneys don't do it.

THE COURT: In rereading the transcript of this morning, I don't find anything that Mr. Kanarek said that triggered you off.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Maybe I am oversensitive, your Honor, and maybe my remarks today weren't totally justified, but he has made so many remarks about me.

Like, your Honor, when Linda Kasabian was on the stand --

THE COURT: I don't want to hear about that now.

If it is important, we can discuss it later in chambers.

We are here at the bench at the moment and I want to get on with the trial.

I admonish all counsel again, I don't want colloquy in front of the jury. If something needs to be discussed, if the point is important, come to the bench;

13c-2

2

1

3

4

5

Ż

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25° 26 but I don't want constant processions to the bench on trivial matters. You are not to make comments, you are not to do things, that are obviously improper.

We will take a brief recess, Mr. Kanarek. Will you let the Clerk know when you are ready.

MR. KANAREK: May I go in the lockup, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you.

MR. HUGHES: Will we come back to the bench before we resume?

THE COURT: Just tell the Clerk when you are through.

MR. FITZGERALD: The reason Mr. Hughes is asking about whether we are coming back to the bench is this: I have carefully thought over the matter of what occurred this morning over the moon hour and, as your Honor knows, I am very hesitant to move for a mistrial, but I think that the colloquy that took place between Mr. Kanarek and Mr. Bugliosi is just one of a whole series of colloquies, and I think the cumulative effect has now reached a point where the defendants cannot receive a fair trial, and on behalf of my client, I am going to move for a mistrial.

I think that the disparaging remarks that have been made on both sides, and of course, I think from my particular point of view and perspective, the remarks made by Mr. Bugliosi impugning the character of Mr. Kanarek as but a defense attorney, cannot help/harm my client, as well as

the whole defense team, the whole group of defendants and their attorneys.

MR. HUGHES: I wish to join.

MR. SHINN: I wish to join also.

THE COURT: I am not going to grant a mistrial.

While there has been some colloquy between counsel, I think it is perfectly obvious that the friction between the attorneys has nothing to do with the merits of the case.

I can't see any prejudice resulting to either side, although it certainly is unseemly on the part of both counsel.

MR. SHINN: Join that motion.

(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: Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to take a brief recess.

I will ask you to remain in the jury box, and I admonish you to disregard all of the remarks that Mr. Manson made to the Court.

(Recess.)

22

23

24

25

26

(The following proceedings were had in chambers outside the presence and hearing of the jury:)

THE COURT: All right. All counsel are present.

Didyou wish to bring up something, Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor,

I would like to have Mr. Manson at least be able to hear what's going on, your Honor,

THE COURT: Well, you mean he's not going to -- he's not willing to come back into the courtroom and to behave nimself?

MR. KANAREK: Well, I can't -- I certainly can't subscribe to your Honor's language as to that. But I can say that -- I mean, I don't -- I can't make a representation

THE COURT: Weil, say something that makes some sense, Mr. Kanarek. Is he going to come back into the courtroom?

MR. KANAREK: Well, no -- not -- I can't make the representations to the Court that he would --

THE COURT: Has he affirmed to you that he is willing to come back out and remain quiet --

MR. KANAREK: No. I can't --

THE COURT: -- as I've ordered him to do?

MR. KANAREK: I can't make that representation to the Court.

THE COURT: Does that mean no?

MR. KANAREK: Well, yes, your Honor, I guess that

21

22

23

24

25

26

would be a fair inference. Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, that's the inference I'm drawing, Mr. Kanarek, from your words.

MR. KANAREK: Well, that is --

THE COURT: I take it from what you say that he has indicated that he is not willing to comply with the Court's order.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, what I'm saying is he feels quite unhappy about your Honor's ruling, or the Court's -- maybe it was the Sheriff doing it without your Honor's knowledge -- for instance, when we go into the lock-up --

THE COURT: I'm not interested in that.

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

THE COURT: All I want to know is, is he willing to proceed in open court and comply with the Court's orders to remain quiet?

MR. KANAREK: No. I can't say that that is so, your Honor. But I would ask that he at least be allowed to hear,

THE COURT: Is that speaker connected?

THE BAILIFF: Yes, your Honor, I believe it is!

THE CLERK: We can test it to make sure, Judge, that it is operating properly.

THE COURT: We will test it to make sure it is operating before we resume.

MR, HUGHES: Is he able to hear these proceedings? Is there a microphone in here?

THE CLERK: Not in these proceedings. Ì THE COURT: No. 2 MR. KANAREK: I'd like to make this point. your Honor: I don't believe that what Mr. Manson did -- when you look at --5 THE COURT: He wasn't removed, Mr. Kanarek, so the record will be perfectly clear, for what he said, but what 7 he continued to do after I told him not to. 8. MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. I believe --THE COURT: Now, if he's willing to stop it, he can 10 come back into the courtroom at any time. Let there be II no question about that. 12 MR. KANAREK: Yes. · I3 THE COURT: That's why I'm asking you, I ask you 14 again, and all I get is evasive answers from you, as to 15 whether or not he is willing to come back and be quiet. 16 MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I can't say that that 17 is so, no. I can't make that representation to the Court. 18 I can't say that he --19 THE COURT: There's another evasive answer. can't say yes or no, apparently. \*\* 21 MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I cannot, no -- I cannot 22, represent to the Court what Mr. Manson is going to do when 23

he comes into the courtroom.

THE COURT: I realize that you don't have any

direct control over what he does or says. I'm trying to

24

25.

26

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

Ĺ

2 -

٠,

~

7

ĝ

10 . 11

12

13 . 14

15

16

17 18:

19

20 21

**Ž**3

22

25

26

24

find out from you what his indication was during your conference.

HH. RAMAREK: That much would not be the case, right, that he would not comply.

THE COURT: How, if you think that it would be desirable and you would like me to, I'm perfectly willing to have him come in here in chambers and I'll tell him again. I don't know why it should be necessary. I certainly made it clear to him.

IN. KANAREK: Well, I might say this, your Monor.
Also putting a deputy in there --

THE COURT: Of course, as the record will indicate, this has happened before. He's been advised that he could come back whenever he was willing to comply.

WH. KAMAREK: Yes, your Honor. The fact of the matter is, putting a deputy in the - for instance, right now they put a deputy in the lockup with him.

THE COURT: Well, that has nothing to do with what we are talking about.

your Monor. That's what -- it affects his state of mind.

Obviously, the man -- we have had a good situation there where we could talk about the case and talk about it in the lookup. Your Monor -- maybe it wasn't your Monor -- but comeone suisponte, maybe it was the Sheriff, the Cheriff all of a sudden said no more talking in the lookup.

Everything has to be --

. 2

ÌÓ

THE COURT: That has nothing to do with what we're talking about.

MR. KANAREK: I'm showing your Honor why it happened.

THE COURT: Well, that's --

MR. KANAREK: I'm showing your Honor why it happened.

THE COURT: Why it happened is because Mr. Manson seems to be not willing to comply with the Court's order to remain quiet when he's in the courtroom. That's why it happened.

Well, I'm going to ask Mr. Manson to come in here. Because I want the record to be perfectly clear that he is free to return to the court whenever he is willing to comply with the rules.

Would you bring in Mr. Manson?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may the record reflect

-- I don't believe that Mr. -- what Mr. Manson did was
sufficient to withdraw him from the courtroom, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, if Mr. Manson had simply made a brief statement and stopped, I would not have removed him. But he made a brief statement and stopped and I told him not to continue or he would be removed and then he proceeded to go on with another rather long, involved statement. It appeared to me that he was going to continue even further.

22

23

24

25

26.

Now, if such was not the case, all he has to do is say so.

MR. KAY: Your Honor, if I may be heard a minute.

Your Honor is probably not aware of this, but I just came in from out at the hall and a couple of press people have statements that Mr. Manson and Leslie Van Houten have released to the press about Mr. Bugliosi's contempt of the \$50 fine. And part of it is in the handwriting — it appears to be Miss Van Houten's, from what I've seen of her writing, and it is signed by Mr. Manson and it is in the hands of the press.

THE COURT: Where did they get it?

MR. KAY: I don't know where they got it from.

MR. BUGLIOSI; What does it say?

THE COURT: Well, it's obvious that one of the counsel, in my opinion, and I am in no position to accuse anybody, but it seems most reasonable to me, since the only contact that these defendants have with anyone, other than court personnel and the Sheriff's Department, is with their own attorneys, that some one of the counsel is passing things and giving out information.

MR. FITZGERALD: I released no such information or no such statement to the press.

THE COURT: As I say, I'm not accusing anybody. But I'm simply giving you my thought at the moment. Because I can't conceive of any other answer to it.

19

20

21

22

23

24.

25

26

MR. HUGHES: Nor did I. I know of no note that went out with Leslie's writing. But I'm --

MR. KAY: I don't know who sent it out. I'm saying I saw it. It's on a piece of yellow paper and signed by Mr. Manson. And part of it appears to be, from what I've seen of Miss Van Houten's handwriting, the major part of it. And then there's about two sentences at the bottom which appear to coincide with the signature of Mr. Manson. And it's signed "Manson."

THE COURT: Well, in the first place, since the matter was conducted at the bench, Mr. Manson wouldn't even know about it unless some counsel told him.

All right. Mr. Manson, would you sit down, please?

The record will show Mr. Manson is present along with all counsel.

I brought you in, Mr. Manson, so that there won't be any misunderstanding between you and me regarding what happened in the court.

I did not remove you from the courtroom because you made a statement and then stopped. But after you stopped and I ordered you not to make any further statements, you then continued. And it appeared to me that you were going to continue to talk even further out loud to me and in front of the jury.

I cannot permit you to prejudice your own

22 .

23

24

25

about at the moment.

case even though you may be willing to do so. Nor can I permit you to disrupt the trial.

Now, if you are willing to go back and resume the proceedings and remain quiet, then you are certainly welcome. And you have the right to remain in the court-room. And I will see that you do.

DEFENDANT MANSON: I have the right?

THE COURT: The right to remain in the courtroom.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Is that the only one I have?

THE COURT: Well, that's the only one we are talking

DEFENDANT MANSON: That is the only one that's apparent to me. The esoteric false face that we are putting out to the public is crumpling, failing very fast. You are not on top of your thought. You are not even close to your thought.

Do you expect me to be a part of it by, sitting there and playing monkey, sitting moot?

This man, I'm no better than his emotions.

Nor am I any better than this man's inadequacies.

THE COURT: By "this man," who are you referring to?

DEFENDANT MANSON: By my attorney or any attorney that
you might hand me and say represents me.

You know, like, your Honor, I've done everything possible to be an obedient child to my father, you know.

And, like, if you don't see it, you better wake up. You

better wake up, brother. It's bigger than me and you.

I'm just a little teeny nobody. And you're tearing your
thing up behind me. It's your laws that you're throwing in
the trash can.

. 16.

Ì8

And the procedure that you are developing in that County Jail, I don't get any visits, I don't get any mail. The only thing I don't get is whipped. And I'm lucky I don't get whipped two or three times a day. And I look for it. I lookfor it.

See, there's a case being fought outside this courtroom, too. You're awareness stops when you go home and go to bed. I don't stop. My awareness goes on and on and on and I'm on top of my thoughts. And you better let me bring you my thought before it gets too much for you.

THE COURT: Mr. Manson, all I want to know is do you want to go back into the courtroom and comply with the Court's rules, or do you want to remain in the lockup?

DEFENDANT MANSON: The Court changes its rules every day.

THE COURT: No. This rule has not changed since the DEFENDANT MANSON: The lockup is much more to my liking under the present circumstances. I don't get no particular thrill out of sitting there and getting tangled with your emotions.

THE COURT: Had you completed what you were going to say in the courtroom when I had you removed?

DEFENDANT MANSON: I said what I said in order to get to the lockup and I think your Honor knows that.

THE COURT: Well, that was the impression I had.

That's why I had you removed. Because I thought that you were going to keep it up until I did remove you.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Yeah. Well, you see, when you cut me off from my attorney, what little bit of client-attorney privilege I did have is slowly dwindling with the word "procedure" being used as the valve to screw it down. I can't visit in the attorney room like any other prisoner. There is a special proceedings. Then there's more procedure when I come down here in the lockup.

Now they can't even come in the lockup and, you know, for what reason? Is there some reason?

THE COURT: No one is keeping you from conferring with your attorney whenever you want to, Mr. Manson. We'd better be clear about that.

DEFENDANT MANSON: At the counsel table in the middle of trial.

THE COURT: You are entitled to confer with your attorney at all reasonable times and in privacy.

DEFENDANT MANSON: We can act like --

THE COURT: No one has denied that to you.

DEFENDANT MANSON: We can act like to the world that this is my attorney but you and I know different. Everyone in this room knows different.

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: You selected him. 1 DEFENDANT MANSON: He is his own attorney. THE COURT: You selected him. 3 DEFENDANT MANSON: He's your boy. You selected him, Mr. Manson. THE COURT: 5 DEFENDANT MANSON: He's your boy. THE COURT: What does that mean? What is that supposed to/mean? 8 DEFENDANT MANSON: He's your boy. When you tell him . 9. to shut up, he shuts up; doesn't he? 10 THE COURT: I don't tell anybody to shut up. ΪÌ DEFENDANT MANSON: 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19. 20 21 23 24 25 26

2

3

4

6.

Š

7 8

ð

9

10:

11 12

13

14

1,5

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek has followed my instructions just as other counsel have.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Your Honor, I would have all the respect in the world for your law if you had any respect for it.

Manson, just so there won't be any misunderstanding and game playing, is we're going to go back into the courtroom and we are going to go along, I'm going to give you an opportunity to comply with the Court's orders to remain quiet and not disrupt this trial. However, I'll tell you again I don't have any choice. If you insist on speaking out and continuing to speak out during the course of the trial in front of the jury, I will have to have you removed. And you will stay removed until such time as you are willing to affirm to your counsel or to the Court that you are willing to come back into the court and comply with the rules.

A speaker will be provided in the lockup so that you can hear the proceedings.

DEFENDANT MANSON: You can save yourself some trouble and me, too, if you just put me in the lockup. Then we won't be embarrassed.

THE COURT: Well, it's/going to be quite that easy because I detect some game playing going on here.

DEFENDANT MANSON: You detect game playing?

2

3

4

5,

б

7.

8.

9

10

11

12

13., 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2Ì

-22

23 24

25

26

THE COURT: I'm not going to place this court in the position of having any misunderstanding with you as to what happened, or what is going to happen. If you are bent on disrupting this trial, you are going to have to do it right out there in front of everybody and on the record so there isn't the slightest misunderstanding.

Do you understand, sir?

We are not going to have any games here.

DEFENDANT MANSON: All right.

THE COURT: No misunderstanding about what your intentions are.

DEFENDANT MANSON: There is a record here. You have the power over me at this point. You have all of your power over me at this point. And I must do what you say. And I must succumb to what you tell me to do. And this I have tried to conform with.

I have done my best to be as sensible a human being as possible.

If you went up and went through two days of what I go through in that County Jail, you would go home and cry to your mother.

Now, I sit out here in this courtroom and I'm not allowed to represent myself or stand up and speak for myself. The questions that I ask to be asked don't get to the witness. I make a list of seven questions. If one of them gets asked, I'm lucky.

Ġ

16.

 The things that the witness say are taken out of context and I could bring them back into focus if I was allowed to speak for myself.

And as your Honor can probably hear with his own ears, I have a voice and I can speak.

I'm not asking for anything unreasonable. Is it unreasonable not to have to labor under the pressure of the inadequate security?

If anything -- if anybody finds anything anywhere in that jail, it's automatically mine. If anybody has a sawblade, it's let's put the blame on Charlie. If anybody has something, it's always me.

Your whole procedure is on me. Man standing there watching me 24 hours a day. Every place I go, shakedown, walk through this, walk through that. And one section doesn't tell the other section the truth. And if they make a mistake they cover it over by saying something else or somebody else.

And then I look at the motion and I say, "Whose motion is it?" It's yours. It's your motion I am living in. It's your rule.

THE COURT: Mr. Manson, we are way off the subject.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Okay. You know, I'm asking you for a little leeway. You are asking me to keep conforming this way but you never give an inch back in the other direction.

. **5** 

.8

15 fls.

Do you have an authority to make a step backwards? Exercise your authority and tell them to give me a break. Let me see my attorney in the lockup room.

What's wrong with me talking to attorneys in the lockup room? It's been that way for 50 years. Why do we need to change it overnight. Why can't I visit an attorney across from the attorney room? Why can't I hand papers like everybody else back and forwards? They're your laws. Will you obey them, too?

THE COURT: All right, gentlemen.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Okay. It doesn't reach, does it?
It only comes one way.

THE COURT: I heard what you said, Mr. Manson.

MR. HUGHES: Those remarks of Mr. Manson in which I believe he's asking to represent himself, I would subscribe to, your Honor. Because in my dealings with Mr. Manson in the lockup, and at the time that I was his attorney, and at the counsel table, I found that Mr. Manson is able in this case to ask much more cogent and meaningful questions than any of the other attorneys in this case. And I find that I'm day by day more astounded at the previous rulings of this Court in not allowing Mr. Manson to represent himself. And I join in his motion and I believe it was one that he be allowed to represent himself.

15-1

Ì

3

24.

THE COURT: I will agree with one part of your statement, Mr. Hughes. Day by day I am more astounded.

Now, let's go back into court, gentlemen.

Is there anything that I said, Mr. Manson, that you don't understand? Do you have any questions you want to ask me before we go back into court?

DEFENDANT MANSON: It is oftentimes --

THE COURT: Let me say one more thing.

I have said this to you before and I will say it again because it is true. I don't see any possible way in the world that you can help yourself by disrupting this trial. No way at all. All you can do is prejudice yourself.

So, if you have a grievance -- and I am not saying you don't honestly believe that you have a grievance -- but if you have one, this is not the way to have it righted.

DEFENDANT MANSON: The picture that I am looking at, oftentimes a brave man has a hard time being meek, but a meek man sometimes has a hard time being brave.

I am not a fighter and I am not a boisterous type of human being, as you may have been led to believe.

I know that I have to fight you for your benefit. I see what is behind me, you know. I see what has been laying in the penetentiary for the last 40 years.

My awareness has been on a subliminal world, and I have

2

3

4

б

5

7 8.

9

11

10

12

TŠ

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

seen things brewing that you don't see.

Now, I come to you and I say: Look, this is beginning to happen here, this is happening there.

And then you say to me: Well, sit down, little boy. Because you place yourself so far above me that you can't even see me. You don't stop and slow down to look at me and see that I am a human being with truth in me.

I am not after money, I am not after stature,
I am not after anything other than just to prove to you
that I didn't do any wrong, even though I may have seen
everything that happened and could bring the truth forward
to save my face, and to save your face also, because your
faces are hanging out.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FITZGERALD: So that I understand what is happening.
Are we going back into open court with Mr. Manson?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: All right.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Is my attorney still barred from the lockup room?

THE COURT: What do you mean by barred from the lockup room?

DEFENDANT MANSON: They are not allowed to come in the lockup. This is one reason -- this is what really set me off this morning.

THE COURT: You always have the right to confer with

15-3 your attorney at all reasonable times, and in privacy, without being overheard, and the present rules will continue. 2 DEFENDANT MANSON: I hope I didn't sing off key. THE COURT: I didn't hear you? 15a fls. DEFENDANT MANSON: I hope I didn't sing off key. 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 24 26.

2

3.

**4** 5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22· 23

24

25

26

THE COURT: By that you mean you intend to sing in court?

DEFENDANT MANSON: Well, I can hum. That will probably do it.

I know if I talk you can gag me, that if I fight, you can chain me, but if I hum.

THE COURT: If you disrupt the trial, Mr. Manson, it is very simple, I don't want to do it, but as I told you on numerous occasions in the past when the matter has come up, I will have to have you removed from court.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Okay. I am not there anyway.

THE COURT: So the choice is yours.

DEFENDANT MANSON: I am not there anyway, your Honor.

I just sit there like a dummy. There is no sense in me
being there.

THE COURT: We will go back into court, then.

(The following proceedings were had in open court. All defendants, counsel and jurors present:)

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

You may continue, Mr. Bugliosi.

DEFENDANT MANSON: I would like everyone to know I am not represented in this trial.

THE COURT: Mr. Manson --

DEFENDANT MANSON: I do not have a lawyer.

THE COURT: Mr. Manson, I order you to stop talking

2

3

4

5 6

Ţ

∴8: `g.

10

ÌĮ.

12 13

15

14:

16 17

18 19

**2**0

21

22

23

24 25

26

in open court or I will have to remove you from the courtroom as I have indicated to you, sir.

DEFENDANT MANSON: I am not allowed to speak up for myself.

THE COURT: All right.

Have Mr. Manson removed from the courtroom.

DEFENDANT ATKINS: You are just a woman, that is all.

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: You are a woman.

DEFENDANT KRENWINKEL: That is all you are, a woman.

(Leslie Van Houten, Patricia Krenwinkel and Susan Atkins sing.)

THE COURT: Remove them.

DEFENDANT KRENWINKEL: You are just a woman.

DEFENDANT ATKINS: You judge you and I will judge me.

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: I think your tie is for you to be led around by.

THE COURT: We will have to take a recess, ladies and gentlemen. I want to make sure that the speaker is operating in the jury room upstairs where these young ladies will be until such time as they are brought back in the courtroom.

I admonish the jury not to consider any of these remarks for any purpose whatever, and I advise counsel that the defendants may return to the courtroom at any time when they are willing to affirm their willingness to comply with the Court's orders.

In view of the hour -- it is now 4:00 o'clock --

24

25

26

we will adjourn for the day.

Do not converse with anyone, ladies and gentlemen, or form or express any opinion regarding the case until it is finally submitted to you.

The court will adjourn until 9:45 tomorrow morning.

You are ordered to return at that time, Mr.

Flynn,

You may step down now.

(Whereupon at 4:00 o'clock p.m. the court

was in recess.)

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES