

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.

128

No. A253156

REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT  
Thursday, October 15, 1970  
P. M. SESSION

APPEARANCES:

For the People:	DONALD A. MUSICH, STEPHEN RUSSELL KAY, [REDACTED] and VINCENT T. BUGLIOSI, DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS
For Deft. Manson:	I. A. KANAREK, Esq.
For Deft. Atkins:	DAYE SHINN, Esq.
For Deft. Van Houten:	[REDACTED]. RONALD HUGHES, Esq.
For Deft. Krenwinkel:	PAUL FITZGERALD, Esq.

VOLUME 128

PAGES 13936 to 14039

JOSEPH B. HOLLOMBE, CSR.,  
MURRAY MEHLMAN, CSR.,  
Official Reporters

I N D E X

E X H I B I T S

SPECIAL COURT EXHIBIT: FOR IDENTIFICATION IN EVIDENCE

11 - Letter to Kitt Fletcher.  
dated 12/17/69

14,019

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1970

2 2:08 o'clock p.m.

3 - - - -

4 (The following proceedings were had in the  
5 chambers of the court out of the hearing of the jury:)

6 THE COURT: The record will show all counsel are  
7 present.

8 Now, we are down to the point of the sentence  
9 "I am not going to fight this."

10 This is in Special Exhibit 8. It appears to  
11 be all right.

12 Does anyone have any comments on that or the  
13 next sentence?

14 MR. KANAREK: Where is that, your Honor?

15 THE COURT: Well, it's about two-thirds of the way  
16 down the first page.

17 MR. HUGHES: "I am not going to fight this."

18 THE COURT: Any comments?

19 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. That's got nothing to  
20 do with murder.

21 This has to do with this lady's state of  
22 mind --

23 THE COURT: As I mentioned, Mr. Kanarek, we are  
24 trying to accomplish just one thing at a time.

25 MR. KANAREK: I see.

26 THE COURT: The purpose of our present conference is

1 to consider the Bruton-Aranda problem.

2 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

3 THE COURT: You are not waiving any objections to  
4 the admissibility of whatever is left if portions are  
5 deleted, and you can make those objections.

6 MR. HUGHES: I don't see any problems as far as  
7 Aranda goes with the next couple of sentences.

8 MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, it is also part --  
9 you see, it isn't the particular words, it is part of  
10 the philosophy that Mr. Bugliosi is trying to pervade  
11 before the jury.

10 fls 12 I object to those --  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

0-1

1 MR. HUGHES: There is nothing about Manson's philosophy  
2 in the lines, "I am not going to fight. I will let my  
3 attorney do it."

4 MR. FITZGERALD: It makes no reference, directly or  
5 indirectly, implicitly or explicitly, to anyone of the other  
6 defendants.

7 MR. KANAREK: Yes, it does.

8 Mr. Bugliosi went into the domination by  
9 Manson. You even allowed him to put in the sexual orgies,  
10 the sexual relationship, that he supposedly dominates.  
11 Therefore, your Honor --

12 THE COURT: Perhaps you should read the next sentence,  
13 too.

14 MR. KANAREK: I read it all. I have read it all, your  
15 Honor.

16 This is a very clever plan by Mr. Bugliosi.  
17 There is no question about it. It is a clever plan, and it  
18 is an attempt to get before this jury these matters,  
19 because he is arguing domination.

20 So, when you get away from the <sup>acts</sup> / at the Tate  
21 house and what this woman did physically, when you start  
22 delving, purportedly, into her mind, you are having  
23 Mr. Bugliosi there saying that these thoughts are thoughts  
24 which come about because of Mr. Manson's domination.

25 No matter which way you slice it, your Honor,  
26 that is it, and he knows it, and your Honor's approach here

1 is catering to that.

2 MR. HUGHES: Irving, I think that is a lot of rubbish,  
3 because the next sentence says, "I will let my attorney  
4 do that."

5 THE COURT: I see your point, Mr. Kanarek, whatever  
6 it is. I think I see it. I don't think there is anything  
7 to it.

8 MR. KANAREK: Well, you see, they are arguing that  
9 there is domination, your Honor. Mr. Bugliosi has put in  
10 reams and reams of evidence --

11 MR. FITZGERALD: Your Honor, Mr. Kanarek constantly  
12 keeps making these objections, and I don't have the rest of  
13 my life to spend here.

14 THE COURT: I agree, Mr. Fitzgerald.

15 I am on the horns of a dilemma between allowing  
16 him unlimited license to make objections regardless of  
17 whether they have any merit or not, which I can't anticipate  
18 in advance, and shutting him off completely, neither of  
19 which I want to do.

20 But I would suggest, Mr. Kanarek, that you  
21 use a little discretion and not try to clutter up the  
22 record with motions and objections and statements that any  
23 ten-year-old child can see is either nonsense or totally  
24 irrelevant or without any merit so far as the matters under  
25 consideration.

26 MR. KANAREK: Well, I can't agree with you, your Honor,  
regrettably.

10a-1

1 THE COURT: All right.

2 Those two sentences will stay in.

3 The next sentence? Any comment on that?

4 You don't have to repeat yourself. If you  
5 have the same objection, Mr. Kanarek, you may just say so.

6 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. It is all part and  
7 parcel of this somewhat --

8 THE COURT: Don't repeat everything you have said.

9 MR. KANAREK: I am trying to convince the Court.

10 THE COURT: All you have to do is say "I object on  
11 the same grounds," and I will understand, Mr. Kanarek.

12 MR. KANAREK: Well, I would like to state this also,  
13 your Honor.

14 Mr. Fitzgerald is not the only person here  
15 that wants to get on with it because he has other things  
16 to do.

17 THE COURT: Good. I am glad to hear that.

18 MR. KANAREK: But I don't think we should sacrifice  
19 the defendants.

20 You see, the blame is with the District  
21 Attorney and what they have done in this case.

22 THE COURT: All right.

23 Any comment regarding the next sentence,  
24 "To live forever is all I want," et cetera?

25 MR. KANAREK: Yes. The same.

26 THE COURT: What about the next sentence?

10a-2

1 MR. BUGLIOSI: The next sentence is extremely  
2 important to the prosecution, your Honor.

3 It, in no fashion whatsoever, implicates  
4 co-defendants.

5 MR. KANAREK: It certainly does.

6 THE COURT: How?

7 MR. HUGHES: I think that is a point that we are  
8 going to have a substantial disagreement on.

9 THE COURT: I'd like to hear your comments.

10 MR. HUGHES: The sentence is: "I did not admit to  
11 being in the second house because I was not in the second  
12 house."

13 The second house, I believe, refers to the  
14 La Bianca house.

15 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

16 MR. HUGHES: Although that is not entirely clear,  
17 arguendo it refers to that.

18 MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

19 MR. HUGHES: In the context of the next sentence,  
20 it certainly appears to refer to that.

21 She says that she went before the Grand Jury,  
22 and in the context of the next sentence, where it says  
23 "Your testimony was enough to convict me and all the  
24 others."

11 fls.



11-1

1 MR. BUGLIOSI: That will have to go out.

2 MR. HUGHES: That certainly refers to that.

3 MR. BUGLIOSI: That will have to go out.

4 MR. HUGHES: The fact that she is commenting on  
5 something that someone else might have done here, I believe  
6 that is all that this sentence does, this one.

7 She admits some knowledge as to what went on  
8 at the second house, of what somebody else, apparently,  
9 did.

10 If she is making a statement like this --

11 THE COURT: I cannot see that, Mr. Hughes. All  
12 she is saying, "I didn't say I was there because I wasn't  
13 there." That is what it says.

14 MR. SHINN: It implies, your Honor, that the others  
15 were.

16 THE COURT: Of course if anyone else --

17 MR. BUGLIOSI: She is talking about herself. She  
18 said "I did not enter the second house."

19 MR. KANAREK: That is hearsay.

20 THE COURT: I don't see anything objectionable to  
21 that sentence.

22 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, again circumstantially,  
23 by her not being there, and these other events allegedly  
24 having occurred, the defendants are implicated by the  
25 fact that she is saying there is a second house.

26 THE COURT: Somebody was there obviously.

1                   If she means the La Bianca house, somebody  
2 was there; bodies were found.

3                   All she is saying is "I wasn't there."

4           MR. KANAREK: The only people before the Court  
5 are the other defendants.

6           THE COURT: That is not the point at all.

7           MR. KANAREK: Circumstantially the inference is  
8 that the other defendants were there.

9           THE COURT: No, the inference is someone other than  
10 Susan Atkins was there, that is all.

11          MR. KANAREK: Well, I think it is the Stein case  
12 that says, your Honor, that some of these things that  
13 we ask juries to do are so impossible that it makes it  
14 error to introduce them, and this is one.

15          THE COURT: We have had the same point raised a  
16 number of times, and if Bruton-Aranda held what you are  
17 now contending, then it would be impossible to get a  
18 statement in under the Bruton-Aranda rule in any case  
19 where there were multiple defendants.

20          MR. KANAREK: No, if she says, as one statement  
21 purports, the witnesses, Virginia Graham and Roni Howard--  
22 when she says "I stabbed somebody," she is talking about  
23 a personal act of her own. Now, that is different.

24                 But when you start bringing in what Mr.  
25 Bugliosi wants in here, when you start getting into the  
26 machinations of her mind and you start getting into

1 things that are away from physical acts on her part --

2 THE COURT: That is enough, Mr. Kanarek, let's get  
3 away from the rhetoric.

4 MR. HUGHES: I feel that is an exculpatory statement  
5 on her part, a self-serving statement, and all it can do  
6 is help the prosecution's case against everyone else and  
7 not against Susan Atkins.

8 MR. BUGLIOSI: I intend to use it against her only  
9 to show she has knowledge of the murder.

10 THE COURT: No, the thrust of the statement is she  
11 did admit being in the first house, that is the thrust of  
12 the statement.

11a fls. 12

11a-1

1 MR. MUSICH: I agree with the Court, I cannot see  
2 her knowledge, knowing of the two locations, clearly imports  
3 knowledge of the first but no knowledge of the second.

4 THE COURT: The next sentence will have to come out,  
5 and the one after that.

6 MR. KANAREK: What is that, your Honor?

7 MR. FITZGERALD: Read!

8 MR. BUGLIOSI: The next line should also go out, your  
9 Honor.

10 "He also said it was my only chance  
11 to save myself."

12 THE COURT: And the one following that.

13 MR. BUGLIOSI: The one following that I think should  
14 also go out, and then I guess --

15 MR. KANAREK: Well --

16 THE COURT: Do you want it in, Mr. Kanarek?

17 MR. KANAREK: Yes --

18 MR. BUGLIOSI: The statement, "Then I was out to  
19 save myself," won't make any sense at all if you remove  
20 the two preceding sentences.

21 MR. KANAREK: No, but you can strike the "then,"  
22 delete the then and say, "I was out to save myself."  
23 With that deletion --

24 THE COURT: What does that sentence refer to?

25 MR. KANAREK: With the rest of these, it's all  
26 gobbledygook in any respect.

1 THE COURT: No, it refers to the Grand Jury  
2 proceedings.

3 MR. KANAREK: How are we to know that, your Honor?

4 MR. MUSICH: By reading the letter.

5 THE COURT: You seem to be omniscient on these other  
6 points which are not present at all, but you don't want to  
7 see what is obvious and in the letter.

8 MR. KANAREK: Well, if we -- of course, my position is  
9 none of this should go in.

10 THE COURT: It is coming out, Mr. Kanarek.

11 Now, what about the one after that, "I have gone  
12 through some changes since then"?

13 MR. BUGLIOSI: Again, your Honor, it should go out,  
14 it is referring to since the Grand Jury.

15 At the time of the Grand Jury she was out to  
16 save herself; since then she had some changes.

17 Now she is interested in saving herself.

18 I think that sentence has to go out, too.

19 MR. SHINN: I have no objections, your Honor.

20 MR. FITZGERALD: The whole balance of the paragraph  
21 has to go.

22 THE COURT: Over to where?

23 MR. FITZGERALD: Down to -- "I am ceasing to  
24 be inside rather than seeming to be" refers to the  
25 immediate preceding which has been stricken.

26 "I have been going through changes about

1 feeling guilty about testifying and all that has happened."

2 That has to go because it refers to her  
3 testimony in front of the Grand Jury.

4 "For me to say I am sorry is not enough  
5 for me."

6 What she is talking about is not remorse for  
7 having committed the crime, but remorse for having  
8 testified against the co-defendants.

9 MR. BUGLIOSI: Is that what she is testifying to?  
10 "For me to say I am sorry is not enough for me" -- she  
11 means she is sorry for committing these crimes.

12 MR. FITZGERALD: No, I think she is referring to  
13 testifying against Mr. M at the Grand Jury.

14 THE COURT: I agree, if you look at the next two  
15 sentences -- no, the next three sentences, you can see  
16 that she is showing no remorse for the crimes, but only  
17 for having testified.

18 MR. BUGLIOSI: Okay.

19 THE COURT: So the entire balance of that paragraph  
20 will have to come out.

21 MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, wait a while, the entire  
22 balance of the paragraph?

23 Are you referring all the way down to here  
24 then?

25 THE COURT: No, there is a paragraph here.

26 MR. BUGLIOSI: Oh, there is a paragraph there.

1                   What about "I know now it has all been  
2 perfect"? Can't that come in? She is saying the committing  
3 of these crimes is perfect.

4           MR. SHINN: She is talking about her testimony.

5           MR. BUGLIOSI: She did not testify.

6           THE COURT: I think it is so out of context there,  
7 it would be unfair to leave it in.

8           MR. BUGLIOSI: All right.

9           THE COURT: It could only be prejudicial to her,  
10 and it would be at best ambiguous.

11b

11b-1

1 MR. FITZGERALD: I don't know what the next sentence  
2 means.

3 MR. KANAREK: It all has to go out.

4 MR. BUGLIOSI: "Those people died not out of hate or  
5 anything ugly." That has to go out too?

6 MR. KANAREK: Yes.

7 MR. BUGLIOSI: On what ground?

8 MR. KANAREK: Because we have a joint trial.

9 MR. BUGLIOSI: In a joint trial we cannot bring in  
10 any evidence against any of the defendants?

11 MR. KANAREK: That is a platitude which is not true.

12 This record will reveal I think that I have not  
13 objected except in places that --

14 MR. FITZGERALD: Your Honor, I personally have no  
15 objection to "yes, we are beyond petty cussing. Love is  
16 also beyond limits. Those people died not out of hate or  
17 anything ugly."

18 But I do have a problem with the next sentence:

19 "I am not going to defend our beliefs."

20 I don't know whether you want to take it out  
21 or change "our," or what. All I am objecting to is the  
22 word "our."

23 THE COURT: Well, I would take out the first two  
24 sentences.

25 MR. MUSICH: At what point is that?

26 THE COURT: The sentences "Yes, we are beyond petty



11b-2 1

cussing," and "love is also beyond limits."

2 They are both ambiguous and they are taken out  
3 of context.

4 I think they refer to what she has been talking  
5 about in the previous paragraph.

6 MR. KANAREK: Now, when you're referring to "those  
7 people," your Honor, you are referring to people that she  
8 has not even admitted killing.

9 MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, if we do cut it there,  
10 though, the whole context of the thing will read, the  
11 sentence before that will be "I did not admit to being  
12 in the second house because I was not in the second house."

13 "Those people died not out of hate or anything  
14 ugly."

15 It is inferring she knows how those people  
16 died and why they died in the second house.

17 MR. KANAREK: It puts the burden on Mr. Manson.

18 THE COURT: I am inclined to think that whole para-  
19 graph should come out.

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

21 MR. BUGLIOSI: She is talking about the people who  
22 were murdered here, of her personal knowledge.

23 She is telling you why they were murdered.  
24 It wasn't out of hate or anything ugly. It shows she was  
25 one of the killers.

26 THE COURT: The point, Mr. Bugliosi, is not that it

1 does not show she was one of the killers, but that in  
2 describing the motive or purpose for the killing of all  
3 of the people, she is in fact saying that she knows what  
4 that motive was.

5 It either is prejudicial to her as tending to  
6 place the blame for all of the killings on her, or else  
7 it tends to implicate the other defendants by having her  
8 state in effect that she knows why the people were killed  
9 that she did not kill.

10 MR. BUGLIOSI: You mean she is stating her own  
11 opinion as to why these people were killed?

12 THE COURT: Yes.

13 MR. BUGLIOSI: She is stating her opinion?

14 THE COURT: Yes, she is either saying in effect  
15 "I know why they were killed because I killed them," or  
16 "I know why they were killed because I know the people who  
17 killed them."

18 That is what she is saying in substance, or  
19 at least it could be interpreted that way.

20 In one case it is prejudicial to her and in the  
21 other case it could implicate the co-defendants.

22 MR. BUGLIOSI: The Court's argument is probably  
23 valid and extremely sophisticated. I cannot think of  
24 any rebuttal to it right now at this moment, but there is  
25 something that does not smack right here.

26 THE COURT: I am afraid it will have to come out,

gentlemen.

1  
2 MR. BUGLIOSI: The reason I think it has to come out  
3 if at all is because it comes right after the second house,  
4 like Mr. Hughes said, that is something that might be  
5 able to be rectified by placing it somewhere different,  
6 at a different locus in the letter.

7 MR. KANAREK: And I am accused of thinking like a  
8 ten-year-old, your Honor.

9 Mr. Bugliosi wants to change our entire law and  
10 change the evidence, and just because of the fact he wants  
11 it in, for no reason whatsoever except he has the emotional  
12 fls. 12 desire to have it in there.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

12-1 1 THE COURT: I have no way of measuring his emotional  
2 desire.

3 MR. KANAREK: All you have to think of is his opening  
4 statement, your Honor, and I think you will find his  
5 emotional desire; and the comments of Mr. Younger and  
6 Mr. Bugliosi and Mr. Stovitz; and I think the emotional  
7 desire is to get Evelle Younger Attorney General of the  
8 State of California.

9 THE COURT: All right, gentlemen. We are getting off  
10 the subject.

11 The rest of that paragraph will go out.

12 That brings us down to "I don't need anything.  
13 My attorney gives me money. He just deposited \$20 on my  
14 account. As I write to you I feel more at ease inside."

15 Now, down to that point I don't think there is  
16 any difficulty.

17 MR. KANAREK: Not on the Bruton-Aranda issue.

18 MR. MUSICH: Your Honor, counsel may want that out,  
19 I don't know, if that was about her other attorney, or  
20 when it was written, concerning another situation.

21 It is neither here nor there.

22 THE COURT: That is a very interesting question,  
23 gentlemen, that occurred to me during the noon hour.

24 There aren't any dates on these letters.  
25 Well, there is on Number 9.

26 MR. BUGLIOSI: Of course, on No. 8, we have the

1 testimony of Roni Howard that she received it in mid-December,  
2 1969.

3 THE COURT: Yes.

4 On 9 there is a date, but what is the meaning  
5 of that date?

6 MR. BUGLIOSI: I can only assume, your Honor, that  
7 this date is -- it is in Sadie Glutz's handwriting -- I  
8 can only assume it is the date that she wrote the letter.  
9 It has got her name.

10 THE COURT: Is the date in her handwriting?

11 I am looking at a typewritten copy.

12 MR. HUGHES: I believe it is, your Honor.

13 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, it appears to be.

14 MR. MUSICH: Yes.

15 THE COURT: All right. That answers my question.

16 MR. MUSICH: I would leave it up to defense counsel,  
17 if he wants it in there.

18 THE COURT: You mean about the \$20?

19 MR. SHINN: I don't think that should go out.

20 MR. MUSICH: I don't think it makes any difference  
21 one way or the other.

22 THE COURT: It certainly doesn't implicate anybody.

23 MR. KANAREK: The Court has delineated this as  
24 being a Bruton-Aranda discussion. We haven't come to the  
25 hearsay.

26 THE COURT: We are not trying to rewrite the letter  
in a form more pleasing. That is not the idea.

1 MR. MUSICH: No.

2 MR. FITZGERALD: Maybe Mr. Shinn should be entitled to  
3 an instruction, based on the records of the Superior Court,  
4 that he became an attorney on such-and-such a date, which  
5 would, obviously, be after that. I mean, at the time that  
6 the jury is instructed.

7 MR. BUGLIOSI: Who is entitled to an instruction,  
8 Mr. Hughes?  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

12a-1

1 MR. HUGHES: No. He said Shinn.

2 MR. FITZGERALD: I meant to say Shinn, if I didn't.

3 MR. BUGLIOSI: I thought you said Hughes.

4 MR. HUGHES: No.

5 THE COURT: What is the problem with the statement  
6 in the letter?

7 MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Musich feels that it deprecates,  
8 in some fashion, Mr. Shinn, because the jury will think  
9 that he was her attorney at this time and he was supporting  
10 her with money and was going to plead her insane.

11 MR. MUSICH: I don't know what adverse inference can  
12 be drawn from that. I can't really see any myself.

13 THE COURT: I don't see any objection to your having  
14 an instruction to that effect, if Mr. Shinn wants it.

15 MR. KANAREK: I think it is hearsay; but, of course,  
16 we haven't come to that point.

17 THE COURT: It is a matter that can be stipulated to  
18 right now on the record.

19 Well, it should be done in front of the jury if  
20 it is a stipulation.

21 MR. BUGLIOSI: There can be a stipulation that at the  
22 time this letter was written he was not her attorney.

23 MR. SHINN: That is satisfactory.

24 THE COURT: Richard Caballero was.

25 MR. KANAREK: I think that is hearsay.

26 MR. FITZGERALD: Or he became her attorney on such and

12a-2

1 such a date. It doesn't make any difference. Either way  
2 you want to do it.

3 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor has made the observation  
4 that we first go through Bruton and Aranda.

5 THE COURT: You don't have to enter into this stipula-  
6 tion, Mr. Kanarek.

7 We will take up the matters as we come to them.

8 You can raise that at the proper time, Mr.  
9 Shinn, if you care to make such a stipulation. Apparently  
10 the People are willing to stipulate with you.

11 MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.

12 THE COURT: That you became the attorney of record  
13 in this case as of a certain date.

14 MR. SHINN: Yes.

15 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

16 THE COURT: All right.

17 Now, the next sentence is: "When I first heard  
18 you were the informer, I wanted to slit your throat. Then  
19 I snapped that I was the real informer and it was my throat  
20 I wanted to cut."

12b fls.



12b-1

1 MR. KANAREK: If I may, your Honor, the word  
2 "informer," I would think it is in the context that you  
3 inform not on yourself but you inform on other people,  
4 and I object to the use of the word "informer" because it  
5 does have the connotation of bringing in the other defendants  
6 by the very use of that word.

7 You never inform on yourself, you confess as  
8 to yourself. You inform as to other people.

9 I would ask that that be stricken because,  
10 clearly, the implication is that she has told, she has made  
11 these statements concerning -- well, I am specifically  
12 interested in Mr. Manson.

13 MR. HUGHES: I would tend to agree.

14 MR. FITZGERALD: We are going to --

15 THE COURT: I think it is a dangerous thing myself.

16 MR. HUGHES: The dictionary says, as one of the  
17 definitions: "One that informs against another. One that  
18 informs a magistrate of a violation of law."

19 MR. FITZGERALD: I think she is referring to her  
20 testimony in front of the Grand Jury.

21 MR. BUGLIOSI: She has already testified -- Roni  
22 Howard has already testified -- that she was the informer,  
23 and this statement right here, more than any other statement--

24 MR. MUSICH: -- clearly indicates --

25 MR. BUGLIOSI: -- verifies, this is the statement in  
26 the whole letter that verifies that she spoke to Roni

1 Howard.

2 This is the statement in the letter that verifies  
3 that Roni Howard did, in fact, have a conversation with her.

4 MR. KANAREK: But we are on a Bruton-Aranda deletion,  
5 Mr. Bugliosi. You slide off the point.

6 MR. BUGLIOSI: She already testified to that.

7 MR. KANAREK: But the point is that what we are  
8 supposed to be doing now is deciding whether these matters  
9 are going to burden the other defendants.

10 MR. MUSICH: How does it do that?

11 MR. KANAREK: By the use of the word "informer."

12 In the context of our criminal courts, an  
13 informer is someone who makes statements against other  
14 people.

15 MR. BUGLIOSI: In the first place, we are dealing with  
16 lay people. "You were the informer. You were the one that  
17 went to the police."

18 Mind you, she uses the singular. She doesn't  
19 use the plural.

20 We put on evidence that she spoke to two people.  
21 In fact, we are going to put on evidence that she spoke to  
22 three people.

23 She is only referring here to the one that went  
24 to the police, Roni Howard.

25 MR. KANAREK: That isn't the point. The point is that  
26 the word "informer" throughout our culture means where you

1 talk, where you say things against other people, and you  
2 know it, Mr. Bugliosi, but you want it in there, and you  
3 are determined, you want to get a conviction even though  
4 you put in reversible error.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

12c fls.

12C-1

1 MR. MUSICH: Your Honor, may I address some remarks  
2 to the Court?

3 THE COURT: Yes, you may.

4 MR. MUSICH: The letter is directed to Roni  
5 Howard. The letter, in this sentence, is directed as  
6 follows: "You were the informer."

7 Clearly, there is no ambiguity that she is  
8 referring to Roni Howard.

9 She talks about Sadie, at that time, wanting to  
10 slit her throat, and then changing her opinion, her  
11 belief, that she, Sadie, was the real informer for even  
12 telling Roni Howard, and now she realizes it is her throat she  
13 should cut and not Roni's.

14 I don't see how this in any way can incriminate  
15 any defendants but Sadie.

16 It corroborates that she did, in fact, tell  
17 Roni Howard.

18 MR. BUGLIOSI: "You are the informer," you are the one  
19 that told the police what I told you. She is differentiating  
20 between Roni Howard and, apparently, Virginia Graham.

21 MR. MUSICH: No question about it. Roni Howard is  
22 the informer.

23 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. No question, she is the informer.

24 MR. MUSICH: There is evidence before the jury that  
25 she told the police.

26 MR. KANAREK: She is stating that she is the real

1 informer, meaning that she is the real informer against all  
2 the defendants.

3 The jury knows that it is written in the context  
4 at a time before this lady has testified before the Grand  
5 Jury.

6 MR. BUGLIOSI: Roni was the informer against Susan  
7 Atkins. She went to the police.

8 THE COURT: There is no question about that.

9 The question, as I see it, is really whether  
10 or not a person uses the expression, "I was the real  
11 informer," when they are talking about a confession. It is  
12 a highly unusual form of speaking.

13 MR. BUGLIOSI: It is, but she is being cute. She is  
14 using cute language.

15 THE COURT: It can be construed to mean that she was  
16 informing on someone else.

17 Does that necessarily implicate the co-defendants?

18 MR. MUSICH: The expression that she was the real  
19 informer indicates that she, Sadie, was the real informer  
20 because she even bothered to tell Virginia Graham or Roni  
21 Howard. That is the context.

22 MR. BUGLIOSI: She is saying that Roni Howard was  
23 the informer, which she was.

24 THE COURT: I understand all that. There is no  
25 question about that.

26 MR. BUGLIOSI: She is not referring to third parties  
there.

12d-1

1 MR. MUSICH: The Court seems to indicate that you  
2 feel when she says "I was the real informer," she is talk-  
3 ing about her testimony before the Grand Jury, and that is  
4 why that should be kept out?

5 There is no testimony whatsoever that anybody  
6 can get that impression from, your Honor.

7 THE COURT: That isn't exactly what I meant, although  
8 that is part of it.

9 People just don't talk this way if they are  
10 talking about themselves.

11 MR. BUGLIOSI: They wouldn't in the abstract. They  
12 wouldn't say, "I am the real informer." But it is prefaced  
13 by this statement: "When I first heard you were the  
14 informer I wanted to slit your throat," but actually I  
15 was the informer.

16 I agree, your Honor, if she just said "I was  
17 the informer," she wouldn't talk that way. But prefaced  
18 by the remark: "When I first heard you were the informer,  
19 I wanted to slit your throat," it would be very common  
20 for a person to add, parenthetically and in a cute fashion,  
21 "No, I was the informer, I informed on myself."

22 THE COURT: That is a question, whether that state-  
23 ment can be interpreted to directly or indirectly implicate  
24 any co-defendants.

25 I am simply asking the question.

26 MR. MUSICH: I don't see how it can be interpreted

1 or the inference drawn that she meant it in some other way,  
2 and taking it out of context, that she was the real informer,  
3 that she informed on the other people.

4 I think that is really stretching it, Mr. Kanarek.  
5 How can you make any inference of that nature?

6 THE COURT: Let's carry it one step further. Let's  
7 assume that it is interpreted that what she is saying is  
8 that "I informed not only on myself but on other people."

9 MR. MUSICH: I can't see how you could read that  
10 into it. You are really stretching the interpretation of  
11 that.

12 THE COURT: That's right, I am stretching it to its  
13 limits.

14 MR. MUSICH: "I wanted to cut your throat," but I  
15 thought it over and "I am the real informer" and I should  
16 cut my throat.

17 She is directing attention to Roni Howard as  
18 being the informer that told the police, "And I wanted to  
19 cut your throat for telling the police, but now I realize  
20 I was the informer."

21 THE COURT: There is nothing to indicate that Roni  
22 Howard informed on anyone other than Susan.

23 MR. MUSICH: Right.

24 MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

25 THE COURT: There is nothing in this statement that  
26 ties into any statement of Roni Howard implicating the

20-1  
co-defendants.

1 MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

2 My questions were: Did you tell the police  
3 what Sadie told you? And what Sadie told her is what Sadie  
4 did.

5 That is what is in front of the jury right now.

6 MR. MUSICH: The clear import of that statement is  
7 that she considers herself the real informer because she  
8 told Roni, and rather than "cutting your throat, Roni, I  
9 should cut my own throat."

10 Any other stretching of the imagination to draw  
11 any inference that she was the informer on other persons is  
12 way beyond speculation and any reasonable possible inference.

13 MR. KANAREK: Look at that, where she refers to  
14 "M or no M".

15 MR. BUGLIOSI: We are crossing that out.

16 THE COURT: That will come out.

17 MR. KANAREK: "M or no M."

18 MR. BUGLIOSI: We are crossing that out.

19 MR. MUSICH: It has nothing to do with the sentence  
20 directed to Roni Howard as the informer.

21 MR. BUGLIOSI: That is the sentence that verifies that  
22 Roni Howard had the conversation with her.

23 THE COURT: I don't think that is the only one.

24 MR. BUGLIOSI: It is the main one.

25 MR. KANAREK: Aranda makes it clear that if there  
26 is any chance of these statements of the declarant burdening  
the other defendants, they have to go out.



1                   You have got plenty of evidence, Mr. Bugliosi.

2           MR. BUGLIOSI: We have got plenty of evidence?

3           You are always saying we don't have any evidence.

4           MR. MUSICH: Whether we have other evidence or not is  
5 immaterial. You don't show how it burdens your defendant,  
6 except by some wild speculation and stretching of the  
7 meaning to say that she informed on your client.

8           MR. KANAREK: That is not stretching the meaning.

9                   What I am saying is, that you have plenty of  
10 evidence, and ---

11           MR. MUSICH: It is immaterial what evidence we have.  
12 What we want to do is get this in there as evidence against  
13 Susan Atkins.

14                   This corroborates that she told Roni Howard  
15 she realizes it was her mistake even opening her mouth.

16           MR. HUGHES: I think when you take a statement like  
17 that that can go either way, you should take it out.

18           MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't think it can go either way.

19           MR. HUGHES: Traditionally, an informer is a person  
20 that informs on other people.

12f-1

1 MR. BUGLIOSI: Roni Howard went to the police and  
2 informed on Sadie Glutz.

3 MR. HUGHES: I think we have to use the word  
4 "informer" in the traditional sense. But I see where you  
5 can make some minor argument to use it in the way that you  
6 are trying to use it.

7 MR. BUGLIOSI: If B goes <sup>to</sup> the police and tells the  
8 police that B saw A in the possession of marijuana, B is  
9 A's informer.

10 Randy Howard goes to the police and informs  
11 on Sadie Glutz.

12 MR. KANAREK: There is no question that she is talking  
13 about all the people there, Mr. Bugliosi.

14 MR. MUSICH: There is no question but that that  
15 statement refers to Roni as the informer, and she says  
16 "I am the real informer" because I am the one that told  
17 you.

18 MR. KANAREK: Told on everybody.

19 MR. MUSICH: "I am the one that told you, Roni."

20 MR. KANAREK: And she, at this time, has misgivings  
21 about having informed on her friends.

22 MR. SHINN: I agree with Mr. Musich.

23 THE COURT: You agree with whom?

24 MR. SHINN: With Mr. Musich, with his argument.

25 THE COURT: You don't want it to come out?

26 MR. SHINN: No, I don't want it to come out, your

12f-2

Honor.

MR. KANAREK: Sure he doesn't, your Honor, because by this, your Honor, it puts the burden on other defendants.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think this is a super subtle way of convincing the Court that something should go out under Aranda. Now I am really starting to get wind of it.

This conversation is so sophisticated, I am going to have to bring in help. This is really getting subtle.

THE COURT: I was about to say that Mr. Shinn just put the kiss of death on it.

MR. MUSICH: They must huddle every morning before they come in here and get their signals straight.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We are going to have to have all of our antennas out.

MR. MUSICH: I can only press on the Court that that is far out speculation; that "informer" must be taken in the context that she is using here, that you, Roni, are the informer, and now I consider myself the real informer because I told you. I am the informer because I told you.

THE COURT: Told you what? That is the unknown.

MR. BUGLIOSI: What we have put on in front of the jury.

12g fls.

1 THE COURT: And what is the jury going to think she  
2 meant?

3 MR. BUGLIOSI: What we put on in front of the jury,  
4 that Roni Howard went to the police and told the police  
5 what Sadie told her.

6 THE COURT: That doesn't answer what the meaning of  
7 this statement is here.

8 This isn't Roni Howard talking, this is Susan  
9 Atkins talking.

10 MR. MUSICH: You are the informer. I confessed to you  
11 and you informed on me, and I can slit your throat for  
12 doing it.

13 THE COURT: If I were sitting on that jury, why, I  
14 would be thinking just as I am now, "What does it mean?"  
15 And one of the meanings that would be bouncing around in my  
16 head would be the meaning that I have suggested to you,  
17 that reading between the lines, people don't talk like this  
18 unless they mean what they say, and she is not talking just  
19 about herself, implicating herself, but what she is saying  
20 is that, "I am the one who informed and broke this case  
21 and, as a result, you now have four defendants in this case  
22 rather than one."

23 That is the implication.

24 MR. BUGLIOSI: I feel, your Honor --

25 THE COURT: It is too dangerous to leave in.

26 MR. BUGLIOSI: I agree with the Court that that is a

1 possible interpretation that the jury can place on it. I  
2 think it is far out, but that is a possible interpretation.

3 THE COURT: Perhaps.

4 MR. BUGLIOSI: I have to concede it is possible.

5 However, there is no reason in the world why the  
6 first clause can't stay: "When I first heard you were the  
7 informer, I wanted to slit your throat."

8 There is no reason in the world why that can't  
9 stay in.

10 The Court was referring to the second statement  
11 as not being the way people talk. Well, the first statement  
12 is the way people talk. There is no reason in the world why  
13 that can't stay in.

14 THE COURT: All right, let's consider that.

15 MR. BUGLIOSI: Of course, they are going to object.

16 MR. MUSICH: I won't even concede the other part of it,  
17 but if you want to do that, half a loaf is better than none.

18 THE COURT: All I can say, gentlemen, looking at it  
19 from the standpoint, assuming for the purpose of this  
20 discussion that there is a conviction, obviously, since on  
21 an acquittal there is no problem, and the matter is being  
22 reviewed by the appellate court. If there is a conviction,  
23 there certainly is a chance that there will be a death  
24 penalty imposed. And you are now talking about how sharp  
25 is the knife that does the editing in a Bruton-Aranda problem.

26 Do you use a dull knife or do you use a sharp  
knife? When you get into areas where you have more than one

1 interpretation and all of those interpretations could be  
2 considered reasonable, or not without some probability of  
3 being adopted by one or more jurors, and when the effect of  
4 the adoption of one of those interpretations would be to  
5 implicate, directly or indirectly, one or more of the other  
6 defendants, I think you have a real problem.

7 It isn't worth the risk.

2H 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

12h-1

1 MR. BUGLIOSI: I think there is a presumption, not  
2 legally, but a presumption of something on appeal.

3 THE COURT: I am not suggesting that we try the case  
4 in the appellate court. That is not the point.

5 MR. BUGLIOSI: No. I agree. I realize that.

6 MR. MUSICH: The Court evidently feels that at least  
7 the last part of that statement somehow indirectly incrimi-  
8 nates the other defendants by speculation but because Sadie  
9 copped out to Roni --

10 THE COURT: I say it is ambiguous to the extent that  
11 one of the interpretations would be that what she is saying,  
12 in substance, is that: When I informed, I informed on  
13 everybody, not just myself.

14 MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor, and it is pretty diffi-  
15 cult just to leave the first half in.

16 MR. BUGLIOSI: No.

17 MR. SHINN: She makes the statement in the first half,  
18 then retracts it in the second half, your Honor. You can't  
19 cut it in half.

20 MR. BUGLIOSI: You want everything?

21 THE COURT: That is another matter.

22 MR. SHINN: She says she wanted to slit her throat,  
23 but then she says "It is my throat I want to slit."

24 If you leave the first sentence in, it looks  
25 bad; but if you read the whole two sentences, it balances.

26 MR. MUSICH: Let's edit it out, "I was the real

12h-2

1 informer," and that will solve the problem.

2 I think you can edit it without directly or  
3 indirectly incriminating the co-defendants.

4 MR. BUGLIOSI: The first clause is just a perfectly  
5 proper statement that verifies the conversation that took  
6 place. It is not uncomfortable language. People talk like  
7 that. "You were the informer. You informed on me."

8 Mr. Musich said you can even keep part of the  
9 second clause in there.

10 THE COURT: I think it can be edited after the word  
11 "throat," without doing any injustice to anyone.

12 MR. BUGLIOSI: Does the Court then want to say  
13 "But then I snapped and" --

14 THE COURT: Just cut it off, period.

15 MR. BUGLIOSI: "And it was my throat that I want to  
16 cut"?

17 MR. HUGHES: I think the sentence together, I think  
18 the total sentence, does not make Susan Atkins out as a  
19 vicious person. "When I first heard that you were the  
20 informer, I wanted to cut your throat, and then I snapped  
21 and it was my throat I wanted to cut."

22 THE COURT: If you look at the following sentence,  
23 though, it says: "Well, that all over with now as I let  
24 the past die away from my mind."

25 MR. BUGLIOSI: Then she says "Love will still run  
26 forever."



1 THE COURT: I am going to put a period after the  
2 word "throat," and strike out the balance of that sentence.

3  
4 121 fls.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

12I-1

1 MR. SHINN: Your Honor, could we just strike out the  
2 balance?

3 I think if you just strike out the balance of  
4 the sentence, it will change the whole meaning of the two  
5 sentences, your Honor.

6 First she states that, "I wanted to slit your  
7 throat," and then she takes that back in the next sentence,  
8 your Honor.

9 THE COURT: She doesn't take it back.

10 MR. SHINN: Yes, she does.

11 She says, "It was my throat that I wanted to  
12 cut."

13 In other words, she is implying: I don't want  
14 to cut your throat now, it is my throat I want to cut.

15 THE COURT: She doesn't say when she first heard it  
16 she didn't want to cut her throat. What she is saying is  
17 that on further reflection that she changed her mind. She  
18 says that in the next sentence.

19 MR. MUSICH: The fact that she wanted to cut her own  
20 throat might be more incriminating anyway, on your theory.

21 The Court is right.

22 MR. FITZGERALD: I think that Shinn has got a good  
23 point except that the whole thing ended up with "Love, love,  
24 love, love," So, obviously, she doesn't want to cut any-  
25 body's throat any more.

26 MR. MUSICH: The next sentence then.

1 THE COURT: The alternative to that would be, one  
2 alternative would be, to edit it so that the sentence  
3 reads, "When I first heard you were the informer, I wanted  
4 to slit your throat. Then I snapped that it was my throat  
5 I wanted to cut."

6 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

7 MR. FITZGERALD: That is what he suggested, and I  
8 think it is a good idea.

9 Could it be edited that way?

10 THE COURT: I think that eliminates the problem and  
11 yet does not throw any additional onus, doesn't increase  
12 the burden on the declarant.

13 All right. That is the way it will be done.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

3-1

1 MR. BUGLIOSI: "Then I snapped that I was the real  
2 informer and it was my throat I wanted to cut."

3 MR. MUSICH: How are we going to do that?

4 THE COURT: "Then I snapped that it was my throat I  
5 wanted to cut."

6 MR. BUGLIOSI: "That is was my throat I wanted to cut."

7 MR. KANAREK: Just as long as the record will reveal  
8 my objection to that, your Honor.

9 THE COURT: All right.

10 MR. BUGLIOSI: The next line goes, then, "Well,  
11 that's all over with now as I let the past die away from my  
12 mind."

13 And, "You know it will all turn out okay in the end  
14 anyway."

15 That's okay then.

16 "M or no M" has to go out.

17 What about "Sadie or no Sadie"?

18 MR. FITZGERALD: "Sadie or no Sadie" ought to go out,  
19 too, because actually --

20 THE COURT: No objection to the next two sentences,  
21 "Well, that's all over with now as I let the past die away  
22 from my mind. You know it will all turn out okay in the  
23 end anyway."

24 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, no objection.

25 "M or no M," we all agree should go out.

26 The question is whether "Sadie or no Sadie"

1 should go out.

2 It appears to be an epigram. It doesn't make  
3 much sense one without the other, and it does not destroy  
4 the continuity.

5 THE COURT: It doesn't add anything. Let's take it out.

6 MR. FITZGERALD: The next sentence is, "Love will  
7 still run forever."

8 That appears to be all right.

9 "I am giving up me to become that love a  
10 little more every day."

11 That appears to be innocuous.

12 The next is "Changes, changes. Only love is  
13 forever changing."

14 The next paragraph is, "Cease to exist. Just  
15 come and say you love me. As I say I love you or I should  
16 say I love me (my love) in you."

17 MR. BUGLIOSI: "Cease to exist" should go out because  
18 this is the title of a song by Manson. "Cease to Exist"  
19 is one of his songs.

20 Start out by saying, "Just come and say you love  
21 me. As I say I love you or I should say I love me (my love)  
22 in you."

23 MR. FITZGERALD: "Cease to exist," comes out.

24 THE COURT: Why not just take out the whole paragraph?  
25 It doesn't add a thing.

26 MR. FITZGERALD: No, no, no, no. The love should  
stay in here.

1           This last sentence in that paragraph, "As I say  
2 I love you or I should say I love me (my love) in you."

3           I think that ought to stay because she is  
4 talking about -- I mean, give us a break! Let's leave the  
5 love.

13a

13a-1

1 MR. SHINN: What do you want to do, make a killer  
2 out of her?

3 MR. KANAREK: I think in the context of this case  
4 it is going to be hollow words.

5 THE COURT: What is going to be hollow words?

6 MR. KANAREK: As far as the jury is concerned, like  
7 "I killed you because I loved you."

8 THE COURT: She is talking to Roni Howard now,  
9 not the victims.

10 MR. KANAREK: I understand that, your Honor, but as  
11 I am saying, this whole concept, again this is part of the  
12 philosophy, the hippie philosophy that Mr. Bugliosi is trying  
13 to get across to this jury, and I object to all of that going  
14 in after the striking of "Sadie or no Sadie" on the basis  
15 of just the Bruton-Aranda type of excision, deletion, we  
16 are going through right now.

17 I think it is inadmissible because of the  
18 circumstances of this case wherein Mr. Bugliosi has offered  
19 this philosophy purportedly of Mr. Manson and the Family,  
20 and so forth.

21 MR. SHINN: Your Honor, love is a universal philosophy,  
22 your Honor, and I don't think it points a finger at Manson  
23 or anyone else.

24 MR. FITZGERALD: And it softens the blow.

25 THE COURT: I have no objection to leaving it in.  
26 I just thought it did not seem to mean very much.

13a-2

1 MR. FITZGERALD: "Cease to exist" would be stricken  
2 out and then a capital J on the word "just," "just come  
3 in and say you love me. As I say I love you or I should  
4 say I love me (my love) in you."

5 I am serious. When you are talking about  
6 cutting thoughts in the immediate preceding paragraph, I  
7 think it is nice to follow up with a little love.

8 MR. HUGHES: Can we get a little girl's handwriting  
9 to do this.

10 MR. KANAREK: I gather we are still on the Bruton-  
11 Aranda deletion, is that right, your Honor?

12 THE COURT: The discussion took a slight turn.

13 MR. FITZGERALD: You agree now "cease to exist" should  
14 go out?

15 MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

16 MR. FITZGERALD: Do you have any objection to just,  
17 say, "you come and love me"?

18 MR. BUGLIOSI: I can't have any objection, I don't  
19 see where it adds anything.

20 MR. SHINN: You want to leave it in because it does  
21 not violate the Aranda rule.

22 MR. BUGLIOSI: You want it in.

23 MR. SHINN: Yes.

24 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

25 THE COURT: What about "cease to exist"?

26 MR. FITZGERALD: That is a song.



13a-3

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

THE COURT: That will go out. I wasn't aware that was a song.

And then capital J, so that paragraph will read "Just come and say you love me."

The entire next sentence will stay in.

The next paragraph is "write me."

The next paragraph reads:

"I hope now you understand a little more. If not, ask."

The end.

MR. KANAREK: On the Bruton-Aranda, yes, but I think it is inadmissible on other grounds, your Honor.

Would your Honor read over the statement now?

THE COURT: Not on the record, there is no necessity because it will be part of the record when we are through, if it comes in that way.

I have no objection to reading it to you informally if that is what you want.

Let's go off the record.

(Off the record while the Court reads, following which the following proceedings were had on the record.)

THE COURT: Let's take a ten-minute recess.

(Recess.)

13b fls.

15-1  
5-  
1 (The following proceedings were had in the  
2 chambers of the court out of the hearing of the jury, all  
3 counsel being present:)

4 THE COURT: The record will show all counsel are  
5 present. Go ahead, Mr. Kanarek.

6 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor, I would like a motion  
7 to sever because of your Honor's -- because of the purported  
8 deletion that has been made in connection with special  
9 exhibit 8.

10 I would like in connection with that motion to  
11 ask your Honor to consider very, very seriously the words  
12 "yes, it could have been your house, it could have been my  
13 father's house also," especially in line with Mr. Flynn's  
14 testimony about Mr. Manson purportedly going out and  
15 picking houses at random in connection with, I think, your  
16 Honor I'm sure remembers it, that resonates, that builds  
17 up the prosecution's argument about Mr. Manson going out and  
18 picking houses at random.

19 Now, this is very, very important, your Honor,  
20 and I know Mr. Bugliosi is going to make much of that.

21 MR. BUGLIOSI: To the contrary, my argument will be  
22 that these are two specific homes he selected.

23 MR. KANAREK: "Yes, it could have been your house;  
24 it could have been my father's house also."

25 It shows abandon, the theory is these people  
26 went out and just picked any house, your Honor struck it in

1 connection with Mr. Flynn.

2 THE COURT: You see, she is answering something  
3 Roni Howard has said. She is not initiating this thought.  
4 She is answering a question or a statement that was made  
5 by Roni Howard.

6 MR. KANAREK: We don't have the complete statement at  
7 all of what she is answering here.

8 THE COURT: That's right, but it is obvious she is  
9 answering.

10 MR. KANAREK: That does not mean that Roni Howard can  
11 bootstrap that kind of impropriety, your Honor.

12 THE COURT: It isn't a question of bootstrapping.

13 MR. BUGLIOSI: She is talking about her premeditated  
14 intent to kill, not about Manson.

15 THE COURT: She is saying, "Yes, it could have been  
16 your house, it could have been my father's house also."

17 MR. KANAREK: Right, and it means, your Honor, --  
18 how do we know after all, in the context of this, there  
19 wasn't any narrowing down to Susan Atkins.

20 This had to do with Mr. Manson and the entire  
21 group, and it is exactly the kind of statement that your  
22 Honor ordered stricken in connection with Mr. Flynn, and  
23 Mr. Bugliosi is going to make much of this, your Honor, that  
24 it has to do that Susan Atkins went out and picked houses  
25 at random, knowing that he is advocating that she is  
26 dominated by Mr. Manson, her every move is dominated by

1 Mr. Manson.

2 Mr. Bugliosi knows this domination is what he  
3 is depending upon, and she is the Zombi, the alter ego of  
4 Mr. Manson.

5 Your Honor, this is deadly, this is the kind of  
6 thing that we -- Mr. Manson is not the declarant on this  
7 now. Either we live by the law or we don't, and clearly  
8 this is to get it across that houses were picked at random,  
9 and there is no necessity for it in her declaration.

10 He has plenty of evidence against Susan Atkins.  
11 He needs that, your Honor, because he wants to bridge the  
12 gap.

13 He wants to get Mr. Manson by the very method  
14 that the Bruton case and Della Paoli was overruled.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
13c

13c-1

1 THE COURT: I think I agree with you, shocking as  
2 it may seem to you. You have a shocked look on your face.  
3 That is what I was referring to.

4 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

5 MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you think you agree with what part  
6 of his rambling discursive statement, your Honor?

7 THE COURT: The statement itself lends itself to the  
8 interpretation of what she is really saying is she had no  
9 part in selecting the location.

10 MR. HUGHES: Right, I agree with that, your Honor.

11 MR. BUGLIOSI: I am beginning to believe that  
12 perseverance really pays off.

13 MR. FITZGERALD: We learned it from you.

14 MR. BUGLIOSI: That's right, I am persevering, but  
15 gee, we are just cutting away and cutting away and cutting  
16 away.

17 Where is the statement here now?

18 THE COURT: In the second paragraph.

19 MR. BUGLIOSI: It could have been your house, it  
20 could have been my father's house also.

21 THE COURT: What does that statement mean?

22 MR. BUGLIOSI: It means this, and I'm going to argue  
23 this, that Susan Atkins and all the defendants went there  
24 to commit murder.

25 They did not go there to rob, to rape, to burn  
26 or anything, they went there to commit murder.

13c-2

1 She is stating there her premeditated intent  
2 to kill. It didn't make any difference who was there.  
3 In fact Virginia Graham has already testified that Susan  
4 told her whoever was there they were going to be killed.

5 THE COURT: There is nothing in connection with  
6 killing in that sentence.

7 MR. BUGLIOSI: That is the obvious inference,  
8 "It could have been your house."

9 THE COURT: All she is saying is, whatever it is,  
10 could have occurred at one place or another place, your  
11 house, my house. She could have added everybody else's  
12 house, I suppose. It would not have changed this meaning.

13 MR. BUGLIOSI: I just don't see how it implicates  
14 the co-defendants.

15 In fact, one of our strongest points in this  
16 case, for instance, is that Manson had been to the Tate  
17 premises before and he had been to the home next door to  
18 the La Bianca residence.

19 THE COURT: Well, the part that bothers me is the  
20 suggestion in the statement which would indicate that  
21 the cho<sub>i</sub>ce was not hers.

22 MR. MUSICH: The Court evidently, similar with the  
23 other statement, is apparently drawing the indirect connec-  
24 tion with these statements from subjective interpretations  
25 bordering on speculation, far out speculation as to what  
26 the evidence effect before the jury is.

13c-3

1 THE COURT: If I were a juror and I saw this state-  
2 ment, what would it mean? What did the writer mean when  
3 she said that?

4 MR. BUGLIOSI: I conceded, your Honor, when we were  
5 discussing "I was the real informer," that it was a far  
6 out personal inference, that she was informing on other  
7 people, I don't think it is a reasonable inference but it  
8 is a far out possible one.

9 But this right here, I just don't see it. I  
10 don't see a jury inferring that she is talking about someone  
11 else directing these murders.

12 Of course you could draw as many inferences from  
13 any fact as the fertility of your imagination permits, but  
14 I mean we can go on and on and on.

15 The statement does not lend itself to an  
16 inference that someone else was calling the shots, and  
17 she was a Zombie, and wherever he said they were going to  
18 go -- I just don't see that.

19 I just don't see it. I think this requires a  
20 fertile imagination to come up with that.

21 THE COURT: Well, of course that is one of the things  
22 that the courts are concerned with, the Bruton-Aranda  
23 problem.

24 MR. BUGLIOSI: The jury can infer anything, your Honor,  
25 the jury can infer anything at all.

26 We cannot eliminate all conceivable inferences

that 12 people as an English barrister said, "Twelve people of average ignorance."

I am not saying that; that is what he said.

We cannot eliminate every conceivable inference that everyone of these 12 people might draw. We just cannot do it.

We are talking about reasonable minds.

THE COURT: Of course the entire sentence is ambiguous in the sense it does not say what it is referring to.

MR. BUGLIOSI: They are talking about killing.

THE COURT: You don't know that.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Susan Atkins told Roni Howard verbally.

THE COURT: The point I am making, Mr. Bugliosi, is that since you don't know what statement Roni Howard made, that this purports to be an answer to, we really don't know what the purported answer means.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think they are talking about the Tate killings here.

THE COURT: I would think so.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The context of the whole letter, "I did not admit to being in the second house," infers she was in the first house.

MR. HUGHES: The first house might have been the Hinman house.

MR. BUGLIOSI: "When I first heard you were the



1     informer" -- informer about what? Well, the Tate killings.

2             It is implicit in this letter they are talking  
3     about killings, looking at the context of the entire  
4     letter, they are talking about killings.

5             And that statement by her showed the premedi-  
6     tated intent to kill on her part, she went there to kill,  
7     she did not care who was there; she did not care what  
8     house it was; she was going to kill.

9             I think that is a reasonable inference. It  
10    might not be the only inference, but it is a reasonable  
11    one.

12            The inference that she is acting as an instru-  
13    ment, a robot instrument for some third party, I don't  
14    think you can draw.

15            THE COURT: What was the testimony -- was it  
16    Virginia Graham who testified something similar to that?

15b fls.

13a-1

1 MR. BUGLIOSI: Virginia Graham said Susan Atkins told  
2 her no matter who was there they would get killed.

3 MR. KAY: No, they were going to die.

4 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor struck the part, whether it  
5 was one or ten, your Honor struck that. It was the idea  
6 that whoever was in the house, it wasn't a matter of  
7 picking a house at random, it was whatever -- whoever the  
8 people were in that house, that is what your Honor finally  
9 left in, that those people that were in there would pass  
10 away.

11 But you had the heart of this, your Honor, is  
12 Mr. Bugliosi's last remarks to the Court where he said it  
13 isn't the only inference.

14 And that is why we are on the Bruton-Aranda.

15 If there is a chance that it can be loaded upon  
16 the back of the non-declarant, then it has to be excised.

17 MR. BUGLIOSI: I said it isn't the only reasonable  
18 inference, there are other reasonable inferences, not,  
19 however, the inference that she was a Zomby for a third  
20 party.

21 MR. KANAREK: You put this in the record, Mr. Bugliosi,  
22 you had these people dominated by Mr. Manson.

23 MR. BUGLIOSI: We are talking about this one statement.

24 MR. KANAREK: Pardon?

25 MR. BUGLIOSI: We are talking about this one statement.

26 MR. KANAREK: Right, but you have made the domination

1 of Mr. Manson -- he is the guru, the guy who tells other  
2 people what to do, and in that context he is the guy who is  
3 choosing these houses at random. That is a reasonable  
4 inference. You stated that in this record a few moments ago.

5 MR. BUGLIOSI: I said that?

6 MR. KANAREK: You said it isn't the only inference.

13E

13E-1

1 MR. BUGLIOSI: I said there might be more than one  
2 reasonable inference, none of which, however, is the  
3 inference you are drawing.

4 MR. KANAREK: How can you say that when you are going  
5 into this case time after time with Mr. Flynn about Zombies?

6 The reason you put on the second orgy was  
7 because Mr. Manson tells people what to do; that they are  
8 dominated by him.

9 MR. BUGLIOSI: That's right.

10 MR. KANAREK: So therefore, it could easily be inter-  
11 preted by these people on the jury that Mr. Manson picked  
12 these houses, and you are having the non-declarant saddled  
13 with the statement.

14 MR. BUGLIOSI: How do you infer from those words  
15 alone that someone else picked the houses?

16 MR. KANAREK: Yes, it could have been your house, my  
17 father's house also, meaning that Mr. Manson is so abandoned  
18 and has such a malignant heart he would pick her father's  
19 house.

20 Remember this is in the context that there is  
21 no attempt to make a -- no Aranda-Bruton problem when these  
22 two girls are talking and probably this girl was very  
23 interested in Mr. Manson and his play in here, and his part  
24 in here, and so therefore it is very much inferable that  
25 they were talking about what Mr. -- and this girl was very  
26 interested in what Mr. Manson had to do with these proceedings.

1 MR. MUSICH: The most reasonable inference, of course,  
2 is like Vince said, it wasn't the house, they weren't there  
3 to rob or to see any particular person, they were there to  
4 kill.

5 That is the most logical and reasonable infer-  
6 ence.

7 MR. KANAREK: If it were a Bruton-Aranda deletion,  
8 we are supposed to protect the non-declarants.

9 MR. MUSICH: It doesn't relate to a declarant, but to  
10 her own state of mind.

11 THE COURT: I am going to take it out, gentlemen.

12 MR. BUGLIOSI: I must say in all candor I am going to  
13 argue that the two particular homes were selected; that  
14 Manson was aware of them. But I am also going to argue  
15 that originally on the second night they were looking  
16 around at random, I will admit that, they were looking  
17 around at random.

18 THE COURT: That is what Linda Kasabian said.

19 MR. BUGLIOSI: Right, I am going to argue that the  
20 inference was that Manson was looking around at random.  
21 It didn't make any difference.

22 But I mean the two particular homes, my argument  
23 is that these were not random selections.

24 THE COURT: In any event I am going to take the  
25 sentence out. I don't think it affects the People's case  
26 one way or the other, and I think it lends itself to

1 misunderstanding.

2 MR. HUGHES: I would ask your Honor then to also  
3 reconsider about the fifth or sixth line from the bottom.

4 "I did not admit I was in the second house because  
5 I was not in the second house."

6 THE COURT: No, that one I am firm on.

7 MR. HUGHES: I understand you are firm on it and I  
8 ask you to reconsider the argument, when she says that she  
9 was not in there, it only can imply that someone else that  
10 she knew was in the context of this whole letter.

11 THE COURT: I don't see that at all. All she is  
12 saying is, "I wasn't there."

13 MR. HUGHES: Why is she talking about it?

14 THE COURT: Because apparently she is answering  
15 something that was asked her, or a statement that was made.

13f-1

1 MR. HUGHES: Why is she being asked that if she  
2 wasn't answering any questions about our case?

3 You know we have these two nights of murder  
4 which are identical in many aspects, people being stabbed,  
5 tied up, Linda Kasabian's testimony putting everyone there.

6 THE COURT: The effect of this sentence is to say  
7 "I did admit I was in the first house," that's all.

8 MR. HUGHES: I agree it does that, but I believe it  
9 ties everybody else in this second house.

10 THE COURT: All right, gentlemen, that takes care  
11 of Special Exhibit 8.

12 Now, let's get on to 9.

13 I would like to get this over with today  
14 so we can start in the morning and get on with the trial.

15 Looking at No. 9 --

16 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, before you proceed may I  
17 have your ruling on my motion to sever?

18 THE COURT: Your motion to sever?

19 MR. KANAREK: Yes, I don't believe there can be an  
20 adequate deletion, your Honor, as to Exhibit 8.

21 THE COURT: You want Mr. Manson severed from the  
22 rest of the defendants, is that what you are saying?

23 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor, because I don't  
24 believe -- this is powerful, your Honor, I don't believe  
25 this deletion can accomplish it, your Honor.

26 MR. SHINN: Your Honor, that is not the last deletion

13f-2

1 we are going to make, your Honor.

2 Are we going to bring it back one more time  
3 and glance through it again?

4 THE COURT: Certainly you will have a chance to  
5 review it as it now stands in its edited form before the  
6 final rule of admissibility.

7 MR. KANAREK: Then I withdraw my motion.

8 MR. BUGLIOSI: The jury will be read these letters  
9 then, tomorrow, is that correct? They won't just be marked?

10 I think they actually should be read.

11 THE COURT: Once the question of admissibility is  
12 determined, yes.

13 MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

14 THE COURT: They may be read.

15 MR. KANAREK: I believe my motion is premature then.  
16 I withdraw it at this time.

17 THE COURT: All right.

18 Now, looking at Special Exhibit 9, anything in  
19 the first paragraph, gentlemen, you wish to comment on?  
20 In the first place, who is Jo?

21 MR. BUGLIOSI: Jo Stevenson.

22 THE COURT: There's been no reference in this trial  
23 to Jo Stevenson.

24 MR. BUGLIOSI: No, she lives in Michigan. We are  
25 trying to find her.

26 THE COURT: So there's been no connection with her



1 so far.

2 MR. BUGLIOSI: No.

3 THE COURT: Anything in the first paragraph?

4 MR. KANAREK: Not Bruton and Aranda.

5 THE COURT: The second paragraph;

6 "As for what is happening in court, I just got  
7 indicted on eight counts of murder and on one count of  
8 conspiracy to murder."

9 Any objection.

10 The next sentence reads:

11 "You remember the Sharon Tate murder and the  
12 La" -- whatever that says "murder? Well, because of my big  
13 mouth to a cellmate they just indicted me and five other  
14 people."

15 What about a period after "me," and strike out  
16 "five other people"?

17 MR. BUGLIOSI: That won't make sense. I don't think  
18 that statement implicates --

19 MR. KANAREK: You're kidding.

20 THE COURT: She says "because of my big mouth."

21 What about the next sentence? I am putting a  
22 period after the word "me" and I'm striking out "and five  
23 other people."

24 What about the next sentence:

25 "It seems to be nationwide news. So I don't  
26 want to say anything about it because of the censor."

1 MR. SHINN: Leave it in, your Honor.

2 THE COURT: All right.

3 MR. SHINN: I have no objections.

4 THE COURT: That makes me suspicious, Mr. Shinn.

5 What about the rest of you?

6 MR. SHINN: It shows how stupid she is, how innocent  
7 she is.

8 MR. BUGLIOSI: I caught that right away this time. I've  
9 got my antennas out now.

10 MR. FITZGERALD: I don't have any objection.

11 THE COURT: What she seems to be saying, if I understand  
12 it, is "Because my mail is read I don't want to say anything  
13 that might incriminate me."

14 MR. MUSICH: Right, I think it should be in. I think  
15 it has an incriminatory effect to it because it is being  
13g fls. 16 censored she is not relating any details.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

13G-1

1 MR. FITZGERALD: But under the Aranda-Bruton legal  
2 microscope there is no problem.

3 THE COURT: The next paragraph. Any comment?

4 MR. KANAREK: Beginning with "but", your Honor?  
5 "But he doesn't seem to understand that my life has already  
6 been saved" --

7 THE COURT: No, no, no. The next paragraph starts:

8 "Although all outwardly appears to be  
9 over with, I look deeper into this mess, and  
10 see a ray of light so bright that it blocks out  
11 all darkness."

12 MR. HUGHES: I have no problem with the rest of the  
13 letter, as far as I can see.

14 MR. KANAREK: The problem I find again, your Honor,  
15 is the philosophy permeating this letter, is the context  
16 of this jury and the domination that Mr. Bugliosi has been  
17 talking about by Mr. Manson.

18 It is clear that she and her attitude is  
19 that really which comes about by her relationship with  
20 Mr. Manson.

21 THE COURT: I see no reference direct or indirect  
22 to any of the others.

23 MR. KANAREK: Why would her life be saved in connection --

24 MR. FITZGERALD: We are not talking about that. We  
25 are not on Page 2.

26 MR. KANAREK: Oh, I'm sorry.

1 THE COURT: I see nothing wrong with this paragraph.

2 Let's go to Page 2.

3 "My attorney wants to save my life."

4 Any comment on that? I don't see anything  
5 sinister about that statement.

6 MR. FITZGERALD: No.

7 THE COURT: "But he doesn't seem to understand that  
8 my life has been already saved."

9 I haven't the faintest idea what that is  
10 supposed to mean.

11 MR. MUSICH: "I speak of my soul."

12 MR. FITZGERALD: The prosecution is going to introduce  
13 evidence that Mr. Manson is, or people believe he is Jesus  
14 Christ, or the Second Coming of Christ, or the Savior; so  
15 I suppose conceivably she could be referring to Manson's  
16 saving her soul, although I think that is tenuous.

17 MR. KANAREK: It is not tenuous.

18 MR. BUGLIOSI: No objection.

19 THE COURT: All right, let's strike out, "But he  
20 doesn't seem to understand that my life has already been  
21 saved. I speak of my soul."

22 The next paragraph, "Jo, I will never give  
23 in to the beast again."

24 Will someone interpret that for me?

25 MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, Manson frequently referred to  
26 the mark of the beast on one's forehead, out of Revelation 9.

1 That should go out.

2 MR. KANAREK: That has to go out, your Honor.

3 MR. FITZGERALD: Then if that goes out, "I have  
4 learned my lesson" ought to go out, because the lesson she  
5 learned is not remorse as the result of the homicide, but  
6 not to give in to the beast.

7 THE COURT: Why not knock out that entire paragraph?

8 MR. KANAREK: I agree, your Honor.

9 THE COURT: It doesn't seem to have much relationship.

10 MR. BUGLIOSI: No objection.

11 MR. FITZGERALD: Great.

12 "Michigan sounds so beautiful" is very sinister.

13 MR. BUGLIOSI: That is irrelevant, Irving, that should  
14 go out, or do you think that has relevance?

15 MR. KANAREK: We are on the Bruton-Aranda.

16 MR. BUGLIOSI: Okay, you're right.

17 THE COURT: I see nothing wrong with any of that  
18 paragraph; is there any comment?

19 MR. FITZGERALD: Right.

20 MR. SHINN: No objection.

21 THE COURT: The last paragraph starts:

22 "Jo, I am a spiritually-minded woman."

23 MR. KANAREK: In the context Mr. Bugliosi is  
24 suggesting, or I believe Mr. Fitzgerald is right, he is  
25 attempting to show in this trial that certain represen-  
26 tations have been made concerning Mr. Manson, that  
spiritually --

13h-1

1 MR. BUGLIOSI: That is far too vague. The next line  
2 I think should go out because Manson certainly believed in  
3 divesting himself of material comforts, that is, up until  
4 about June of '69.

5 At that time there was a change, but basically  
6 his philosophy was to divest himself of material things.

7 THE COURT: That was also the philosophy of Jesus.

8 MR. BUGLIOSI: That's right.

9 THE COURT: One which may or may not be subscribed to  
10 by a fair segment of the population.

11 MR. BUGLIOSI: That is true, that is true.

12 MR. FITZGERALD: Do you remember the testimony of  
13 some prosecution witnesses was to the effect that Manson  
14 wanted to get rid of the wants, wanted to get rid of  
15 desires, that is what she is referring to now, not get  
16 rid of them, let go of them mentally so you don't want  
17 them.

18 THE COURT: That sentence will go out.

19 MR. BUGLIOSI: "Cast aside all things" -- that sentence  
20 goes out.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: The rest of it is all right.

22 MR. HUGHES: Well, there are two things that I  
23 question.

24 It says so much between the lines and in the  
25 lines. I don't like that because I don't want the jury  
26 to think they should start reading between the lines.

13h-2

1 THE COURT: Where are you?

2 MR. BUGLIOSI: "I love your letter, Jo."

3 MR. HUGHES: I'd like to leave it say -- it says so  
4 much. The last thing I am really concerned with, the last  
5 sentence where it says "In the end love you take is equal  
6 to the love you make," which is a Beatles line, and you are  
7 going to do something with the Beatles, is that correct?

8 MR. BUGLIOSI: Just with their songs, actually four  
9 songs, but the lyrics of three.

10 I don't think it's one of those three.

11 THE COURT: Actually the younger generation in the  
12 world has heard the Beatles; there shouldn't be much  
13 surprise on that.

14 Do you have any comment with regard to the rest  
15 of the letter?

16 MR. SHINN: No, your Honor, I'm satisfied, your Honor.

17 THE COURT: In that case I better inquire further.

18 MR. SHINN: I am satisfied.

19 MR. KANAREK: The last line in the end.

20 MR. HUGHES: That love thing, I think it's a risk.  
21 Maybe that should be taken.

22 THE COURT: What is that?

23 MR. KANAREK: I would ask "In the end love you take  
24 is equal to the love you make" -- that means if you commit  
25 murder -- I would say the converse of that could be  
26 inferred, and it goes again -- we are getting into

philosophy here.

Of course that is not Bruton-Aranda, but it is if you consider that in a murder case, this is a unique murder case and Mr. Bugliosi has suggested from the People's viewpoint that we have philosophy and religion, and the second coming of Christ and all of that.

Who knows what these people will hang their hats on?

THE COURT: Of course she is talking here about love, not murder.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor, but he is going to show, your Honor, by I think, witnesses that he has not yet put on -- he is going to try to advocate that there is a certain philosophy here, that by killing you are in fact-- you know -- doing away with the ego and life goes on.

This is a form of love; this is what he is going to advocate as a philosophy which some people --

THE COURT: There is already in the record through the testimony of either Virginia Graham or Roni Howard, I have forgotten which now, statements of Susan Atkins with regard to Sharon Tate, "I had to love her to kill her," in substance.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That was stricken.

MR. KANAREK: He is going to try to get this in by other witnesses, that this is Mr. Manson's philosophy.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I did not put it in. I know that.



1 THE COURT: What's wrong with that? Suppose he does.

2 MR. KANAREK: Then this is the declarant, your Honor.

3 Bruton-Aranda says that the declarant is the one, and you  
4 cannot foist statements upon a non-declarant, and he is  
5 going to try to show that --

6 THE COURT: I know what it says. Relate it to the  
7 letter here so I can understand what you are talking about.

8 MR. KANAREK: Well, Mr. Bugliosi is going to try to  
9 show the kind of philosophy that by killing you I am doing  
10 you a favor and it's a form of love.

11 He is going to try to show that this is Mr.  
12 Manson's philosophy.

13 THE COURT: Yes, but here she is talking about love.  
14 "The love you take is equal to the love you make."

131 fls.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

13I-1

1 MR. KANAREK: Right, and therefore, love being  
2 equated to killing, getting rid of your present dead,  
3 this is a way he can equate that in final argument.

4 MR. MUSICH: We agree to striking it.

5 THE COURT: Take out the last sentence.

6 MR. KANAREK: Normally the word "love" in a trial  
7 would have a certain connotation, but the way Mr. Bugliosi  
8 is advocating it --

9 THE COURT: What about love loves love?

10 MR. SHINN: Do you object to that?

11 MR. KANAREK: Well --

12 MR. SHINN: Does that refer to Manson?

13 MR. KANAREK: Because of the context of this case I  
14 think it does. It is unusual but Mr. Bugliosi is advocating  
15 this.

16 THE COURT: It sounds more like Gertrude Stein.

17 MR. KANAREK: Phonetically, yes, it does.

18 THE COURT: I don't think she is a part of the case.

19 All right, gentlemen.

20 Well, with respect to these edited statements,  
21 Exhibit 8 and 9, Special Exhibits 8 and 9, will you have  
22 these retyped?

23 MR. BUGLIOSI: I have another letter here, your Honor.

24 THE COURT: Well, they will have to be retyped.

25 MR. HUGHES: You are talking about the Kift letter?

26 MR. BUGLIOSI: Very clear.

1 MR. HUGHES: You told us earlier you would not  
2 introduce the third letter.

3 MR. BUGLIOSI: Here is another one:

4 "Why did I do it or why did I open my  
5 big mouth to a cellmate? To either/<sup>one</sup>of those  
6 questions I did what I did because I did what  
7 I did; it's my karma, a pretty heavy karma  
8 at that."

9 MR. FITZGERALD: That's the one you showed us about  
10 two months ago.

11 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

12 MR. FITZGERALD: That is the one I thought you were  
13 going to introduce.

14 MR. SHINN: Does it add anything else, Vince?

15 MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, "Why did I do it?" Or in the  
16 disjunctive, "Why did I do it" might well have been "Why  
17 did I commit these murders," or "Why did I open my big  
18 mouth?"

19 "To either one of those questions I did  
20 what I did because that is what I did."

21 Either one of those, two separate things.

22 MR. FITZGERALD: So I understand it.

23 MR. BUGLIOSI: I would like to have these typed up  
24 tomorrow, the reading is very clear. In fact, I think  
25 right now we can start right now. The Court could almost --

26 MR. KANAREK: We haven't seen it yet.

1 MR. BUGLIOSI: Again, it has Sadie Glutz on it,  
2 December 17, 1969.

3 THE COURT: Is it a signed letter?

4 MR. BUGLIOSI: To Kitt Fletcher.

5 The envelope has Sadie Glutz in the right-hand  
6 corner; it has Sadie Glutz.

7 MR. SHINN: Where did you get that?

8 MR. BUGLIOSI: From the Sheriffs.

9 It is signed, "Love you as I always do, all is  
10 love loves love, Kitten Cat Sadie."

11 It is very easy to read this letter. It has  
12 been gone over in ink.

13 There is a pretty powerful statement in here.  
14 It seems to be saying, "Why did I commit these murders," or  
15 "Why did I open my big mouth?"

16 Either one of those questions.

17 "I did what I did because that is what I did."

18 MR. SHINN: You have testimony on the record now  
19 by one of the witnesses saying that Susan Atkins said,  
20 "I killed Sharon Tate."

21 What more do you want?

22 MR. FITZGERALD: He is going to have three of them.

23 MR. BUGLIOSI: You are going to argue that they came  
24 forward just for that money.

25 THE COURT: Barbara Hoyt --

26 MR. FITZGERALD: One more, your Honor, the People are  
going to call a witness, Roseanne Walker, who will testify

1 to still another oral admission.

2 MR. BUGLIOSI: She will be on the stand about three  
3 minutes.

4 MR. FITZGERALD: I wouldn't be too sure about that.

5 MR. BUGLIOSI: We are talking about statements we can  
6 give to the jury that Sadie made herself, not statements  
7 she made to another party who is testifying. These are  
8 statements she made herself.

9 It is certainly not cumulative, in fact I don't  
10 think we have any other statements.

11 None of these letters say "I did it."

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

13J

13j-1

1 MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, may I inquire about what your  
2 Honor has in mind about the actual format about how these  
3 will be handed to the jury?

4 Will it be typewritten?

5 THE COURT: As I mentioned yesterday they cannot see  
6 the original because the original does not have any dele-  
7 tions, so the originals will be special exhibits, 8, 9  
8 and 10.

9 10 apparently is going to be either withdrawn  
10 or not pursued.

11 Then the People will have to type up a copy of  
12 each of those letters as edited, which will be the exhibit  
13 which the jury may see.

14 That will be the People's exhibit.

15 MR. HUGHES: I was wondering if in place of that there  
16 could be a hand-lettered copy so if one of the others go  
17 in in total, so it will appear not to have been edited.

18 I think the jury could reasonably infer that  
19 the inmates at Sybil Brand do not have typewriters, or  
20 that they are not seeing the exact letters themselves.

21 THE COURT: Well, I don't think there is any question  
22 about that.

23 MR. HUGHES: The jury might start to question why  
24 they are seeing a typewritten copy of this letter.

25 MR. FITZGERALD: Particularly a typewritten letter  
26 with all these misspellings.

1 MR. MUSICH: It might just as well be read to the  
2 jury.

3 THE COURT: Actually there is no reason why it has  
4 to be a physical exhibit as long as the original is an  
5 exhibit for the record which the jury will not see.

6 Then it simply can be read to them as if it  
7 were testimony and that is what they will hear. They  
8 won't take anything into the jury room.

9 They will just have to recall it as they would  
10 the testimony of any witness.

11 MR. MUSICH: They won't have the actual letters,  
12 whatever they have will be a facsimile.

13 THE COURT: That will meet Mr. Hughes' objection  
14 that the jury somehow would know the typewritten letter  
15 was not really what she wrote.

16 From the defendants' standpoint that is better  
17 because the jury has to remember and not have it in the  
18 jury room to look at.

19 MR. SHINN: I agree with you, like Mr. Musich said,  
20 read it to the jury.

21 THE COURT: What?

22 MR. SHINN: I agree with Mr. Musich, we should read  
23 it to the jury instead of giving out typewritten papers.

24 THE COURT: There is good precedent for that. There  
25 are cases of transcripts of recorded conversations where  
26 the transcripts are read to the jury and then collected

1 again and not taken to the jury room.

2 All the jury remembers is what was read to  
3 them.

4 You never do see the transcript -- well, the  
5 reasons for transcripts is where the tapes are somewhat  
6 garbled and the transcript is to aid them to follow the  
7 tape while it is being played.

8 Once it is played the transcripts are collected  
9 again and all they have is what is in their heads.

14 fls.



14-1

1 MR. SHINN: That is satisfactory with me.

2 THE COURT: All right. That is the way we will do  
3 it.

4 MR. MUSICH: Does the Court want the final edited  
5 version just typed up so it can be read?

6 THE COURT: If you want me to read it, I will read it.

7 MR. FITZGERALD: Not the Judge.

8 THE COURT: If you want an attorney on one side or the  
9 other to read it, it doesn't make any difference.

10 The reporter could read it.

11 MR. BUGLIOSI: The reporter could read it.

12 MR. FITZGERALD: Let's have the court reporter read  
13 it. Somebody in a lowly status.

14 THE COURT: Let's review to make sure there is no  
15 misunderstanding.

16 The original photocopies of the letters will be  
17 Special Exhibit 8, 9 and 10.

18 MR. FITZGERALD: Correct.

19 THE COURT: Assuming that they are admissible,  
20 they will be received in evidence, but will never be  
21 shown to the jury. They will simply be received for the  
22 purposes of the record only.

23 The People will then type up the edited versions  
24 of these letters, and the edited versions will be read by  
25 the court reporter to the jury.

26 No copy of the edited version will be given to

red?

1 the jury and they will not take any copy to the jury room  
2 with them. They will simply hear it read as any other  
3 testimony, and that will be the end of it so far as they  
4 are concerned, apart from the argument by either side.

5 Any comment on that?

6 MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.

7 I believe that Mr. Bugliosi said he was not going  
8 to use Exhibit 10; right?

9 MR. FITZGERALD: That's right.

10 MR. MUSICH: That is right, Mr. Shinn. But he has  
11 another letter here.

12 MR. SHINN: Are you going to make this one 10?

13 MR. MUSICH: This will have to be special exhibit 11.

14 MR. KANAREK: 11.

15 MR. BUGLIOSI: First, do you stipulate this is Sadie's  
16 letter?

17 MR. SHINN: I didn't even see it.

18 MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you want to look at it?

19 THE COURT: Let's go off the record a moment while you  
20 look at that.

21 (Off the record.)

22 MR. BUGLIOSI: Will there be a stipulation among  
23 all counsel here that this letter dated December 17th,  
24 1969, presumably from Sadie Glutz, the addressor, to  
25 Kitt Fletcher, the addressee, was, in fact, written by  
26 Sadie Glutz, or Susan Atkins?

1 So stipulated?

2 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

3 MR. SHINN: I will stipulate to that.

4 MR. KANAREK: Yes.

5 MR. BUGLIOSI: So stipulated.

6 MR. KANAREK: Mr. Kiser has examined this, too, hasn't

7 he?

8 THE COURT: When was it written by Susan Atkins?

9 MR. BUGLIOSI: December 17th.

10 THE COURT: 1969?

11 MR. BUGLIOSI: 1969.

12 I haven't given it to Kiser.

13 14a

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

14a-1

1 THE COURT: Was that part of the stipulation?

2 MR. BUGLIOSI: That is what I mentioned, December  
3 17th, 1969.

4 MR. KANAREK: You mean, it is dated that?

5 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

6 MR. KANAREK: Mr. Shinn?

7 MR. SHINN: Yes.

8 MR. KANAREK: I will stipulate that she wrote it.  
9 if he says so.

10 MR. SHINN: We will stipulate.

11 MR. BUGLIOSI: So stipulated, Paul?

12 MR. FITZGERALD: So stipulated.

13 THE COURT: Mr. Hughes?

14 MR. HUGHES: Yes.

15 May I look at that?

16 THE COURT: What date are you talking about?

17 MR. BUGLIOSI: December 17, 1969.

18 THE COURT: What does that date mean? Is that the  
19 date that it was written?

20 MR. KANAREK: We can't stipulate to that.

21 MR. BUGLIOSI: It is in the upper right-hand corner.  
22 It has her name and address.

23 THE COURT: Was that the date she attempted to mail  
24 it?

25 MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't know.

26 THE COURT: When was the date put on?

1 MR. BUGLIOSI: The most reasonable inference is that  
2 that is the date. It is in her writing.

3 MR. KANAREK: When you are in jail, time has --

4 THE COURT: If it is in her handwriting, that is one  
5 thing.

6 MR. BUGLIOSI: Oh, yes.

7 THE COURT: The date is included within the  
8 stipulation as being part of the letter?

9 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, your Honor.,

10 MR. KANAREK: You mean, as means of identification;  
11 but I don't think we are prepared to stipulate that that  
12 is the date, because, you know, when someone is in jail  
13 like that, they do not necessarily know the exact date.  
14 They might put down a date, but that doesn't mean it is  
15 the date.

16 THE COURT: Is it stipulated that she put the date  
17 on it?

18 MR. KANAREK: Yes. I gather that.

19 MR. FITZGERALD: That she put everything on the  
20 letter.

21 MR. KANAREK: We would so stipulate, wouldn't we?

22 MR. SHINN: Yes.

23 MR. KANAREK: Yes. But the date is a date that she  
24 wrote.

25 MR. FITZGERALD: I am going to leave my letters  
26 here, particularly if the Herald Examiner is going to print

1 them tomorrow.

2 THE COURT: Let's get on with this.

3 MR. BUGLIOSI: Let's get the stipulation.

4 THE COURT: This should be marked.

5 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes; 11.

6 THE COURT: Special Exhibit No. 11.

7 MR. BUGLIOSI: May it be stipulated that Special  
8 Exhibit No. 11 was, in fact, written by Susan Atkins?

9 MR. HUGHES: I will stipulate that that is her  
10 handwriting.

11 MR. KANAREK: Actually, it is a copy, isn't it?

12 MR. BUGLIOSI: It is a photostatic copy of a letter  
13 written by Susan Atkins to Kitt Fletcher on December the  
14 17th, 1969.

15 So stipulated.

16 MR. KANAREK: Now, I can't stipulate to the date.

17 I stipulate that she wrote that date, but I  
18 am not going to stipulate that that was, in fact, the date  
19 because, as I say, when someone is in jail that doesn't  
20 mean necessarily they know the exact date.

21

22

23

24

25

26

14b-1

1 MR. BUGLIOSI: Does it make a difference if it is the  
2 18th or the 16th?

3 MR. KANAREK: I don't know. It is conceivable that  
4 it might.

5 THE COURT: He is willing to stipulate that she put  
6 the date on there. Whether she put it on that date or  
7 some other date is another matter.

8 MR. KANAREK: It might conceivably become important.

9 MR. BUGLIOSI: There is a stipulation that Susan  
10 Atkins wrote this letter to Kit Fletcher, that Special  
11 Exhibit No. 11. Can we get that stipulation?

12 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

13 MR. SHINN: So stipulated.

14 MR. HUGHES: So stipulated.

15 MR. KANAREK: Yes.

16 That is a photostatic copy of the original?

17 MR. BUGLIOSI: May it further be stipulated that  
18 on this letter Susan Atkins wrote the date December 17th,  
19 1969.

20 MR. SHINN: So stipulated.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: So stipulated.

22 MR. HUGHES: So stipulated.

23 MR. KANAREK: So stipulated.

24 MR. BUGLIOSI: Would the Court look at this? Possibly  
25 we could edit this.

26 It is only one paragraph.

14b-2 1

MR. KANAREK: About Karma, the word Karma, I agree.

2

MR. BUGLIOSI: Karma was Manson's word, but Karma is a popular word among hippies.

3

4

THE COURT: What is this "tiger"?

5

MR. MUSICH: That is what she calls Kit.

6

MR. HUGHES: Karma is a popular word.

7

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, it is a popular word.

8

MR. BUGLIOSI: Linda used it in a letter to Hannum, Maybe it should remain.

9

10

MR. KANAREK: The point is, if there wasn't this domination thing, but I know you are going to put in Brooks Posten, and what is his name, Watkins, you are going to get them to testify, and they are probably going to be using that word.

11

12

13

14

15

MR. BUGLIOSI: I agree, this was a heavy word of Manson's, but it is the type of word that didn't originate with him.

16

17

18

Many, many people use that word.

19

MR. KANAREK: Looking at the Bruton-Aranda purpose, there can be the inference, again, of domination by the use of the word.

20

21

22

Karma has the meaning of retribution. It is a word used in hippiedom.

23

24

MR. BUGLIOSI: In Hinduism too.

25

MR. KANAREK: That's right.

14c fls.<sup>26</sup>



4C-1

1 MR. HUGHES: (Reading) "The force generated by  
2 a person's actions which is held to be the  
3 motive power for the round of rebirth and deaths  
4 incurred by him until he has achieved spiritual  
5 liberation from the effects of such force."

6 The dictionary goes on with a lot of other  
7 definitions.

8 MR. KANAREK: One of them is retribution.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: Karma, by and large, means fate.

10 THE COURT: I was going to say, isn't there a  
11 definition something to the effect of destiny?

12 MR. FITZGERALD: Destiny, fate, a life force.

13 MR. BUGLIOSI: Manson used it in terms of action and  
14 reaction; that you reap what you sow. That is the way he  
15 used it.

16 MR. KANAREK: Well, whatever, I am sure we are in  
17 agreement that it should come out.

18 THE COURT: Well, the letter appears to be one that  
19 could come in without any editing.

20 MR. FITZGERALD: That was my opinion.

21 MR. KANAREK: Except for the word karma, your Honor.

22 THE COURT: What is your thinking along that line?

23 MR. KANAREK: Like Mr. Bugliosi has candidly said,  
24 the word karma, he is going to show --

25 THE COURT: Karma comes from the Hindu or Sanskrit,  
26 if I remember.

1 MR. KANAREK: Right.

2 In the context of this trial and in the context  
3 that Mr. Manson is the guy who dominates everybody, I  
4 am sure that Mr. Bugliosi is going to elicit testimony  
5 from some witnesses that have not yet testified as to the  
6 use of the word "karma" by Mr. Manson.

7 It is used, he is going to allege --

8 MR. BUGLIOSI: I have no objection to karma going  
9 out, your Honor.

10 The only thing -- I can state this, and I  
11 don't know if you want it to be on the record --

12 THE COURT: You say you don't object to taking out  
13 "it is my karma, pretty heavy karma"?

14 MR. BUGLIOSI: Right. Because it is true that  
15 Manson did use this word. It was a big thing with him.

16 THE COURT: All right. Let's eliminate those two  
17 sentences then.

18 Do you have any comment or objection to that?

19 MR. KANAREK: No.

20 May I just take a quick look at it?

21 MR. BUGLIOSI: With respect to the rest of the letter,  
22 basically, this is a letter that -- this could be off the  
23 record, your Honor; it is up to the Court.

24 MR. KANAREK: On Bruton-Aranda, I don't have any  
25 objection.

26 MR. BUGLIOSI: Are we still on the record? I have a

1 comment to make.

2 THE COURT: Go ahead..

3 MR. BUGLIOSI: It is pretty obvious that apparently  
4 Susan Atkins has bisexual propensities. She is writing to  
5 a girl friend who is apparently in love with her.

6 Do you want that to come out in front of a jury?

14d

14d-1

1 THE COURT: It is not obvious to me.

2 MR. BUGLIOSI: I have learned this from other  
3 sources, and I think the letter certainly refers to  
4 emotional involvement between the two.

5 She tells the girl to stop crying, and I  
6 know you are hurt by all of this, but don't let it  
7 linger on your mind. Kit, you must live your life.  
8 Sticking by me is okay, it makes me feel good, but having  
9 you run around in a drunken stupor isn't going to do you  
10 any good.

11 She says: No matter what happens, I walk with  
12 you everywhere. When you see the sun shine, think my  
13 love is there.

14 As I say, do you want this to come out in  
15 front of the jury?

16 MR. HUGHES: It sounds like Aimee Semple MacPherson.

17 MR. KANAREK: That is Bruton and Aranda.

18 MR. BUGLIOSI: I am not saying it is. I am saying,  
19 by stipulation, we will go along with a deletion.

20 MR. FITZGERALD: There won't be any deletion.

21 MR. BUGLIOSI: Is Karma coming out on the letter,  
22 or is the whole thing coming in?

23 MR. FITZGERALD: The whole thing.

24 MR. SHINN: The whole thing.

25 MR. BUGLIOSI: With the exception of the word  
26 Karma.

14d-2

1 MR. KANAREK: No.

2 MR. FITZGERALD: I will agree that Karma can come  
3 out.

4 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, we agree.

5 THE COURT: Those two sentences using the word  
6 Karma will be stricken.

7 MR. BUGLIOSI: Does the Court want this typewritten  
8 too?

9 MR. MUSICH: I will have all these typed in a deleted  
10 form. Or do you want to read them?

11 We can give them to the reporter and he can  
12 type it up tonight, and we can proofread it tomorrow,  
13 if the Court wants it that way.

14 THE COURT: You can read it into the transcript and  
15 then it will be read back to the jury in that fashion.

16 MR. MUSICH: It will save me the retyping of it.

17 THE COURT: Actually, that can be done with all  
18 three of these in edited form.

19 MR. MUSICH: I am just asking. If the Court or  
20 counsel has any objection to reading the edited version  
21 in the transcript?

22 THE COURT: In view of the competency of the clerks  
23 in the District Attorney's Office, that may be agreeable.

24 MR. MUSICH: Well, the problem I have is that I  
25 get down there at 4:30 and they rush through it trying to  
26 read the photostat which is difficult.

1 THE COURT: Why don't I do this? I will give the  
2 three copies to the reporter and he can copy them into  
3 the record. We will proofread in the morning against the  
4 copies. That is, proofread the transcript against the  
5 copies, to make sure they conform to each other.

14e fls.

6 MR. MUSICH: Fine.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

14E-1

1 THE COURT: And those edited versions in the  
2 transcript will be what will be read to the jury.

3 MR. FITZGERALD: Agreeable.

4 THE COURT: I am going to give you Special Exhibits  
5 8, 9 and 11, and I would like for you to copy/into the  
6 record, the transcript.

7 The parts that are in red brackets are deleted  
8 and should not be copied.

9 Wherever there has been a correction made on  
10 these copies, that correction should be shown.

11 That is what we did this morning when we went  
12 through and corrected the typographical errors in the work  
13 copies.

14 For example, do you see this little "Sp" in  
15 parentheses here? That goes in.

16 In other words, whatever shows here is the way  
17 it should read, deleting the part in the red brackets.

18 If the word is misspelled, then it should be  
19 misspelled the same way, because that is the way it was  
20 in the original.

21 Just be careful in going through these edited  
22 copies that you don't leave out anything that is between  
23 brackets, that is not actually in the brackets but might  
24 appear to be if you read it too quickly.

25 We will proofread this in the morning.

26 Wherever there is an underline, that should be

1 deleted. There were no underlinings in the original  
2 letters.

3 MR. KANAREK: Are we still in session, your Honor?

4 THE COURT: Yes.

5 Just a minute.

6 Just for the record, so you won't be confused,  
7 on Special Exhibit No. 11, on the second page, there is  
8 some red underlining which will be deleted.

9 There are also two sentences in red brackets  
10 which read: "It is my karma. Pretty heavy karma at that."

11 Those sentences will be deleted.

12 Anything else, gentlemen?

13 MR. KANAREK: What about these, your Honor, these  
14 copies that we have?

15 THE COURT: They should be given back to the Clerk.

16 MR. KANAREK: I guess we can use them again tomorrow?

17 THE COURT: He will keep them and pass them out in  
18 the morning.

19 MR. HUGHES: Your Honor is aware that we have the  
20 photostated copies from the day previous?

21 MR. SHINN: I will hand in mine.

22 THE COURT: I would suggest that all of them be  
23 turned in to the Clerk tonight.

24 Off the record.

25 (An off-the-record discussion was had.)

26 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may I suggest this, your



1 Honor, for your Honor's consideration?

2 These three documents should have exhibit  
3 numbers.

4 THE COURT: They have.

14F

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

14f-1

1 MR. KANAREK: The actual exhibits are 8, 9 and 11,  
2 but these are physical pieces of paper that are different  
3 than 8, 9 and 11.

4 THE COURT: That is true, and the transcript will  
5 contain exactly what these three pieces of paper say.

6 MR. KANAREK: And these three pieces of paper will  
7 go into the file?

8 THE COURT: There is no need to. The statement as  
9 edited will be in the transcript.

10 THE CLERK: This is a Court Exhibit. (Exhibit 11.)

11 THE COURT: The originals will be special exhibits.  
12 The edited statements will be in the transcript. That is  
13 what he is going to copy in.

14 MR. KANAREK: But I would like, if I may, the ones  
15 that your Honor personally worked on be made part of the  
16 actual file.

17 THE COURT: Why? It is the final results that count.

18 MR. KANAREK: Just for a complete record, your Honor.

19 I think that your Honor having worked on  
20 this --

21 THE COURT: My work papers are not going to go in  
22 as an exhibit. I scratched them up without any system,  
23 rhyme or reason.

24 MR. KANAREK: Well, the law is not completely clear  
25 on Bruton and Aranda.

26 THE COURT: That has nothing to do with it.

14f-2

1 You have a complete statement and you are  
2 going to have an edited statement. Both will be part  
3 of the record. Now, what happened in between is totally  
4 irrelevant.

5 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor is the one to rule.

6 My motion is that these work sheets that are  
7 here, that all of us worked <sup>on</sup> / in executive session, or in  
8 session in chambers; we <sup>all</sup> / worked together and your Honor  
9 made orders concerning it, I think to integrate the  
10 transcript correctly, it is going to be necessary, perhaps,  
11 in the future to have these physical items that your Honor  
12 worked on.

13 I can see no harm in making them part of the  
14 record.

15 THE COURT: We are going to sit here tomorrow morning,  
16 Mr. Kanarek, and proofread one with the other, so the  
17 transcript will then be precisely accurate.

18 MR. KANAREK: I can only request.

19 THE COURT: As to what the edited statement is.

20 MR. HUGHES: 9:45 tomorrow, your Honor?

21 THE COURT: 9:45.

22 MR. BUGLIOSI: Could we have Exhibit 10 back?

23 THE COURT: I don't know where it is.

24 THE CLERK: I have it here.

25 MR. BUGLIOSI: Could we have it back?

26 THE CLERK: It is up to the Court.

1 MR. BUGLIOSI: It is withdrawn. We are not going  
2 to use it.

3 THE COURT: Yes. If it is withdrawn, there is no  
4 point in keeping it.

5 MR. BUGLIOSI: We are not going to use 10.

6 MR. KANAREK: Is there any reason why we can't  
7 keep it in the file, Mr. Bugliosi?

8 MR. BUGLIOSI: It is our letter.

9 THE COURT: It is withdrawn.

10 MR. MUSICH: It might become important.

11 THE COURT: That exhibit number will be deleted.

12 You can make a note to that effect, withdrawing  
13 Special Exhibit No. 10.

14 Good night, gentlemen.

15 (Whereupon at 4:28 o'clock p.m. the court  
16 was in recess.)

14g fls 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

14G-1

## (SPECIAL EXHIBIT 8)

Hello

I can see your side of this clearly. Nor am I mad at you. I am hurt in a way only I understand. I blame no one but myself for even saying anything to anybody about it. My attorney is going to go on insanity.

Insanity is reality and not caring. When you truly love you do not care about anyone or anything you just love. I am not going to fight this. I will let my attorney do that. I am going to save my soul, this body my soul is housed in can be destroyed for all I care. To live forever is all I want, and I really don't care about that. I did not admit to being in the 2nd house because I was not in the 2nd house.

I don't need anything. My attorney gives me money. He just deposited \$20. on my account. As I write to you I feel more at ease inside. When I first heard you were the informer I wanted to slit your throat then I snapped that it was my throat I wanted to cut. Well that all over with now as I let the past die away from my mind. You know it will all turn out okay in the end any way. Love will still run forever. I am giving up me to become that love a little more every day. Changes, Changes. Only Love is forever Changing.

Just come and say you love me. As I say I love you or

1 I should say I love Me (my love) in you.

2 Write me

3 I hope now you understand a little more. If not ask.

14H

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

## SPECIAL EXHIBIT 9

SADIE GLUTZ

313 059 5000

Dec. 13, 69

Dear Jo,

I just got your letter. You sound so happy and content. I hope you find all the things in life are good.

As far as what is happening in court, I just got indited on 8 counts of murder and on 1 count of conspirisy to murder.

(sp)

You rember the Sharon Tate murder and La Beicinca murder? Well because of my big mouth to a cell mate they just indited me. It seems to be nation wide news. so I don't want to say anything about it because of the censor.

Although all outwardly appears to be over with. I look deeper into this mess, and see a ray of light so bright that it blocks out all darkness. No matter what the outcome of this is, the love I have for all the world keeps me in the light of love.

PAGE 2

My attorney wants to save my life.

Jo, Mich. sounds so beautiful that I know  
your Christmas will be right and good for you. If only  
you would look at each day of your life as a Christmas  
and give to everyone you meet or see a deep real smile  
you would see a new joy in giving of yourself. Jo you are  
a

PAGE 3

beautiful warm woman.

I am sure your role as you portray your life is right in  
your eyes. There are not many people I would write but  
there is something good inside you that wants to be let  
out to give itself freely, uninhibily to all you meet.

Jo, I am a spiritually minded woman. I want  
to give you all I can in spiritual vibrations. For life  
has so much to give to a person who lives a life of love.  
I love your letter Jo, it says so much between the lines  
and in the lines. They just turned out the lights so I  
will close for now. Jo write me soon. I love to hear  
from you.

Love Loves Love

Sadie



141-1

(SPECIAL EXHIBIT NO. 11)

Sadie Glutz

313 059

Dec. 17, 69

Tiger

Dear Kitt

I just got your letter. I also just sent you one.

Baby don't use me as an excuse to be miserable. Get yourself together now.

Everything that has happend to me doesn't bother me as much as it does the rest of the world. I know you are hurt by all this But don't let it linger on your mind. It will all work out OK.

Kitt you must live your life for you right now. Sticking by me is OK and it makes me feel good. But having you running around in a drunken stupor isn't going to do you or me any good. Don't you send me any money untill you have everything you need.

Why did I do it? Or why did I open my big mouth to a cellmate? To either one of those questions, I did what I did because that is what I did.

Stop crying. Ive done enough of that for both of us, and it doesn't help Put a smile on that pretty face of your and live each day for that day Know that no matter

1 what happens I walk with you everywhere. When you see the  
2 sunshine know that my love is forever. When you see the  
3 ocean waves meeting the shore that I am there as patient  
4 and serene as can be.

5 I want you to have a happy and joyful Christmas and  
6 New Year.

7 In spite of all that has happened Im still me.

8 Come see me in disguise. Dress up so they won't know  
9 you. I know you can do it if you want to. It would do us  
10 both good.

11 Love you I do.

12 Always Love Loves Love

13 Kitten Cat

14 Sadie