SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 2 DEPARTMENT NO. 106 HON. RAYMOND CHOATE, JUDGE 3 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, 5 Plaintiff, 6 No. A-267861 7 vs. 8 CHARLES MANSON, Defendant. 9 10 11 12 13 REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT Monday, October 18, 1971 14 VOLUME 61 15 16 17 18 APPEARANCES: JOSEPH P. BUSCH, JR., District Attorney 19 For the People: BY: ANTHONY MANZELLA, Deputy District Attorney 20 For Defendant Manson: IRVING A. KANAREK, Esq. 21 22 23 24 25 26 MARY LOU BRIANDI, C.S.R. ROGER K. WILLIAMS, C.S.R. Official Court Reporters 27 28

1-1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1971 9:55 1 2 3 THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. 5 (Whereupon, murmurs of "Good morning, your б Honor," were heard from members of the jury.) 7 THE COURT: Welcome to another glorious week in 8 Department 106. I hope you're all in good health. 9 We will be ready to proceed as soon as everyone 10 arrives. 11 (Pause in the proceedings while a discussion 12 off the record ensued at the bench between the Court 13 and the bailiff.) 14 THE COURT: We're still in recess, ladies and gentlemen, 15 then, until 10:00 o'clock. 16 (Short recess.) 17 THE COURT: All right. The record will show that 18 all the jurors are present -- all the jurors and alternates. 19 Mr. Kanarek is now present. 20 Mr. Kanarek? 21 (Whereupon the following proceedings were had at the bench among Court and counsel, outside the 23 hearing of the jury:) 24 THE COURT: The Court waited for you about 25 minutes 25 What is the explanation? this morning. 26 MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, if -- the box that I carry the transcripts in, it just gave out on me. I had to 27 get another one, and there was -- I had -- the mechanical 28

problem of getting things to this court is incredible.

And I would just point out to the Court that -THE COURT: Other lawyers seem to be able to do it in
cases that are less complicated than this, --

MR. KANAREK: Well --

THE COURT: -- and you should be able to do it.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor -- well, as your Honor knows -- and I am just doing this by way of illustration -- Mr. Manzella was late, I think -- what? -- one day last week; and your Honor didn't have the jury in the box waiting.

And one of the jurors kept us waiting, I think, 45 minutes or an hour, and your Honor didn't even mention it.

But I do apologize. I -- the box that I carry these transcripts in gave out, and I had to get -- I had to get -- otherwise, I -- I -- it would be impossible to carry all those in. And I had to get a box. The thing just broke on me.

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, will you ask your client whether or not he is willing to behave himself and be quiet today?

(Pause in the proceedings while a discussion off the record ensued at the screen of the detention room door between Mr. Kanarek and the defendant.)

MR. KANAREK: He says "Good morning," and "No," your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's proceed, then.

Let's see. You have consumed what? About two and

a half days, actually? 1 MR. KANAREK: Well. I think that's approximately it. 2 THE COURT: And --3 MR. KANAREK: I don't know -- the word "consume." I 4 don't know that -- that I have --5 THE COURT: Are you going to quibble with the word 6 "consume." is that it? 7 MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor, I'm not quibbling, What I'm saying --9 THE COURT: Your argument has extended, let's say, 10 two and a half days thus far. And I think the People argued 11 approximately three hours. 12 MR. KANAREK: Well, but the People, I feel sure, 13 will -- but anyway, it isn't a matter of -- just like --14 well, I don't wish to belabor --15 THE COURT: And how much longer do you believe that 16 your argument will be? 17 MR. KANAREK: I would say -- I would say about two and 18 a half days, your Honor. I have gone over it over the 19 weekend, and I spent the weekend on this, taking out --20 taking out and summarizing even further, outlining even 21 further, your Honor. 22 And I -- I will -- I will speed it as fast as 23 possible, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: All right. 25 Let's proceed. 26 MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor. 27 (Whereupon the following proceedings were had 28

1:

9:

Aa fls.

in open court, within the presence and hearing of the jury:)

MR. KANAREK: Good morning, your Honor, and ladies and gentlemen of the jury, and Mr. Manzella:

I would like to apologize for being late, but this container -- this box that I carry these transcripts in gave out on me this morning, and I had to scurry around and get something strong, because I had to bring the transcripts in, with two or three trips.

I hope everyone had a pleasant weekend. And if we may, I think that -- that one of the -- one of the matters that we were speaking of had to do with -- with Barbara Hoyt, and how she heard those screams that we heard about in this courtroom.

بمبؤ

(Pause in the proceedings while a discussion off the record ensued at the Clerk's desk between Mr. Kanarek and the Clerk.)

MR. KANAREK: And I think that there's an implication that the prosecution's presentation of the case to us -- there's an implication that there was something magic about a particular day here, in connection with Mr. Shea.

And -- and I -- in order to get an insight into whether or not this was a particular day that had significance, of course, the testimony of Frank Retz and the evidence pertaining to Frank Retz comes into focus, because Mr. Retz, supposedly, wanted some kind of a night watchman to guard the ranch.

And I think it's significant that, if we look at the testimony of Mr. Retz -- for instance, he stated:

"Now, after June --" this is the question:

"Now, after June 30th, 1969, when you were
on the property almost every day, did you see Mr.
Manson there?

"A Yes, I did.

"Q On one occasion or more than one occasion?

"A More.

"Q And can you tell us approximately how many occasions?

"A It's hard to say. More occasions.

"Q And was Mr. Manson alone on these occasions, or was he with other people --" no. (Continuing) -- or was he with other people?

1 fls, 14

w.

28.

"A With other people."

Now, the reason that that's important is because it shows -- it shows that Mr. -- we know that Mr. Retz bought the adjacent Kelly property; and he bought this Kelly property, and he had it as of June 30th. Now, I am sure that the -- there was no need -- here's June 30th, and here's July.

If this is such a problem as they would have us believe, and Mr. Retz had seen Mr. Manson and Mr. -- and the people that are friends of Mr. Manson's on this property for a long time, Mr. Retz would have -- would have sought out some kind of person other than a person like Mr. Shea.

Mr. Swartz was on the property; there were many, many cowboys on the property.

1-1

Uh, these people would all be available for such type employment by virtue of their actually living there.

So the attempt, uh, the attempt to make us believe that there was something about Mr. Shea that was different than the -- than these other people, it is kind of a thing that is makeshift and it is the kind of thing that -- that shows that the prosecution is grabbing at straws in connection with some kind of a reason, because -- that they want to foster pertaining to Mr. Shea.

Then, for instance, this leading and suggestive question was asked by the prosecution of Mr. Shea -- of Mr. Retz.

In other words, during the last half of August, 1969, the previous question which was asked and was actually part of this, because the Court did not make any ruling, is significant because it is all really just one question.

"Did these conversations that took place after the Spahn Ranch raid occur before, say, the first week in September, 1969? In other words, during the last half of August, 1969?"

Now, that the entire question that the witness had to answer because the Court overruled the objection.

And the Court said, "You may answer it."

And the witness said, "I don't remember exactly the date."

Then, the prosecution asked:

"All right, I'm not asking you for the date.

ľΑ Yeah. 1 "Let me ask it this way, during what 2 period of time during the -- after the Spahn raid 3 did these conversations occur? "Eight days, 14 days, three weeks, I'm 5 6 not sure. Then, in order to foster the prosecution's 7 viewpoint, the next question was another leading and sugges-8 tive question, trying to get the witness to answer the way 9 10 the prosecution wants. It was within a week to two weeks after 11 12 the Spahn Ranch raid? A^{II} 13 Something like that." Now, this is -- this is significant in view of 14 the testimony of Mr. Swartz, because here, -- and this --15 this is, uh -- all right, then, the prosecution asked the 16 17 question, uh: 18 "All right, do you recall the conversation 19 that the first time that Squeaky was present? nA. 20 Yes. 21 All right. Would you tell us what the 22 conversation was? "THE WITNESS: First the conversation was --23 Mr. Spahn told me that he has a -- that he has 25 Shorty as the man for the right job. And was Shorty a man you knew otherwise II'O. 26 as Donald Shea? 27 ¹¹A That's correct. 28

×

৾

"And did you say anything more about hiring a guard or about hiring Shorty on that occasion, the first occasion?

"A I agreed with Mr. Spahn and told him to send him to me.

"Now, on the second occasion what was said about hiring a guard or about Shorty?

"Uh, I came out and I said, 'How come
Shorty didn't show up?' And he said, 'I didn't see
him around and so he -- as soon as he comes, I'm
going to send him to you.'"

Now, we come to -- we then come to an interesting bit of testimony by Mr. Swartz, and it shows how these witnesses have chosen up sides, so to speak.

"Now, would you tell us what Shorty said during the conversation?"

Now, this has to do -- go back and get a little background.

Uh, the question that was asked, remember about the boardwalk, "Who was present during that conversation besides you and Shorty?

"Just Shorty and myself."

And it is interesting in that regard that these various conversations that have significance are never -they never bring us more than one person who hears that conversation, a particular conversation. They always bring to us one person. I tried to go through this transcript and find any place where more than one person testifies to a

given conversation, but they don't do that, because of the exclusion of witnesses. They only bring one person who purportedly hears a conversation.

"And just Shorty and myself, oh, it was on the boardwalk in front of the ranch.

"Is that in front of the main buildings?
"In front of the main buildings.

"And it was during the day?"

Then, the Court allowed the conversation to be spoken to us.

"Mr. Swartz, would you tell us what Shorty said during the conversation?

"Shorty told me that Frank Retz had bought the adjoining or half the property -- or half the property from Mr. Spahn and had offered him a job as a watchman. And that he was going down that evening and see about it, go see Mr. Retz."

He says that he was offered a job as a watchman, and he was going down that evening and see about it, go see ... Mr. Retz.

Now, in that regard, the question revolves itself around -- we are -- we are supposed to believe that with Mr. -- with Mr. Retz being on this property, on the Kelly property and on the Spahn property, for this entire period of time, we are supposed to believe that Mr. Retz made some kind of an arrangement on a particular day to see Mr. Shea. It never happened. Mr. Retz never testified to this -- in other words, that's what happens when you exclude witnesses, because there

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

27

28

is a tendency to show these kinds of defects in testimony.

Mr. Retz doesn't tell us that on a particular day at a particular time there was some kind of a -- a meeting set up for a particular night.

"I came out and I said, 'How come Shorty didn't show up?' And he said, 'I don't see him around and as soon as he comes, I'm going to send him to you.'"

Now, the question -- and it is the question that is important in connection with this testimony -- why doesn't the prosecution show us that there was a meeting for a particular time with Frank Retz who is in this courtroom? Why doesn't the prosecution show us that Frank Retz on a certain day at a certain time had a meeting with Mr. Shea? And -- like we've spoken of and we've indicated previously, if -- if Mr. Shea is around this ranch so much, why doesn't they just bring him up to Mr. Spahn, bring him in, meet you at Mr. Spahn's and talk about it all over this period of time? Because there was no meeting. Otherwise, Mr. Retz tells us that on a particular day, on a particular day there would be -there was a meeting. And he doesn't say that there was a meeting. He says, "How come Shorty didn't show up?" In other words, Shorty is not interested in this kind of a job. That is the reason. That is the reason that permeates all of the relationship between Mr. Retz and Mr. Shea. right here in the transcript.

These -- these -- all of this testimony, and it also -- it also -- it points up why in -- in conversations the foundation is so important. It is important, difficult as

2 fls.

it is to remember words that are uttered, it is important because you got to make sure you're talking about the same time. And that's why we ask for a date, people present and all of that. And the prosecution — the prosecution does not present to us any such meeting.

There is a significant -- there is a significant bit of testimony here by Mr. -- by Mr. Retz.

"Q Had you seen Shorty Shea at any time on the ranch or prior to the conversation you had with Mr. Spahn about hiring him as a guard?

"A No.

"Q Had you ever met Shorty Shea personally?

"A Oh, yes, yes.

"At --

"Q Where did you meet him?

"A At Spahn Ranch.

"Q Now, did you see him after you spoke with Mr. Spahn about hiring him as a guard?

"A No."

2-1

"Q Did you see Mr. Shea -- strike that. Then I take it you saw Mr. Shea, when you saw him at Spahn Ranch, you saw him prior to the conversation you had with George Spahn?

"A. Yes, before.

"O Did you ever see Mr. Shea again?

"A. No."

Now, Mr. Swartz went on to testify that he had seen Mr. Shea with the attache case, which is People's 54.

Now, we have -- now -- now, Mr. -- Mr. Shea -Mr. Shea was just as much -- at that period of time -- at the
Spahn Ranch as was Bill Vance, as was Danny De Carlo and as
was everyone else at that Spahn Ranch.

We have here, in this attache case, we have here what is obviously — what is obviously an attempt to defraud George Spahn. We have here (indicating) a series of checks made out to the order of William Rex Cole. You'll have them in the jury room, and they're all — it says: "Spahn's Movie Ranch, Motion Picture Livestock, Equipment, Transportation."

And they're all of the same date, October 3rd, 1969. Now, to be October 3rd, 1969 means that somebody -- means that somebody -- Mr. Shea and Mr. Spahn -- pardon me -- and Mr. Vance, Danny De Carlo, and various ones of the -- of the various people there, undoubtedly got together, in connection with some kind of a -- some kind of a scheme to pass these checks on the particular day or a particular weekend or something like that.

Now, Mr. -- Mr. Shea was a man of many, many

ļļ

occupations; and Mr. Vance was a man of many occupations and many faces. And we have here "George C. Spahn," Mr. Spahn's signature.

Now, there's something here in connection with these checks, if you -- if you think about it, that shows that Mr. Spahn -- Mr. Spahn is blind. Mr. Spahn is blind.

Ruby Pearl wants Mr. Shea to sleep in the shed, on a cold night. She doesn't offer him anything except a shed to sleep in. We all remember that.

And so, if these checks are dated October 3, 1969, you can't -- when -- when the people do these kinds of things, what they do is, they hit the supermarkets, they hit the supermarkets like maybe on a Friday night or something like that.

And then they go -- various people that are part of the scheme like this will go to various supermarkets, various check cashing places, and they have to do it almost at the same time; because obviously, obviously when these hit the bank, there's an automatic stop on this account, after they get two of them that are as identical as these are.

They're all being purportedly with a -- purportedly some kind of a deduction for pay, what appears to be -- \$25.30, turning it into \$137.35.

And there is a signature of George C. Spahn, supposedly. Now, why doesn't somebody tell us -- why doesn't somebody -- here we have some documentary evidence. Why doesn't somebody tell us -- is that George Spahn's signature? Is that the signature of Rex Cole? Is that the signature of Donald Shea? Did Bill Vance write on each of

2

3

4

5.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

21

24

25

26

27

28

2a

these?

We aren't told anything about these checks, which has the date October 3, 1969, on them.

Now, for whatever that might be worth -- for whatever that might be worth, that's in this -- that's in this attache case. And Mr. Manson isn't connected with any of this.

Where is Mr. Manson? This (indicating) is in evidence, before us. What showing is there, between these checks and Mr. Manson -- between that blue suitcase and Mr. Manson? Between all of these and Mr. Manson?

The pawn ticket -- the pawn ticket was gone over. What showing is there between that pawn ticket and Mr. Manson? There isn't any. There is no showing.

Now, the Court is going to instruct us on this -in connection with circumstantial evidence -- that it's
circumstantial evidence -- did I write that on?

No, I guess I didn't write that out.

But circumstantial evidence -- if circumstantial evidence has two possible interpretations, one of which points to the innocence of Mr. Manson and one of which points to his guilt, we have to take the -- to take that which points to his innocence.

Well, all of this -- well, all of this in the suitcase, all of this evidence in connection with the attache case, all of this evidence in connection with the guns, everything that Mr. Launer -- all of that points to Mr.Manson's innocence. 2a

12.

It certainly doesn't point to any kind of a guilt on the part of Mr. Manson. And they have offered all of this evidence before us, and there is just no way that any of this has been connected up or shown that Mr. Manson had anything to do with it.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

Now, in connection with this statement by Mr. Swartz, Mr. Swartz says that Mr. Manson told him --

"Q Now, approximately how long after your release from jail. . .did you have this conversation with Charles Manson?

"A Oh, two weeks, I guess, ten days.

"It was on the boardwalk in front of the ranch."

I don't know if it's just sort of a passing interest, but this is a movie ranch; it is a place where movies are made. And it's a place where a lot of fiction takes place, in connection with — for instance, I think one of the most interesting parts of the fiction is the deal where — and I can almost see the westerns, when we were kids; you know, how the guy comes into the bar, and the guy throws the knife?

Dawn Quant told us that this -- that Mr. Manson was walking -- that Mr. Shea was walking -- and I could just -- like when -- in the -- in the bar is where it usually happens. The villain comes in, and the guy is in the bar, and the villain throws the knife, twang. It twangs, and it just barely misses the bar.

And that's the signal for all the people to leave, because the good guy and the bad guy are now going to have their duel and shoot it out.

And this is a movie ranch, and this is the kind of thing that -- that this girl testified that Mr. Manson did.

Well, there it is for you. I mean, it's the kind of thing -- it's the kind of thing that fits in with the movie ranch, a place where -- where Westerns are made.

But in any event, the testimony of Mr. Swartz is: "Where did you have It?

"A. It was on the boardwalk in front of the ranch.

"Q Who was present besides yourself and Mr. Manson?"

He says: "No one." And then he has a conversation with -- with Mr. Manson.

"Okay. I asked Charlie if he had seen
Shorty around, and he said that a friend of his in
San Francisco needed someone to work or had a job.
That he told Shorty about it and gave him a few
dollars and that he had left for San Francisco."

Then he went on to testify about the guns.

And again, we have Mr. Vance and Mr. De Carlo -- Mr. Vance and

Mr. De Carlo supposedly with Mr. Shea's guns.

And he testified:

"A. Well, the people at the ranch called it the prop room, because we kept a lot of motion picture equipment in there.

- 1	1	•
1	"О. Н	ave you ever heard it referred to
2	by any other n	ame, by people at the ranch?
3	"A. W	ell, I heard it called the 'gun
4	room' a couple	of times.
5	T. Q.	he gun room?
6	"A. Y	es. Not very often.
7	"Q N	ow, were you in the gun room at the
8	time you saw B	ill Vance and Danny De Carlo?
9	"A. Y	es, I was.
10	"Q. A	nd did they come into the gun room?
11	"А. У	es.
12	"Q. N	ow, did Mr. Vance and Mr. De Carlo
13	have anything	with them
14		Did they come in together?
15	nA. Y	es, they did.
16	T Q D	id they have anything with them
Ì7	when they came	into the gun room?
18	"A. Y	es, they did.
19	"Q. W	hat was that?
20	A A"	n attache case with a set of
21	matched pistol	s.
22	A	nd have you ever seen that attache
23	case and those	matched pistols before?
24	TA. Y	es, I have.
25	"Q. A	nd in whose possession had you seen
26	those before?	•
27	"A. I	n Shorty's.
28	"Q H	ad you seen them once or more than

10.

"once in Shorty's possession?

"A. Two or three times. He showed them to me."

Now, what -- it would seem -- it would seem like -it would seem like -- now -- that those people and their possession of these pistols and this attache case would -- is part of what -- when we remember that there is a burden of proving a defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty, there would be -- it would seem like the possession of what they say belongs to Mr. Shea, that that should somehow or other be brought to us, and we should be told about it.

2b

Because there is nothing to connect Mr. Manson with those pistols, or with this attache case, except that he was just one of many people on the ranch.

So, Mr. Swartz goes on further and tells us about -- about -- about how the guns were broken down and all of that.

Now, then, we get to Mr. Swartz's testimony; we get to Mr. Swartz's testimony about the benefits that he's received. And I think -- the way he's -- in other words, a witness -- the way we can evaluate a witness is to determine his -- his motivation and his honesty and all of that.

And here he started off by saying:

"And you spoke with the police officers, and you discussed with them the fact that you were a witness in connection with Mr. Manson?"

That's when he said that he had this problem in connection with checks.

"Q That was part of your discussion?

"A. Yeah.

"Q You discussed this with them, and you received a benefit in connection with that case, because of your conversations with those law enforcement officers; is that correct?

"A. I don't think so, no.

"Q You don't think so?

"A I says: 'I don't think I did.'"

Now, we know that Mr. Swartz -- we know that Mr. Swartz, indeed, reserved the benefits -- I'm not going to read it all, but he got -- he had this felony charge reduced

to a misdemeanor. And he walks out of the courtroom, because of his posture in connection with this case. He knows — you see, he has some kind of problem with the police. What did he do? He goes to the police and he tells them, "You know, I'm — I'm giving testimony against Mr. Manson." And he lets them know. And he — and so they call up, and they wheel and deal with justice in this fashion, so that they again make an arrangement for Mr. Swartz to be relieved of his felony problem.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

Now, I am trying to cut down the -- well, -- with -- remember, without reading it all, remember how Mr. Swartz doesn't know what day it is he starts off? He says -- he says -- uh -- he says: "It wasn't September. It was a few days after I got out of jail I had the conversation with him.

"Q Now, you say it was a few days after?

"A. I don't know when it was."

And then the question was: "Was it a few days or days?

"A. It was a few days.

"Q Do you include 10 days as possibly being a few days?

"A. I don't include 10 days. I just say a few days went by and we had the conversation.

"Q As a matter of fact, Mr. Swartz, the reason you say it was August and not September is because you've talked to so many police officers

1	"concerning these matters pertaining to Mr. Manson
` 2	that you've come to accept what the police officers
3	tell you?
4	"A No, no, no.
5	"Q. That's not
6	"A. Never happened."
7	And he says: "Never happened. Not a bit.
8	"Q Then, some time after you tell us you
9 .	spoke to Mr. Manson
10	"A. That's right.
11	"Q. And how long did that conversation
12	last, when you spoke to Mr. Manson?
13	"A Just a passing conversation.
14	We stood there for just long enough to have a
15	conversation, the conversation I told you about.
16	And that was it. That was the extent of it.
17	"Q. And what day was that?
18	Oh, boy, I I know it was about
19	it was the latter part of August. I don't know
20	what day it was.
21	"Q. It might have been in September?
22	"A. No, it was not in September.
23	"Q. Is there any reason why you know your
24	conversation with Mr. Manson was not in September?
25	"A Well, I say it wasn't in September,
26	but I've got no reason to I just know it wasn't
27	in September. It was in August."
28	And then: "And you've spoken about these

"matters as you've said many times with police officials; right? Well, when they ask you something, you've got to answer them." And so on and so on. 2c 13.

2c-1 , And then he says -- now, the question is: 1 so you, as far as this conversation with Mr. Manson 2 was concerned, it was a passing conversation that may 3 have taken just a few seconds; is that right? HA. Right. There was no reason to remember it, was 6 there, Mr. Swartz? 7 Well, if Shorty hadn't disappeared, I A" 8 probably wouldn't have remembered it." 9 Well, who says that Shorty has disappeared, really? 10 Except in the context of the -- of the police interrogation 11 concerning Mr. Shea? 12 The -- the fact of the matter is that Mr. Swartz --13 Mr. Swartz has been -- he's telling us that it's something that 14 he wouldn't have remembered if Mr. -- if Mr. -- if Mr. Shea 15 hadn't disappeared. 16 Then, after -- then the question was asked of 17 him: 18 "After you heard of Mr. Manson being 19 arrested, you made no missing person's report 20 concerning Shorty Shea to any law enforcement 21officials, did you? 22 "A No. I never did. 23 "0 Never did, right? 24 "A 25 Right. And so, Mr. Swartz, you made no notation 26 of this conversation that you say took a few seconds 27 with Mr. Manson, right? 28

2c-2	1	"A Oh, I didn't write it down, no.
	2	"Q And you spoke to many people on that ranch
	3	during the summer of 1969 during the year of 1969;
, 	4	is that right?
_	5	"A Probably had spoken to everybody."
på*	6	Now, then, he we it goes to
	7	"You don't know you don't know whether
	8	it was August or September, do you, Mr. Swartz?
	9	"A Sure do. It was August."
	10	And he's speaking about the date that he saw
	11	the guns with with Mr. Vance and Mr. DeCarlo.
	12	"Q You know for sure it was August?
	13	"A Sure, it was August.
	14	"Q You don't know whether it was September 1st
	15	or the 2nd? It had to be either August 30th or 31st
•	16	that the latter right?
÷.	17	"A It was in the latter part of August
	18	sometime.
	19	"Q Now, Mr. Swartz, you had no reason for
	20	making any kind of a demarcation between August 31st
	21	and September 1, did you?
	22	"THE WITNESS: Sure, because it wasn't why
	23	don't you ask me that again?"
*	24	And the question is: "Yes. In your mind, you
å	25	had no reason for making any kind of a determination
	26	on the difference between August 31st and September 1st;
	27	right?
	28.	"A None whatsoever.

"Q And you had no reason in your mind for making any demarcation between September 1st and September 2nd; right?

"A No.

"Q And you had no reason in your mind for making any demarcation between September 3rd and September 4th?

"A No, no reason at all.

*Q And you had no reason for making any demarcation between September 5th and September 29th; is that right?

"A That's right."

So, what happens is -- what happens is that a witness -- and it takes a -- it-- it takes the reading of the transcript and going into the detail of it. And I know this isn't very entertaining, and it's not -- it's not the kind of thing that's a Perry Mason glamorous approach to law.

But that is where it is. This shows -- this (indicating) shows how law enforcement -- how law enforcement operates.

Now, we may -- some of us have heard, and probably all of us on the jury have heard that, over the weekend, the man who was the chief, the top man in the administration of criminal justice in the Department of Justice in Washington, D_*C_* --

THE COURT: Excuse me just a minute, ladies and gentlemen.

That has no bearing on the issues in this case,

Mr. Kanarek.

We'll recess at this time. During the recess, you are obliged not to converse amongst yourselves nor with anyone else, nor permit anyone to converse with you on any subject connected with this matter, nor are you to form or express any opinion on the matter until it is finally submitted to you.

About ten minutes, ladies and gentlemen.
(Midmorning recess.)

3 fls.

THE COURT: The record will show that all jurors are present.

Mr. Kanarek, you may proceed.

MR. KANAREK: The -- this is just a little for instance to show -- to show the effect of how the prosecution can influence people, and I'm referring now to the testimony of Mr. Binder, wherein the question was asked of Mr. Binder:

"Did Mr. Shea speak to you of a lady that he called Phyllis Shea?

"A Yes.

"And he told you that he had married Phyllis Shea, right?

"A Yes, I believe he did.

"Q Correct?

"A Yes.

"And that Phyllis Shea is a lady who is different than Magdalene Shea?

"A Yes, it is a different lady."

Now, that was before the recess when he tells us he spoke to nobody.

And afterwards, then, this question is asked:

"With reference to Mr. Shears wife's name or the names of any of his wives, is Sandy the only name he ever used with reference to any wife of his?

"A That and Magdalene, is the only one he ever called Mrs. Shea in my presence.

"And he never used the word 'Phyllis,'
the name Phyllis in your presence?

1	"Yes, there was girls that came to the
2	house with Donald over the time and one of them may
3	have been named Phyllis.
4	"Q I see. It was a girl friend of his that
5	was named
6	"A I didn't say that. I said one of them
7	may have been named Phyllis.
8	"And you heard Mr. Shea use the name
9 ,	Phyllis, right, with reference to a female?
10	"He came with Barbara, and Mary, and a
11	Susan, and probably a Phyllis. His home was my home.
12	And he had free access. And he came with different
13.	girls to the house.
14	"Did he ever refer to someone a female
15	by the name of Phyllis when that female was not
16	present in your house at the time he was present then
17	"A I don't recall.
18	" at the time he was present and you
19	were present?
20	"A I don't recall, You are asking something
21	I really don't know. I really don't remember."
22	And the Court says:
23	"Just enswer the question."
24	Then, the question is:
25	"Then, I will ask you, Mr. Binder, did
26	Mr. Shea ever refer to someone that he called his
27	wife by the name of Phyllis?
28	"A Not to my recollection."

3a fls.

So there you have -- there you have the kind of situation where a witness just over the recess as a result of talking to whoever he did talk to, changed his testimony from what the transcript reveals.

Now, I suppose -- I suppose, really, in our -in our listing here in -- we really should make it sort of
a big circle and write in "police officers." Because in
these relationships that we're speaking of here, the police
officers certainly played a very, very big part.

Now, if we just look at the intense surveillance that was at the Spahn Ranch when Mr. Manson and his friends were present there, -- Officer -- and this refers to the raid of August 16th, raid, before coming to the ranch -- I'll withdraw that.

3a-1

-3

10[.]

"What time did you come to the ranch that

"It was approximately 5:00 o'clock in the morning and it was just at sunrise.

"Q Just at sunrise.

morning?

"And before that, you were briefed? You were briefed at the Malibu Station, is that right?

"That's correct."

In other words, here is -- this is August 16, 1969, and there is an actual raid which is planned.

Now, that raid obviously wasn't planned the morning of August 16th. We have one police officer testifying that he was at the Spahn Ranch. He, himself, literally hundreds of times, he said. So if you go back from August 16th, and you go back and with the focus and with the intense interest upon -- that these people had concerning Mr. Manson, is it -- is that circumstantial evidence of Mr. Manson's innocence as to the charges that are here? It has got to be.

How -- you probably couldn't leave that ranch without -- and come to the ranch without every vehicle being -- being -- that is, the license place of every vehicle being taken down. This is the only inference that we can make as to what went on at this particular area.

And this is circumstantial evidence to indicate, to indicate -- and Mr. Manson was not -- Mr. Manson was the person that they had this fantastic interest in. And recognizing that the Tate-La Bianca events occurred on August 8, 9 and 10, and then the body of Gary Hinman, they

tell us, is found around August 1st; and August 16th Mr.

Manson is arrested, kept in jail; then, on August -- I think

if you add up that, you find about three days in jail at that

point, on August 16th.

On August 24, on August 24 he is arrested again and spends about two days in jail.

And then, they bring the indictment in December of 1970, with all of this talk to these witnesses, talk and retalk to them.

Does that have any significance? Does that have any significance?

This fantastic surveillance in connection with whether or not -- with whether or not Mr. Manson, uh, uh, is guilty of the things that they are accusing him of.

You have a situation here -- you have a situation here wherein, going to the next aspect of it, can we believe that anyone could scream on that ranch without some police officers hearing it.

Could anyone scream -- we look -- we've looked at the pictures, at the pictures of --

Now, we remember the testimony of Ruby Pearl.

And there's -- it is interesting -- it is interesting to
think of what the prosecution's approach is in this case.

The prosecution would have us believe that this -that when Ruby Pearl testifies about these people surrounding
Mr. Shea -- excuse me just a moment, your Honor.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

MR. KANAREK: If we think in terms of, let's say --

let's say the people that — that the prosecution has spoken of as — who are alleged to have done these things that they are speaking of here, with their surveillance, with the surveillance that was going on at the Spahn Ranch first of all — first of all, it is not — it is just — it is beyond belief that anyone would try to do anything improper at the Spahn Ranch area because the parachute — if we look at where this parachute room is, if we — and we'll get into the detail of Barbara Hoyt's testimony that shows that this didn't happen. It is the ab— — there's no question about it when you look at the transcript that this never happened.

But anyone who was out to do wrong, do anything wrong with all of this police surveillance that was there night and day, and day and night, and after August 16th, and the 24th, and when the Tate-La Bianca events happened on August 8, 9 and 10, and the finding of the body of Gary Hinman -- this place must have been -- this place was like a battlefield, constantly, with police officers.

But over and above that, is the fact that any -any screaming would certainly have been heard by what I am
sure was a 24 or 36-hours a day vigil, so to speak, by that
area of law enforcement people.

Then -- and then, we will get into the detail of the transcript to prove it -- to prove it. Barbara Hoyt says that on this night there was a moon -- I mean, it -- we have -- we have an impressionable girl who is the focus of attention in connection with what the charges are against

4 fls. 27

Mr. Manson. And they take her testimony and she tells us that she saw all of this by the light of the moon.

Ruby Pearl tells us on that night it was so dark she couldn't tell -- she couldn't tell who was even there.

So the transcript -- let's see, the transcript of Ruby Pearl's testimony, I think, is significant.

She tells us that -- that Mr. Spahn -- and that's an interesting -- an interesting type of relationship between Ruby Pearl and Mr. Spahn.

She tells us that he, Mr. Spahn, is old and he has problems with his sight. That he is blind. And she tells us that she runs the stables, rented out the horses, picked out the horses for jobs, did the book work, answered the phone, seeing that the people that worked for us did their duties.

Now, she then is the manager. She is the manager of the Spahn Ranch, and she is the real manager.

I mean, with Mr. Spahn being infirm and not being able to see, we have reason to believe that as far as that ranch is concerned, Ruby Pearl is, we might call, the chief executive officer. She's the one -- she's the one that has been there, she says, 17 or 18 years.

Now, I have been trying to get to some -- I'm trying to read as little as possible, but this is the evidence. And my synopsis of it as far as the words are written down here, of course, is not as adequate as what the court reporters took down.

Now, during the summer of 1969, 1 were you at the ranch every day, in your capacity 2 as forewoman of the ranch? IIA. Yes." So she was there, she tells us, every day. And she tells us that during the summer, she saw 6 Mr. Manson wearing a knife, one time a sword. And then she 7 describes the sword to us, the 20-inch or 24 inches. 8 Then, then she goes on to tell us that she met ġ Mr. Shea and she met Niki, and she met Niki at the ranch. 10 Then she goes on and describes that on a certain 11 day, at 11:00 o'clock in the evening, she saw these events 12 13 that she told us. 14 Now -- "Now, when Donald came over to your car, 15 did you have a conversation with him? 16 HA. Yes. 17 'nQ. Did he æk you anything? 18 ηA. Yes. 19 What did he ask you? ^HO. 20 "A He asked if he could come home and 21 stay at my house. 22 Did you say anything in reply? "Q. 23 "A. Yes. I said, well, you could --24 there's a place in the shed there to stay. My 25 house is too small. And I had the little dogs in 26 my house. And I said, 'You're welcome to stay in 27 the shed.' 28 Did Donald say anything in reply uð.

. -

y

4a

"to that?

"A Yes. He said it was rather cold in there. He didn't think he would."

And then she made the suggestion that he go to the Fountain of the World.

"Q What is the Fountain of the World?

"A. That is a religious cult that takes in people that doesn't have a place to sleep.

"Q. And how far is that from the ranch?

"A. It's only three miles west of the ranch."

Now, then, she describes how a car supposedly sped in, and she says that it sped into the Spahn Ranch yard.

Now, if we look at this picture -- if we look at this picture, can you consider the time the events of August the 10th and afterwards, to think that there wasn't a notation made of every automobile that entered this ranch? Every one -- every one would be incorrect, if -- it's -- it's absolutely -- if these people were going to raid the place and do everything that they did in connection with the surveillance of this ranch, we have got to believe that every automobile -- and especially late at night -- that entered that ranch area, that there was a log kept by law enforcement people of every car that went in there. That's one thing that we can certainly infer occurred.

4a-1 Now, she says: "I kept stretching my 1 neck and slowly pulling out and seeing where 2 they were going, and I saw them sort of spread 3 out, as they reached the boardwalk. And where was Donald -- where was 5 6 Shorty at that time? пA. He was just on the edge of the 7 8 boardwalk, in the middle of this group. 11 O. Of the group of men? 10 иA. Yes. 11 And when you last saw the men, 12 were they still approaching Shorty? 13 11 A. Yes." 14 Now, then, she goes; on she described for us where 15 Mr. Shea was standing, and she described in detail, supposedly, 16 where the telephone pole was and all of that. 17 Now, if we take Ruby Pearl's testimony concerning 18 who the people were at the Spahn Ranch, that night -- and let's 19 look at, in detail, who she says on direct examination was there, and who she says on cross-examination was there. 21 Let's see if I can find that. I thought I had that marked here. Excuse me just a moment. 23 (Pause in the proceedings.) Now, here it is, right here. An unmarked page. 25 I'm sorry. 26 "O. And did you continue to look 27 at the car when it stopped after it stopped? 28 "Ā. Yes.

1	"Q And what, if anything, did you
2	see?
3	"A. I saw the male members of the
4	Family get out and, in a hurry, start down
5	towards the boardwalk."
6	Now, already there, she has the male members of
7	the Family. She has been she has talked to many people,
8	and she thinks in terms of the male members of the Family.
9	"Q Now, did you see can you identify
10	any of the people who got out of the car?
11	"A. Yes.
12	"Q Would you give us their names,
13	please?
14	"A Steve Grogan, Tex Watson, Charlie
15	Manson and Bruce Davis."
16	Now, that is her answer to the question of who
17	the people were.
18	^a Q Did you continue to watch them as they
19	approached the boardwalk?
20	"A. Yes.
21	"Q. And what did you see?
22	"A. I kept stretching my neck" and all of
23	that, that we've just heard.
24	Now, she says, "The male members of the Family."
25	Now, at that time at that time, she did not mention Bill
26	Vance, when she was testifying here in court. She she would
27	never have mentioned Bill Vance, if she had not been examined
28	further.

She chose -- she chose to leave Mr. Vance's name out. Now, does that mean anything, when she deliberately -- we know from later on -- we know that she deliberately left Mr. Vance out of that listing?

She puts Mr. Manson in, definitely, and she leaves Mr. Vance out.

Now, then, she makes a statement here that's significant. Here's a statement that we think is of some significance.

"Now, at the time that you had this conversation with Mr. Shea, had you spoken with Mr. Shea concerning security work that Mr. Shea was to do at the ranch?

"A. Yes. Yes, I had."

And in terms of relationship, this indicates -this indicates that Ruby Pearl would have had some -- forgetting the testimony, the fact that she ran the ranch -- she's
the one that would have had some conversation with Mr. Shea about
so-called security work. And the fact that Mr. Shea never
got this employment or took this employment has nothing to do
with Mr. Manson.

It has to do with the fact that Mr. Shea was not interested in that type of employment. And we have it here. She says she spoke with Mr. Shea --

"You don't know whether it was the end of the week or the beginning of the week?

"A. I can't say for sure.

"Q. Now, at the time that you had this conversation with Mr. Shea, had you spoken

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

4b

"with Mr. Shea concerning the security work that Mr. Shea was to do at the ranch?

"A Yes. Yes, I had."

And then previously, she states -- "Well, what --" in answer to the question, "What day of the week was it when this incident occurred that you have told us about, Mrs. Pearl?

"A I can't say exactly what day of the week it was.

"Q Well, Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday?

"A. I can't say.

"Q Do you know?

"A. I don't --

"Q Do you --

"A I don't know.

"Q. You don't know?

"A No." And so on.

I am going through here, and I am trying to read as little as possible; but nevertheless, the context of it is clear that she had spoken with Mr. Shea already when this — when this supposed incident had occurred, and she had spoken to Mr. Shea some time previously.

so that Mr. Shea and she would probably, undoubtedly, be the ones to talk about any employment. She kept the books, and Mr. Spahn -- Mr. Spahn was infirm.

4b-1

,

"Q And you had spoken with him, and you still stated that there -- that there wasn't anybody on that ranch that Mr. Shea could fear or need fear?

"No, because he said he wouldn't have any trouble with them.

"Q Mr. Shea told you he wasn't going to have any trouble?

"A. Yes. He said he wouldn't have any trouble.

"Q Well --

"A He was easy-going and good-natured.

He never had any enemies."

If you take her statement that this is late at night -- remember, she's leaving; she's leaving the ranch at ll:00 o'clock at night -- and supposedly -- supposedly Mr. Shea did not make an appointment with Mr. Retz -- pardon me -- did not meet an appointment with Mr. Retz.

Well, this is already 11:00 o'clock at night.

What time of the night was there to be an appointment with

Mr. -- with Mr. Retz, from the prosecution's standpoint?

Was he going to meet with Mr. Retz around midnight or 1:00 a.m.

to have an appointment, to talk about becoming a nightwatchman?

It's poppy-cock. It's baloney; it's contrived; it's staged, because if that was the night that he was to have a meeting with Mr. -- with Mr. Retz, he's not going to have it at 11:00 o'clock at night.

The fact of the matter is that -- that Mr. Donald

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Shea is not interested in this kind of work, and no matter how you try to buttress it, and you try to -- and you try to argue it, that he was, if you look at this transcript and read it, it's -- it hits you right in the face that such is not the case; that there -- that Mr. Shea -- you -- for Mr. Shea to go to work on that ranch, it requires more than the prosecution wanting him to go to work on that ranch. He has to want to go to work on the ranch.

Now, then, she goes on to say --

"Q Mr. Shea told you he wasn't going to have any trouble?

"A. Yes. He said he wouldn't have any trouble.

"Q Well --

"A He was easy-going and good-natured. He never had any enemies.

"Q But you tell us Mr. Shea -- just now, a few moments ago, that he told you that he was square -- he was scared?

"A. That was later. It wasn't the same moment. That was later. It wasn't even the same day."

"It wasn't even the same day," she tells us. If it wasn't even the same day, then it means that Mr. Shea was not the person that this lady says was surrounded, or the event never happened, or whatever; because she says it was later; it was later that she had this conversation; it wasn't even the same day.

So if it was not even the same day, it means that she spoke to him after these events, where she tells us that supposedly he is surrounded.

> It's right here in the transcript (indicating). Now -- "Well, was there any reason for

you not -- not to remember the supposed conversations you had with Mr. Shea about his becoming some kind of a guard?"

And here's where it all hangs out. how absolutely contrived this is.

> "He wasn't afraid to be a guard at that time. That was an honor job.

What do you mean by 'an honor job'? "A. Well, he was there anyway, and that would be a good honor for him, to be the night watchman, and to draw pay, just to see that people didn't bother the horses, to see that people didn't break up the place."

Now, she's telling us -- she's telling us that her state of mind and her thinking was that this job of Mr. Shea's was to be an honor job.

What does that mean? It's something to think about. It's interesting to think about. A man that's supposedly -that's supposedly, with Mr. Shea's background, she tells us that she considered this job to be something of an honor.

I suppose like -- like being -- like being an honorary chairman of the Red Cross or something like this. This was an honor job, to be the night watchman at the ranch.

23

20

21

.22

25

26

27 28

Well, this is just -- it's -- I mean, she's making it up as she goes along. "And that was what the job was for, was to make sure that people didn't bother the horses or break up the place? "A. As I understood it."

4c

26

27

28

That was what the job was for, she says, so that people didn't bother the horses or break up the place.

"Q Then, were there any other reasons for the job?

"A Well, if so, it was between -- it was between Mr. Spahn and Shorty.

"Q Well, my question is: As far as your thinking was concerned, Mr. Shea's entire job was just to watch the horses and see that no one broke up the place?

"A And keep other -- other so-called hippies from coming in.

"Q Oh, he was to keep other hippies --

"A Other hippies out.

"Q In other words --

"A They were beginning to appear and disappear, through the ranch, too often.

"Q I see. And in other words, he wasn't supposed to do anything, as far as the hippies that were there then, but other hippies --

"A And their friends. They probably -- it probably included all of them. They were milling around and -- and too many on the ranch. George didn't want too many on the ranch."

Well, in -- in the space of an instant, she changes her duties, as far as Mr. Shea is concerned. She changes her duties from just keeping track of the horses to including the hippies, and -- and thepeople from breaking up

the place.

Now, at -- all right. Here we go.

"Q Now, directing your attention to the time that you saw Mr. Shea on this evening, what was the condition of the weather?

"A At that evening, it was cool outside. It was always cool up in the mountains.

"Q Well, how was the visibility?

"A Like it always was. Never had lights. Learned to work in the dark.

"Q Well, as far as seeing what people were there --

"A At one point, they passed me. I could see them.

"Q You had no difficult seeing them?

"A No.

"Q How long was it that you stayed at the ranch, that you stayed in your car after these people arrived, Mrs. Pearl?

"A Barely a few minutes. Barely more than a few minutes; just -- just as Shorty left, I started the engine and was going to start creeping away when the car came in.

"Q Now, would you tell us, Mrs. Pearl, how could you tell Mr. Shea that there was nothing to be ascared of; you did tell him that?

"A I told him that. I had seen nothing to indicate that he should be afraid.

4c-3	1
	2
	3
	4
à [‡]	5
A.B.	6
	7
fls.	8
•	9
	10
,	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
7	16
** ** **	17
3	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
÷	24
4	25
•	26
À	27
	28

"Q You saw nothing whatsoever? This is after the raid, people are carrying these knives around that you are speaking about, and you saw nothing for anybody to be afraid about?

"A We all worked together. We never expressed our feelings. We had to work. There was no getting around that. We had to stay there until way after dark and work."

5-1

And then, it goes on.

Here she says:

"Q You had no reason -- er -- to change that feeling except when you spoke to law enforcement, is that right?

"A No, I got a shuddering feeling as I left, seeing that, and then I realized what Shorty was thinking about.

"Q And then, you realized what Shorty was thinking about; when was that?

"When I was leaving I got the message that he was trying to put across.

"Well, did anybody interfere with his putting across any message to you, Mrs. Pearl?

"No one interfered. It was between us right then."

Now, on this night when she says it was so dark, this is the very same night that Barbara Hoyt says that she looked out the window and said she saw a moon and said she could see everything that was very, very well lit up.

And so the question is, whether or not -- whether or not Ruby Pearl is telling it the way it is or Barbara Hoyt is telling it the way it is.

"Q He owed you quite a bit of money, Mrs. Pearl, didn't he?

"A. Not that anyone knew about."

She's speaking now about her financial arrangements with Mr. Shea.

"Tell us about it right now. Now is the 1 right time. 2 "A At times I gave him money. When I give money to the boys, I know I'll never see it again. I see. And so how much did Mr. Shea owe you? 6 "Oh, I can't say exactly. 7 "Well, give us your best estimate. "\$20 at a time maybe, now and then. "How much does he owe you right now? 10 "I wouldn't say he owed me anything because 11 I never expected it back when I gave it to him. 12 "You gave it to him? 13 14 "No, we never acted as if it was a long period 15 when they needed money --"When you say 'we' --17 "Mr. George. 18 "You mean --19 "Mr. George. I always asked George if I 20 could give him some. It wasn't always my money 21 I was handling. 22. "You handled Mr. Spahn's money? 23 "I handled Mr. Spahn's money. 24 "Mr. Spahn was blind? 25 "Right." 26 Excuse me. 27 Now, I think what shows -- what shows the -- uh, 28 what shows the actual -- reliability of Ruby Pearl's testimony

,

.22

is right here.

"Now, directing your attention, Mrs. Pearl, to the time that you tell us you saw these people, and you drove up to the ranch and all of that, you remember discussing that a little while ago with Mr. Manzella?

"Yes.

"On that occasion, how many people -- how many men did you see get out of the car that you've spoken of, Mrs. Pearl?

"Well, I didn't sit down there and count them.

I just recognized them, as they were pouring out.

"Well, would you tell us now how many there were?

"There were four, maybe five, but I recognized definitely the ones I mentioned."

She's trying to protect herself. She's trying to protect her testimony. She remembers, and this is the deceit that the jury instructions warns us about in the credibility of witnesses. This woman knows that she lied when she tells us previously about the four people that she mentions. And she knew it when she stated those four people. She told — she testified in this courtroom the first time, she testified Steve Grogan, Bruce Davis, Tex Watson and Charles Manson. And she leaves out Bill Vance because she knows that Bill Vance is close to Ella Jo Bailey. And she knows that Ella Jo Bailey, from her talking with police officers, and the people that are prosecuting this case, she knows that

.25

Bill Vance was sort of an untouchable. He's the kind of person in these proceedings that we must not -- we must not put anything upon him because there are people that don't want that. She says:

"There were four, maybe five. But I recognized definitely the ones I mentioned."

She's remembering back to when she testified about those four. Nobody even asked her that.

The question was:

"Would you tell us now how many there were?"

And she is already defending herself in connection with an answer that she knew was a -- that she remembered that she had given previously.

"Q Maybe five, maybe six, maybe seven?

"A There weren't that many in the gang."

And there in the word "gang," you get Ruby Pearl's feeling towards Mr. Manson and the people on the ranch. And that's an interesting thing about the relationship of these people. Ruby Pearl probably had some kind of a little empire there. She was king pin. Mr. Spahn was blind. She's the one that ran the show.

And then, what happens? Somebody comes in, like Squeaky, Lynn Fromme. Mr. Spahn has some kind of a feeling of affection for Squeaky. Mr. Manson and his friends are there. And they're invading her province. Ruby Pearl doesn't like it. She wants it the way it has been for 17 or 18 years.

And so the question is -- the question is, can we depend upon Ruby Pearl's testimony? Can we depend upon her

credibility when she uses, for instance, the word "gang." 1 Now, you don't use the word "gang" in the context 2 of somebody you like, a group of people you like. You use the 3 word "gang," when you don't like a particular group of people.' And that word "gang," gives us a real insight into 5 what Ruby Pearl thinks about Mr. Manson and -- and his friends. б There weren't that many in the 7 gang; is that right? 8 "Right. 9 "And -- do you remember testifying before 10 the Grand Jury? 11 "A Yes. 12 "Did you testify before the Grand Jury that 13 Bill Vance --" 14 And then, this is her answer, after the word "Vance" 15 was uttered, she says, "Might have been there." 16 May I finish the question? Mrs. Pearl? 17 "A. Go ahead. 18 "Previously you -- today, you have told us --19 you have not mentioned Bill Vance up to this point; 20 right? 21 I didn't mention him. 22 Did you tell the Grand Jury that Mr. " O. 23 Vance was one of the people that you saw in this 24 automobile? 25 "A. I said he could have been there. 26 "O. Was Mr. Vance one of the people that 27 you saw in the automobile? 28

"A. I didn't recognize him. I was too busy watching the others."

Now, what does that mean?

"I was too busy watching the others."

In her contrived way, she's trying to let us know that — that for sure, there's no question about it, she was keeping her eyes upon the others. But when people get out of an automobile and you are just watching a scene and have no reason for remembering it, there's no reason for focusing your attention on what she now calls "the others." It is just — it is just not true. I mean, the woman's testimony is clearly —

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we'll recess now until 1:45. During the recess, you are obliged not to converse amongst yourselves, nor with anyone else, nor permit anyone to converse with you on any subject connected with the matter, nor are you to form or express any opinion on it until it is finally submitted to you.

See you at 1:45.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken to reconvene at 1:45 p.m., same day.)

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1971 1:50 P.M.

nany diap san am

THE COURT: All the jurors are present, the record may show.

Mr. Kanarek, you may proceed.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, thank you, your Honor.

(Whereupon, Mr. Kanarek conferred with the Clerk.)

MR. KANAREK: Well, ladies and gentlemen, some of the exhibits pertaining -- I guess all the exhibits pertaining to Mr. Shea are in another courtroom, but I will try to work around them so that we can cover this material, try to change the outline that I have had so that we can make best use of the time, because the exhibits are in another courtroom.

And the testimony of Ruby Pearl reveals that -that on occasion she has given Mr. Shea some money that
belongs to Mr. Spahn. She --

"Q So when you gave Mr. Shea money, you gave him Mr. Spahn's money on occasion?

"A On occasion.

"And on occasion you gave him your money?

"A Yes.

"How much of your money have you given Mr. Shea that is not yet repaid?

"A I don't think that's anyone's business."

And then, after the Court asks her to answer the question, she says:

"How much money I have given him over a

1 "period of all of those times? "THE COURT: That he owes you. 2 .3 "THE WITNESS: Well, I give himmoney now and 4 then. I can't say even how much he owes me. If he 5 owes it. IIQ. ٠6 The question, Mrs. Pearl, is how much 7 have you given to Mr. Shea that he has not returned? 8 ΠA That he has not returned? Well, some 9 things I gave him, not giving it to him, I bought 10 things off of him. I bought a movie projector and 11 things like that when he needed money. So that's 12 not giving it to him. 13 "Those boys always come up with something 14 to sell if they needed money." 15 And Mr. Shea is one of these people she is 16 including in "those boys always come up with something to sell if they needed money." For whatever that may be 17 18 worth. 19 "Mr. Shee always came up with something 20 to sell when he needed money? 21 ΗA Not often, no. 22 "He came up with a movie projector one 23 time when he needed money? 24 ñΑ Yes. 25 "When was that? 26 "That was recent. That was recent. 27 "Would you tell us when it was, Mrs. Pearl? ΠA It was in June. 28

11.A Yes. 2 "He came up with a movie projector? 3 11 A Uh-huh. "How much did you give him for the movie 5 6 projector? ΉÃ That was \$50. 7 II O And he gave you -- you got -- in other words, that would be full price for the movie projector? 9 Α^Ħ 10 Yes, yes." Uh, so, we see that -- that Mr. Shea -- that also 11 12 goes into the state of mind, and gives us some insight into 13 Mr. Shea's activities. There's one thing that we would like to discuss, 14 15 and that is as far as -- this police officer testimony and 16 the place of the police in all of these things. We're -the police are just people, I suppose, like all of us. And 17 18 they are subject to the same -- to the same human traits that 19 all of us have. Now, there -- there -- there have been Los Angeles 20 police officers that have literally committed burglaries out 21 22 of black and white cars. There's been a District Attorney of 23 Los Angeles County that's gone to prison for bribery. 24 There have been Deputy District Attorneys that 25 have been convicted of murder. There -- there -- in the last couple of years, 26 there was a sergeant, a sheriff in the -- a sheriff's argument 27 out here on Topanga Canyon in Canoga Park that sat across a 28

#169 -- 1969?

1

÷٤

4 5

table, pulled out a gun and killed his wife, bang, just like that.

Now, what -- the reason we're saying this, is not to damn police officers. The reasons we're pointing this up -- that police officer that killed his wife, by the way, got probation, but -- for whatever that means. But the fact of the matter is, and I'm saying this on the record here, the fact of the matter is that what does it prove?

It proves that these people are just plain flesh and blood like all of us. And that when they inject themselves and when they -- when they use the force of their personality to convert testimony into a viewpoint that they want, that they want to foster, then we have to give pause. We have to realize the great power that these people have, especially in connection with the types of witnesses that have come before us here. And we have to realize that in assessing the credibility, in assessing the credibility of these people, there lurks in the background police pressure. There lurks in the background a great power. That's why you hear these police organizations wanting to do away with jury trials, cut down the number of people on juries. We don't need jury trials. We don't need juries.

And the -- the Court will instruct us that any kind of an oral-- supposed oral confession or oral admission that supposedly somebody made, that that is to be viewed with caution, that, and the Court will instruct in that regard.

And the reason for that is because of -- one of

the reasons is because of what we are talking about at this point. The fact that these statements that come to us by word of mouth cannot be depended upon, not only because of the lack of the -- of the human species to memorize and remember everything that he hears, but because of the bias and prejudice and the source that the -- the fact that some of these people, shall we say, to say the least, are influenced by police officer relationship, by what the police can do for them in connection with getting cases dismissed and everything that we've seen in this courtroom. It looks like the best way, the best way to get a case resolved if you are suspected of doing wrong, is to say something or other bad about Charles Manson.

5b-1

We've seen this in the courtroom here, and so it is, uh, it is something that is a very live part of this case. And so the theme has to do with Ruby Pearl.

Now, Ruby Pearl, when we look at her credibility and her -- her motivation in connection with this case, it would appear that she is taking sides. And what we just read, it is clear she's not a neutral. She's not a person who is looking at this -- this subject matter without any passion or feeling. Clearly she has a passion or feeling and her passion or feeling is against Mr. Manson. And going into -- going into, now, --

(Whereupon, Mr. Kanarek confers with the Clerk.)

MR. KANAREK: I'll try -- this particular exhibit is in another courtroom. I'll try to work around it.

"Now, for instance, taking People's 80-C, where you have 'SS' at this point (indicating), you have intended that to mean Shorty Shea --

"A Yes.

"Q -- is that correct?

"On how many different occasions have you seen Mr. Shea in that area, that general area, depicted in 80-C, in the summer of 1969?

"A Oh, quite a few times.

"Q And on how many different occasions did you see automobiles with people in the automobiles in the summer of 1969, in that general area?

"A Every day. Only during business hours.

"Q Well, you never saw any automobiles in

.28

"that area except during business hours during the summer of 1969, is that correct?

"A No, not exactly. There was friends came up once in a while and parked along --

"Q Well, when you say --

"A -- the boardwalk.

"Q Then, when you said a few moments ago that only during business hours, that is incorrect?

"A Well, you said many cars, you said.

Many cars weren't there. Only during business hours.

"Q Well, what do you state are business hours?

"A Well, usually from morning until 6:00 in the evening.

"Q Now, as a matter of fact -- well, I'll withdraw that.

"On occasions, then, did you go home at 6:00 in the evening; is that the end of the business day for you?

"A No, not for me."

Now, if what she says there is true, then it is only -- that there are very few automobiles coming up there in the later hours, that even makes that surveillance that we're speaking of more effective because the police -- if there are very few cars coming up, the police have an easier chance to make their surveillance, and which we -- this is supposedly during the time of -- when all of these arrests and the raid at the Spahn Ranch has been taking place. And it -- it would pinpoint -- it would pinpoint when they write

down on their -- their interrogation sheets and on their notes this -- the fact -- the fact of an automobile coming up there at night would certainly be something that would be written down on a Sheriff's log. And the -- and -- I mean, it would seem like there -- that is just -- that is just -- there's no question but what that would be the case.

6-1

1 2

.

"On occasions, then, did you go home at 6:00 in the evening; is that the end of the business day for you?

"A. No, not for me.

"Q. Well, what dictates the end of the business day at the Spahn Ranch?

"A. When the customers don't come in after dark, then I did my other work.

"Q Well, after 6:00 in the evening, during the summer of 1969, did only one automobile come into that area after 6:00?

"A. No.

"Q. So that during the summer of 1969 there were many automobiles that came into that area with people in them; is that correct?

"A. Not outside people. Those that live there came in.

"Q. All right. Those that lived there came in many times during the summer of 1969, into that area where you have the FS; is that correct?

"A. Yes."

Well, now, in connection with --

(Pause in the proceedings while a discussion off the record ensued at the clerk's desk between Mr. Kanarek and the clerk.)

Well, due to a problem with the exhibits, if I may, there's one interesting point, if I may digress a little

bit. 1 Mr. Springer, we will recall -- Mr. Springer stated 2 that when he came to the ranch on August the 15th, 1969. 3 ۳a. Now, when you went back to Spahn 4 Ranch on August the 15th of 1969, did you take 5 anything from the ranch? б ft A. I took this knife (indicating). 7 11 O. And you are referring to the exhibit Я marked People's 20 for identification? 9 "A. Yes. That one and another bayonet, 10 which I don't know what become of it." 11 Now, that's the one that we know that was broken. 12 Now, looking back at August the 15th, 1969, and 13 looking back that that is after August the 1st, 1969, and 14 realizing that Mr. De Carlo is a friend of Mr. Springer's, 15 and realizing that of all the things on that ranch, Mr. 16 17 Springer took that knife -- which ended up broken -- does 18 that tell us anything? 19 Does that tell us that maybe it hasn't -- maybe 20 these events have not happened the way that some people want 21 us to believe it? 22 He takes the very weapon, supposedly, that is used to cut Mr. Hinman. Maybe Mr. De Carlo -- could Mr. De 24 Carlo have had any part in the proceedings? 25 Could Mr. De Carlo, who knew Mr. Hinman, could 26 Mr. De Carlo have been over there and cut Mr. Hinman? 27 Why would Mr. Springer, who is certainly not a 28 friend of Charles Manson -- in this record, he tells us he

2

3

5

7

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

26 27

28

doesn't like Charles Manson.

But if you look at the sequence of events, on August the 15th, he comes up there and gets the weapon that they say cut Mr. Hinman. And he has that great friendship for Mr. De Carlo. It's after Mr. Hinman's body has been found.

He wants to take Mr. De Carlo away, but not just take Mr. De Carlo. As a matter of fact, Mr. De Carlo stayed there.

Mr. De Carlo was arrested. Mr. De Carlo didn't want to leave. He has got this vast affection for him.

So, he takes the item of evidence that we -- that the prosecution tell us was used to cut Mr. Hinman. He takes that item of evidence back to Venice with him -- of everything there, that's what he takes.

Then, he -- he is a very knowledgeable person with -- in connection with police activities and -- and police methods. He -- he does nothing in connection with that until he is arrested, until the chips are down, as far as he's concerned, and his liberty is at stake -- which we know, from the record, is after October the 12th, 1969, when Mr. Manson has been arrested, and it's spread out in all the papers and all the television stations, that Mr. Manson is arrested.

Then after that, after Mr. Manson is arrested, then he comes up with this, with this what is now People's 20, and extricates himself from his legal difficulties, and -and keeping -- knowing what the prosecution viewpoint is in connection with Mr. Manson, he gets this weapon -- he gets

this weapon, and he uses this weapon to get out of custody, in his statements that he makes. 12:

6a

6a-1

1 2

So, look at the relationship that he had with Mr. DeCarlo. He wasn't doing anything when he took that thing away from there to help Mr. Manson; he was helping Mr. DeCarlo.

So does that tell us anything in invoking the doctrine of reasonable doubt -- especially, in view of the fact that Mr. Vance and Mr. DeCarlo are not brought here by the prosecution, despite their having contact with all of these items?

For instance -- for instance, the pawn ticket; there's no showing that Mr. Manson had any relationship to that pawn ticket -- which supposedly redeemed the guns -- there's just no showing of Mr. Manson having any relationship with any of these physical items.

The only thing -- the only thing that they -that they have are these alleged statements of Mr. Manson;
that's all that, really, there are. And Mr. Manson has -has a right that we analyze these statements; that we look
at these statements, and look and see if they come from a
tainted source.

The -- the interesting thing about Mr. Springer's testimony is, he tells us -- he tells us that Mr. Manson told him something about Mr. Hinman's ear.

Mr. Springer tells us that.

Now, if that indeed happened -- if that indeed happened, why would Mr. Springer hold on to that information, say nothing about it, take the weapon that's -- that supposedly did it back with him to Venice? Why would be do

6a-2

<u>.</u> =

2 3

Ì

that?

The point is that we have a tendency, when we listen to these words from the witness stand, to get a thinking -- to get a -- to sort of follow a path that superficially the words tend to take us on.

But that's why we have to -- that's where we have to be very cautious; and not allow -- not allowing those words to take us down that path, when the words come from someone who is motivated the way Mr. Springer is motivated.

So, if we look at what his thinking was when these events happened, we come to no other conclusion. His purpose was to defect Danny DeCarlo, -- I think that we all would agree.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

I'11 try to --

(Further pause in the proceedings.)

Now, if I may, so that we can make best use of the time, I'll -- I'll discuss Barbara Hoyt and her testimony.

Now --

(Pause in the proceedings while a discussion off the record ensued at the Clerk's desk between Mr. Kanarek and the Clerk, following which Mr. Kanarek, together with the Clerk, repaired to the antechambers, returning shortly, whereupon the following proceedings were had:)

MR. KANAREK: Well, in any event, we don't -- there's --

(Further pause in the proceedings while a discussion off the record ensued at the Clerk's

6a - 3

desk between Mr. Kanarek and the Clerk.)

Obviously, a very critical portion of the prosecution's viewpoint in this case involves the screams of Barbara Hoyt. And in connection with those screams that she says she heard, her word for word testimony illustrates that the lady is just not telling us the truth.

First of all -- first of all, even assuming it's someone that you know very well, can you detect a person's voice from a scream, especially when you are supposedly -- like she says she was -- awakened in the middle of the night?

But in this case, the evidence makes it clear that this lady didn't even know Shorty Shea's voice, talking -- just plain ordinary talking. She says:

"Q All right. Now, would you name any other occasion when you walked by or were in the presence of Mr. Shea when he was speaking to you or anyone else?

"A I don't know. It was just that -- you know, when you see somebody or they say, 'Hi,' you say, 'Hi,' or whatever. I don't know exactly each time, you know, how many times I heard him say 'Hello' or whatever. You know.

"Or if he ever did?

"He did.

"Well, would you tell us to whom he said 'Hello'?

"A Sometimes to me; sometimes to other people.

"Q Well, would you tell us the names of these other people?

6a-4	1	"A I do not remember. I really didn't pay
	2	that much attention.
	3	"Q Tell us the name of one other person?
	4	"A I don't remember.
¥.ª ¶.÷	5	"Q You paid no attention; right, Miss Hoyt?
e e	6	"A I didn't pay that much attention, like,
	7	'Who did he say that to?' You know? Or, 'Who did
	8	he say this to?
	9	"I didn't think it about it at the time.
	10	"Q And you paid no attention to what he said;
	11:	right?
	12	"A When he said, 'Hi,' I said, 'Hi' back;
	13	that's all.
	14	"Q And you had no occasion to remember what
	15	the voice of Mr. Shea sounded like; is that correct?
•	16	"A Well, only when I heard well, only
á	17	when I heard him screaming, I remember thinking that
) F	18	that was him, or that was so I guess I recognized
6b f1	.B. ¹⁹	his voice. But now, I wouldn't."
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24.	
₩	25	
*	26	
—	27	·
	28	·
		1.

3b-1

*

__

Now, what do those words mean? She says -- now, when Shorty Shea -- when she sees Shorty Shea, she wouldn't be able to tell us that she would recognize his voice.

"My question is: Let's take a time before the day that you say you heard these screams -- or the night you say you heard these screams, Miss Hoyt.

"Did you have any occasion to remember what Mr. Shea's voice was like?

"I knew what his voice was like, or I'd know it was him, if he was talking or whatever.

"Q Did you, Miss Hoyt, at any time before you heard these screams, make it a point to remember what Shorty Shea's voice sounded like?

"THE WITNESS: No, I don't think so."

All right. Then -- then she tries to -- even though we know that she didn't have any glasses on, she says -- she says that she recognized him. She says he was coming out

"Q And when you last -- the last time that you saw Mr. Shea, at a time that these people that you mentioned were there, what was Mr. Shea doing?

"A He was coming out from -- well, by the bathrooms there's a -- a door, sort of; not a door, but an entrance.

"It's like a door next to a door; you know?

"And -- only it's under the house, and he was turned around, and he was looking under the house,

1	"and that's about all.
2	"Q And how far away was he from you
3	when you last saw him?
4	"A. Oh, about 30 feet; I don't know.
5	"Q 30 feet. Then you don't know that
6	it was Mr. Shea, do you, Miss Hoyt?
7	"A. I can recognize people without my
8	glasses.
9	"Q You can? Without your glasses?
10.	"You can't recognize five fingers
11	closer or, further away than a couple of feet;
12	right?
13	"A. Yes.
14	"Q Is that correct?
15	"A. Yes.
16	"Q And at night, you could recognize
17	Mr. Shea 30 feet away?
18	"A. It wasn't at night.
19	"Q Who was Mr. Shea with, Miss Hoyt?
20	"A. He was alone.
21	"Q. And he was 30 feet away from you?
22	"A. About that, I suppose.
23	"Q Or further?
24	"A. I don't know.
25	"Q. Or closer?
26	"A I don't know.
27	"Q And did you testify did you answer
28	this question as indicated?
	1

1	"'What kind of a conversation, if any,
2	did you have with Shorty at dinnertime?
3	"'A. I didn't have any.'
4	"A. Which dinnertime?
5	"Q Well, was there every a dinnertime
6	when Mr. Shea was present, that you had no
7	conversation with him?
8	"A. Yes.
9	"Q And
10	"A No, wait. There was only that time
11	that I told you about this morning, when he just
12	asked you know, if this was all the meat there
13 [.]	was. And that was all.
14	- "But I don't remember him any time, that
15	the Family had dinner, him being there."
16	So now, she's telling us that it's this one time,
17	and she previously had testified that she had no conversation
18	with this person at any time.
19	"Q So this is the only time that you have
20	in mind; right?
21	"A. Yes.
22	"Q And you did testify
23	"'What kind of a conversation, if any,
24	did you have with Shorty at dinnertime?
25	"You didn't have any; that's what you
26	previously said; is that correct?
27	"A. Yes".
28	"Q On August the 5th, 1971, Miss Hoyt?

"A Yes."

6c

Now, so when she was in another courtroom on August 5th, 1971, she stated that. And so it's only because that was pointed out to her that she told us what she told us. If that hadn't been pointed out to her, she would have gone on and told us that she had conversations with him on many different occasions.

So there is an aspect of credibility that we have, as far as: Can we depend upon a witness like this, who is telling us the truth, only because she knows she's going to be nailed down by the next question? And not because she is -- it's coming from her heart, or it's coming from her thinking, because this is what actually happened?

But she's trying to tailor her testimony, so that it will make what she says right now look consistent. with something that she said on another occasion.

And then -- then, this is an answer to a later question by the prosecution.

"Q Miss Hoyt, did you ever have a conversation with Shorty Shea?

"A No.

"Q How do you use --

"When you answered that question, how were you using the word 'conversation'? What does the word mean to you?

"A What does it mean to me?"

That's an answer.

And the prosecution asks:

"Right."

And she says:

"Like a discussion."

"Can you be any more elaborate about what the word 'conversation' means to you?"

And then the question is asked:

"Miss Hoyt, did you talk to Shorty Shea, and

6c-2

"did Shorty Shea talk to you?"

Now, she says:

"Yes."

The answer to that question is: "Yes."

(Pause in the proceedings.)

Miss Hoyt -- well, I'll have to have one of those exhibits that's in the -- which we willget momentarily, I hope.

Now, we know -- we know that Miss Hoyt was living there at the Spahn Ranch, and that she partook of drugs. She tells us, for instance, that she took something once -- I mean, I'm sure we'll all recall that she says she took -- I think it was -- LSD once; and it didn't have any effect on her.

She tells us that she -- she tells us that she smoked marijuana a lot, but only took LSD once.

If everybody out there is taking LSD, is it believable that she took it just once? There's no question about it, but what this young lady is a person who has managed, by means of her -- of her youthfulness, her beauty, her projection of being naive -- she's managed to get away with an awful lot in her lifetime.

Well, you remember the -- the various and sundry names that she -- that she had used in her lifetime -- eight or nine or ten different names.

Remember that she was living with Mr. DeCarlo.

She was living with Mr. DeCarlo in the middle of the summer of

6c-3

Ì2

6d fls.

Ž6.

1969.

So undoubtedly, she has some affection for Mr.

DeCarlo. And so -- and so the best place to put whatever she wants to do by way of testimony is to put it on Mr. Manson.

And in that manner, she accomplishes two things. She protects the person that she lived with, the man that she has this affection for, Mr. DeCarlo; and at the same time, she assists the prosecution in whatever -- in whatever they may desire, as far as Mr. Manson is concerned.

Oh, yeah. She -- I think a critical analysis -- a critical analysis of Barbara Hoyt will show that this -- what this particular witness, for instance, is willing to do, as far as her testimony is concerned.

"Q Did you tell Mr. Whiteley, the gentleman sitting to my left, on November 18th, 1970, that on one occasion you heard male screams, the screams of a male voice, while you were at the Spahn Ranch?

"A I don't remember the words. I remember telling the police that I heard Shorty screaming. 6d-1 nQ. My question is: On November the 1 18th, 1970, did you state that you had heard 2 the sound of a male? 3 I don't remember. 4 ¹¹0. You don't remember what you told 5 them: is that it? 6 "A. I don't remember what words I used. 7 "O. Did you tell the law enforcement 8 people that the voice you heard was that of a man? 9 II A. Yeah. That it was Shorty." 10 Now, is she being a witness, when she testifies 11 like that? Or is she being a -- a person who is arguing the 12 case for the prosecution? 13 Clearly, she's an advocate, from the witness stand. 14 We know -- we know from what happens later that there is no 15 question that, supposedly, she said it was a male voice that 16 she heard screaming. 17 Now, "You told them that it was a male voice, and **' 18** 19 it was Shorty? 20 I told them that I heard Shorty 21 screaming. 22 "O. When you first talked to the law 23 enforcement people, did you state that it was a 24 male voice, and as far as who the voice belonged 25 to, you did not know? 26 11 A. No." 27 (Pause in the proceedings.) 28 And then they tell us that she went down the

27

28

next morning; supposedly, she went down the next morning and supposedly there was a conversation about a -- about a body, about lye versus lime in connection with a body there, that was supposedly buried under some leaves.

Now, she doesn't present this information to any law enforcement person or agency. She doesn't bring this to the attention of anyone — until when? Until all of the publicity and all of the — all of the emphasis is placed upon Mr. Manson, not only by the news media, but also by the law enforcement people.

And then she joins the group, concerning the statements about Mr. Manson, and about what she heard and the screams and all of that.

But the fascinating part about it is that she is willing to lie on the witness stand. She is willing to get up on this witness stand and tell us things that we know, from her previous statements, are untrue.

We know -- we know that she told law enforcement people that it was a male voice that she heard.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

She says --

"I'm talking about law enforcement people.

"Did you tell any law enforcement people?

"A Did I tell them what?

"Q That you knew that someone had been killed at the Spahn Ranch?

"A. Did I tell them?

"O Yes.

"A. 1 Yes. 2 "Q. When? 3 WA. When? I think the first time I 4 told them was in December, 1969. 5 "O. December, 1969, is the first time 6 you told anybody about it; right? Any law enforcement person? πA. Any law enforcement person? 9 110. Right. 10 "A. Yes. 11 "O. Is that right? 12 "A. Yes. 13 That was after Mr. Manson was 14 arrested; right? 15 "A Yes." 16 So the question is: Did it ever happen? Did it 17 ever happen? Can we believe -- can we believe that she allowed 18 all of this information to reside within her, all of this 19 period of time, and not tell any law enforcement people about 20 it? This is a question which obviously comes to mind. 21 Here she is. Here she is. She goes -- she goes 22 up to the desert with Mr. Manson; she comes up there; and 23 during all of this period of time, she knows that Mr. Shea 24 has been killed. 25 Well, obviously -- obviously, this is untrue. 26 She wouldn't -- it's -- it defies the imagination, to 27 believe that she's going to -- that she's going to live with 28 anyone who is this dangerous.

13,

She tells us -- she tells us she heard, in fact, all about the body being buried and all of this. And she didn't do anything about it; she didn't do anything about it until December of 1969.

Now, she tells us that she left -- she left in September -- in September of 1969; she left the Barker-Meyers' area there. There's no reason, no reason, then, why she shouldn't tell somebody about it, if it indeed happened.

But what happens in connection with these publicity type of things is that she reads in the paper -- she reads the papers; and they have a self-generating aspect. She reads in the paper something, and then it's read back as supposed evidence from that witness stand.

And this is what happened in connection with Barbara Hoyt. Barbara Hoyt had nothing to do -- nothing to do after September, 1969; she had nothing to do with living up there, with Mr. Manson. She had -- there's no reason whatsoever, no reason whatsoever why she should keep that information to herself.

The fact of the matter is that Barbara Hoyt is

-- she becomes -- she becomes sort of a darling of the

prosecution; she becomes a person -- she becomes a person who

is -- who is -- she -- she's catered to; she's looked upon as

if she were a princess.

7-1

б

And she, because of the things that they wish her to say --

(Whereupon, Mr. Kanarek confers with the Clerk.)
MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may we approach the bench?
THE COURT: Yes, you may.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had at the bench among Court and counsel, outside the hearing of the jury:)

MR, KANAREK: Wait, excuse me just a second.

Your Honor, I need those exhibits that are over there, the Shea exhibits, your Honor.

THE COURT: What do you need?

MR. KANAREK: I need the keyring and the keys, and the shoe, and the letter, and the -- the check, Mr. Binder's check.

THE COURT: Do you have the numbers for those?

MR. KANAREK: People's 74.

THE COURT: Keyring, very well, go ahead.

Give Mrs. Holt the numbers of those. I can't see why you -- except for the letter, which the contents of which you might want to read -- unless there's something peculiar -- or perhaps a check of which you may want to read. Unless there is something peculiar about it, I think reference to it -- give Mrs. Holt the numbers.

MR. KANAREK: Here.

THE COURT: Why don't you proceed now. Give her the numbers. Why don't you proceed now and we'll attempt to get them during the next hour.

7-2

1 2

4 5

 MR. KANAREK: All right.

THE COURT: While you're at it, if you have any more that you need, you might give her the numbers.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had in open court within the presence and hearing of the jury:)

THE COURT: You've been sitting there about an hour.

We'll give you a recess. During the recess you are admonished not to converse amongst yourselves, nor with anyone else, nor permit anyone to converse with you on any subject connected with the matter, nor form or express any opinion on the matter until it is finally submitted to you.

A little over ten minutes.

(Afternoon recess.)

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, you may proceed.

The record may show that all the jurors and alternates are present.

MR. KANAREK: Before we leave Barbara Hoyt for just a moment, I think without reading the transcript, that we all remember that she says that she woke up on the floor of the parachute room that night. And, I mean, all of that -- all of her testimony and her -- her statements, uh, where she used the word "male," -- she never identified Shorty Shea even to the police when she first talked to them.

I'm sure you remember that, that Officer -- without reading it -- that Officer Whiteley's report, law enforcement report, clearly shows that it was a male voice she said at that time. But she -- she begins with the male voice, and time has a

Q.

 tendency to make it sweeter and sweeter, and so she bootstraps the male voice into Shorty Shea.

And so it is for the jury to determine whether or not that -- that little girl can be believed in terms of what the prosecution is asking us to use her testimony for.

And going on to Mr. Watkins.

THE CLERK: Here is 74, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: Oh, yes, thank you.

I just wanted, if I may, with People's 74, which refers to the person, Richard Alan Smith, which Mrs. Holt has kindly just got it for us from the other courtroom, you'll notice that this person who, I'm sure we now believe to be Danny DeCarlo, is a person who is five foot four inches tall, weighs 130 pounds, and we've seen -- his picture is here before us, also. He's certainly not a person who is tall and lanky. He's certainly not a person who, in connection with -- with receipting the pawn ticket, where we see the signature of "Donald Shea," and the name of this R. A. Smith under -- in People's 57 -- remember Mr. Launer testifying about a tall, lanky person?

But what about -- what has that all got to do with Mr. Manson, in any event? What's that got to do with Charles Manson? It doesn't have anything to do with him.

Now, like I -- I say, we don't -- I don't know the pawnbroker business that intimately, but I can't picture a hardbitten pawnbroker just giving items of valuable -- value to anybody that just walks in.

Now, getting to Mr. Watkins, his testimony, we

know that Mr. Watkins is a person who at least has made 1100 bucks off of Charles Manson's -- uh, the incidents revolving around Charles Manson.

And, again, Mr. Watkins tells us that -- makes a statement to us about that supposedly Mr. Manson made, when supposedly there's an actual statement by Mr. Shea supposedly being killed.

And looking at what Mr. Watkins tells us is the time that this occurred, the time was --

"And while Mr. Manson was at the ranch, before -- before you left the ranch on September 1st, 1969, did he talk to you?

"A Yes."

And we all heard the statement about wherein he says about -- supposedly about we had to kill Shorty and Clem cut off his head and all of the things that he said.

Now, if you take that statement, standing alone, and don't look at the surrounding material concerning Mr.

Watkins, you get one view. But if you look at what Mr.

Watkins -- what Mr. Watkins is, what Mr. Watkins has been, and what his credibility is, maybe you get a different view.

First of all, we have a relationship -- we have a relationship between Mr. Watkins and Barbara Hoyt. There's no question that they are friends of long standing.

And Mr. Watkins stated that he has made -- and

I'll try to go through with it -- go through this as -- as -without -- as speedily as possible.

"Q In directing your attention to people, editorial people, book people, in connection with those events which allegedly occurred on August 8th, 9th and 10th of 1969, those alleged Tate-La Bianca murders, you have made certain money; is that correct?"

And he says, "That is correct."

And we know without going into all the detail that he is -- that he got this 1100 bucks.

But, furthermore, Mr. Watkins has an expectancy in the future. And he states in answer to this question:

"So now, you are free to go ahead and sell whatever you want to sell to completely new people, if you so desire, right?"

And he says -- he answers:

"If I so desire.

"Q Correct?

 "A. Correct."

And then, he tells us a very interest point, that one time during December of 1968, both he and Mr. Hinman -- and Mr. Beausoleil were thrown out of the Gary Hinman house.

Now, there's no showing in this record, whatsoever, of any animosity between Mr. Manson and Mr. Hinman. You take — you take away this — the — the accomplice testimony of Mary Brunner, you take away the — the tainted information that we've discussed, you don't see anything — you don't see anything of any kind of a bad feeling between Mr. Manson and Mr. Hinman.

Now, he makes the point that Bobby Beausoleil had the argument with Mr. Hinman and I just watched the whole thing. That's what Mr. Watkins tells us.

And then, Mr. Watkins tells us that he has taken LSD. And he says he's taken it approximately 150 times, the very powerful hallucinatory, dangerous drug, LSD.

And he says -- I asked -- the question was: "Hundreds of times, right?"

And he answers: "150, perhaps 200," in answer to my question. And he says he didn't — he didn't start — he didn't keep a log of it. And he says that he first started taking LSD when he was 16. And he's now 21. And he says that he has taken LSD at the Barker Ranch, the Meyer Ranch and the Spahn Ranch. And he smoked marijuana on hundreds of occasions.

Now, he stated that he has spoken to law enforcement officers on many occasions.

"Is that right?

	.
· 1	"That's right.
2	"Concerning Mr. Manson; right?
3	"Right.
4	"On how many different occasions?
5	. "Oh I'd say dozens of occasions.
б	"Dozens
7	"Yes.
8	" literally, that you've spoken to law
9	enforcement officers?
10.	"A. Yes.
11	"About Mr. Manson?
12	"Yes."
13	Why is it necessary why is it necessary to speak
14	dozens of times to law enforcement officers concerning
15	Mr. Manson?
16.	Now, he then talks about then, he tells us
17	I'm sure we will remember where he spoke about being gone
18	for some three hours.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

b

7b-1 1, 2 HA. 3 'Why?' "You came three hours later? 5 " A. Yes. 6 "And saw Mr. Manson again? 7 "A. Yes. 8 "What did you say then? 10. 11 12 "Anything else? 13 14 15 right? 16 17 with Mr. Manson, is that it? 18 19 20 21 22 is that right? 23 "A. Yes. 24 25 period? 26 27 For -- via Las Vegas. 28

"Well, you did have words with Mr. Manson then before you came back three hours later?

That was the words I had.

"Well, I was asking him about another story. He told me some other guy had killed somebody else and so I was asking him about that.

"No, that was all there was for that day.

"Well, after -- this blew your mind, you say, You went around, sort of wandering around . in a daze for three hours? You were so disenchanted

"That -- you ain't too far off.

"I see. So you came back after three hours, and now you've told us everything you said after you came back in three hours and spoke to Mr. Manson;

"Then, where did you go after this three-hour

Well, the next day I left for Los Angeles.

"Now, is there -- yes, you've told us everything

1 "that was said after you came back in three hours, is that right? 2 [#]A 3 Yes, it was a very short-type 4 conversation. I didn't tell you everything, though, because I didn't think it makes any 5 6 difference. I told you the essence of it." 7 So, in other words, he is telling us that he is 8 telling us the essence of it and he's deciding, not us, as to whether or not it makes any difference. 10 "Well, when you came back after three hours, 77 Mr. Watkins, this having blown your mind, you made 12 no mention of Mr. Shea? 13 ⁴3. Right.* 14 In other words, he supposedly heard this about 15 Mr. Shea. He comes back. He makes no mention of the very 16 subject matter that is supposedly -- he tells us what blew 17 his mind. 18. "And Mr. Shea was not mentioned in this 19 conversation that you say occurred three hours 20 later? 21 #A Correct. 22 "And you tell us that you didn't want to 23 believe it ---24 "That's ---25 "-- right?" 26 *1 Right." 27 Now, he states -- then, he deviates. He says, 28 then -- he says here, finally, he says:

77

"Now, in -- on this occasion, after this - 1 three-hour period, Mr. Watkins, is there some 2 reason that you didn't mention Shorty Shea to 3 Mr. Manson in this -- after this three-hour 4 period when you saw Mr. Manson again, you tell us? 5 ΉÄ. Yes. 6 "Is that because your mind was blown? 7 "A Yes, I'd say so. Didn't want to. R πO. You didn't want to? 9 No. 10 "Because your mind was blown? 11 'nΑ. Well, because -- because it --12 because, uh, I didn't want to press it. 13 "You didn't want to press it? 14 "It was surely none of my business in the 15 first place. 16 "It was none of your business. You didn't 17 want to press it? 18 ΠA. Right. 19 "And so you -- and what do you mean when you 20 say it wasn't any of your business, Mr. Watkins? 21 "I mean I wasn't involved in it, so it wasn't 22 any of my business." 23 24 And he states: 25 "Anything Charlie was doing or the Family was 26 doing at that point was none of my business." 27

28

7-c-1 "I wanted it to remain none of my business 1 because I didn't want to get involved, yes. 2 "You didn't want to be involved, right? 3 "Right. 4. "You didn't want to be involved in murder? 5 "Right. 6 "You didn't want to be accused of the 7 murder of Shorty Shea, right? 8 "I didn't consider such. 9 "What do you mean you didn't consider such? 10 "I didn't consider being accused of the 11 murder of Shorty Shea. "Well, then, when you say you didn't want 13 to be involved, what was it that you didn't want to be 14 involved in? 15 "I didn't want to be involved in -- if I 16 had got interested in that, then, I'd get interested 17 in other things, and interested in other things, and 18 pretty soon I'd be right back there in it again. And 19 then, it would have been all my business. I had other 20 things to do. 21 "You'd be in it again? 22 "Yes. 23 "What were you in before that you didn't 24 want to be in again? 25 "The Family. 26 "And that -- and that's the reason or 27 you've told us the reasons why you didn't mention 28

"Shorty Shea? 7c-2 1 "Not totally. There are other reasons. 2 "Well, give us other reasons. 3 "The other reasons was I told you before, I didn't really believe that it was true and I didn't want to believe that it was true because I thought 6 it was just -- Charlie was just trying to stir fear 7 with me and so I just sort of shined it on like the breeze blowing by because it didn't really amount to Q that thing, because at that point it didn't really 10 pay to be afraid because when you are afraid you're 11 12 subject to control. 13 "And you felt that if you -- if you were 14 afraid, you were subject to control? 15 11A Yes. 16 "This way you're not afraid? 17 A 11 Yes. 18 "Is that right? 10 Α^{II} Yes. 20 "But you came -- after leaving on this occasion, you came back to the Barker area, right? 21 22 "Yes, yes. 23 "And you knew that Mr. Manson was there? 24 "Yes. .25 "And you thought that Shorty was dead? "I didn't think too much about that. 26 "What do you mean, you didn't think too 27 much about that, Mr. Watkins? 28

7c-3 11 A I kind of just put it out of my mind and 1 didn't -- didn't even think about it until I talked 2 with police officers." 3 Then, "Did you, uh -- did you, uh, report 4 your thinking, whether it was back in your mind or 5 in the front of your mind or wherever it was in б your mind, did you report this to any law enforcement 7 officer? 8 A. Yes. 9 "When? 10 "Uh, about the 15th of October I reported 11 it to Sergeant Whiteley." 12 And we have Mr. Manson arrested on October 12, 13 and then Mr. Watkins reports it to Sergeant Whiteley. Mr. 14 Manson was then in the Inyo County Jail. 15 16 "Now --"And you decided that you were going to 17 18 make as much hay as possible out of Mr. Manson's being arrested, is that right? 19 "A As much what? 20 "Q Hay? 21 II A Hay? 22 "Q 23 Hay, money. 24 1l'A Oh, money. 25 "I decided to make a certain amount. 26 didn't decide to make as much as possible. Maybe I should have, 27 "You decided to make a certain amount? 28

II A 7c-4 Yes. 1 "O You put a limit on how much you were going 2 to make? 3 II A No. 4 "So you were out to get as much as the 5 traffic would bear, is that right? 6 "No, I tell you how I did it, I decided 7 to publish stories in foreign countries because the R United States was in sort of a state of shock, and 9 they didn't -- I didn't think that the people in the 10 · United States were in any position to hear the truth 11 and view it objectively. And so all the publications 12 that I was responsible for having written, were 13 published in foreign countries. Anything that was 14 published within the United States was without my 15 knowing." 16 And then, he tells us the incredible thing that 17 the people who published his book, the people who gave him 18 the money --19 "Well, Iver Davis and Mr. LaBlanc 20 published a book? 21 nA Without my knowing. 22 "From which you have received proceeds 23 and you've taken the money and used it for your 24 personal advantage, right? 25 HA. No, that's not. 26 iiQ Is that right?" 27 And the Court -- the Court would not allow any 28

7e-	.5	further interrogation at that point.
	2	Now, then, Mr. Watkins goes on and tells us
- °	3	about Mr. Vance.
	4	"Q Mr. Vance is a person whose girl friend
■•	5	was Ella Jo Bailey, is that correct?
4 <u>'</u>	6	"A I guess you could say that."
Q :	7	Then, we come to the then, we come to the
	8	(Whereupon, Mr. Kanarek conferred with the Clerk.)
	9	MR, KANAREK: Well, we, I'm sure, remember the map,
	10	wherein
	11,	(Whereupon, Mr. Kanarek again conferred with the
	12	Clerk.)
	13	THE COURT: Is there some problem, Mr. Kanarek?
7d f	fls _M	MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, yes.
	15	(Pause in the proceedings.)
	16	
*	17	
₹ ≜	18	
	19·	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
庞	24	
*	25	
Š	26	
	27	
	.28	

q

Z.4 - # - 7.2

MR. KANAREK: There, I'm sure everybody recalls this map which shows on this dot where the car was found, where Mr. -- allegedly Mr. Shea's car was found.

Now --

THE COURT: Now, let's see, for the record you are referring to People's --

MR. KANAREK: 83, I think, your Honor.

THE COURT: People's 83.

Now, Mr. Watkins tells us that this was a house that was owned by Bill Vance. Bill Vance is the person who owned this house near Gresham and Independence. That's where the car was found. And that's the house that the -- that the people who are friends of Mr. Manson and Manson's friends lived in at one time.

Now, we know that this car is found there in December of 1969. So it is quite -- it is quite fascinating to consider who put that car there. Who put the car in December of 1969 at that spot, and we'll come to -- but Mr. Watkins goes on to say:

"Now, after you came, Mr. Watkins, to the Los Angeles area, how many days was it before you saw Bill Vance?

"Just about three.

"Would you tell us your -- tell us the date that you saw Bill Vance?

"Yes. It was about the fifth, sixth and seventh."

28

And this is of September.

"You saw him for three -- on three separate days during that period of time; is that what you are telling us?

"A Yes, at three different occasions, different times during days.

"Sometimes in the morning, sometimes late in the evening, sometimes in the next morning, late the next evening, and then early the next morning.

"At the Spahn Ranch?

"Q At the Spahn Ranch?

"A Yes.

"In Los Angeles County?

"A Yes."

And, again, it is a part of the iceberg. All we see is that which is above the water. Mr. Watkins comes to Los Angeles County and sees Mr. Vance. He talks to him, evidently has some kind of relationship with him.

Then, the question is asked:

"When, Mr. Watkins, did you, in your mind, think that for sure Shorty Shea was not living, if you ever did think that?"

And he says, "I can give you a -- uh, the approximate date, the 6th or 7th of September.

"Q About the 6th or 7th of September you are telling us now is the time that in your mind you

7d-3	1	"felt sure that Mr. Shea was not living, right?
	2	11A11
	3	And I'm sure we'll all remember Paul Watkins.
	4	He'll play with the questions back and forth.
•	5	He said, "First you said 'Think, now you say
* 2	6	'felt sure.'"
	7	And he's differentiating between "think" and
	8`	"felt sure."
	9	"Well, I'll ask 'felt sure.'
	10	"When did you feel sure that Mr. Shea
	11	was not living?
	12	"I'd say the same time I began to feel
	13	sure around the 6th or 7th."
	14	And the time that he was with Bill Vance in the
	15	Spahn Ranch area.
	16	"You then" this is what he is telling
∌ ′ 9	17	us.
\$	18	"And after you now tell us feeling
	19	sure that Mr. Shea was not alive, you then went back
	20	to live at the Barker Ranch? Is that correct?
	21	"A That's correct.
	22	"And you went back to live at the Barker
	23	Ranch and you slept at the Barker Ranch and stayed
į.	24	on the Barker Ranch at the same time that Charles
ų. B	25	Manson was on the Barker Ranch, Barker-Meyers Ranch
-	26	areas?
	27	"That's correct.
	28	"Q Is that correct?

6.

"A That's correct."

Does that make sense to you, ladies and gentlemen?

Does it make sense to us that he is going to sleep in an
isolated area where supposedly someone told him that somebody
had someone's head cut off and this person had something to
do with it.

The fact of the matter is, that Mr. Watkins -and this is -- this is -- this is one of the problems in
connection with this case, that -- that's in your laps
to discuss.

Mr. Watkins has at this point in history, he has many reasons to fabricate.

One, one reason to fabricate is his own economic advantage.

It is to his economic advantage to perpetuate, to -- to keep going -- the stories that he has told concerning Mr. Manson. It means money to him.

The fact -- the fact, though, the relationship between him -- he says he's no longer a member of the Family. He says that he no longer -- he no longer is a part of that group.

He then goes back up to an isolated area and doesn't tell anybody about it, about what Mr. Manson told him. He goes back up there and sleeps in the same area where this -- where Mr. Manson is and all of that. It is -- it is hard -- it is -- I hate to use the word again, but it is hogwash. It just -- it just doesn't make sense.

Just look -- look at our own -- look into our

8 fls.

own personalities and our own thinking. Would we? Would we go into an isolated area if we thought that any such thing had occurred with a person that was going to be the same general area? It -- that's one of the things we have to decide, because he makes the bald statement -- he makes the bald statement, he tells us these were the statements made by Mr. Manson.

"And in connection with this period of time, when you went back to the Barker-Meyers Ranch area, you went of your own free will; is that correct?

"That's correct."

And so here, of all the places in the world that he can go, he goes back -- he goes back to the area of where this person is supposedly did what he tells us.

Now, he -- he was asked this:

"And you have stated to the best of your recollection you left for Los Angeles about August 31st, 1959 -- 169?

"A Yes.

"So Charles Manson would have been there around the 27th or 28th of August, is that correct?

So previously he told the Grand Jury, told the Grand Jury that Mr. Manson would have been in the Barker area around the 27th or 28th of August.

Why is that important? That's important because this pawn ticket, this pawn ticket, ladies and gentlemen, was redeemed on September 3rd, 1969.

27

28

It was redeemed. And the man has testified -the expert, Officer Campbell, testified that Mr. Shea signed -that these are all signatures of Mr. Shea's; and that
includes -- that includes this 57-C.

We are in -- in a -- in a situation where previously -- you see -- you see, Mr. Watkins is changing his tune, because he's now apprised of further details, as far as the evidence goes. And so he changes from August the 27th or the 28th, he changes it to a later time.

He makes it later, when he comes to this courtroom.

But when he was in the Grand Jury, he said the 27th or the 28th.

"I actually so testified.

"Q And did you testify at the Grand Jury?

"A. Yes."

(Pause in the proceedings.)

Now, remember the point that was made about September the 1st? That was the date that Mr. Watkins supposedly left? Well, at the Grand Jury, --

"Did you testify:

"'Q And you have stated to the best of your recollection you left for Los Angeles about August 31st, 1969?

"'A. Yes.'

"Did you so testify?

"A Yes, I so testified.

"Now, I'm being exact, when I say that I left there on the 1st."

1 2

23.

In other words, he's -- he's cleaning it up; he's cleaning up the testimony in order to make it fit something that he wants us to believe.

He says, "Now, I'm being exact." Now, would anybody, really, as you look back at the events that have occurred, back to 1969, September of '69, would anyone possibly remember that kind of detail?

Again, it's -- it's up to the jury to decide whether Mr. Watkins is telling us the truth or whether Mr. Watkins is telling us something that is other than the truth.

Now -- now, I think that -- I think that Mr. Watkins, in connection with a certain sequence, clearly shows that the man -- I hate to use the word, but I have to -- the man is a liar.

Now ---

(Pause in the proceedings.)

Now, you remember that -- I am sure that if -- I think that we will remember in this courtroom where Mr. Watkins -- Mr. Watkins tried to deceive us. It started out, and he was trying to break -- break something up into two conversations.

And I could sit up here -- stand up here and argue and make argument to you about what my interpretation of these words is, but no matter how much I pound on the table or how -- or how I talk about it, if you don't get precise with the actual evidence, maybe some of the effectiveness of it is bst.

And here is a case where the man so clearly tried ŀ to deceive us: "Now, you say, then -- who were the 3 people that were present at the time that this conversation took place, about where Mr. Retz 5 was the person that -- that was mentioned? "Myself, Charlie Manson, Bruce Davis, 7 Tex Watson and Paul Crockett. B. ¹⁵O. That's all that was present? ġ "A. As near as I recall. 10 u O I see. Yesterday, Mr. Watkins, did 11 you testify as follows? 12 So you came in, and 13 14 Mr. Manson was there. And then what happened?'" 15 16 And this is what he testified, which was 17 yesterday -- that is, before he -- the day -- the day before he's 18 now testifying. 19 Oh, there was -- they were already 20 in the midst of a conversation, and they conversed 21 for a while and talked on and on. 22 " Ta Who's "they"? 23 Oh, there was -- there was Brooks 24 Posten, Paul Crockett, Bruce Davis, Charlie 25 Manson, Tex Watson were all sitting around the 26 table.'" 27 That's what he testified to on the previous day. 28 "Did you so testify yesterday?

1	"A Sure did.
,	•
2	"Q. Today, you testified that Mr. Posten
3	was not present?
4	"A I am talking about a different time.
5	"Q Oh. This is a different time, now?
6	"A Perhaps ten minutes later than the
7	time I was speaking of there."
8	And that's and that's the heart of that kind
9.	of an answer is the heart of why these people cannot be
10	believed.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	•
26	
27	
28	

8a

You see, if you have -- if you bring two people to the witness stand, who both observe or hear the same thing, and you exclude witnesses, then you may not get -- you may not get what is consistent.

And this is why the prosecution has not brought to us a single instance, in connection with these so-called conversations or statements of Mr. Manson -- they have not brought to us two people who hear, supposedly, this thing at the same time.

They bring one person for one conversation and another person for another conversation, another person for another statement.

But never two people, as far as the same statement goes.

But here is Mr. -- here is Mr. Watkins playing prosecutor. Mr. Watkins is trying to deceive us, and he says:

"I am talking about a different time."
And so the question is asked:

"Oh. This is a different time, now?

"A Perhaps ten minutes later than the time
I was speaking of there.

"Q What was ten minutes later, Mr. Watkins?

The conversation that we are talking about, with Frank Retz.

"Q The conversation that you are talking about with Frank Retz occurred ten minutes later where?

Page 1986

8 a- 2	1	"A In	the very same place, at the Barker
	2	Ranch.	
	3 .	"Q WI	no was present?
	4	"A Bi	cuce Davis, Tex Watson, Charlie Manson,
à	5	Paul Crockett	and I and I'm not sure if Brooks
4	6 :	was there or m	not.
_	7	n a	don't recall him being there.
	8	"Q We	ell, Mr. Watkins, is there let me
	ò	withdraw that	
	10 ;		Nas Mr. Poston present or was Mr. Poston
	11	not present?	
	12	I A"	just gone done telling you: I don't
	13	recall him be	ing there.
	14	itQ Di	d Mr. Poston get up and leave, and then
	15	ten minutes la	iter there was another conversation, Mr.
	16	Watkins?	
94å Ner	17	"A F	om when to when? What are you talking
5	18	about?	
:	19	"Q Yo	ou have just told us, Mr. Watkins, about
:	20:	another conver	sation ten minutes later.
:	21	"A Ol	ay.
:	22	"Q WI	no was present at the conversation ten
:	23	minutes later?	
;	24	LA A"	1 right, I told you those people.
•	25	"Q We	11, who was present ten minutes earlier,
.	26	Mr. Watkins?	
:	27	"A Ti	ne same people, and I know Brooks was
:	28	there then. A	and those there was the two girls

		* ·
8a-3	1	"around, but I don't know which ones they were, because
	2	they were wandering around the back rooms.
	3	"Q Now, you know Brooks was present then, ten
	4	minutes earlier?
ō.	5	"A Yes.
á.	6	"Q And you know that Brooks was not present
	7	ten minutes later; right?
	8	"A I said: I'm not sure.
	9	"Q I see. And where was the first conversation
	10	the ten-minute earlier conversation? Where did that
	11	take place?
	12	"A Sitting around the table in the Barker
	13	ranch house.
	14	"And where did the second conversation
	15	take place, ten minutes later?
	16	"A The same place.
Ķ K	17	"Q And in between the ten minutes, in that
 &	18	period of time, what occurred?
	19	"A Talking.
	20	"In fact, Mr. Watkins, there was no two
	21	conversations, was there?
	22	"A Well, we are calling it two conversations,
	23	so that we can look at it. But actually, we just sat
Ą	24	around there and talked for an hour or so."
· ·	25	And there it is, ladies and gentlemen. There
\$	26	it is. The man tried to deceive us, tried to make it like
	27 ⁻	there were two conversations. Deliberately, intentionally,
	28	eo that he could clean it up the way he wanted us to believe

8a-4	1	that it happened.
	Ź	"Well, question"
	3	Well, let me just repeat it again.
	4	"Well, we are calling it two conversations,
a	5	so that we can look at it. But actually, we just sat
*	6	around there and talked for an hour or so.
	7	"Q And actually, there was just one conversa-
	8 .	tion?
	9	"A Well, we could cut that up into a thousand
	10	little parts, if you want to,
	11	"Q Right.
	12	"A and call it a thousand conversations,
	13	"Mr. Watkins, so, in fact, there were not
	14	two conversations, ten minutes apart; there was just
	15	one group of people sitting at the table, talking,
	16	"A That's correct.
₩	17	"Q is that right?
5	18	"A That's right.
	19	"Q So, in fact, that is untrue about there
	20	being two conversations" well, the Court sustained
8b fls.	21	that objection.
	22	
	23	
4	24	•
*	25	•
•	26	
	27	
•	28	

8b-1

11:

"Well, were there two conversations ten minutes apart?

"A. It was one conversation, in which we covered many subjects; and so I was -- and the Court was really calling it two, and I was just going along with it, because we were looking at different parts of it, two parts of the conversation.

"Oh, the Judge said there were two; is that it?

"A. Well, no. The -- This just seemed to be the way it went, that we were calling it -- talking about one part, and then talking about another part; and, in order to have reference points, we was calling it two.

"But you're right; it was just one flowing conversation."

So there you have a situation -- there you have a situation on the part of Mr. Watkins, who is deliberately trying to deceive us. I mean, there's no other explanation, no other way that that can be explained -- except for the fact that that's what he was doing.

Then, we come -- and again, this all -- this all has significance in connection with the doctrine of reasonable doubt, because nobody -- we can't -- that's why the doctrine is there, to -- to protect all of us, including Mr. Manson.

In fact, when we protect someone like Mr. Manson,

when we protect someone in his station in life, we are protecting our children; we are protecting us; we are protecting everybody; we are protecting our institutions.

If we find a man innocent when a man is not guilty, when the evidence shows he's innocent, we are doing -- we are doing a service, not only for the -- for the particular person, we are doing a service for every one of us.

We are doing a service, if we may say so, in fact, for the -- for the people that prosecute.

So that these kinds of things -- so that these kinds of actions do not constitute the sort of situation in which -- they have no place in a free society, the kinds of things that are being presented to us in this case.

For instance, going on further in connection with Mr. Watkins and his credibility, and his animosity towards Mr. Manson, Mr. Manson was arrested, and we -- I am sure we recall that -- that Mr. Manson was approached by Mr. Watkins with a lawyer in the County Jail.

"Mr. Watkins, was that your state of mind when you came to jail after Mr. Manson was arrested with a lawyer, trying to get Mr. Manson --"

Well, that was sustained.

"Do you remember when Mr. Manson was arrested?

"A. Yes.

"Q And he was in the Los Angeles County Jail?

"A. Yes.

"Q Did you come with a lawyer to see

"Mr. Manson and ask Mr. Manson to sign papers so 1 that you could participate, you and the lawyer 2 3 participate in making money from the publicity surrounding Mr. Manson? 4 "A. That was the lawyer's idea." 5 "That was the lawyer's idea." 6 7 Now, here, we have a witness on the witness stand. 8 Whoever that lawyer was didn't know Mr. Manson. Mr. Watkins 9 knew Mr. Manson, and he says it was the lawyer's idea. 10 11 O. That was the lawyer's idea? 11 лЪ. Yes. 12 u O You came with the lawyer to partici-13 pate in the publicity surrounding Mr. Manson; is 14 that correct? 15 17 A. That's correct. 16 ^ηQ. When was it that you visited Mr. Manson 17 in the County Jail with this lawyer? 18 "A. It seems like it was around December, 19 as near as I recall. It was in December. 20 "December of 1969? 21 "A. Yes. 22 "And you and the lawyer came to the County 23 Jail, and your state of mind was that you wanted 24 to participate in the making of money by virtue of 25 the publicity surrounding Mr. Manson; is that 26 correct? 27 ۳Ă. I was interested in putting out that 28 album.

"Q Pardon? 1 "A. I was interested in putting out an album, and Charlie told me that I could just go 3 ahead and do it. That I could do whatever I wanted I said, 'All right, that's just fine.' 5 "So I proceeded to do so. And it came to a 6 position where we needed a signature from Charlie 7 for me to participate and do so, and so we went 8 about to get the signature. 9 Did you talk -- " this just says: 10 "Did you talk to the County Jail? 11 "A. Yes. 12 13 "O. I'll repeat the question. "You came to the County Jail with this lawyer, 14 15 hoping -- your state of mind was that by virtue of 16 the proceedings in the County Jail with Mr. Manson, 17 to obtain his signature and make money off of the 18 publicity surrounding Mr. Manson; is that correct? 19 No. The idea was to make money from 20 an album which was going to get put out. 21 "And the album which was to be put out was 22 to have financial value because of the publicity surrounding Mr. Manson's name; that was your state 24 of mind? 25 Good thinking." 26 27 28

"Was it in your mind that you were coming to the County Jail with the lawyer and seeing Mr. Manson, have Mr. Manson sign papers, in order to make money out of the fact that Mr. Manson had publicity surrounding him?

"A. Yes.

"Q. What is the name of that lawyer?

"A. J. Freedman."

And so forth.

"Well, did you, Mr. Watkins -- were you disappointed, Mr. Watkins, by virtue of the fact that you did not make any money from this arrangement that you wanted to take place between yourself and Mr. Manson and Mr. Freedman?

"A. Was I disappointed?

"O. Yes.

"A Yes, I'd say so, yes.

"Q You were disappointed, and you were disappointed because you couldn't make any money off of that; right?

"A. Well, I was disappointed because -because Charlie lied to me. He said it was mine.
I could do anything I wanted to do with it. And then,
when it came right down to it, it wasn't mine. I
couldn't do anything.

"Q And the signature that you say you didn't have is the signature of Mr. Manson; is that right?

"That's right.

"Mr. Manson refused to sign the paper; 1 is that right? 2 "Refused to sign it over to Jay Freedman 3 or I, yes, that's right. 5 "He refused to sign it over to Jay Freedman 6 and you, and -- is that right? "Or I." 7 8 And so forth. 9 THE COURT: Well, regrettably, ladies and gentlemen, we 10 must conclude for the afternoon. 11 You are admonished that you are not to converse 12 amongst yourselves nor with anyone else, nor permit anyone to 13 converse with you on any subject connected with this matter, 14 nor form or express any opinion on the matter until it is finally submitted to you. 16 I'll see you tomorrow morning at 9:45. 17 9:45. I'll see you then. 18 Good night. 19 (Whereupon, murmurs of "Goodnight" were heard from 20 members of the jury.) 21 MR. MANZELLA: Good night, your Honor. 22 (Whereupon, at 4:01 p.m., an adjournment was 23 taken in this matter until 9:45 a.m., Tuesday, October 19, 1971.) 25 26 27

28