

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT NO. 130 HON. EDWARD A. HINZ, JR., JUDGE

--ooc--

9035

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

NO. A253156

LESLIE VAN HOUTEN,

Defendant.

REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT

Wednesday, June 1, 1977

Volume 35

Pages 4821 to 4900, incl.

APPEARANCES: (See Volume 1.)

EMANUEL J. SANZO, C.S.R. No. 1267
- and -
LOIS R. JOHNSON, C.S.R. No. 812
Official Reporters

COPY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

000000
ENABLE
000000
000000

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

10/10
UNRECOVERABLE
FIND
10/10/10

INDEX FOR VOLUME 35

PAGES 4821 to 4900

DAY	DATE		PAGE
Wednesday	June 2, 1977	A.M.	4821
		P.M.	4824

CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

PEOPLE'S WITNESSES	DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS	VOIR DIRE
HOCKMAN, Joel Simon	4825	4856
(Resured)	4857	

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 1977; 10:08 A.M.
2 DEPARTMENT NO. 130 HON. EDWARD A. HINZ, JR., JUDGE
3 APPEARANCES:

4 MAXWELL S. KEITH, counsel for the defendant
5 who is not present; STEPHEN R. KAY, Deputy
6 District Attorney of Los Angeles County,
7 representing the People of the State of
8 California; Emanuel J. Sanzo and Lois R.
9 Johnson, Official Reporters.

10
11 (The following proceedings were held in
12 open court out of the presence of the jury:)

13 MR. KAY: Your Honor, we have Dr. Roberts here.

14 It came to my attention during cross-examination
15 late yesterday afternoon that Dr. Roberts had what he termed
16 400 pages of typed notes about his interview with Miss Van
17 Houten.

18 I feel that I need to review those notes in order
19 to effectively cross-examine Dr. Roberts.

20 Dr. Roberts has been very cooperative about that.
21 He says, unfortunately, they are back in Madison, Wisconsin,
22 and nobody there has access to them.

23 So he's going to have to go back and get them.

24 When we had just talked to Your Honor we thought
25 that the doctor could be out here Monday afternoon. However,
26 he has told us in the hall that he's on the parole board back
27 in Wisconsin, and they are meeting on Tuesday --

28 Tuesday, is it, Doctor?

1 MR. KEITH: Tuesday.

2 DR. ROBERTS: Yes.

3 MR. KAY: And he would like to come out Tuesday, bring
4 the notes out Tuesday, and then resume cross-examination on
5 Wednesday.

6 And I certainly have no objection to that.

7 MR. KEITH: I have no objection to it.

8 I feel badly about not telling Dr. Roberts to bring
9 his 400 pages of typewritten tape recordings initially.

10 THE COURT: All right.

11 MR. KEITH: Under the circumstances, he is entitled to
12 examine the supporting information upon which Dr. Roberts
13 bases his ultimate conclusions. So --

14 THE COURT: All right; the witness is ordered to return,
15 then --

16 That will be on Wednesday, the 8th?

17 MR. KAY: Well, Tuesday he said he will bring the notes
18 to the court. So maybe if we could at least have him ordered
19 to return Tuesday afternoon with the notes --

20 MR. KEITH: Well, I will get the notes to you somehow.

21 MR. KAY: Okay.

22 MR. KEITH: But if he could be ordered to return to
23 court Wednesday morning.

24 THE COURT: All right; the court orders the witness
25 Dr. Roberts to return to court on June 8, Wednesday. That's
26 June 8, 1977, 10 a.m.

27 Counsel make arrangements on the notes.

28 MR. KEITH: All right.

A-3
1 And with respect to witnesses in the interim,
2 Dr. Hockman will be here today. He was ordered back on June
3 1st.

4 And on Monday and Tuesday, I should be able to
5 get Dr. Coburn here.

6 And if counsel finishes with Dr. Coburn, I will
7 put the defendant on the stand.

8 THE COURT: All right.

9 Well, you will have a witness in today at 1:30?

10 MR. KEITH: Yes, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: All right.

12 MR. KEITH: Hopefully.

13 THE COURT: Dr. Hockman.

14 MR. KEITH: God willing.

15 THE COURT: Yes.

16 All right; Dr. Hockman is to be here today.

17 This matter, then, will go over to 1:30, and we
18 will proceed at that time.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. KAY: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 MR. KEITH: Do we need the jury in to put it over until
22 this afternoon?

23 THE COURT: No; they have been admonished, and they will
24 just come back at 1:30.

25 MR. KAY: Okay. Thank you.

26 (At 10:10 a.m. a recess was taken
27 until 1:30 p.m. of the same day.)
28

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 1977, 1:55 P.M.

2 DEPARTMENT NO. 130

HON. EDWARD A. HINE, JR., JUDGE

3 APPEARANCES:

4 The defendant with her counsel, MAXWELL S. KEITH;
5 STEPHEN R. KAY, Deputy District Attorney of
6 Los Angeles County, representing the People of the
7 State of California; Emanuel J. Sanzo and
8 Lois R. Johnston, Official Reporters.

9
10 (The following proceedings were held in
11 open court in the presence of the jury:)

12 THE COURT: I was going to say good morning, ladies
13 and gentlemen, but it's afternoon.

14 (Laughter.)

15 THE COURT: People versus Van Houten.

16 Let the record show the defendant is present,
17 represented by counsel, the People are represented by counsel,
18 the jurors are in their assigned places.

2-1

1 Ladies and gentlemen, due to the necessity to
2 obtain some additional records, Dr. Roberts, who was on the
3 stand yesterday, will come back next week to finish his
4 testimony.

5 I believe Mr. Keith is prepared at this time to
6 call his next witness.

7 MR. KEITH: Yes.

8 THE COURT: All right, you may proceed.

9 MR. KEITH: Dr. Hockman, would you take the stand, please.

10
11 JOEL SIMON HOCKMAN,
12 called as a witness by the defendant, was sworn and testified
13 as follows:

14 THE CLERK: Would you raise your right hand, please, sir.

15 You do solemnly swear the testimony you may give
16 in the cause now pending before this court shall be the truth,
17 the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God.

18 THE WITNESS: I do.

19 THE CLERK: Just take the stand and be seated, please.

20 Would you pull the microphone over, please,
21 directly under your chin, up as close as you possibly can,
22 and would you give your name for the record, please.

23 THE WITNESS: Joel Simon Hockman, H-o-c-k-m-a-n.

24
25 DIRECT EXAMINATION

26 BY MR. KEITH:

27 Q Dr. Hockman, what is your profession?

28 A I'm a psychiatrist.

2-2

1 Q You are a medical doctor as well, I take it?
2 A Yes, I am.
3 Q You have to be a medical doctor before you can be
4 a psychiatrist, I --
5 A I was a real doctor first.
6 Q When were you born, Doctor?
7 A January 3rd, 1941.
8 Q And you presently reside in Santa Fe, New Mexico?
9 A Yes, I do, Mr. Keith.
10 Q And you practice psychiatry there?
11 A Yes, I do.
12 Q Tell us about your medical training, please.
13 First, where did you attend undergraduate school?
14 A I got my Bachelor's in philosophy at Rice University
15 and --
16 Go ahead.
17 Q That's in Texas?
18 A In Houston.
19 Then I went across the street to Baylor College of
20 Medicine, B-a-y-l-o-r, where I got my medical degree under the
21 aegis of Dr. Debakey, D-e-b-a-k-e-y.
22 Q When did you graduate --
23 A 19 --
24 Q -- from medical school?
25 A 1966.
26 Q And after graduating from medical school, I take it
27 you took an internship somewhere?
28 A Yes. I left the Gulf Coast forever. I came to

1 Los Angeles.

2 I interned at Cedars Sinai Medical Center, rotating
3 internship.

4 Then I left, after completing that, and I went
5 to the University of Colorado for my first year of psychiatric
6 residency.

7 Then I came back to UCLA where I completed an
8 additional two years in psychiatric residency.

9 Q When was that, Doctor? When did you complete that?

10 A That was in '67, '68, finishing that in '69.

11 Then I proceeded to do a research fellowship at
12 UCLA in '69 and '70.

13 Q What was the nature of the research fellowship?

14 A That was finishing up a four-year longitudinal
15 long-term study on the chronic effects of various kinds of
16 drug abuse with particular emphasis on the major and minor
17 hallucinogens, marijuana and the other hallucinogens.

18 Q Now, after completing --

19 When did you complete your fellowship at UCLA?

20 A That was actually in '70. I think '7- -- I think
21 it was in 1971, June of '71.

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
3 fl

3-1

1 Q And thereafter where did your practice take you?

2 A Well, in connection with research I was doing,
3 I was asked to take a position as a senior consultant to the
4 Department of Mental Health here in the County of Los Angeles,
5 as a senior consultant in drug abuse treatment in programs.

6 I conjointly handled those responsibilities for
7 two years, finishing that in '72, while I completed the
8 research at UCLA and began a private practice.

9 Q Did your private practice --

10 Or where was it located?

11 A I was in the Barrington Building in Santa Monica.

12 Q And some time after that did you go to New Mexico?

13 A Yes; in 1972 I was visiting New Mexico and made
14 the decision to leave Los Angeles.

15 And I left L.A. and went to Santa Fe, where I
16 became director -- what was the combined position, actually,
17 of director of mental health, director of mental retardation
18 program, director of drug abuse program, alcohol; all the
19 human services for the State of New Mexico.

20 I did that for a little over two years.

21 Q Now, let me ask you this:

22 Since that time have you been in private practice
23 in Santa Fe, New Mexico?

24 A I would say about 80 percent of my time has been
25 in private practice.

26 The other 20 percent has been forensic work,
27 consultations to agencies, some additional research.

28 Q Doctor, are you a member of any medical or

1 psychiatric organizations at the present time?

2 A I'm a member of the American Psychiatric, the
3 New Mexico Psychiatric, the Southern California Psychiatric.

4 These are the principal -- and the American
5 Medical.

6 Q And are you on the staff or connected with any
7 hospitals?

8 A Yes, I'm on the staff at two hospitals, Vista
9 Sandia, a private psychiatric hospital in Albuquerque, and the
10 Saint Vincent Psychiatric -- well, Saint Vincent Medical
11 staff, where we now have a psychiatric facility as well,
12 in Santa Fe.

13 Q Would you be kind enough to spell the first
14 hospital.

15 A Vista, V-i-s-t-a; Sandia, S-a-n-d-i-a,
16 That's one of Dr. Cohen's psychiatric hospitals,
17 Sidney Cohen.

18 Q Dr. Sidney Cohen is a psychiatrist, is he not?

19 A Yes.

20 Q He is also an expert in the drug field?

21 A He was one of Dr. Ditman's mentors at UCLA, as
22 well as mine.

23 Q Dr. Koekman, have you authored any publications
24 in the psychiatric field?

25 A Yes, I have one book published, three chapters
26 in other people's books.

27 Perhaps, oh, I think over 20 professional
28 publications in various journals. For starters.

1 Q And do your publications concern various phases
2 of psychiatry and drugs?

3 A I would say that my publications were mainly
4 around the area of symptomatic drug abuse, the dynamics of
5 that particular condition.

6 Q Are you also trained in the psychoanalytical
7 field at all?

8 A Yes; I have had approximately three years of
9 personal psychoanalytical training.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 And all the training I received at the various
2 facilities I have been in has been intensely analytically
3 oriented over the years.

4 Q And would you consider yourself a Freudian
5 psychoanalyst?

6 A No, I really wouldn't.

7 I would have to say I'm more pluralistic at this
8 point.

9 Too much has been taught and said since Freud
10 died to be purely Freudian any more.

11 I think one has to be rather eclectic from a
12 variety of sources.

13 Q "Eclectic" means drawing from many sources?

14 A Yes.

15 I have done special training in behavior
16 modification approaches. A lot of additional training in
17 family and conjoint treatment theories, family conciliations
18 theories, schizophrenia.

19 I would say I draw from a variety of sources in
20 how I approach --

21 Q When you speak of additional training, are you
22 referring to training subsequent to your residency?

23 Or do you include your residency plus the additional
24 training?

25 A No, subsequently. Subsequently.

26 In New Mexico we are required to continue our
27 education, gather our points, 150 points every three years to
28 retain our licenses.

1 So I go take courses and gather my points.

2 Q And have you also appeared and qualified as an
3 expert in forensic psychiatry in various courts?

4 A Yes. I have appeared before courts here in
5 California and Texas, New Mexico, principally.

6 I think I have -- I have been involved in about
7 50 capital cases at this point now.

8 Q By "capital cases," are you referring to cases
9 where the death penalty could be imposed?

10 A Murder, attempted murder.

11 Q Incidentally, Doctor, you testified in behalf
12 of Leslie at the death penalty phase of her first trial, did
13 you not?

14 A Yes, I did. In 1970 I believe that was.

15 Q That was '71.

16 A '71.

17 Q I won't forget that.

18 And did you examine Leslie personally at or about
19 the time you testified in her behalf then?

20 A Yes, I did.

21 I think I had over four hours of examination with
22 Leslie on two occasions.

23 Q And you examined her in connection with this
24 proceeding, did you not?

25 A Yes, I did. The week of February 21st, daily.

26 Q How many hours do you estimate, or do you have
27 an exact figure, that you examined her in connection with this
28 proceeding?

4833

EX-100

A Well, let's see. I haven't added up the hours.

I think it would amount to probably close to 20
hours altogether, I would say, at this time.

4-1
1 Q In addition to examining Leslie with respect to
2 this trial, were you supplied with certain materials to
3 consider?

4 A Yes.

5 I was given copies of transcripts, I believe 16
6 through 23, of this proceeding.

7 In addition, I was given some background materials
8 on certain legal points, malice aforethought, premeditation,
9 et cetera.

10 Q And did you have occasion to reexamine or reread
11 any of your testimony at the previous proceeding?

12 A I beg your pardon.

13 In addition, I got three volumes of the previous
14 proceeding covering my previous testimony.

15 I also got a copy of a cassette tape of an interview
16 between Leslie and her attorney. I believe that was dated '69,
17 September of '69.

18 Q Did you have occasion to listen to that tape?

19 A Several times.

20 Q Incidentally, Doctor, your tape does not have a
21 minute and 15 second gap, does it?

22 A No, I have the complete tape.

23 Q I will bring it. I don't have it with me, but I
24 will bring it tomorrow. We'll make up the minute and 15 seconds.

25 A All right.

26 Q Did by any chance you read Leslie's testimony at
27 the death penalty phase?

28 A Portions of it. I did not read the entire testimony.

4-2

1 Q All right.

2 And you also appeared as a witness in the trial of
3 The People versus Charles Watson, did you not?

4 A Yes, I did.

5 Q And that trial occurred in the summer and fall of
6 1971; is that correct?

7 A That's correct.

8 Q Does that square with your memory?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Now, who called you initially to appear in the
11 Watson matter?

12 A Well, I think it was the prosecution.

13 No, no, I take it back. I was called originally
14 by you for the defense in the Watson matter, and subsequently
15 I was called in the penalty phase by the prosecution, as I
16 recall it.

17 Q You appeared also --

18 You appeared in the insanity phase, did you not?

19 A The insanity phase, I beg your pardon.

20 Q And you appeared in behalf of the defense at that
21 time, did you not?

22 A I believe I did.

23 Q And you appeared in behalf of the prosecution in
24 another phase, did you not?

25 A Yes, I did.

26 Q Do you remember whether or not it was the guilt
27 phase, so-called, or the penalty phase?

28 A As I recall, it was the guilt phase.

1 Q On behalf of the prosecution?

2 A Prosecution, yes.

3 Q And then you appeared for the defense for
4 Mr. Watson on the issue of whether or not he was legally
5 insane at the time of the homicides; is that not correct?

6 A That's correct, Mr. Keith.

7 Q Now, Doctor, in connection with your interviews of
8 Miss Van Houten, in preparation for this proceeding, did you
9 take a complete history from her?

10 A Well, I would say it was a rather complete history.
11 Certain points that I felt we were both familiar with from
12 previously and from briefer discussion I didn't delve
13 elaborately into.

14 For instance, I did not extensively review her
15 childhood history, her school history.

16 I didn't go into elaborate investigations of the
17 factual matters related to this murder charge.

18 I mainly investigated how she was functioning
19 currently, what had happened to her in the seven years since
20 I had seen her.

21 We did a lot of discussing of how she perceived
22 Charles Manson, reviewed a lot of history about the Family,
23 went through some detailed history of the chronological
24 succession of events then.

25 So I would say that my focus was more on matters
26 relevant to this proceeding rather than extensive historical
27 material.

28 Q Now, Doctor, in connection with her experiences

4-4

1 with Manson, and in connection with the events of August 10th,
2 1969 -- that's the evening in which the LaBiancas were killed --
3 you discussed that with her, those subjects with her, I take
4 it?

5 A Yes, I did.

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

4-5
1 Q Now, did you discuss those same subjects with her
2 back in 1971 when you examined her?

3 A Yes, I did. I took extensive histories on both
4 occasions.

5 Q Now, did you find a substantial difference in
6 certain areas between what she told you now and what she told
7 you six, seven years ago?

8 A Well, I think, yes. The answer to the question is
9 yes.

10 And to elaborate, the differences seemed mainly
11 to revolve around the person of Mr. Manson; that in the
12 original evaluation Leslie omitted almost all -- well, she
13 omitted all reference to his presence or involvement, denied
14 his involvement, denied his presence on any of the occasions,
15 and essentially omitted all such material from her narration
16 of what happened.

17 Allowing for that, however, the descriptions were
18 fairly consistent then and now as to her actions specifically
19 at the events.

20 Q Did she tell you that, in 1970, for instance,
21 Manson was not in the automobile as it drove around leading
22 to eventually the LaBianca residence?

23 A Well, briefly stated, she reported to me, one,
24 that she was actively intoxicated with LSD; two, Charlie was
25 not in the car and had no knowledge of what they were doing;
26 three, that he found out about it when she told him, she
27 discussed with him later the next day.

28 Those were the main differences.

1 Q Did she tell you during your present interviews,
2 most recent interviews, that she was not under the acute
3 influence or intoxication of LSD?

4 A Yes. She made that quite clear, that that was not
5 true.

6 Q And did she also tell you, in substance, that
7 Manson very much was present?

8 A Yes.

9 We discussed it at some length, his involvement,
10 the events earlier that evening, his approaching her and the
11 others --

12 MR. KAY: Well, Your Honor, if it appears that the
13 psychiatrist is going to relate to things that Miss Van Houten
14 told him, I think Your Honor should instruct the jury.

15 MR. KEITH: I have no objection.

16 THE COURT: Yes.

17 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, as with the
18 other psychiatrists, the statements that the defendant made to
19 the psychiatrist that he now recites or will are offered as
20 a basis for his opinion and are not offered to prove the truth
21 of the matter stated in those statements.

22 All right, Mr. Keith.

23 MR. KEITH: Thank you.

24 Q Would you say it would be accurate to put it this
25 way: That during your first interviews with Miss Van Houten
26 in 1971 she denied that Manson participated in any homicides
27 in any fashion whatsoever?

28 A That's accurate, Mr. Keith, but she went beyond

4-7
4a
1 that with me.

2 Q Yes, I --

3 And did she also deny to you, in substance, that
4 Manson had any influence over her or anyone else, as far as
5 she knew?

6 A Both Leslie and the other girls adamantly denied
7 any influence on Mr. Manson's part or any responsibility on
8 his part for anything that she did.

9 They took that a further step and in almost the
10 same terminology declared, using almost the same terms, declared
11 to me that a person can only be responsible for themselves;
12 that no one could make them do anything other than themselves.

13 So that's the point that all three drove home with
14 me in my interviews with them.

15 Q When you say "the other girls," you are referring
16 to Susan Atkins?

17 A (Nods head up and down.) Patricia Krenwinkel.

18 Q And Susan Atkins and Patricia Krenwinkel were at
19 that time charged not only with the LaBianca homicides but the
20 so-called Tate homicides?

21 A Correct.

22 Q As a matter of fact, by the time you examined the
23 three girls, all three had been convicted of those killings?

24 A Yes.

25 Q With the exception of Leslie, who was not convicted
26 of any of the Tate homicides.

27 A Correct.

28

5-1

1 Q-- Did you back in 1971 maintain a certain
2 skepticism about what the three girls told you concerning
3 Manson's influence and concerning his participation in the
4 various homicides?

5 A In reviewing my testimony again this morning,
6 I find at least four places where I was fairly firm.

7 In fact, I was quite firm that I would not -- I
8 simply didn't buy that, were my exact words. I really did
9 not buy what they were saying about his influence.

10 That occurred after I had subsequent interviews
11 with them from that first day's appearance in --

12 Q You --

13 A Let me restate that.

14 I had interviewed Leslie, and subsequently I
15 interviewed the other two girls, when I came to that
16 conclusion that they were not telling me the truth, I didn't
17 buy their explanation.

18 Q What you are telling us is this, I believe:

19 You examined Leslie, and then you testified; is
20 that correct?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q And then you went -- returned to the Sybil Brand
23 Institute, the women's jail, and reexamined Leslie and
24 examined Susan Atkins and Patricia Krenwinkel.

25 A Correct.

26 Q And then you returned to court.

27 A And testified again.

28 Q And testified again.

5-2
1 And when you returned to court and testified
2 again your opinions, we might say, or diagnoses had been
3 altered in some effect, to some effect?

4 A Yes; I think my skepticism about the story arose
5 after my first interview of the other two girls and after
6 reinterviewing Leslie.

7 Q Now, with respect to this proceeding, you of
8 course heard of a number of occasions the tape that she made
9 with Marvin Part in December of 1969.

10 A Yes; I have listened to it several times.

11 Q And in hearing that tape many times, was it your
12 opinion that Leslie was telling the truth on that tape?

13 A I would say that my impression was that she was
14 telling the truth on that tape.

15 That the emotion expressed on that tape was
16 genuine and was reliable. Her explanations, her views, her
17 feelings were reliable.

18 Q Had you --

19 Did you hear the tape, Doctor, before you examined
20 her this year, in 1977?

21 A Yes, I did, about two weeks before my examination.

22 Q And I take it you have heard the tape perhaps
23 subsequent to your examination of her.

24 A Several times.

25 Q All right.

26 Now, was your personal examination of Leslie in
27 1977 supportive of what she said on the tape?

28 A Well, of course there are the contradictions that

1 we have been discussing.

2 On the tape she much more elaborately revealed
3 and explored with her attorney her motivations, her beliefs,
4 her values, her feelings about the Labianca murder.

5 And this was different from my original examination
6 with her.

7 Q I understand that. I may not have put the question
8 as nicely as I should have.

9 What I was referring to was your recent
10 examinations during this year; were they supportive or
11 consistent with the tape, generally, or inconsistent or
12 non-supportive of what she said on the tape?

13 A I misunderstood you; I'm sorry.

14 My subsequent examination in February, during that
15 week, of Leslie I think very much supported the tape.

16 And it went beyond supporting it to considerably --
17 she considerably elaborated on many of the points that were
18 only touched upon in the tape.

19 She would make a reference to some incident with
20 Charlie or something he said about Helter Skelter, and I
21 would -- in my interviews I would go further with her;

22 "When did he say that? How did you
23 respond to that? What did you think about that?"
24 trying to explore her responses.

25 So the tape was very much supported I think by
26 my interview material with her, and also I thought very much
27 supported by the interview I had with Paul Watkins and the
28 material I have reviewed in the transcripts.

1 Q Paul Watkins is the young man who was a witness
2 at this proceeding, the same Paul Watkins?

3 A Yes, the same Paul Watkins.

4 Q And you read his testimony, presumably, at this
5 proceeding, or some of it?

6 A Well, I read his testimony; but to remind you,
7 I did interview him for an hour --

1 Q Yes.

2 A -- at the jail as well, at Sybil Brand.

3 Q I'm aware of that.

4 And did you also read the testimony of Linda
5 Kasabian and Dianne Lake and Barbara Hoyt at this proceeding?

6 A Yes, I have.

7 Q And as a result of your previous experience in
8 this case and in the matter of Charles Watson, were you
9 familiar with the physical evidence, let's say, sometimes
10 called demonstrative evidence with respect to the Tate and
11 LaBianca cases, such as certain photographs, autopsy reports,
12 blood smears on walls, that kind of thing?

13 A Yes; I have examined the photographs and the other
14 materials that were provided at the first trial.

15 Q Doctor, as a result of your examination of
16 Leslie in February of this year, your listening to the tape,
17 your consideration of other materials that have been provided
18 to you in connection with this proceeding, in consideration
19 of your examination of Leslie in 1971 and also your
20 examinations of Mr. Watson --

21 I take it you did personally examine and interview
22 him --

23 A Yes, sir.

24 Q -- in 1971.

25 -- have you been able to form an opinion as to
26 whether or not in 1968 and '69, when Leslie was a member of
27 the Manson family, she suffered any mental illness?

28 A Well, I think from this vantage point -- and

1 hindsight is always much easier -- given the variety of
2 corroborating testimony about what she believed, given the
3 testimony to what extent they acted upon their beliefs, given
4 the bizarre and highly personalized interpretations of facts
5 and stimuli that other people were not responding to that
6 way, such as the white album of the Beatles, Revelations 9 --

7 Q Let me first ask you this:

8 Let me ask you if you have an opinion -- I will
9 ask you what your opinion is, and then we will go into the --

10 A I'm sorry.

11 Q -- reasons therefor.

12 A I was laying some foundations as to how I arrived
13 at my opinion.

14 But, yes, I have an opinion that she did suffer
15 some a very demonstrable and severe mental illness at the
16 time.

17 Q Now, would you describe that mental illness, what
18 your diagnosis is.

19 A Well, I think we can look at it two ways.

20 The diagnosis can be looked at on an individual
21 basis of what psychological state she was in,

22 And I will discuss that in a second.

23 And then we can look at it also in terms of
24 trying to establish some useful diagnosis for the entire
25 situation, the Family, a diagnosis, if you will, of the
26 Family's psychological situation.

27 The way I best understood it is to believe, in
28 retrospect, based on the evidence, that I think that Leslie

1 was suffering from what might be understood as a shared
2 psychosis; that she was participating in a psychological
3 event which was characterized by delusions, which were
4 fixed in very powerful, ideas of reference, which were very
5 believable, in fact impelling to them.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SEARCHED
SERIALIZED
INDEXED
FILED

1 A great deal of omnipotency and grandiosity,
2 believing that they were the chosen people to bring the
3 cleansing Helter Skelter to the world, as an example.

4 Certainly highly diminished judgment.

5 All of which together constituted, I believe, a
6 psychotic state in which her personal reality testing was
7 grossly diminished and impaired with.

8 So the individual diagnosis would probably be
9 a paranoid psychosis.

10 Q Would you tell us what a paranoid psychosis is,
11 medically and psychiatrically.

12 A Well, I depend on -- for definitions, I depend
13 upon the Diagnostic Manual of the American Psychiatric
14 Association, which is our official text in diagnoses.

15 And based upon that document, I would diagnose
16 her as psychotic, as they define it, which is characterized
17 by severe impairment of reality testing, judgment, appropriate
18 behavior.

19 The impairment of reality testing, as characterized
20 by the misreading of perceptions, again ideas of reference,
21 grandiosity.

22 It's also frequently characterized by highly
23 idiosyncratic peculiar beliefs or belief system.

24 Leslie suffered from all of these characteristics,
25 in my opinion, at the time.

26 In addition to which there was a strong favor of
27 paranoia, which is a suspiciousness, a belief that people
28 are after one or opposed to one or - - - - -

1 unsympathetic with one, which I think reveals a deeper level,
2 profound alienation from others, from society.
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

6-1
1 Hers was paranoid in character, her type of
2 psychosis.

3 Q Doctor, you mentioned another diagnosis.

4 The diagnosis you have just given us apparently
5 is on an individual basis?

6 A Yes.

7 Q You did mention a shared psychosis.

8 Would you elaborate on that, please.

9 A Well, to go back a bit, in 1971, after seeing
10 Mr. Watson and getting that additional information from him
11 about what had happened, I was very struck -- and testified
12 to this extent -- I was very struck by the similarity between
13 what had happened to them and a very old rather infrequently
14 diagnosed condition in psychiatry called a folie a deux,
15 f-o-l-i-e a d-e-u-x, literally a delusion of two people, a
16 folie.

17 And this condition, which I testified in '71, I
18 believe, that Watson and the others were suffering from, is
19 characterized by the presence of one psychotic person in the
20 midst of a group or family who, after a while, begin to
21 participate and share with that psychotic person and their
22 world view, their psychotic delusional system.

23 After sufficient involvement in that psychosis,
24 the other people begin to function -- psychotically as well.

25 It's a classically described psychiatric condition,
26 and I think it fits rather nicely, what happened here.

27 At the time, though, because there were more than
28 two people involved, I called it a folie a famille, a folie of

6-2
1 the entire family, as it were.

2 Q And you made that diagnosis as long as --

3 A '71 in the Watson trial.

4 Q -- six years ago?

5 And you entertain the same diagnosis now?

6 A I think I'm more convinced of it now than I was
7 six years ago.

8 Q What factors lead you to be more convinced now
9 of the illness that you described than you were six years ago?

10 A Well, I think that six years ago it was -- I was
11 bewildered, as were many others, to understand how something
12 as bizarre as that could happen to people who in so many ways
13 seemed rather average or within the spectrum of average.

14 So I wondered if I were reaching too far at that
15 time, because I did not understand how it might have happened.

16 Subsequently, however, with reviewing all the
17 material of all those involved, in testimony here and
18 interviews outside, at cetera, the evidence for how it was
19 done is rather explicit in my mind.

20 Q How do you --

21 A The theory --

22 Q Tell us how it was done, in your opinion.

23 A Well, I think it was a combination of three things,
24 essentially, from the largest perspective.

25 The three factors were the conditions of enforced
26 learning; very similar to what has been called brainwashing.

27 I think it was the influence of powerful and
28 frequent alteration of consciousness through the use of mind-

1 altering substances.

2 And I think the third factor was the factor of
3 the individual psychology of those individuals involved,
4 their own personal psychological needs.

5 I believe it was the extraordinary and most unusual
6 coming together of those three factors that helped at least me
7 to understand what happened there.

8 I could extend a bit in terms of, for instance,
9 the literature on forced learning.

10 Q Have you read certain literature on that subject?

11 A Yes, I've reviewed the current -- well, the medical
12 literature up to date on enforced learning and brainwashing,
13 enforced conditioning.

14 Q What are some of the -- if you can recall --

15 Could you describe to us, or at least characterize,
16 the literature you have read on that subject.

17 A Well, the literature tends to be older literature,
18 older scientific publications, coming out, interestingly
19 enough, about five or six years after the Korean conflict when
20 there was an intense interest in how so many servicemen had
21 signed false confessions and made statements and -- "turncoat"
22 was the big term.

23 MR. KAY: Well, Your Honor, I think I'm going to object
24 at this point unless some foundation can be laid for expertise
25 as to this witness on the subject matter rather than just
26 quoting materials that other people have written.

27 MR. KEITH: I didn't ask him to do that. I just asked
28 him to designate, Your Honor, what --

6a

6-4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE COURT: Well, he can do that then.

In response to the question, designate those materials which you have read on that subject matter.

THE WITNESS: Well, I've read, let's see, one, two, three, four --

I've read 27 papers on the subject of brainwashing and manipulation of human behavior, conditioning, the so-called DDD syndrome, debility, dependency, and dread syndrome, which became the accepted theory of how brainwashing was accomplished.

6-5

1 And these are in mainly professional journals,
2 Journal of Psychiatry, Comprehensive Textbook of Psychiatry,
3 Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, et cetera.

4 I have a list of the bibliographies, if you are
5 interested.

6 Q BY MR. KEITH: Did you consider that literatura
7 in reaching your opinion about how Manson accomplished what
8 he did accomplish with his Family?

9 A I strongly, I think, relied upon some of this
10 theorization in coming to my opinion about what happened.

11 Q Now, without expounding at length on your readings
12 on the subject of thought control or brainwashing, as it
13 sometimes called, could you tell us, Doctor, how, in your
14 opinion, Manson was able to do what he did with these people?

15 MR. KAY: Well, excuse me, Your Honor.

16 I wonder if I could take the witness on voir dire
17 as to his expertise in this field?

18 THE COURT: Do you have anything further that you'd like
19 to inquire of first, Mr. Keith?

20 MR. KEITH: Well, I could -- no.

21 I can ask him, though, I do believe, what factors
22 led to the doctor's opinion, which is really all I'm doing --

23 THE COURT: Well, I'll permit Mr. Kay --

24 MR. KEITH: -- that the Family suffered from a shared
25 psychosis. That's all I'm reaching for.

26 THE COURT: Well, will counsel approach the bench, and
27 may we have the court reporter.
28

(The following proceedings were held
at the bench:)

THE COURT: All right.

Is he going to go into brainwashing as the theory
of what happened here? And, if so, has he been qualified as
an expert?

Those are the two things the court has in mind.

MR. KEITH: He's a psychiatrist. He can draw from any
number of sources in reaching his conclusion.

He's never said she was brainwashed anyway.

MR. KAY: I asked him before the proceeding if he'd ever
testified on brainwashing in a court of law before, and he
said he had not.

MR. KEITH: That doesn't mean that he's unqualified.

THE COURT: Well, the issue that we now have is whether
or not I should allow Mr. Kay to inquire into his qualifications.

I'm inclined to do that.

I wanted to give you an opportunity, however, if
you wanted to ask anything further concerning his qualifi-
cations, before I allow Mr. Kay to go on.

MR. KEITH: Go ahead. Let Mr. Kay inquire.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KEITH: I don't care.

THE COURT: Okay.

(The following proceedings were held in
open court in the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Kay, you may inquire on voir
dire.

1 MR. KAY: Thank you.

3 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

4 BY MR. KAY:

5 Q Dr. Hockman, have you ever testified in a court
6 of law before on the subject matter of brainwashing?

7 A As I discussed with you, Mr. Kay, I'm only aware
8 of one such case. It was the Hearst case. And I would not
9 participate in that case.

10 Q So your answer is no, that you have not?

11 A No.

12 Q All right.

13 Have you made any interviews of soldiers, shall
14 we say, that have been prisoners of war in foreign countries,
15 to find out different methods that have been used on them
16 as far as brainwashing is concerned?

17 A No, I have not had any direct experience with
18 investigating with someone who has experienced brainwashing,
19 what happened to them.

20 Q All right.

21 Have you traveled to any foreign countries and
22 made any studies of brainwashing techniques in foreign
23 countries such as Chinese thought control, for example?

24 A Well, I have not done any traveling to any of
25 those areas, no.

26 Q I take it basically all you have done in the
27 area of brainwashing is to read literature in the field and
28 maybe attend a seminar or two?

1 A In fact, I have not attended a seminar.

2 I have reviewed the literature to acquaint myself
3 with current theory and past theory in this phenomenon.

4 MR. KAY: I don't have any further questions.

5 THE COURT: You may proceed, Mr. Keith.

6
7 DIRECT EXAMINATION (Resumed)

8 BY MR. KEITH:

9 Q Doctor, you have told us that in your opinion
10 your medical diagnosis is that Leslie suffered from a disease
11 that you described as folie a famile in addition to suffering
12 from a form of psychosis, right?

13 Now, I take it in reaching that diagnosis you
14 used certain materials to assist you.

15 A Correct.

7-1
1 Q You used the insight, if I can call it that, that
2 you gained during Charles "Tex" Watson's trial.

3 Would that be correct?

4 A Correct.

5 Q And you have also used the insight, if we can call
6 it that, that you acquired during Leslie Van Houten's first
7 trial.

8 And to be more specific, the penalty phase
9 thereof, where you appeared as a witness in her behalf.

10 Right?

11 A Right.

12 Q And you have also employed to assist you all the
13 training that you have received in the past many years in the
14 field of medicine and psychiatry.

15 A Correct.

16 Q And all the literature you have read in the
17 scientific journals on a variety of subjects, not just thought
18 control or coercive persuasion, or whatever else brainwashing
19 is called.

20 A Correct.

21 Q And you also considered, presumably, the tape
22 that we have discussed earlier in your testimony, Leslie's
23 tape, and the extensive interviews that you have had undertaken
24 with her and your interviews with Paul Watkins at the Sybil
25 Brand Institute.

26 And, in substance, you have drawn from many,
27 many, a variety of sources in reaching the opinion, the
28 medical opinion that you have.

1 Would that be a fair statement?

2 A That would be accurate.

3 Q And one of the sources you have drawn upon is
4 comparing Charlie Manson and his family and their acts and
5 conduct and belief with literature that you have read, the
6 27 or so articles that you have read on the subject of
7 attitudinal changes, I believe you put it.

8 A Enforced learning.

9 Q Enforced learning.

10 And this is just one of the many, many tools
11 you use to arrive at what you believe is a valid medical
12 opinion.

13 A Yes.

14 Q All right.

15 Now, could you tell us, please, how you arrived
16 at that opinion, what factors concerned you, what reasons do
17 you have for your opinion that Leslie suffered from a
18 paranoid type psychosis -- and correct me because my
19 terminology wanders sometimes -- and the entire group
20 suffering from a folie a famille condition?

21 A Well, the specific relationship between enforced
22 learning and my conclusions I think came after I had completed
23 my interviews here in Los Angeles.

24 And I went back and started reviewing the literature
25 again.

26 And the thing that began to strike me was the
27 striking parallel between some of the principles of enforced
28 learning, as discussed in the literature, and the information

7-3
1 reported by members of the Family.

2 The factors in enforced learning were present --

3 Q Well --

4 A -- In my opinion, in the Family.

5 Q Well, now --

6 MR. KAY: Excuse me, Your Honor; I'm going to object,

7 I don't think this witness has shown any expertise
8 in the field. And to just read from material written by
9 other people I don't think is proper.

10 MR. KEITH: He's giving his reasons as to why he thinks
11 she was suffering from a mental illness.

12 THE COURT: Well --

13 MR. KEITH: That's all we are doing.

14 THE COURT: Let me in response rule as follows:

15 The doctor of course is entitled to give his
16 reasons for his opinion, but his statement should be confined
17 to those reasons.

18 And the question before the doctor relates to her
19 mental illness.

20 MR. KEITH: All right, but --

21 THE COURT: And it seems to the court that he was
22 straying somewhat from that subject matter.

23 MR. KEITH: I will put it to him this way, then, if I
24 may.

25 Q Doctor, you diagnosed Leslie before you read
26 anything about enforced learning, I presume. Or at least --

27 A Yes. As I stated, I testified that I thought
28 this condition had occurred six years ago.

1 And subsequently I have tried to do some
2 additional informing of myself so that I might theoretically
3 understand how Leslie became insane.

4 Q All right.

5 Now I want to ask you this: Did your reading on
6 the subject of enforced learning buttress the opinion that
7 you have always held, or in some way detract from it?

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 MR. KAY: Well, I will object, That calls for a
2 conclusion.

3 THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

4 THE WITNESS: I would say in my mind my speculation of
5 six years ago has been strongly supported by additional
6 information, as well as this review of literature.

7 Q BY MR. KEITH: Now, without going into the sum
8 and substance of the articles and the literature you have read
9 and considered on enforced learning, would you advise us,
10 Doctor Hookman, the basis and reasons for your opinion in
11 support of your diagnosis of Leslie's mental illness.

12 All the reasons, all the factors that entered
13 into that diagnosis.

14 A Well --

15 Q Including, if you will, any literature that you
16 have read. There is nothing wrong with that; that's how you
17 learn.

18 A We have two issues here in my mind:

19 One is the issue of what data did I personally
20 see or cull from the information available to me which
21 supports the diagnosis of paranoid psychosis. That's one kind
22 of question.

23 Another kind of question is the question of how
24 did that psychosis happen.

25 Q All right.

26 A Now, the information on how I arrived at that
27 descriptive diagnosis I mentioned earlier, beliefs in things
28 that would not be believed in, or beliefs that would not

1 be shared by the general population, peculiar, idiosyncratic,
2 bizarre beliefs, such as the bottomless pit, Helter Skelter,
3 becoming immortal, being perfect, death having no meaning,
4 right is wrong, the absence of identity is identity.

5 We could go on and on into a variety of beliefs
6 and values and thoughts that were shared by this group of
7 people which were I think by any ordinary test simply beyond
8 the pale of reason.

9 Further than that, the presence of beliefs that
10 were so -- despite the fact that they were so peculiar and
11 inappropriate, bizarre, belief in these things to the extent
12 that the power of that belief in their own minds outweighed
13 their rational judgment, their prudent control over their own
14 behavior, their awareness of the impact of their actions on
15 themselves and others.

16 That all this, in my mind, is extremely strong
17 evidence for the presence of psychosis and meets the criteria
18 in the Diagnostic Manual of the American Psychiatric Association,
19 which is a worldwide adopted document.

20 The presence of compulsion, of the compelling
21 powerful nature of their beliefs, in impelling them to do
22 things which were not socially acceptable, or would even be
23 seen as insane by others in an ordinary circumstance.

24 This, too, buttresses my diagnosis of a paranoid
25 psychosis.

26 Specifically digressing, the paranoid aspect of it,
27 again the presence of feelings and beliefs, of profound
28 alienation and suspicion of others. This would be typical

1 of a paranoid viewpoint.

2 I could go on. I have made a list of examples of
3 the idiosyncratic beliefs, the shared delusions, the bizarre
4 values, and have even correlated that amongst the individuals
5 where they said these things independently in testimony, the
6 followed beliefs and attitudes.

7 Q Let me ask you this:

8 Your diagnosis of folie a famille, is that
9 diagnosis based on the same facts and circumstances and for
10 which you base the diagnosis of paranoid psychosis individually
11 in Leslie, or are there differences you could share with us?

12 A Remember now that that diagnosis is a diagnosis
13 that we could give to a psychological event involving more
14 than one person.

15 Two people --

16 Q Yes.

17 A -- classically, or more. Usually a family.

18 So my description of that folie a famille is
19 another step beyond the individual diagnosis of the individual
20 participant.

21 Q Now, Doctor, do you have an opinion, as a result
22 of all the information available to you, together with your
23 training and reading and learning and experience, both as a
24 clinician and as a research Fellow, as to whether or not
25 Leslie Van Houten had the capacity to premeditate and
26 deliberate?

27 And by that I mean maturely and meaningfully
28 reflect upon the gravity of her contemplated act and the

1 gravity of the consequences thereof.

2 I'm referring to the participation in the
3 killings of Mr. and Mrs. LaBianca.

4 Do you have an opinion of whether she had that
5 capacity to premeditate and deliberate a homicide?

6 A I have an opinion, which I would like to qualify.

7 Q All right.

8 A I'm not expert in the law, and certainly not in
9 California law, since I left five years ago.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

8-1

1 My opinion is based upon my understanding of what
2 "premeditate" means in California, and that would vary from
3 state to state depending on their rule on insanity.

4 Q Did I provide you with a definition --

5 A Yes, you did.

6 Q -- of "premeditate" and "deliberate"?

7 MR. KAY: Well, Your Honor, I'm going to -- the witness --
8 I'm going to object.

9 The witness keeps saying "insanity."

10 We are not involved with the issue of insanity
11 here. There has been no plea of guilty by --

12 THE COURT: Well, the jury should be admonished that
13 this case does not involve the issue of insanity.

14 Q BY MR. KEITH: No, you don't have to read it.
15 My --

16 A Well, I was going to elaborate on what I meant by
17 that.

18 Q All right.

19 A I was provided with some material, legal material,
20 as to what premeditation -- what the relationship is between
21 diminished capacity and the ability to premeditate, deliberate,
22 harbor malice, or intend to kill.

23 Q Right.

24 A And it states --

25 Q I'm interested at the threshold in whether you had
26 an opinion or not as to her capacity to premeditate and
27 deliberate a killing as that term is defined under California
28 law.

8-2

1 A I believe beyond any reasonable doubt that
2 Miss Van Houten did not have the capacity to maturely and
3 meaningfully premeditate, deliberate, and reflect upon the
4 gravity of her acts.

5 Q All right.

6 Now, let me ask you this, Doctor:

7 Do you have an opinion as to whether Miss Van
8 Houten, Leslie, had the capacity or ability at the time of
9 the LaBianca homicides to be aware of her obligation, of her
10 obligation of her duty, to act in accordance with the laws
11 of our society?

12 A To be very candid with you, I have an immense
13 amount of difficulty with understanding what is meant by
14 "aware" there.

15 Q To appreciate.

16 A I -- Even that doesn't help me, okay?

17 If I may elaborate: To be aware can be many
18 things in my mind.

19 For her to be aware that it was wrong, that it is
20 not a good thing to kill someone or to even think you are
21 killing someone, to be aware of that can be meaningless, for
22 instance, if that awareness is only a very small voice in the
23 midst of a riot of voices in one's head dictating other kinds
24 of things, espousing other directions.

25 For example, in a case I worked on last week, a
26 man shot his aunt four times, did not kill her, believed she
27 was a witch.

28 He was aware that the police were going to arrest

1 him; he stood there and waited.

2 He was aware that he better not make any sudden
3 moves.

4 But he believed to the depth of his soul that this
5 woman was a witch, had driven his mother crazy for eight years
6 in a mental hospital, driven him crazy, had done a variety
7 of other things which he frankly had made up or deluded himself
8 with.

9 So there was inside of him some aspect of him
10 which was aware that that was wrong, but it was overwhelmed
11 by other psychological forces present in his mind.

12 So I would have to say yes, he was aware; but he
13 was unaware. His awareness was, in essence, ineffectual.

14 Q How do you describe Leslie's situation?

15 A I see it very similarly.

16 I think that some part of Leslie was aware.

17 To be honest with you, I've never seen any insane
18 person who did not have some aspect of him, if you looked hard
19 enough --

20 Q Don't use the word "insane" --

21 A Okay.

22 Q -- if you will, because we are not discussing that
23 precise issue.

24 A I have never seen a person suffering from
25 diminished capacity who did not have some aspect of them which
26 was able to be reached to reason with them, to be aware with
27 them.

28 That's how we do therapy. We get in touch with

8-4

1 that aspect and lead it out of the morass of all the rest.

2 So there was some part of Leslie, I believe, that
3 did understand, was aware, but I think it was a very small
4 force or factor within her psychology.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

8-5

1 Q Do you find an overriding factor that overshadowed
2 or overrode what small awareness she may have had that it
3 was wrong?

4 A I think that her actions were driven, were impelled,
5 psychologically speaking, and that her awareness was grossly
6 ineffectual to resist that at that point.

7 Q And you started to tell us when we somewhat
8 changed the subject, Doctor, about how, in your opinion,
9 Manson accomplished, using your words, the driving forces
10 compelling Leslie to participate in these homicides to the
11 subjugation of all her other instincts.

12 Perhaps you can elaborate for us on that.

13 A Well, I will attempt it with the footnote here
14 that in reviewing my previous testimony I was not terribly
15 satisfied with what I felt my ability was to communicate to
16 other persons some rather complicated concepts.

17 I'm very aware that that is risk here, a mis-
18 communication, so I'm going to try to make my points clear.

19 There exists within all of us certain emotional
20 forces of which we are generally unaware. These forces are
21 immensely powerful. They sometimes act beyond our conscious
22 control.

23 Any of us who fail to lose weight on a diet know
24 all about that.

25 It seems to me that Mr. Manson had some kind of
26 an unusual ability to intuit the feelings or the concerns of
27 other people, to recognize the emotional forces inside of them,
28 and to manipulate those emotional forces toward his own

8-6
1 purposes and ends.

2 The process by which he manipulated those forces,
3 I believe, is very similar to enforced learning, theoretically
4 speaking.

5 The use of isolation of the people who would be
6 influenced from alternative influences, the use of repetitive
7 enforcement of points of view.

8 For example, it is acknowledged or generally
9 thought, generally acknowledged, that the ability of an
10 individual to resist conditioning or enforced learning,
11 subjugated learning, is largely related to the ability of the
12 individual to maintain a secret kind of an internal private
13 sense of psychological distance from the people who are trying
14 to condition or brainwash them.

15 MR. KAY: Well, again, Your Honor, I hate to interrupt,
16 but I don't think that the witness has established any expertise
17 in this area, and I would object to the testimony in this
18 area.

19 THE COURT: Objection is overruled.

20 MR. KEITH: Go ahead, Doctor.

21 THE WITNESS: Given that this was the major factor that
22 discriminated those who won't be indoctrinated from those who
23 can be indoctrinated, this private sense of self, internal,
24 different from the captor, Mr. Manson then proceeded, as far
25 as I can understand it, to utilize two major forces to break
26 through that private identity. One was drugs -- three forces,
27 now I think about it --

28 He used -- there were no private places around,

8-7
1 psychologically speaking, as far as I can see it, around
2 Charlie.

3 There was no place that one could be alone in
4 one's own head to be different or to hold views which were
5 different from Charlie.

6 Because if you were attempting to be private, then
7 you might have some LSD dumped inside your brain, which is
8 quite excellent at removing all these ordinary barriers to
9 perception or thought or stimulation.

8-8

1 I think that the -- from what I can see --
2 extremely regular use of marijuana, which is in itself an
3 hallucinogen, it is accepted as such, a mild one, augmented
4 that mind invasion, if you will.

5 So I think that that was one major factor, the
6 use of hallucinogens to break down psychological defenses and
7 to invade private psychological areas.

8 The second force that struck me was the use of
9 group dynamics or group pressures.

10 We all know very intimately the power that group
11 suggestion can have upon us. I think that's beyond any real
12 argument.

13 You had here, as far as I could see, a variety
14 of people who were in the bottom of the pit. As far as I was
15 concerned, they weren't looking for it, they were in it,

16 And in the midst of life for them, that was
17 characterized by disillusionment, alienation, disaffection
18 from family and their social ties, adrift in that area through
19 the Haight-Ashbury and the misery of all that, the exploitation,
20 et cetera, I think that they were absolutely vulnerable for
21 the emotional motivations of trying to establish an identity
22 within a group.

23 They were seeking to replace families that they
24 had lost but not matured beyond.

25 They weren't competent individuals mature in that
26 sense. They were looking for something to tie into, to
27 believe in, and were literally, as far as I can tell,
28 physically dependent, as well as emotionally dependent, upon

1 membership in the Family. Food, clothing, shelter, protection,
2 et cetera.

3 That's the third D, dependency, the three-D
4 syndrome.

5 So I think that Mr. Manson unquestionably used
6 group process techniques to influence the beliefs and the
7 behaviors of those who followed him.

8 Now, I think that there was a third factor.

9 Of course, I could go into examples of the group
10 dynamics process, could parallel them to the literature here
11 on enforced learning.

12 Dance, group dance, group activities, pairing,
13 group sexuality. All these were techniques which were
14 magnificently, if you think about it strictly theoretically,
15 without any moral aspect, wonderful, the effective means of
16 conditioning values and behaviors.

17 Now, the third factor, I believe, was disinhibition.
18 That he had a variety of ways of removing people's inhibitions
19 against various behaviors, and that when you remove the
20 inhibition against a behavior, and that behavior is committed,
21 then that begins to alter the value in one's head that is
22 attached, psychologically speaking, to the behavior.

23 Best example, of course, is in violence. That as
24 one becomes acquainted with violence, the repetition of it,
25 one's values and attitudes toward it change.

26 And I've interviewed many soldiers from the Vietnam
27 conflict who independently tell this over and over again,
28 that after a certain number of exposures their attitudes

changed.

I remember one fellow told me he was horrified the first time he blew the head off of a five year old girl.

But the fifth time that that happened -- particularly the second time one of those small children had come into camp with a hand grenade wired to them -- his attitude changed about doing that.

In fact, to not digress too far, I was seeing him because he had outbursts of impulses of violence and rage, homicidal inclinations and urges.

So it appears to me that Manson used this disinhibition. He used a variety of types of disinhibition.

One, he used sexual disinhibition. That by behaving sexually in ways in which transgressed behaviors -- those transgressed values were altered, as in my example of the soldier.

He used, as far as I can tell, certain variance of hypnotic effect, augmented by drugs.

I remember Mr. Watkins was telling me about a typical kind of pattern was that there would be a family gathering. Perhaps the ingestion of LSD.

There would be a new girl, toward whom Charlie would pay a great deal of attention at first, and then Watkins described a typical scene:

The girl would be in the arms of Watkins -- of Manson, and very intoxicated, at the height of the LSD experience, and he would begin to ask her about her attitudes, about, well, the quote he gave was killing.

"Do you believe that killing is wrong,"

1 he would ask her.

2 And you have to understand you have a young girl,
3 14, 15 years old, who has blown her mind before she was even
4 sure what it was, very confused, overwhelmed with input
5 in her brain.

6 Well, she didn't know -- Her dad told her that.

7 "Well, isn't your dad the fellow who told you
8 this, that or the other?" some piece of value that the girl
9 no longer believed in, that everyone was kind, for instance.

10 "Didn't your daddy also tell you that people are
11 good, that everyone is good?"

12 "Well, yes."

13 "Is that true?"

14 "No, it's not true; everyone isn't good; I know
15 that. I lived in Haight-Ashbury, and got raped three times
16 the first time I was there."

17 "Well, then, I guess you can't believe your
18 daddy, can you?"

19 And that kind of conversation would go on, as
20 Watkins described it, the undoing of the parents.

21 He had a variety of techniques for forgetting of
22 the origin of their beliefs, and then kind of undoing them
23 subtly.

24 Then he would do things, as described by Watkins,
25 at the end of a session exchange. He would say, "Now you
26 know how deep I am inside your mind? No one else can ever
27 be able to get there but me. You will never let anyone else
28 get there."

1 And that, in my mind, constituted a rather
2 obvious example of a posthypnotic suggestion, a suggestion
3 placed there in an altered state of consciousness.

4 I think that was another disinhibiting technique
5 that he used.

6 And then the other disinhibiting technique I
7 think was again going back to ^{peer} pure pressure.

8 If there are 100 people -- Well, there is
9 extensive research literature on this.

10 If you rig an experiment where there are three
11 volunteers in a room and two of them are "plants" and two
12 of them deny seeing a stimulus that the other one does see
13 because it's there, very quickly you can get that person who
14 does see it to begin to start wondering if they did see it or
15 perhaps they didn't.

16 So I think that was a tremendously powerful
17 influence in the Family, the belief of the Family and what
18 should be believed or what should be accepted.

19 Now, the last, I guess fourth factor that I think
20 he did to change their beliefs so profoundly was, I believe
21 that he had -- perhaps now even -- has an incredible ability
22 to intuit, as I said earlier, what's going on in the minds
23 of the people around him.

24 That's understandable because I think that
25 Mr. Manson has long -- for a long while been a paranoid
26 psychotic, perhaps a long while before this ever happened.

27 The typical paranoid psychotic has this ability
28 to be extremely sensitive, extraordinarily intuitive about what's

1 going on in other people.

2 Most analysts are very well versed in treating
3 psychotics. And it's uncanny sometimes. They can almost
4 read your mind, what you are thinking.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 I think he had this ability. I think that ability
2 was probably highly trained in his many years of experience
3 in very hostile environments.

4 I think he was able to use that to get into the
5 minds of those around him.

6 Of course it seems -- to me it seems a little
7 naive. You know, I read somewhere -- I think it was Linda --
8 no, Dianne.

9 The first time he met her he said, "Well, you have
10 got a father hangup, don't you?" That really astounded her.
11 "How did he know?"

12 Well, the fact of the matter is there are very
13 few ladies in the world who don't. But to Dianne I think
14 that was a very powerful --

15 Q It was Linda, I believe.

16 A Pardon?

17 Q It was Linda.

18 A It was Linda? That's right, it was Linda.

19 THE COURT: Would this be an appropriate time to take
20 the recess?

21 MR. KEITH: Yes.

22 THE COURT: All right.

23 Ladies and gentlemen, at this time we will recess
24 in this matter for 10 minutes, until 3:30.

25 Hear in mind during this recess you are not to
26 discuss this case amongst yourselves or with anyone else and
27 you are not to form any opinion concerning this matter or
28 express any opinion concerning this matter until the case is

1 finally given to you.

2 Furthermore, you must not allow yourselves to read,
3 see or hear any news media accounts of this matter.

4 All right. The Court will be in recess until
5 3:30.

6 The defendant, counsel, the witness and jurors
7 are ordered to return at that time.

8 (Recess.)

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ORIGINAL
FILED
FEB 1 1967

10-1

1 THE COURT: In People versus Van Houten, let the record
2 show the defendant is present and represented by counsel, the
3 People are represented by counsel, the jurors are in their
4 assigned places.

5 You may proceed, Mr. Keith.

6 MR. KEITH: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 Q Doctor, in developing your diagnosis that you have
8 already indicated to us, did you consider the Family's belief
9 that Manson was some kind of a deity, Jesus Christ, to be more
10 specific?

11 A Yes.

12 I reviewed references to that idea in the testimony
13 of others whom I mentioned earlier.

14 Q Did you also consider the role, if any, the
15 Beatles played as prophets of Halter Skelter and the black-
16 white revolution?

17 A Yes.

18 I similarly reviewed the references to that idea
19 throughout the testimony.

20 Q And did you consider the Beatles significant as a
21 factor in Leslie's mental state, let's say, at the time when
22 the Labiancas --

23 A I viewed that as another -- as a piece of the
24 delusional system in which she participated, that that was
25 only one part of the entire delusion that she shared.

26 Q And did you consider the Family's belief, fostered
27 by Manson, that he was Jesus Christ as part of that delusional
28 system?

10-2

1 A Well, yes.

2 I think that their acceptance of him was
3 unquestionably delusional and could be understood, as I've
4 mentioned earlier, in terms of how, overall, they acquired
5 certain beliefs or values in belonging to the Family.

6 Q Did you ever reach a determination in your mind
7 as to whether Manson himself believed that he was the savior
8 of the world, bearing in mind that he, with the Family, and
9 other chosen people, were going to go to the bottomless pit
10 and then emerge with Manson as the spiritual leader of the
11 remnants of society, namely, the blacks that did survive?

12 A Well, I think that there is no question that he
13 espoused these beliefs; that he espoused them in such ways
14 that they were believable or accepted by those around him.

15 Now, as to whether he himself believed it then
16 and believes it now, or whether this was manipulative on his
17 part, I have no direct evidence to base a conclusion.

18 Q You haven't had the opportunity to read the
19 testimony of Gregg Jakobson, who appeared as a witness in this
20 trial last week?

21 A No, I haven't.

22 Q Now, you told us that the use of hallucinogenic
23 drugs was an important factor, I believe, in changing the
24 attitudes and beliefs and imparting the delusional system --

25 A Yes.

26 Q -- on members of the Manson family.

27 Have you undertaken research in the field of
28 hallucinogenic drugs?

1 I really shouldn't ask you that, because I believe
2 heretofore you have done extensive research in that field.

3 A Yes.

4 Over a course of four years at UCLA, we had
5 assimilated immense amount of information about chronic drug
6 users, and we collected well over 200 individuals who had many
7 years' worth of experience personally in the use of hallucinogens
8 of various sorts.

11-1

1 Q How, outside your experience as a researcher at
2 UCLA, have you also had clinical experience? In other words,
3 patients that have suffered from drug abuse?

4 A Well, there was a period at UCLA when almost
5 every patient referred to me was a patient whose mental
6 illness had been precipitated by the use of a hallucinogen.

7 So for a period there I had almost exclusively
8 a drug-related private practice.

9 Q Generally, Doctor, in people you have seen, is
10 the continued use, let's say over a period of years, of
11 hallucinogenic drugs, primarily LSD, capable of producing
12 a change in attitude, a change in beliefs?

13 Not in and of itself, necessarily, but being an
14 agent in producing such a change in attitudes. Provided the
15 belief system is offered the user.

16 A I --

17 Q Or is this particular situation unique?

18 A Well, this situation I think represented an
19 extreme form of something that perhaps was happening rather
20 commonly at that time:

21 The thrust toward communal living, departure from
22 traditional values in home arrangements.

23 I have discussed this extensively with my
24 colleagues, Dr. Grinspoon particularly; and we all concur
25 that simply the experience of LSD by itself would be unlikely,
26 in one instance, for instance, would be unlikely to result
27 in significant value change or belief change that was lasting
28 in the majority of people who had such an experience, an

1 isolated experience.

2 But I think that we also concurred that the use
3 of this substance in that circumstance, with the additional
4 factors of the personal psychologies involved, the group
5 dynamics involved, the mutual dependencies involved, that
6 that particular combination I think was a necessary and
7 essential -- required the necessary and essential elements
8 of LSD, and marijuana as well.

9 Q What you are telling us is, the use of LSD
10 assisted Manson in materially -- or appreciably assisted
11 Manson in imparting his ideas, his beliefs, his value system
12 in his disciples?

13 A Yes. I think it was a very powerful tool in
14 Mr. Manson's hands in effecting those changes.

15 Q It could be described as an agent facilitating --

16 A Yes.

17 Q -- his being able to get inside the minds of his
18 followers and taking over the minds of his followers.

19 A Well, that's a little black and white.

20 But essentially I think that's the role of LSD.

21 Q Well, be gray, if you will.

22 A Okay.

23 Q I don't want to make it -- I don't want to overly
24 simplify something.

25 A And I don't want to overly complicate it, either;
26 so let's see if we can do it.

27 The medical literature concludes that LSD is not
28 an effective agent in psychotherapy, for instance, in effecting

1 belief and behavior changes in people in a clinical setting.

2 However, if one reviews that literature you see
3 that the experiments were really sort of simple-minded:

4 That you bring someone who is profoundly ill into
5 a room, drop LSD down him, and you have a nurse watch him
6 for 12 hours, or perhaps even talk to him casually, or perhaps
7 even try to talk towards some point with him.

8 The results were not very effective.

9 There is increasing pressure now to reinstitute
10 research into the use of these agents, with sophisticated
11 approaches, such as group dynamics, group pressures, consistent
12 reinforcement.

13 I think within a carefully designed protocol
14 LSD could probably have a very powerful effect in assisting us
15 with value and attitude change of a therapeutic type.

16 So it wasn't LSD alone or an isolation; it was the
17 presence of that factor in a very specific formula in
18 retrospect of factors necessary to change attitudes and
19 beliefs and behaviors as that occurred back then.

20 Q Can LSD, in your experience and observation,
21 itself, the continued use of it, cause psychological
22 toxicity?

23 A Oh, I think there is no question of that.

24 LSD is an immensely powerful, disorienting
25 experience; that if you are acutely intoxicated, literally
26 physical objects may be different in size or feeling, or
27 color, even, to you.

28 So the persistent experience of confusion in one's

1 perceptions, in one's beliefs and responses over a period of
2 time I think would leave a residual of confusion.

3 I think on the other side of the coin, that the
4 repetitive experience of things not being as they seem to you
5 ordinarily -- because of repeated alterations in your state of
6 consciousness -- that that, too, has a residual effect in
7 changing one's attitude to ordinary things subsequently,
8 even in nonintoxicated states.

1 I was looking a little while ago -- Aldous Huxley
2 said something about that. It was beautifully stated.

3 Somewhere I had a note on that. Let me take a
4 moment to find it.

5 MR. RAY: Well, I'm going to object what Aldous Huxley
6 said. I don't see the relevance of that.

7 MR. KEITH: What Aldous Huxley said may be perfectly
8 admissible, providing the doctor considered it in reaching his
9 conclusions about the effects of LSD.

10 THE COURT: Well, the objection is sustained in the
11 absence of a foundation.

12 You may put your next question.

13 Q BY MR. KEITH: Did you consider Aldous Huxley?
14 Aldous Huxley was a user of LSD?

15 A No; he wrote --

16 Q No; he's an author, of course.

17 A He wrote a book on his experience with mescaline.
18 Mescaline being a hallucinogen.

19 And the point he made --

20 Q What I was going to ask you is, you were about to
21 quote Aldous Huxley.

22 Before you would be entitled to quote him you would
23 have had to have considered his book and his statement, along
24 with all the other things you had considered, in reaching
25 your ultimate conclusion about the effects of LSD on
26 Leslie's state of mind.

27 A Correct.

28 Q That's all.

1 A Correct.

2 Q You say "Correct." Does that mean you did
3 consider --

4 A I considered that precisely, as I considered --
5 or similarly, as I considered all the other information that
6 I bring to my conclusion.

7 Q And I take it Aldous Huxley was not only a
8 superb writer but he also used drugs and wrote about the use
9 of drugs, his personal use of drugs.

10 A Yes.

11 Q All right.

12 What did he say that you were going to quote?

13 A Well --

14 Q If you were able to find it.

15 A It won't take me but a moment.

16 (Pause.)

17 Q If you are going to have difficulty, tell us and
18 I will ask you -- you can always do it tomorrow.

19 A Okay.

12f

12-1

1 Essentially what he said was what he discovered
2 from his own personal experience was that once he had
3 experienced ordinary things in an extraordinary way that that
4 changed the way that he experienced these ordinary things
5 later.

6 It was an altered perception for him.

7 The same principle applies to beliefs. If you
8 experience something opposite what you believe, next time you
9 confront that belief it alters your attitude toward it.

10 The LSD experience in the Family apparently was
11 very commonly -- apparently very commonly resulted in
12 extreme changes in perception and behaviors, and I think that
13 this was an element in the total group that began to result
14 in the assimilation of these dissimilar people into this
15 peculiar belief system that they eventually shared, and, as
16 far as I can tell based on their behaviors, they shared totally.

17 Q Now, Doctor, did you learn as a result of your
18 interviews with Leslie and other materials that you acquired
19 throughout your research of this case, and I'm just not talking
20 about this case now but back in 1971, that at some time,
21 probably in the spring of 1969, Manson began to talk about
22 starting Helter Skelter; that it wasn't happening fast enough;
23 that he found it necessary to precipitate Helter Skelter by
24 killing people; that that thought entered his mind, and that
25 he expressed it to others in the Family?

26 A Materials I've reviewed seemed to all indicate,
27 from all the informants, that in the spring of '69 his
28 references to Helter Skelter became more frequent, his concerns

12-2

1 with it were more intense, and he began for the first time,
2 as I read the record, to make suggestions of initiating
3 Helter Skelter.

4 Q And did you also learn that the Family itself in
5 the spring of 1969 began preparations for Helter Skelter in
6 that they acquired dune buggies, by hook or crook; they began
7 to repair those vehicles; that they acquired a large number
8 of geophysical maps, particularly of the desert area; that
9 they began looking for the bottomless pit; and that in one
10 instance -- you may not have known about but I'll tell you --
11 Manson was interested in acquiring thousands of feet of golden
12 rope in order to gain access to the center of the earth; that
13 arms, weapons, were acquired by the Family, knives and guns,
14 even a machine gun, a Schnitzer.

15 What my question is, simply, did you learn, as a
16 result of your exposure to this case, that those kinds of
17 preparations were occurring in anticipation of the beginning
18 of Helter Skelter, the revolution?

19 A I think that the important difference in the
20 evidence available to me this time from last time was the
21 extent of detail of the planning, the actual real action of
22 planning undertaken, sewing of leather clothes, the elaboration
23 on the delusions that there were 12 kinds of fruit trees and
24 milk and honey down in the bottomless pit.

25 That was the distinction this time, the elaboration
26 of detail on the delusional system.

27 Q And what I'm interested in is your opinion as to
28 whether the delusional system went so far as to include the

12-3

1 actual killing of human beings by Manson and members of his
2 Family to start the black-white war.

3 Was that part of the delusional system created
4 by Manson, or was that something above and beyond that that
5 you were unable to fit within that paranoid state, that folie
6 a menage or famile that you have described?

7 A I think that the centrality of Mr. Manson's
8 delusion, in my mind, is not questionable at this point because
9 of the evidence available.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

12-4

1 In fact, as I recall, it was the prosecution's
2 theory six years ago.

3 The degree to which he began to elaborate on it,
4 I think, was very significant, and I think it revealed his
5 increasing psychosis at the time.

6 I think that they unquestionably acted upon it
7 in states of complete surrender to that belief.

8 And I recall that in the tape from '69, with
9 Miss Van Houten's attorney, she expressed to me convincingly
10 the point of view that even if she were caught and convicted
11 and executed, that that was okay, because that fit the purpose,
12 too, in terms of publicizing the mission.

13 So I think that in my mind there was no question
14 that that was overwhelmingly important to their actions.

15 Q When you say that that was overwhelmingly important,
16 to what do you refer?

17 A The belief in Helter Skelter, the belief in
18 Charlie, the belief in their Messianic mission, the belief in
19 the imminence of a social chaos and cataclysm, the belief in
20 their chosen role, their perfection, their own immortality;

21 That these were all essential beliefs in their
22 participating in the murder -- the murders on the part of all
23 of those involved -- and, in fact, I believe that the willing-
24 ness to participate was, in itself, a psychotic test.

25 Q What do you mean by that, sir?

26 A I recall that it is reported --

27 Well, Leslie reports that Charlie used to talk --
28 well, all of them reported, in fact, that Charlie used to

12-5
1 talk about being crazy;

2 That he was crazy, and they used to believe that
3 if you got crazy enough you got sane.

4 If you were crazy enough to see through all the
5 delusions and the illusions of this world, then you would be
6 so far out there that you would be the only one who really
7 saw things sanely;

8 That the people who believed in mom and home and
9 truth and goodness were so crazy that when you could see
10 through their craziness then you would be sane.

11 I recall that Leslie reports that on the evening
12 of the LaBianca murders Charlie came to her, as I recall, and
13 asked her was she crazy. Meaning in her mind was she crazy
14 like him, did she share in his views of the world, was she
15 sane by inference like he was, did she share that.

16 And there was a certain, I think, psychotic
17 excitement as she describes the events in that original, that
18 old tape, of membership, of belonging, of totally -- the words
19 were totally surrendering herself to this belief.

20 It is a psychotic level of melding with him, of
21 fusing with him in his identity.

22 The murders were a test of whether they were fused
23 with him.

24 Q Doctor, did Leslie report to you that once in the
25 LaBianca house and once the homicides commenced she, to use
26 her terminology, started to get freaky?

27 A Say again? I'm sorry.

28 Q Started to get freaky or felt freaky?

1 A She felt freaky.

2 Q Or, started to freak out --

3 A Um-hmm.

4 Q -- which is the --

5 Now, do you recall that kind of statement reported
6 to you by Leslie?

7 A Yes.

8 We discussed the actual events of the murder in
9 quite a lot of detail, what happened next, what did you feel,
10 and she described several things about the actual event of
11 the murder.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 And I have some notes on that, if I may take a
2 moment to find them.

3 I've got one quotation there --

4 Q Let me ask you this, while you are looking:

5 Did Leslie report to you that subsequent to the
6 LaBianca killings she felt guilty not because of what she had
7 done but because she was unable to do more?

8 A Yes.

9 And at one point she expressed the -- she called
10 the feeling of being very unhappy that she hadn't had an
11 opportunity to participate with the Family in the first
12 murders, to pass that test.

13 So there was a certain kind of insane joyousness
14 that she described in participating.

15 Then she described the actual events of the murder
16 and describes, as you say, becoming freaky, remembers the
17 stabbing, and it was -- she described it -- it was almost
18 ecstatic, the feelings described there.

19 It was a bizarre kind of ecstasy.

20 And feeling like a shark, like an animal, that
21 the shark had no feelings about killing but just did. It was
22 like an animal.

23 It was that level of pure process. These are my
24 words now. That level of just acting. And she describes
25 being at that shark-like level.

26 I have that in some detailed description.

27 Q Did she ever tell you she had done anything more
28 either in person or -- strike that.

1 Did she ever tell you, however, that she had
2 participated any more in the stabbing than stabbing a person
3 she believed to be dead?

4 A No. She described only stabbing the person of
5 Mrs. LaBianca, and she described even how that felt, as I
6 recall.

7 Q That was on the tape that you heard?

8 A Yes.

9 But no other stabbing.

10 There was even a point where Charlie had suggested
11 to make it -- to do something witchy, I think was the term.

12 Q Are you discussing now the wiping of fingerprints?

13 A To make it messy, to make it really horrifying,
14 to further the stimulus it was going to cause the social
15 revolution.

16 And Leslie describes not really being able to get
17 behind that in thinking about it retrospectively.

13-1

1 But at the time she describes what I would have
2 to say as really authentic primary process thinking.

3 That's the lowest, unconsidered, nonrational,
4 basic level of action or activity in the mind.

5 Just flat out, acting, unreflected, like a shark.

6 Q Are you talking about her actual use of the
7 knife?

8 A The actual stabbing.

9 Q And this primary process thinking is primitive
10 thought on its lowest level?

11 A Yes; primary process thinking dominates a person's
12 thinking. That's one of the characteristics of a psychosis.

13 Q Is it at all manifested by a repetitive activity
14 that may not appear to have any purpose?

15 Would that be a symptom -- or a manifestation?

16 A Well, technically speaking, that kind of behavior,
17 perseverative behavior, is present in psychoses.

18 It's also present in certain kinds of drug
19 intoxications, organic brain damage. It is characteristic.

20 It frequently accompanies that level of
21 decompensation of the thinking process.

22 THE COURT: All right.

23 At this time, ladies and gentlemen, we are going
24 to recess in this matter until tomorrow morning.

25 Bear in mind during this recess you are not to
26 discuss this case amongst yourselves or with anyone else and
27 you are not to form any opinion concerning this matter or
28 express any opinion concerning this matter until the case is

13-2
1 finally given to you.

2 Furthermore, you must not allow yourselves to
3 read, see or hear any news media accounts of this matter.

4 The court will be in recess in this matter until
5 tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m.

6 All jurors, the defendant, counsel and the
7 witness are ordered to return at that time.

8 The court is in recess. Have a good evening.

9 MR. KAY: Your Honor, I wonder if Mr. Keith and I could
10 be heard on the record after the jury leaves.

11 THE COURT: Yes.

12 MR. KAY: Thank you.

13 (The jury exited the courtroom and the
14 following proceedings were held:)

15 THE COURT: Let the record show we are meeting in the
16 absence of the jury.

17 MR. KAY: I just wondered, Your Honor, so we won't
18 have to waste any time tomorrow morning; I notice that the
19 doctor apparently had notes that he was referring to about
20 his interview with Miss Van Heuten.

21 I would like to have those so I could review those
22 notes in preparation for cross-examination.

23 THE COURT: I assume there is no objection. Is there?

24 MR. KEITH: He's entitled to examine notes that
25 Dr. Hockman has relied upon.

26 I hope he has copies.

27 DR. HOCKMAN: I don't have copies. Those are all my
28 original notes, Your Honor.

13-3

1 MR. KAY: I won't lose them.

2 MR. HOCHMAN: Well, could we make copies now -- It's not
3 that extensive -- so I could do a little bit reviewing --

4 THE COURT: I'm sure counsel can work out the arrangements
5 and make copies of the appropriate documents.

6 We will see you tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m.,
7 then. Thank you.

8 MR. KEITH: Thank you.

9 (At 4:05 p.m. an adjournment was taken
10 until Thursday, June 2, 1977 at 10:00 a.m.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28