THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

VS.

CHARLES WATSON,

Defendant-Appellant.

8017

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY HONORABLE ADOLPH ALEXANDER, JUDGE PRESIDING

# REPORTERS' TRANSCRIPTS ON APPEAL

### APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff-Respondent:

THE STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

600 State Building

Los Angeles, California 90012

622-4191

For Defendant-Appellant:

CHARLES WATSON,

In Persona Propria

Harold E. Cook

and

Clair Van Vle**c**k Official Reporters 111 North Hill Street

III MOICH WIII Scieec

Los Angeles, California 90012

VOLUME C

PAGES 4253 to 4538, incl.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

· 27

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

2Ì

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1971; 9:45 A.M.

THE COURT: Good morning,

People against Watson.

Let the record show all jurors, counsel and defendant are present.

Mr. Bubrick, I believe you had one further witness?

MR. BUBRICK: Yes: Mr. Escalante, please.

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

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

THE WITNESS: I do.

# FRANK R. ESCALANTE,

called as a witness on behalf of the defendant, testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Thank you.

Take the stand and be seated; and would you state and spell your name, please.

THE WITNESS: Frank R. Escalante, E-a-c-a-l-a-n-t-e.

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

### BY MR. BUBRICK:

Q ... Mr. Escalante, what is your business or occupation, please?

Ì		
1	A	I sm # police officer for the City of Los Angeles.
2	Q	And were you so employed on April 23, 1969?
3	. A.	I was, sir.
4	Q	And what were your duties on that day, Mr.
<b>5</b>	Escalante?	·
б	A	I was the jailer in the processing end of the
7.	jail at Val	Lay Services Division.
8	Q	That is in Van Muys, is it?
9	. A	Yes, it is.
10	Q	What do your duties entail on that particular
11	assignment?	
12	. A	Well, at that particular time I was the fingerprint
13	officer tak	dag all fingerprints of all prisoners booked into
14	our jail.	•
15.	,	
16		
17	, d	
18		
19		
20	,	•
21		
<b>22</b>		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

¥	2				1
ı					2.
					3
					4
		•	;		<b>5</b>
ŗ		٠	•	,	6
					7
					8
					9
					10
					'n
					12
					13
					14
)					15
					16
					17
	•				18
					19
					20
•					21
					22
					23
					24
					25
					26
					27

Q	Did it	make	any	diff	erence	what	the	nature	of	the
offense was	for wh	ich th	iey w	ere	being	booke	1?			
* * *	77		4						•	

No. it did not,

As long as they were in the booking process, you took their prints on that day?

That is correct.

Inviting your attention to what has been marked people's exhibit 245 --

THE COURT: E like in Edward.

MR. BUBRICK: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you see that one?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: It is in the upper right-hand corner of the exhibit.

Q BY MR. BUBRICK: Did you take the fingerprints of one Charles Watson on or about April 23, 1969?

A Yes. I did.

And do you remember about what time of the day or night it was when you saw Mr. Watson for the first time?

Well, not particularly. It was nighttime. wouldn't know what time it was.

Q What were your assignment hours on that particular day, if you remember?

I was working what we call the p.m. watch, that is 3:30 to 11:30.

> Q 3:30 in the afternoon to 11:30 at night?

A Yes, sir,

And do you remember Mr. Watson being brought into Q

the booking office? Yes, I do. A 2 Do you remember how he got there? Q 3 A No. not offhand. 4 Was he accompanied by other officers when he Q 5 was in the booking office? 6 Yes, he was. A 7 Q Do you remember who they were? 8 No. I don't. A 9 Can you describe Mr. Watson when you first saw 10 Q him on that occasion?  $\mathbf{n}$ 12 When I first had contact with Mr. Watson after 13 the booking process, it was my duty at that time to fingerprint 14 him and this is when I first noticed Mr. Watson. 15 Q Do you remember what you first noticed about him? 16 Well, to describe it, we get many hippie type 17 bookings in that particular end of the valley and of all the 18 hippie type persons that I fingerprinted, Mr. Watson just seemed 19 to be a little bit more or stood above the normal type hippie 20 that we book in that jail. 21 Q In what respect? 22 Well, in his manner of dress and, well, he was 23 very, very dirty and his clothes were just completely filthy 24 and his hair was long and just straggly and it was just more 25 than you would normally see in a more or less regular hippe. 26 He just seemed to be more. Do you remember about how big he was at the time? Do you remember what his weight was?

1	A No, I don't,
2	Q Were you able to talk with him?
3	A Well, I was able to print him but so far as any-
4	thing so far as conversation is concerned I couldn't remember.
5	Q Do you remember whether he was able to talk at
6	#11?
7	A Well, he talked I remember that we talked but
8	as to what we talked about I don't remember, sir.
ð	Q Do you recall whether or not you were able to
10	understand anything he had to say?
n	A No, not particularly. He was cooperative so far
1 <b>2</b>	as the processing was concerned but so far as the actual con-
13	versation itself I couldn't remember.
14	Q Do you remember whether it was in English?
15	A Oh, yes, it was.
16	Q And do you have a recollection of being able to
. 17 ,	understand what he was saying?
18	A Well, he was, so far as I remember, he would
19	go from one thing to enother. It was just very difficult to
20	keep the conversation with him.
21	Q Did you hear any beep beep sounds coming out of
22	him?
23	A I couldn't recall that,
24	Q You don't remember that?
25	A No.
26	Q Did you have to assist him at the fingerprinting
27	process?
28	A Well, more or less. He wasn't actually falling

ľ 

4.

5.

down. He was just cooperative enough and yet at the same time

not really coherent.

to have when you fingerprint a person.

It was just, he was just right in the middle. Something about the whole process that I was able to print him, his hands were very, very loose. This is what you have

3 fls.

11 3

ļ	Q Well, was he very loose in the legs, also?
2	A Well, he wasn't falling down, no, sir; but he was
á	just standing, like I said, I was able to fingerprint him very
4	easily.
5	Q Were there other officers present at the time he
6	was being fingerprinted?
7	A Yes, sir, there were.
8	Q Were they supporting him in any way?
ģ	A No, sir, not that I recall.
10	Q But, then, he was fingerprinted; is that correct?
11	A Yes, sir.
12	Q How long did that process take?
13	A It doesn't take but maybe five minutes.
14	Q Did you ask him to sign the card?
15	A Yes, I did.
16	Q Could he do that?
<b>17</b>	A No, sir, he couldn't.
18	Q And what how did he evidence his inability to
19	#ign?
20	A Well, he wasn't able to when I sat him at the
21	table to sign the fingerprint cards, he wasn't able to.
22	Q Did he just fall forward on the table?
23	A No, he just sat there and he just shook his head
24	and he couldn't sign; he wouldn't sign.
25	Q He wouldn't or couldn't?
26	A Well, he just couldn't sign it.
27	Q Was he able to make any markings at all on the
28	

- 1	
2	Q Was he able to hold a pen?
3	A Well, as far as I can recall I can't recall
4 :	that particular end of it.
5	Q Do you remember whether he moved about this room
6	without the assistance of any other officers?
7	A No, I don't.
8	Q You don't remember that, either?
9.	A No, sir.
0. (	Q Did you ever call any doctors to find out what his
1	trouble was?
<b>2</b> .	A No, sir; that wasn't part of my duties.
3	Q Have you seen, in your experience, people under the
4	influence of drugs before?
5	A Yes, sir, I have.
6	Q Do you have an opinion as to whether or not Watson
7	was under the influence of drugs at the time?
8	A Yes, he was.
9.	Q Can you describe the degree of that intoxication,
Ò	that drug intoxication?
1	A Well, I'm not an expert, but in my opinion, he
2	apparently well, he was under the influence.
3	Q Well, you have seen lots of people under the
4	influence, have you not?
. <b>5</b> .	A Yes, sir.
6	Q And they are graduated or they are matters of
7	degree, so far as being under the influence is concerned?
8	A Yes, sir.
	1

1	Q Would you say he was moderately under the influence
2 .	or severely narcotized?
3	A Well, in my opinion, I think he was severely.
4	Q But he wasn't belligerent, as far as you were con-
5	cerned?
6 ,	A No, sir, he wasn't.
7	A No, sir, he wasn't.  Q Was there a follow-up with any reports that brought
8	him to your attention?
9 .	A No, eir.
.0	Q You don't know why he happened to be brought into
1 ,	the station at the time?
<b>2</b>	A Well, I know why he was booked.
3	Q What is that?
4.	A Section 647 F, which is drugs, under the influence
5	of drugs.
6	Q You don't know whether he had been in an accident
. <b>7</b> °	prior to being brought into the station or not?
.8	A No. sir.
9	Q You don't know whether he was afoot or on a motor-
0	cycle, before being brought into the station, do you?
1	A No, sir, I don't.
22	Q Mr. Escalante, I assume that you have obviously
2\$	booked many, many people while you were there as a jailer; is
24	that correct?
25	A Yes, sir, I have.
26	Q Is there any particular reason for remembering Mr.
27	Watson after this period of time?
28 '	A Well, it is just like I stated, he was just

<i>y</i> — м <b>р</b>	1
	2

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

outst	and	ling	as f	ar as	a h	ippi	le i	type	MES	COI	icerii	ed; h	ė Wi	LS :	ust
more	#O	than	the	norma	1 =	111	of	the	peoi	le.	that	COME	in	oui	•
jail.	•														

Q And how about his degree of intoxication or drug intoxication?

A Well, we have many people that come in our jail that, well, say, were as high or have been as high as Mr. Watson.

MR. BUBRICK: I have nothing further, your Honor.

# CROSS-EXAMINATION

## BY MR. BUCLIOSI:

- Q Did you learn that Mr. Watson had fallen off a motorcycle that day?
  - A No, sir, I didn't.
  - Q You don't know about that?
  - A No. I don't.
- Q You don't know what drug, if any, Mr. Watson was under the influence of, do you?
  - A No. sir, I don't.
  - Q Have you ever heard of the drug, belladonna?
  - A I have heard of it.
- drug?
  - A No, sir, T don't.
  - MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions.
  - MR. BUBRICK: I have nothing further, your Honor.
  - THE COURT: Thank you, Officer; you may be excused.

3

4

5

7

8.

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19, 20

21

22 23

24

26

27

28

Æ.

MR. BUBRICK: We have prepared a stipulation, your Honor, which we are working on right now.

Your Honor, we are prepared to enter a stipulation, which reads as follows:

May it be stipulated that the first time that
Mr. Kay heard about the incident that occurred between Myers
and Barker Ranch in early September 1969, in which Mr. Watson
allegedly demonstrated to Barbara Hoyt, Kitty Lutensinger,
Ruth Moorehouse and several other girls how to stab a person is
when this incident was related to him by Barbara Hoyt in July
1971.

That this incident was related to Mr. Kay by

Barbara Hoyt in response to a question by him, which is essentially as follows:

"I understand that you did not testify to the actions and conduct of Tex at the first trial because he was not a defendant and therefore such testimony would not be relevant."

Mr. Kay then said that Tex's mental state would be an issue at the upcoming trial and, therefore, he asked, "Did Tex ever do anything bizarre that you observed?"

Miss Hoyt then thought for a minute and related the above incident. To Mr. Kay's knowledge, this was the first time he had ever heard of the incident and also, to his knowledge, it is the first time she had ever been asked about it.

MR. KAY: So stipulated.

MR. BUBRICK: I would join in that stipulation, your Honor.

3

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

D.

**26** 

27 28 THE COURT: I take it, ladies and gentlemen, you recall what I told you about stipulations, that is where both sides stipulate to a certain fact we need have no further testimony pertaining to that fact, but you are to accept that stipulation as such.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The people are willing to stipulate that at the previous trial I asked the Los Angeles County Sheriff's office -- actually prior to the trial -- to get a printing exemplar from defendant Susan Atkins, Patricia Krenwinkel and Leslie Van Houton and Susan Atkins did furnish printing exemplars, but Patricia Krenwinkel did not furnish a printing exemplar prior to the trial.

During the trial, during the progress of the trial I asked Judge Older to order Miss Krenwinkel to furnish a printing exemplar and on the advice of her attorney, Paul Fitzgerald, she refused to give a printing exemplar.

MR. KRITH: So stipulated.

MR. BUBRICK: So stipulated.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The people call Dr. Grovner Bailey.

THE COURT: Just a moment.

MR. BUBRICK: The defense rests.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Oh, I am sorry.

THE COURT: You have some exhibits. You have A, B, C and

MR. BUBRICK: May they be admitted in evidence, your Honor, under the same designation.

THE COURT: Let's see what they are.

MR: BUGLIOSI: May we take a look at them at the bench?

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

,14 . . .

-16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

THE COURT: The high school graduation class, photo, and junior high school and football uniform as A, B and C. And D, the bolt cutter that was found in the car received in evidence.

MR. BUGLIOSI: May we approach the bench for one moment? (The following proceedings were had at the bench.)

MR. BUGLIOSI: During the defense's case while Mr. Watson was on the stand, he was shown people's 87, photograph of Sharon Tate, and he identified it. We would again ask that it be received into evidence.

There has been testimony now from several people identifying people's 87 and the jury has it on their notes as people's 87.

THE COURT: The one showing the enlarged stomach full of blood?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I repeat to the court again that basically the only thing that shows is a murder victim covered with blood, which is not nearly as grotesque as some other murder victims where there is a decapitation or large holes in the body or something like that.

It is basically a dead person covered with blood and there has been testimony as to people's 87 and I think the jury --

THE COURT: It was shown to Watson and also shown to one of the doctors.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think the jury will really wonder why they are not permitted to see the photograph. There has been testimony on it.

THE COURT: I still think the prejudicial effect of the photograph far outweighs the probative value particularly where you have so much other evidence which covers it.

5. C. 大大社会

4A

-8

20.

21 .

You have evidence, all the Coroner's photographs, black and white ones. You have blowups. You have the diagram showing how the ropes were looped around his neck. I think it is covered by so much testimony, it is highly inflammatory and prejudicial.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you.

(The following proceedings were had in open court.)
THE CLERK: Raise your right hand, please.

You do solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give in the cause now pending before this court shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

THE WITNESS: I do.

## K. GROVNER BAILEY,

called as a witness on behalf of the people in rebuttal, testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Will you take the stand and be sewted. Will you state and spell your name.

THE WITNESS: K. Grovner Bailey, G-r-o-v-n-e-r B-a-1-1-e-y.

### DIRECT EXAMINATION

### BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q Doctor, are you a medical doctor duly licensed to practice in the state of California?

- A Yes, I am,
- Q And do you have a medical specialty?
- A Yes.

many years and who has studied with Ebau and Stecker in

13.

15.

Į6

18.

.28

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

19̀

I had a precepteeship with him for five years.

Subsequent to that, because of the fact that I was concerned -- frequently consulted as regards the difference between a hysteria which caused symptoms of brain tumor and a paralysis which was caused by hysteria, to give a short example. I determined to know a whole lot more about neurosurgical procedures and I studied in neurosurgery in various areas in the United States giving techniques in New York, St. Louis, Chicago, and here in Los Angeles.

Then I had the opportunity to be a junior attending neurologist at the Los Angeles County Hospital, starting in approximately 1930; and inasmuch as this precepteeship was related to that practical experience --

THE COURT: Doctor, would you be good enough to tell us what is a precepteeship?

A Precepteeship is that particular program in which a young man, in those days -- and the idea still finds favor -- is devoted to an older psychiatrist or older surgeon or older general practitioner, depending on the specialty, who gives his entire time to that particular individual and who is tutored by that individual in the discipline; and that, in general is the picture.

It has to do with attending seminars, it has to do with assigned studies, of course. It has to do with practical experience in the clinic and in this case, the General Hospital.

And following that perticular period, I then was a junior attending surgeon in consonance, also, with this

5-2

other experience, because I had been more or less concomitantly -- and I was the only one, as it happened, in our particular unit -- who had this dual interest.

I was then on the staff as the neurologist, and as, also, a neurologist in the college, teaching; and those were the dual capacities at the County and at the college.

This continued for a period of some five or six years and subsequently I obtained the position of executive of the department of neurology of the College of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons; and subsequently the California College of Medicine; and in that capacity had the management of the department with other individuals, junior neurologists and junior instructors, and so on.

This was also accompanied by the position, later, of senior -- a co-senior in psychiatry at that same institution, at Unit 2, Los Angeles General Hospital; and I was co-senior in psychiatry for a period of five years.

Subsequent to that, then, because the department had to be split because the department was getting very much too large and we had junior members coming along, I chose to, at the County, go into the neurosurgical field and I was given the position, after a ten-year period, a position of executive of the department of neurosurgery, and I am -- or I was, at the time of the changeover to the USC Medical Center, and at which time the California College of Medicine was joined and became the Medical School at Irvine campus of the University of California -- since that time I have been emeritus professor of that, of the original two institutions, and I am still an

3

5 6.

8

.9 10<sup>.</sup>

11 12

13.

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23 24

. 26

27

·28

emeritus consultant in neurosurgery at what was then the unit

I mention that only because of the dual interest which I have had in the surgical procedures necessary to repair or to treat neurological and surgical conditions of the brain and spinal cord.

Now, along with that there has been the opportunity afforded by Judge Fricke, I may say, who had occasion to appoint me to the panel of the Superior Court, the psychiatric panel; this occurred in 1936 and since that time, I have been on that panel --

- Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: This is a court appointed list of psychiatrists?
  - A A court appointed list of psychiatrists.
- Q So you have been on that list, then, for what, 30 years?
  - A Since 1936, yes.
  - Q It would be 35 years?
- A 35 years; and I am not on the faculty any more of the colleges, I am emeritus in that respect.

And in the process of that time, in response to the question about my further training, I have made it a point to do, as others do and are expected to do, have traveled the world, somewhat, and have had an opportunity of studying in the Middle East and in, for instance, Einsheim's University in Cairo, and at Victoria Augusta in Jerusalem, in the Evangelismos Hospital in Athens, several hospitals in London. These were not extended periods of time, but I have had

occasion to have two very happy trips with the medical tours ŀ of USC, one in the Middle East and one in the Scandinavian countries and in Russia. .27 

5af.

27

28

There I had the opportunity in Russia of observing three mental hospitals, two in Moscow and one in Leningrad; and have made it a point through these observations not only to study the discipline, which I was there to do, but also to be interested in psychological, muscial, religious art having to do with the feelings of people.

I naturally am a member of several --

- Q Various professional associations?
- A -- professional associations.
- Q Now, how long were you associated with General Hospital?
  - A From 1930 to 1962 -- yes, 1962.
  - Q 32 years?
  - A Right,
- Q Were you ever a co-director of the neuropsychiatric section over there?

A In our section -- in our section, in Unit 3, yes; I was not in the psychiatric division of 96, for instance.

Q Have you written and had published any articles, papers or books in the fields of neorology or psychology?

A Yes, and it isn't by happenstance that I have them with me.

- Q ... What did you bring with you to court today?
- A Well ++
- Q Without soing over the contents, just basically, the names of the articles and where they were published.
  - A Well, if I might refer to my material, I would be -
  - Q All right.

5A-2

16 .

. 

18-

25· 

A --- because otherwise I don't have an independent memory; it isn't that long.

THE COURT: Doctor, if you need that to refresh your memory, you may refer to it.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: But I suggest you remove that so the jurors can see you, put it over here, if it will help you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

don't have them with me -- but the first time I published was when I was a student in 1925, and I will never forget that one because my discussion centered on a little bit of my Latin background, "Vis medicatrix naturae," The Healing Power of Nature. That was very presumptuous; but I have one here in 1942 containing my first hundred cases for the Superior Court, and I entitled it, "Crime Marches On"; that was years ago, when the idea of time marches on first came into vogue. That was published in June 25, 1941.

Then in 1948 I published one on the Thoroco-lumbar Sympathectomy in Essential Hypertension," which means due to the fact of stress and so forth on the nervous system, the sympathetic nervous system alongside the spinal column has been operated and has frequently been sympathetic in cases of high blood pressure.

Then I have one here, "Surgery in Psychosomatic Medicine," where I was beginning to combine the two fields; that was in March 1969.

September 1950, "Twenty Years of Neurology and

5A-3

-6

18.

1ġ

Pediatrics"; it was my responsibility -- from a medical standpoint good fortune; but from the compassion of a physician, . the awful experience -- of taking care of 134 cases of polio; and during that particular epidemic, and that was in our contageous department at the county in relation to neurology, and that was a bit of my experience in that regard.

10<sup>-</sup>

20.

We had and I reported them also as regards various diagnoses in the pediatric field.

I had a total of 300 cases and they ranged all the way from depressed skull fracture to Mongolian idiots.

Then I have one here under date of November 1959
"Neuropsychiatric Considerations Peculiar to the Aged."

And here is one I wrote with my associate at that time. "Hematoma Hunters."

Hematomas, they can be large blood clots anywhere, but they are particularly vicious when they are on the brain inside of the skull and hunters for the simple reason that they aren't always apparent, from the outside never, and neurologically sometimes silent and therefore I entitled it "Hematoma Hunters." I gave a little credit to my granddaughter on that one. This was in 1956.

Then I had a paper that I gave in the honorary society in 1957 on amytrophic lateral sclerosis, Lou Gerhig's disease, and differentiated that with X-rays, and so on, from a condition which frequently is not disgnosed because it isn't looked for because people don't know when they are drunk whether they have had an accident or not, but all of a sudden they develop over an extended period of time, possibly, symptoms of amytrophic lateral sclerosis and when you take an X-ray of the neck they find a fractured neck.

They fell down drunk and that happened but nobody bothered to take a picture and that was under date of October 157 about some 13 years ago.

Then here is one on epilepsy and hypotheses, and

2

3

6

7

8

9. 10

11

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

that was under date of 1958.

Then one on neurosurgery, 1959. And this one, forgive me if I say this, but this I prize because it starts out "Oh. Lord, How Manifold Are Thy Works and In Wisdom Have You Made Them All." because we start there and that not only is biblical but in the floor of the Westminster Abbey when Rulton discovered the heart function.

And then we go from that. Here is one, a report of the proceedings at UCLA on global research for global health. This was October 1961 and I reported this verbatim and I wrote -- I don't do shorthand but I wrote pretty rapidly and so I wrote just as fast as they talked and I have this down and I published it because I knew I had it correctly and I turned that in to interested parties. That was November 1961.

Then at the California Medical Association mental health conference in 1963 I happened to be chairman of the committee on mental health for our particular portion of the medical society and I wrote my report of that and that is all I have with me.

- Q These articles were actually published?
- A These are published articles and these are reprints.
- In terms of numbers, how many articles would you 0 say you have published in the fields of neurology and psychiatry?
- Oh, I think somewhere in the neighborhood of 40 or 50, 45, something of that sort,
  - You just brought in some of the important ones? Q
  - I brought some of them, yes. A

Q Have you ever taught any course in the field of psychiatry?

A Well, I have taught courses in the field of neuropsychiatry, which is a combination of the two, yes, I have.

Q Where and when?

A. I have taught those in college, as I pointed out, because in the course of my teaching I taught not only the neurological features but also the impingements as it has to do, as I mentioned at first, with the differentiation between hysteria, giving signs of paralysis, and a brain tumor, giving signs of mental disease.

Q Have you ever participated in any seminars on psychiatry?

A Yes, I have.

Q Where and when?

A I have frequently in my period as senior executive officer at the college and in my period of time when I was, for instance, from 1955 to '62 I was chairman of the American Osteopathic Board of Neurology and Psychiatry, which controls the teaching and the credentials and the criteria of reference in each of those disciplines for the United States in our profession.

Q Apart from teaching in schools and universities and colleges, have you ever given any lectures in the field of psychiatry to other interested groups?

A Yes, I have given many lectures in psychiatry and in neurology to hospitals, hospital staffs.

1Ò

П

6A

14. 

26·

I remember resigning from one of the hospital staffs -- not from a staff, but from the credentials committee of two hospitals, when as a member of the abortion and sterilization committee, for a matter of three or four years. I found myself at variance with the policies which came into vogue, so I resigned from that because I didn't agree.

I mention that because as related to that function, both as determining the credentials of applicants to the staff and also in this committee having to do with what cases were admitted to the hospital, for what abortions and whatnot, it was necessary for me to take a stand and, of course that isn't easy.

1

3

4

5

7 8

10

9

11 12

13

15

14

16 17

18

19

20

21

22.

23 24

25

26 27

28

Q Are you presently, in private practice?

A I always have been and I might say at the time I was with the County Hospital, we were not paid one nickel.

This was all free.

We gained our benefits, of course, and such stature as we might be accorded by reason of our activity with the interns, with the externs, with the residents, and with our other staff members on the staff of the various hospitals, but at the County for 30 years, that was not one dime paid.

Q For 30 years you worked at General Hospital then as a neurologist and a psychiatrist without any compensation?

A Without any stipend. There were lots of compensations but they weren't monetary.

- Q No monetary compensation?
- A None whatsoever.

Q How many criminal defendants, Doctor, have you examined during your career as a psychiatrist, approximately?

A Oh, I would say approximately -- including those not appointed by the court?

Q Yes.

A 0h, 2,500, I suppose.

Q You have examined approximately 2,500 individuals charged with crimes?

A That is right.

Q And how many were charged with the crime of murder of the 2,500, approximately?

A I figured that out and that comes to about 25 percent, 25 percent of those.

17	
1	Q That would be about 500, then?
2	A Well, 25 percent of 2,500.
3	Q No, let's see
4	THE COURT: 625.
5	THE WITNESS: That is right, somewhere, five or six
6	hundred.
7.	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: So you have examined five or six
8	hundred criminal defendants being charged with murder?
9	A That is right.
10	Q With murder?
11	A Not always related to the court here.
12	Q Right. And you psychiatrically examined them?
13	A That is correct.
14	Q And how many times have you testified before any
15	court of law as to the mental state of a criminal defendant at
16	the time of the commission of a crime, approximately?
17	A Oh, I suppose in the neighborhood of about 200
18	times, something of that sort, possibly.
19	Q Not just talking about murder defendants now, any
20	type of criminal defendants?
21	A Oh, I beg your pardon.
22	Q Let's talk about murder defendants. About 200
23	times you have testified in a court of law to the state of mind
24	of an individual charged with murder?
25	A Yes.
26	Q Overall, how many times have you testified in a
27	court of law as to the state of mind of a criminal defendant
28	at the time of the commission of a crime?
	A I would like to give you a firm enswer, the only

1	

3

4 5

6

7

9

10  $\mathbf{n}$ 

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

Can you give us a vague, rough approximation? Q

Well, I can't even make it percentagewise, for the simple reason that some cases you appear and the court's dark.

MR. KAY: Like vesterday?

BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, you have examined about 2,500, apparently, criminal defendants charged with a crime; of these 2,500 would you just estimate that you have testified actually in court 500 times, a thousand times --

No, I suppose about 400 times, something of that sort, not any more than that.

The courtroom is not a place that is new to you, or anything like that?

No, but there are many who have had much greater experience.

Q During these 400 or so times, Doctor, have you testified for the defense as well as the prosecution?

A Yes. I have.

What would the breakdown on that be -- again. approximately -- how many times, approximately, have you testified for the defense as opposed to the prosecution?

Oh, I suppose 75 and 25.

2.75 percent of the times for the defense?

. For the defense: I think so.

Now: directing your attention to defendant Charles Watson. I take it you examined him?

Yes. I did.

Did Judge Alexander, the judge in this case, appoint you to examine Mr. Watson?

1	A Yes.
2	Q And when and where did you examine Mr. Watson?
3	A If I may refer to my material, your Honor
4	THE COURT: Certainly.
5	THE WITNESS: I examined Mr. Watson on order of the Court
6	at the new County Jail July 7, 1971
7	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: How long did you talk to Mr.
8	Watson?
9	A That examination was two hours.
10	Q Did you speak to him after that? Did you examine
11	him after that?
12	A Yes, I did.
13 <sup>.</sup>	Q All right; when was that?
14	A The next examination was on July 8th.
15	Q The following day?
16	A * The following day.
17	THE COURT: The first was July 9th, did you say?
18	THE WITNESS: July 7th, I believe.
19	THE COURT: Thank you, Doctor, I'm sorry.
20 .	THE WITNESS: July 7th.
21	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: The next time, July 8th; again,
22	at the County Jail?
23 24	A Again at the Jail.
24 25	Q For how long on this occasion?
25 26	A For one hour.
27	Q Did you examine him after that?
28	A I did.
20	Q When was that?

		A Property of the Control of the Con
1	A	I examined him on July 9th.
2	Q	Again at the County Jail?
3	Å	Again at the County Jail.
4	Q	For how long?
5	A	For one hour.
6	Q	Did you examine him after that?
7	A	Yes, I did, Counsel.
8	Q	When was that?
9.	A	That was on the 10th; July 10th.
10	Q	Again at the County Jail?
n	٨	Yes.
12,	Q	For how long?
13	Ä	Two hours.
14	Q	Is that the extent of your examination of Mr.
15	Watson?	
16	A	No.
17	Q	Okay. Would you relate to the jury the additional
18	times and n	umber of hours?
<b>19</b>	Å	I again examined him on July 15.
20	Q	County Jail?
21	٨	County Jail.
22	Q	For how long?
23:	· 🔥	For one hour.
24	Q	You may continue.
25	<b>A</b> '	I again examined him July 16.
26	Q	County Jail?
27	٨	County Jail.
28	Q	How long?

.ķ

10.

ر 

to remember.

I did several emotional profile charts -- or, he did, at my request.

Q Would you relate to the jury how he performed these various tests that you were talking about, like the neurological test and the projective test?

A Yes, if I may, in the neurological test -- if I may start with the first and go sequentially?

Q Yes, yes.

A -- we established good rapport, in the first place. Substantially, he was concerned as to any examiner, a new one, because I had understood that he had had others, and so I made it a point to explain the purpose of the procedure and something as to the foremat of the procedure and as to what my place in the picture was.

I therefore started out asking him to look at some pictures, and these pictures are standard pictures which have to do with simply asking the individual what the picture tells, what the story is as described in the picture. He did this very well.

I then showed him another standard page having rather ridiculous combinations of pictures, such as a rooster with three legs and a man in armor, or at least a figure in armor with a gun, other tests, indicating other pictures which were equally unrelated; and he very quickly and very accurately recognized the inequitiess and described them.

I tested him on memory items, and, as is evidenced in the dialogue later, he did very well, with certain

£.

exceptions which he, himself, indicated, which will later appear.

Q Before you go any further, give us an example of what you considered to be good memory on his part.

A Well, I think he could remember what he did in high school and what he used to do when he was fishing and how he used to be with the zirline and what he could do at the time; and what his folks had always taught him to do and what he remembered about his life at the ranch and before that; when he picked up a hitchhiker and was subsequently on the road.

3

4

5

Ĝ

He remembered many of the details of the incident in question and had a very good recall of circumstances in the area of detention.

- Q You mean when he was incarcerated?
- A Incarcerated in Texas. There was no problem.
- Q He remembered everything that occurred in Texas?
- A Yes.
- Q. While he was in jail there?

A That is right. I don't know, when I say everything, I wouldn't say that enyone remembers everything, but in general.

Then his description of his experience in the jail here, his experience that he had at Atascadero and subsequently, and his recall of the various portions of my examination, because we tried to make it cohesive from day to day and I examined him, naturally, from day to day to have more points of reference than one or two.

- Q So you found no impairment of memory?
- A And I was satisfied that -- well, the first memory tests that I gave him, when I showed him some ten items on a picture, I told him I was going to ask him some questions about that and he answered, gave me eight of the ten right away and with a stimulus of my rubbing my ring -- "oh, yes, a ring," or my moving my hand across the face -- "Oh, yes, a shaving brush."

Those two items he recalled, but that was with an added visual stimulus.

Q He remembered eight without any stimulus on your part?

26

27

10'

9.

A Yes.

Q He remembered the additional two by what you did?

A That is right.

Q You may go on with respect to the various tests you gave Mr. Watson and how he performed them.

A I am looking now at the material that was on the hospital charts, which is part of my examination, but which does not relate to the question at the moment.

Then I, in order to determine how steady his hand was, whether he could see, whether he could understand my request, whether his brain could function in response to my request and to his understanding of it and, therefore, he could make his hand do what he wanted his hand to do, I drew a diagram, which is routine with me.

And this diagram, I drew the top one, with a circle, a square, a diagram, and the male and female symbols, and with all due respect to me, he did a better one than I did.

In other words, I mean his line was firm and his duplication was excellent. Then I asked him to draw me a picture of a person and this is partly for the same reason: To determine this, the ability to make the hand do what the brain asks, and to understand what is asked of the individual, but it also is a thing that I studied in Switzerland, as it happens.

This is years ago when I was a delegate to the Third Internstional Psychological Congress at Zurich, and I became very much interested in this sort of thing, and every

case I have had since 1954, whether surgical, neurological, or psychiatrical. I always asked them to do two things.

1. I have had some 5,000 cases, that I have never had an opportunity of researching, but it is ready -- one is to draw a person -- in this case the person is drawn very nicely. There is good balance.

- I don't see too well, but is there a person drawn there?
  - Oh, yes, there is.
- I was looking at the center of the sheet. Way up Q in the upper left-hand corner?
  - A Yes.
- Sorry, Doctor, to have interrupted you like that. You may continue.
  - Come into my office.
- I am so busy I don't have time, Doctor. I even work on weekends. You may continue, Doctor,

Well, no. but this, the fact is that this person is well proportioned but is drawn as it happens in the upper left-hand corner of the page.

Then I asked the individual, in this case Mr. Watson, to draw me a picture of a fruit tree and he did that and that is a well proportioned tree, but it too is in the upper left-hand corner of the page.

> THE COURT: Does that have any significance? THE WITNESS: Yes, it does, your Honor.

This has significance. It may have other significances but it has one significance -- which through

the years I have determined and others have determined -when an individual puts their figure in the upper-left-hand
corner of the page, this is due to a feeling of being
cornered, simply stated, a feeling of being cornered.

Now, if the individual has an organic problem primarily, this figure will be in the lower half of the page.

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Organic brain problem?

A Brain problem or any other problem that has to do with their concern regarding a withered limb or some area of difficulty which they may not be aware of, but which from a psychological standpoint will give them the weighted index, if I may say, of an organic problem rather than one having to do with emotional stress.

- Q You formed this opinion as a result of examining or giving approximately 5,000 people that test?
  - A Yes.
  - Q You may continue.
- A Then after that, and this is on the same day, I asked Mr. Watson to do a Cornell emotion profile.
  - Q A standard psychological test?
- A Yes, having to do with answers of yes and no and he being perfectly free to answer in any way that he saw fit and he did answer those and those are part of my consideration.

I then asked him to do another somewhat similar but rather more. I will say, emotional sensitive -- this other test has to do with physical situations, responses to certain circumstances, questions of some emotional feeling, conditions, as regards the sympathetic nervous system relating to the

heart, lungs, and so forth, questions also relating to the degree of tension -- whether the individual used to wet the bed very much and questions of physical response, but sometimes occasioned by emotional conditioning.

·5

9,

15.

20.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

16. 

**24**<sup>-</sup>

25. 

Q ... Ten new items or the same ten?

Then questions about whether the individual has had trouble with the law, whether they have used dope regularly, what their experiences were in reform school, something about the opposite sex and so on.

Now, this one (indicating) is a modified Mooney chart of some -- this one (indicating) has 100 questions, 101, and this last one, the modified profile, has 88 lines but 100 questions.

Several, the questions are twofold, but totaling 100 questions.

And these are answered without any other stimulus than to say, "Charles, will you please look this over and you can answer it yes or no sometimes or none of your business, just write it down," and that is exactly what I told him, so he did that.

That was my first examination. Then I examined him again on the 8th and I noticed that his nails were neatly manicured but that his nail beds were a little cyanosed, a little on the bluish side and I didn't like that.

Q What was the significance of that?

A I didn't know but I wanted to find out. It had something to do with circulation and so I wanted to find out and so then I, as I say, reviewed the hospital chart and the file, then proceeded with other questions which I have included in my full report.

Then I repeated the memory items and he again got eight out of ten.

```
an individual gets stuck on the record, so to speak, and he
1
     did not. I found no perseveration.
2
3.
5
7.
9
10
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

3.

R

15.

In other words, sometimes people will look at a standard card and say, "Here's a parrot -- oh, yes, here's a parrot"; and they go on and on, and maybe two or three more cards, "You know this parrot has some red on it," indicating that they come up with the same image; and this can have other implications, but it is so often present in organic brain damage cases that I always look for it.

From that standpoint and from that standpoint, only, because otherwise I send my Rorschachs out to clinical psychologists for a report.

Q But the lack of perseveration by Mr. Watson caused you to come to what conclusion?

A This was only a straw in the wind; I didn't come to any conclusion at that particular time, but that, added to other things, gave me the feeling that, at least that did not support the view of gross brain damage -- because people who have strokes, for instance, will have that frequently, perseveration, providing it is in the right area --

Q Of the brain?

A -- of the brain.

Then I went on with my examination, asked him many questions, all of which are verified. Then, this was all for that examination.

Then, on the 9th --

THE COURT: Before we come to the 9th, suppose we have our worning recess.

MR. BUCLIOSI: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we will

9-2 have our morning recess at this time. Once again, heed the admonition heretofore given. (Recess.) ġ 

5.

28 .

THE COURT: People against Watson. Let the record show all jurors, counsel, and the defendant are present. Mr. Bugliosi, you may proceed.

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you, your Honor.

of these examinations you gave Mr. Watson and how he performed them.

THE COURT: You were starting on the examination of the 9th, I believe.

THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.

On July 9th, I examined Mr. Watson that morning, had occasion to ask him about how he had been feeling and he told me.

He discussed his diet. He said that he had been moved out of the hospital facilities after the middle meal. He said, "I ate a lot of fruit and I can eat tuna fish, soup, if it is vegetable. I can't handle sugar or greasy things yet. It comes out by my spitting it up."

I noticed that he had new hospital garb. He was neatly attired in denim and he appeared to be very much better and he said, "I can eat dried foods, in fact, mother used to bring me that in jail in Texas."

He said, "I am in 2500 now." That is the cell area -- "and I can keep down all of the vegetable and fruit juices."

I checked his blood pressure and his pulse and respiration at that time, they were normal, and he said, "I had a stomach X ray this morning, so I had no breakfast."

And at that time I launched into the problems of his background as regards difficulty with the law and have reported it in my full report. 5 \*

lif.

9.

. 15

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

11R-1

2

1

3 4

5 6

7 .8

.9

10 11

12

13<sup>-</sup>

15

16 17

18

**1**9

Ž0

21

22 , 25

> 24 25

26 27

27 28 This report, if I may say, is a verbatim copy of this material which is all handwritten at the time the question is asked and the answer is given; and this related to various items as to what went on at times at the ranch and it was in that general discussion.

Then I saw him -- that was on the 9th -- on the 10th. I saw him for two hours and I just -- to give an idea of the kind of finding at the time, I said, "How did you get along last night?"

His enswer was, "All right."

"Did you have a good supper?"

"No. "

"Why not, Charles?"

"I spit it up."

"Why?"

"Fried chicken, thick, yellow dessert; I gave it to somebody else."

"Any breakfast?"

MNo. H

"Any juices?"

"No, and just a roll with sugar on it; eggs and cereal stuff, I don't know what it was. Then they have the same stuff that everybody else has, and when I go back to the cell I go into this feeling of spitting and coughing and chest pains, so I don't eat it; and heart starts hurting, too."

And then, further description of the dietary difficulties which he was having -- and, the physician, irrespective of paychiatry or anything else -- as a physician,

baby?"

I was concerned as regards his nutrition; and so I then asked him about other questions.

well, he said, in response to my question, "You are concerned about your food and your diet supplements; and do you know what I mean by that?"

And he said, "Yes, I do, vitamins fruit and vegetable juices."

Then he told me what he could eat if he could get it, and he said, "The more natural it is, the better."

And then we talked about eating raw fish, providing it had been treated with lime juice, and so on and so forth; and he responded with excellent rapport -- in other words, he laughed when there was a little opportunity to smile at a little quip of some kind, and was very responsive.

Then I asked him several questions as regards matters of fact; so I asked him, "What's the difference between a lie and a mistake?"

And he said, 'Well, a lie is if you tell somebody not the truth."

I said, "Well, what about a mistake?"

Well, he said, "A mistake just happens."

"What's the difference between a midget and a

"A midget is a little man."

Then I asked him what was the intent or the meaning of several aphorisms, you know, commonly stated items, such as, "Benjamin Franklin said, "If you make honey of yourself,

8)

10.

. · · 15

12£.

.

the flys will est you. 1

"If you make honey of yourself, the flies will est you. What do we mean by that, Charles?"

He said, "I don't know."

Then I asked him another questions, which any schoolboy would know, and I'm sure he knew; but he said, "I don't know."

THE COURT: What was the question, Doctor?

THE WITNESS: "If we say the early bird catches the worm, what do we mean?"

Then he went on to tell me -- and this stimulated a very interesting response -- he said, "I used to dig worms to go fishing around Copeville, my hometown. There was a lake there and my uncle had some pool-like ponds and I used to fish or crawfish and sell the crawfish."

of memory, to read to himself and then read to me the following -- and this happened to be a brochure that I had gotten from the new railroad combine which took over the Southern Pacific, and so forth; and this tells the story, or it is a brochure having to do with a little trip that some of the railroad buffs who like to ride trains for the fun of it were going to have a trip up to surf.

#12

2

1

3

6 7

9

10 11

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 ^-

## And it read this way:

"Piests de la Purisima and Tour of the Lompoc Valley Flower Gardens, Sunday, May 16. 1971.

"Mission bells ring hearlding a day of celebration. The largest and most complete historic restoration in the west and this is brought to life with demonstration of the crafts by its early residents. Many of the original tools. Pressing olives to make olive oil. Weaving, candle dipping, wine making and many more. Of course no flests is complete without music and dancing of which there will be a great amount."

And I said, "What is the story there. Charles?" And he said, "Well, it is a story of taking a trip to the mission, to the flests. There is going to be dencing and music and it was up at Lompoc at a mission. It was going to be in May and they used to make wine there, pressing for olives and crafts and talked about their ancestors."

> "Where was the train going?" And he said, "U, the coast."

Then I asked him as to what his mother's maiden This is standard procedure, of course, because most everybody knows their mother's maiden name.

> And he said, "Mary Elizabeth Montgomery," And I said, "How many doctors have you seen?" And he said, "Four at UCLA and four here,"

12-2

1 2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11.

12 13

14 15

16

,17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

Then I said, "Did you see any in Texas?"
And he said, "No."

"Were you in the hospital in Texas?"

"Only when I was a little boy and got my foot cut and I still can't bend my left big toe down because it is numb."

And he showed me the scar on the base of his foot, a two-inch scar which is diagonally under the arch of the foot.

Then I said, "Are your mother and father living?"

He said, "Yes."

And I said, "Do they write?"

And he said, "Well, he puts a note in mother's letters and mother has written 75 letters."

And I said, "Do you write them?"

And he said, "Everyday."

It was at that time that I then reviewed the hospital charts -- I had reviewed them on the 9th and on the 10th I again looked at them.

Now, on the 9th I made this statement on the chart -- those of us who are in this particular capacity have no jurisdiction as regards the medical services at the detention facilities unless we are, as some of the doctors are, are on the staff of that facility, but nevertheless those of us who are consultants, as we were in this case, are given the opportunity of writing on the chart if we so desire.

In fact, we have to write on the chart whenever we are there just to indicate that we have been there, including the time in which we started our examination and

12-3

-3

12<sup>.</sup>

.28

when we complete it.

On the 9th I reviewed the chart. After the defendant had left the interview room I made this notation, "Please make special diet and quiet surroundings available stat --" that means at once -- "to this patient. His need is real. Thank you."

And signed my name.

Q ... You say "His need is real." What do you mean by that?

A "His need is real." Well, in the first place he couldn't eat the food that he had access to.

I had determined that he was losing weight. He would have times in which he was very listless. The hospital chart indicated that.

I haven't indicated that all -- I haven't that all down here but there were factors which indicated that when he wasn't getting the kind of food that either he thought he could eat or that he would eat -- if he won't eat it, whether you think you can or not, if you won't, you don't, and so when you don't, why, then something can happen.

It was related to his condition and so I said
I recommend that the patient be returned to the hospital here
in central jail for care -- back to the hospital because in
the hospital they are able to give a dietary which they are
not able to give -- it is impossible for them to give in the
routine ward care.

That is, I will say, cell care. They would like to but it just can't be done.

2 .

Q. What did you determine Mr. Watson's weight to be at the time of your examination?

On the 12th I saw him -- I again saw him on the 15th. I have completed now up to the 10th.

I saw him again on the 15th and I saw him in order to determine the location and status of the defendant; in other words, I wanted to know where he was and I wanted to know what his condition was and I found out that he had been transferred to 7000, which is the hospital area and there are comments there as regards that.

And at that particular examination on the 15th I have these notations -- not on the hospital chart but in my own notes -- "He came down to the psychiatric interview room ambulatory --"

- Q Meaning that he could walk?
- A That he could walk -- "weeping and saying he wouldn't see me."

And he stood outside of the door and the deputies were with him as they have to be bringing a defendant in, but he didn't want to come in.

So I invited him in and I invited him to sit down and I explained that I was there to help regarding his nutritional and health problem as per my recommendation of the 10th, which was five days before, and then he calmed down and then he said that he had been to court yesterday.

I saked him, "When do you go again?"

And he said, "I don't know, I just want to go

5.

i1

to court to testify the truth I know."

Then I said, "Charles, you know that I mentioned a special diet and quiet surroundings especially?"

And he said, "Yes, I know. And the first day they put me in a room with three people and it was too much confusion. Then I was put in a room by myself, in room 15, and I felt great.

"I was sitting there writing my parents, had a good night's sleep, and then they got me up, told me I was going to court.

"They took me early and all I had to eat was applesauce. I couldn't eat the pancakes. I was brought down on the line, then brought back up because it was too early and they moved me back to the three people room and I flipped out in there and started hollering for the nurse and a guy jumped on me and started choking me."

I said, "Do you mean you were choking him or he was choking you?"

And he said, "Don't be silly," and he laughed at me. "I was crying. He was choking me. Then I went to court.

"I just told my attorney I wasn't getting along too well over here, and about the people in my room. It was all confusion and my head aches now. So they put me back in the single room until bedtime and then they put me back with all those people again and I didn't sleep last night and I just came down here from there now," which certainly explained why he didn't want to see me.

13R-1

1 2

3

4

Charles?"

5

6 7

8

9.

10<sup>.</sup>

12

13

14 15

> 16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

**2**6

27 28 But I have a notations here, "Defendant responds to my interest and concern."

Then I said, "When did you see your attorney,

And he said, "Last night."

I said, "What do you weigh now?

"Trank time was 112 and the observe as of 7-12-7

"Last time was 112 and the chart as of 7-12-71 showed 114."

The chart on the 15th, 1971, this was the day that I saw him, 0730 -- that's 7:30 in the morning, I believe -- "Laying in fetal position" -- all curled up -- "bed has not been made up, requesting to move to a single room."

0755, almost 8:00 o'clock, seen by doctor -- one of the doctors -- "No new orders."

8:15, "Was visited by the chaplain."

10:10, "To the first floor for a psychiatric examination" -- and that's where I came in at that particular time that morning.

NB, after my examination I weighed the defendant; I took Hm into the dispensary and weighed him, myself, and he weighed 112 pounds at that time.

I excorted him to 7000, I took him up with a deputy -- I suppose you should say the deputy took us up; but nonetheless, he and I walked up together and I talked with the charge nurse there and he and I then went to the Director's office and discussed the case dynamics, and the need for nutritional superalimentation -- in other words, he needed to have forced feeding, if you will -- but what I meant by that,

Ð

 he needed to have more food than he was getting.

He was getting all the food that anybody else got, but he wasn't eating it; so, technically, he was getting the food but he would either give it away or let it sit, and the necessity of individual -- the necessity of an individual cell was discussed.

These items were written on the hospital chart this date. In other words, I wrote those facts on the hospital chart.

Then, going back, if I might, to the 10th, because this was on a separate series of sheets of paper, I asked a lot of questions to which he gave answers to all of the questions, and those were included in my report.

The questions were not asked exactly as these particular -- these are statements here, but I devised a question based on the statement and have given those questions and answers in verbatim account.

- Q . Is this pertaining to the two nights of murder?
- A This pertains to the nights of the murders.
- Q These questions and answers?

A Questions and answers; there are some 30 -- well, there is some 40-some questions and his answers, and I wrote his answers on the material at the time.

I believe that constitutes the main body of my observational examination.

And, of course, then, I had previously and subsequently have had access to the other transcripts, voluminously;
and, of course, have very recently to some of the other

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

	1	to whether	or not he was mentally retarded?
	2	A	Yes.
	3	Q	What is your opinion?
	4	A	He is not mentally retarded.
13af.	5		
	6		
	7		
	8		·
	9		
	10 11		
	12		
	13		
	14		
•	15		
	16		
	17		
	18 <sup>.</sup>		
	19 20		
	20 21		
	22		
	23		,
	24		
	25		
٠	26		
	27		
	28		

2	

á

5

б

7 8

ġ

10 11

12

13. 14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

7	$\mathbf{Q}_{\gamma,\mathcal{L}}$	Did	you	form	any	opinion	基章	to	hi:	intelligence
other	than	that	he v	as n	ot me	entally	ret	arde	ed?	

I considered that his enswers were intelligent and pertinent and his responses were certainly relevant to either his needs or mine, either one of the two -- sometimes both.

Did you feel, based on your examination of him, that he was an intelligent individual?

> A Yes.

You are familiar with the Wechler I.Q. test. Doctor?

Yes.

Q Do you feel that the results of the Wechler I.Q. test can be adversely affected by a person's physical health?

I would say that they can be adversely affected by -- any of the intelligence tests can be adversely affected by the individual's emotional attitude toward a physical condition or toward an environmental situation, where there is stress and where there is pressure. Any psychologist knows that.

Do you feel that that is an ideal place -- or do you feel that being incarcerated and being charged with seven counts of murder is an ideal situation for being administered the psychological tests?

No. I do not.

Do you feel that the situation is such that it Q could cause the results of the tests to come out lower than they normally would come out under more relaxed circumstances?

9

20 -

~23

24 · 

that specifically in this case, considering the problems which he has experienced and considering the stress, some of it self-induced, some of it the manner of contagion from his any environment; but, in event, he has had so much on his mind and so much actually on his conscience that it is a fact, as far as I am concerned, that a specific member is not as -- it is valid for -- it is valid for the condition at the time, but it is not valid for his usual capacity nor for his potential.

I am sure that in general, and I would have to say

Q When you say "a specific number" you mean a specific number on a psychological test?

A That's right.

Q So you feel that that number could be lower in view of the fact that when he took these tests he was incarcerated, he was in poor health and he was beset with all types of emotional problems?

A Well, he had the same milieu, if you will, when he was answering the rest of my tests; he didn't do badly on those, and I'm the first one to emphasize that fact. But, also, when it comes to the various tests of intelligence -- now, there are various kinds of intelligence; I don't have to go into that, except to say that one can have a high musical quotient and have a low mathematical quotient, but the general overall picture can be one which can be all the way from idiocy, to genius; and there are many eccentrics who are genii, as well as genie.

Q Based on your evaluation of Mr. Watson, if he had

1

8

10

**12** 

13

 $\mathbf{n}$ 

14 15

17

16

. 18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

.27

26

28

taken all of these psychological tests, not only the ones that you gave him but the ones administered to him out of UCLA, do you feel that he could have done better or would have done better if at the time of the tests he wasn't being charged with murder and he wasn't incarcerated?

MR. BUBRICK: Objection; conclusion,

MR. BUGLIOSI: This is a conclusion they were going into with their psychologists, your Honor, way back in Texas, even before Mr. Watson came out here.

MR. BUBRICK: He is asked to assume facts which are actually not in evidence, your Honor.

THE COURT: Objection sustained.

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Doctor, do you feel that Mr. Watson is an intelligent individual?

A I felt that he answered me intelligently; and, therefore, he has capacity, yes.

- Q What does the term "dissociation" mean?
- A Dissociation?
- Q. Is that a psychiatric term?
- A That is a psychiatric term.
- Q. ... What does it mean?

A That is a condition which one's answers and one's feelings don't jibe.

Q One's answers and one's feeling don't jibe, they don't -- aren't consistent with each other?

A That's right.

1	Q Could you give an example?
ź	A Well, I suppose we know lots of examples an
3	individual might think he wasn't drunk, when he was, for
4	instance; that's one. That is dissociation.
5	An individual who is has a condition in which
6	he says, "Well, isn't this a terrible tragedy we are having?"
7	when the earthquake hits and then laughs about all the
8	people that are having troubles
9	Q As a result of the earthquake?
10	A Sure; that's dissociation.
11	Q Did you find any evidence of dissociation in
12	Mr. Watson?
13	A No.
14	Q Now, as a neurologist you are concerned very
15 .	such, of course, with the central nervous system; is that
16	correct?
17	A Xes.
18	Q And you did give some physical examinations to
19.	Mr. Watson, also?
20	A Yes, I did.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	1.

4K−Ť	•	

2

3

5

б

7

- 8

9

-10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

.24

25

26

Q	Did	you	find	any	damage	to	his	central	nervous
ystem?					•				

- A If I may refer --
- Q You might also like the type of examination you gave him?

A Well, the neurological examination has to do with the determination of the ability of the body to function and the ability of the brain and the spinal cord and the nerves coming from the spinal cord to the various extremeties and to the areas of special sense having to do with smell, vision, hearing, taste, and so on.

Even the ability to shrug the shoulders is controlled by one nerve, the eleventh cranial nerve.

There are other muscles functioning but that is one of them. The ability to stick the tongue out is controlled by one nerve, the twelfth cranial nerve that comes from the base of the brain, and the nerves of special sense have to be investigated.

He could hear me. He could see me. He could talk. He could walk. He could think. He could feel.

I tested him as regards his reflexes. His reflexes were satisfactory. They were equal bilaterally, on both sides.

He had no pathological reflexes with the exception of the fact that he had about three-quarter dilated pupils on both sides when I first saw him, but subsequently when I examined him, why, his pupils were equal and smaller.

I refer to that particular thing as a possible bangover from his previous belladonne, or whatever other

27

28

He

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

his foot.

Q	His	reflexes	appeared	to	be	good?
---	-----	----------	----------	----	----	-------

- A They were.
- Q Did you find any evidence of brain damage?
- A I didn't find any evidence of brain damage.
- Q You, of course, did not administer an encephalogram?
- A No, I did not. I did not do a pneumoencephalogram,
- Q But from the examinations you gave him, the physical examination and the psychological examinations and your personal interviews, you did not form the opinion that he had brain damage?
  - A I did not.
- Q This considerable loss of weight on Mr. Watson's part, to what do you attribute this? Merely a lack of eating on his part?
- A I attribute that to several conditions. I attribute that to not eating the foods that he felt he could, if he could have, that he could eat, and I believe that he could have eaten them had he had them. That loss of weight was partially due to that.

There was another reason for the loss of weight, so far as I am concerned and that is that he refused to eat, not just because he didnot get what he wanted to eat, but he several times refused to eat and I believe that, that along with certain other situations, which indicated his displeasure with the circumstances that he found himself in -- that he utilized those techniques to obtain, as I have reported in my formal report, a little bit like one man, one vote -- one man,

2

3 4

5 6

Ź 8

9. 10<sup>-</sup>

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

**Ž**1

22.

23

4.7

26

27 28 one room.

When he got the room he was then happier. He had his way. He was honestly -- and I say this right from the heart -- he was honestly not as disturbed in the single room as he was in the other rooms, because the people in the other mome were not concerned with how he felt about anything or how he got along and this was a legitimate need, but he utilized techniques in order to achieve it.

- Q Now, Doctor, did Mr. Watson dscribe his personality to you during your interviews with him?
  - A Well, the whole picture I believe is --
- Q Referring to Page 6 of your report, does there appear to be a description given by Mr. Watson of himself on that page, the fifth paragraph down?

THE COURT: You can use it, Doctor.

THE WITNESS: Would you like a copy?

THE COURT: All right, if you would like me to, all right.

- Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Line 20, does he describe himself from Line 20 to 27?
  - A Page 67
  - Q Yes.
  - A Line what?
  - Q Line 20 to 27?
  - A Yes.
  - Q Well, how does he describe himself?
- A Well, now, you understand that these descriptions, these answers are in response to my questions.
  - Q Yes.
  - A On the regulation chart.

0	Rut	these	are	his.	words?
v	DUL	LHCDE	476	HLD	MOTUDI

- A These are his words.
- Q What does he say about it?
- A He said:

"I am oversensitive and sometimes I stay too much by myself. I have a hard time making up my mind but I resent suggestions from other people.

"Sometimes I am suspicious of other people and sometimes I seem to be depressed and other times optimistic without reason.

"Yes, I'm upset by arguments but I am hungry for affection. I love children. I have sort of lost interest in current events and I have lost my ambition. Sometimes I think my life has been a failure.

"Yes, I lack self-confidence and I wish I were a child again.

"Yes, sometimes people and new places seem unfamiliar. I am exceptionally orderly. I dm a Methodist.

"Yes, now the influence of my relatives is unusually strong. As I say about my memory, with those drugs, it wasn't good, but usually it is all right and my memory now, like I am telling you, is better than it was.

"Sometimes it is hard for me to relax and sometimes I oversleep. At times I am emotionally

1· 2

3

**4** 5

6 7

8

9

ļ0

, \* 11 · 12

13

14 15

.16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28 unstable and I have had these physical symptoms:
When I eat, I spit up most food that lies in my
stomach and some things I can eat but most things
I can't est. I have stomach pains and chest pains
and hemorrhoids but I can handle light foods and
juices.

"I somehow spit up oils and sugar and sweets just after eating them. I have a tender stomach. I can eat raw or dried foods."

- Q Doctor, did you ask Mr. Watson about his participation in these murders?
  - A Yes, I did.
- Q And did you incorporate your enswers and/or your questions and his enswers into your report?
  - A I did.
- Q Incidentally, how long is your report? How many pages?
  - A 54 pages.
- Q This is a 54-page psychiatric report that you submitted to Judge Alexander; is that correct?
  - A That is correct.
- Q How many pages of notes have you taken on this case, your personal notes, approximately?
  - A I am ashamed to say that I haven't counted them.
  - Q Is it in the hundreds?
- A I wouldn't say it was in the hundreds, but each of these constitute a page, and that is two pages so far as I am concerned because I write on the back -- let's see for

moment, if I may.

get a general idea.

A Just this once so I can get an idea and measure it out. 28. Well, you might be right -- a couple hundred I would say.

Q' You personally have taken a couple hundred pages of notes on this case?

A That is right.

Q How many hours of work would you estimate you devoted to this case, that is reading reports, examining Mr. Watson, et cetera?

A Well, I'll tell you I have had it on my mind since I first saw him and that doesn't answer your question but it overshadows a lot of things.

		1

2		

5

7

.8 9

10

ų

12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27 28 Q All the reports you have read, all the notes you have written, how many hours?

A I know that I have spent -- well, I suppose in the neighborhood of 300 hours; I think so. That's a lot of hours, but I have spent that much.

Q You have spent 300 hours solely on this case?

A That's right.

Q Now, you indicated that you asked Mr. Watson some questions about these murders and he gave you answers and you incorporated these questions and answers into your 54 page report to Judge Alexander; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Will you relate to the judge and the jury the questions you asked Mr. Watson about these murders and the answers he gave you?

A If I may, then, refer to my report -- do you have the page that you were thinking of there?

Q I have it written down here -- I believe it starts on Page 12, but I'm not sure about that.

A I'd like --

Q Certainly.

A No, I know where it is.

Q Certainly on 15 and at seq, has questions and answers about the case; but you also start asking on Page 12 and 13. I believe.

A I start on Page 8, Line 6.

Q All right, what did you ask him?

A. "How many times have you been in trouble with the

law?#

á

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1Ò

11 12

1š

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

MR. KEITH: I am going to object --

MR. BUBRICK: Yes, your Honor.

MR. KEITH: May we approach the bench, your Honor?

MR. BUGLIOSI: May we approach the bench, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

Mr. Reporter, please.

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

MR. BUGLIOSI: There are certain things in here, I think, that might refer to the theft of the typewriters back in Texas -

MR. KEITH: Yes, that's what I was going to object to, immaterial.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The thing is, your Honor, under case law -- in re Spencer, 63 Cal. 2d, People vs. Henderson, also in 63 Cal. 2d, I think this type of thing has a right to come in if the Court gives the jury a limiting instruction.

I do have to lay a foundation that he took these things into consideration in forming his opinion; but if he did take these things into consideration, with a limiting instruction, I think the California Supreme Court has said they come in.

I might add this --

THE COURT: I am trying to recall what was the Spencer case that let it come in with a limiting instruction.

What was it they permitted to come in?

MR. BUGLIOSI: You mean in the Spencer case?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I forget, your Honor, but I might add this, your Honor: The defense, during their case in chief, they brought in things that -- past history, substantively -- substantively they brought in all types of things that rarely come in during the guilt phase. They came in substantively --

THE COURT: Like what?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Pardon?

THE COURT: Like what?

MR. BUGLIOSI: He got in school, that he was a nice kid, went fishing; these things are almost invariably reserved for the penalty trial, all good things about his character --

THE COURT: No, I took this only on this basis, to show a marked difference between what he was then and what he became later, to show a lack of mental capacity.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I agree. I think the Court properly ruled inpermitting it to come in.

What I am saying is this: Evidence of his good character came in substantively. We are trying to get this in right here, not even substantively -- not even substantively -- but as a basis for the doctor's opinion.

I, personally, feel that the typewriter thing should have some in substantively, because it shows that he didn't have the good character --

THE COURT: But your question to the doctor, though,
Mr. Bugliosi, was, "Did you question him about these murders?"

MR. BUGLIOSI: I agree; and then he went back --

THE COURT: And he is going back.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I agree on that. I can certainly take

ŽQ.

him back; I had intended to go into this later, but he jumped back, himself, on this; but I think under in re Spencer, your Honor -- I have several other cases --

THE COURT: I know there are certain things can come in, but I'm trying to recall exactly what came in on the Spencer case that led to the limiting instruction.

MR. BUGLIOSI: John, could we have 63 Cal. Ap. 2d?
THE COURT: It is after 12:00 now. I will let the jury

(To the jury:) It is now past our recess time. We will recess at this time until 1:30, and, again, head the usual admonition.

(The following proceedings were had after the jury left.)

HR. KEITH: I will make my objection for the record.

MR. KEITH: No. 1, there is no evidence to show that Dr. Bailey used this incident that occurred back in Texas involving typewriters as a basis for any opinion he may have subsquently formed about Mr. Watson.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I haven't laid a foundation, I agree.

MR. KEITH: There is no foundation.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I agree with that.

THE COURT: Go shead.

MR. KEITH: Secondly, it would appear to me at this juncture, at least, that the prejudicial effect of this conversation concerning stealing of typewriters that Watson had with Dr. Bailey, far outweighs any probative value it may have with respect to Dr. Bailey's opinion about Mr. Watson's mental

,2

.9

16£.

condition.

I seriously doubt that Dr. Bailey concerned a high school or college prank that occurred many years ago in reaching his conclusion.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It just speaks in the abstract, your Honor, that it should come in for a limited purpose. It doesn't indicate what came in, but there are several other cases in this area --

THE COURT: You see, Mr. Bugliosi, I am inclined to keep that out.

MR. BUGLIOSI: On what, if I may be so presumptuous to ask the Court, on what legal rationale?

THE COURT: The legal rationals would be, No. 1, under 352 it would be perfectly proper for me to keep this out.

If the doctor finds -- or, if the doctor feels
that this is necessary to a proper psychiatric evaluation of
the defendant, then I would permit it in with a limiting instruction; but the doctor must find that this was necessary for a
proper psychiatric evaluation of the defendant.

HR. BUGLIOSI: Okay.

(Recess.)

#16

1

2

3

5

6

7

. 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26-

**27** 

28

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, SPETEMBER 21, 1971; 1:30 P.M.

THE COURT: People against Watson.

Let the record show all jurors, counsel, and the defendant are present.

Mr. Bugliosi, you may proceed.

K. GROVNER BAILEY.

resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)

## BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q Thank you, your Honor.

Doctor, before getting into the questions and answers with respect to these two nights of killings, did Mr. Watson tell you anything concerning an incident back in Texas when he was 19, which you took into consideration in forming your overall evaluation of Tex Watson?

A Yes.

Q And what incident was that?

MR. KEITH: Object to the question on the ground previously stated.

THE COURT: Yes.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, very often a doctor when questioning a patient will elicit facts from a patient and the doctor will base his opinion upon facts elicited from the patient.

16-2

2.

i

12# ™ - 5

ź8`

Those facts are not to be considered as evidence by you. Remember those facts are facts upon which the doctor has based his opinion and is not evidence in this case and you are not to use that against this defendant in any way whatspever.

Is that clear, ladies and gentlemen?

The objection will be overruled. You may proceed.

3

4 5

6

7

<sup>1</sup>9

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23.

24

25 26 \*

> . 27

28

MR, BUGLIOSI: Thank you, your Honor,

- Q What was that incident back in Texas, Doctor?
- A Well, I asked, "What kind of trouble?"

And he said, "It was when I was in college at North Texas State at Denton, Texas, I was about 19" -- and I saked him how much he weighed at the time and he said, "150 pounds; another guy and I stole some typewriters from the high school that I went to before when I was in Farmersville,"

And I asked him how far that was from Denton and he said about 35 miles; and I said, "Well, why did you go that far to get the typewriters?"

And he said, "Just for something to do, I guess."
"How long did you keep them?

"Well, a couple of weeks and then the other guy took them back.

"Unharmed and unsold?

"Yesh, no charges were filed,"

And I asked him then, "Were you ever in jail there or were you in jail there?"

And he said, "No, I have never been in jail before except for overnight in jail in Van Nuys with this beliadonna thing."

- Q Getting into the questions and enswers with respect to these two nights of the killings, what did you ask him and what did he respond?
  - A May I ask a question in answer to that question?
  - Q Yes.

A . Are you speaking of the intimate details of that

ij

 night or are you speaking of the background which led up to whatever, because I very necessarily considered background relating to his time in California.

Q All right, you can include that, then: First, the background; and then the questions and answers on these two nights --

THE COURT: And if you skip pages or paragraphs, Doctor, would you let us know, please?

THE WITNESS: I will, of course, your Honor.

I started out with a dialogue regarding -- now, this is on page 9, line 15, I believe -- dialogue regarding motivation and parental attitudes, Texas to California:

"Were you just adventurous or were you dismissed from college or were you mad at your folks or were you miffed with your girlfriend or were you tired of Texas?"

And he laughed when I asked that question, "Or why did you leave?"

His answer, "I knew one guy out there, David Neal, and I flew out a few times on airplane passes. I was working for Braniff and I got passes and a discount on my fare, so I liked it there and I moved out here in August 1967.

"What did your folks say?

"I was 21. They didn't want me to go. Mother let me come because I told her I was going to college. I went to California State for a couple of months until I found that going to college was too much, plus my working, so I had to work at the wig company to pay for my apartment; so they

didn't pay me too much and I couldn't go back to school. 1,7-3 ŀ 3. 10. 11. 15. . . . 2Š-

2

4

Ś

ę

7

8

9

10 11

12

13 . . . . .

15

16 17

18 ;

19·

20 21

22

23 · 24

25

26

27 28

him?

"Did you keep in touch with your folks?

"Yes, up to the time I started taking drugs and as I said at the same time I met Charles Manson.

"Where did you meet him?

"I picked up Dennis Wilson of the Beach Boys hitchhiking. I was on Sunset Boulevard and Pacific Palisades and he took me to his home and Charlie and some of the girls were there and Dean Moorehouse.

"About when was that?

"In March 1968,

"When were you arrested?

"December 1, 1969.

"Had you been in trouble out here before that

"No

How long a time was it between the time that you had beliadonna root that you told me about and December

"Well, the beliadonna roots were in March 1969. It was not until December 1st, 1969 that I was arrested."

Q Doctor, your report is 54 pages. Actually rather than reading your entire report, let me direct your attention to specific things.

Did you ask Mr. Watson whether he did certain things on the nights of these murders?

Do you have a list of questions which you asked

Yes, I did but if I may go to page 10?

your report here with some answers?

Oh, this was a little bit leter. I'm sorry.

Q May I see that sheet?

A This is on the 10th I saw him,

Q Now, I notice here there are 36 questions with respect to the Tate murders and 12 questions with respect to the La Bianca murders.

Did you ask him all these questions?

A I asked the -- these are statements taken from the transcript or from testimony -- on the basis of the statements I asked a question and his answer is appended and I have the questions that I asked here.

Q All right. So you could read the questions and enswers either from your report here or this document right here?

A I can read the questions from the report. I can read the answers from either one.

Q All right. Would you do that, sir?

A On page 14, line 30:

"Q You said that you would like to tell me about it. For the record you might care to respond to some of the questions which rather naturally are related to your activities at the ranch and at the Tate location and later at the La Bianca home.

"Okay."

That was his answer. This is on page 15, line 5.

"Did you and the girls get any specific orders from Charles Manson as to what you were to do?

"I don't know what he told them. He told me to go with the girls. He told me some things to do. He seld, 'Don't worry. The girls know everything else to do.'"

THE COURT: What page are you on?

THE WITNESS: Page 15, your Honor, at the top of the page

THE COURT: Excuse me. Doctor.

THE WITNESS: This is line 9.

Linda Kasabian said that you said that they were going to a house that they had been to before, that you knew the layout of the house and for those of us in the car to do what he told us to do."

In other words what Mr. Watson told us to do.
"How did you feel about that? Had
you actually been in the house before?

"A I had been to the house before. I had been in the front room."

Then my comment:

"We have done some memory tests here.

Do you remember what clothes you were wearing? The record has it that you had a change of clothing with you, that there were three knives and a gun in the car.

"I was wearing Levis, so I didn't have

a change of clothing with me. I guess the girls brought those. They handed them to me and told me to change my clothes.

"Why?

"Because mine were all bloody, I guess. There was a gun and a knife and I had a pistol. I had never shot a gun at the ranch.

"Do you remember how you felt when you told Miss Kasabian to wrap the knives and the gun in her shirt and if you got stopped to throw them out of the window of the car?

"No, I didn't tell her that,

The record says when you got to the Tate house you parked the car by a telephone pole and then climbed the pole and cut the telephone wires and after that I guess you drove to the bottom of the hill in front of the Tate house and parked there.

"I was in the back seat and I got out of the back seat.

"Was it then that you and Linda and Sadie and Katie started walking up the hill?

"Yes, I did. Two girls were in front and one was behind me.

"Again as a matter of memory testing, what kind of rope did you have around your shoulder?
"I didn't have any rope around my shoulders.

The record shows that you all climbed the fence and then went up the driveway and about that time the headlights of a car showed up, that you told the three girls to get back in the bushes and you went toward the car and pointed the gun at the driver's head. Somebody said the driver begged you not to use the gun and he promised not to tell the police but that you shot him four times and then reached in and turned off the ignition and pushed the car back several feet. Why did you shoot this fellow?

"The girls hollered at me. It wasn't Linda.

"Did these people annoy you when they were hollering at you and a little later how did you feel when after you told Linda to go to the back of the house and see if there were any open windows or doors, she came back and told you that there were no open doors or windows?

"I walked into the front door of the house and all of a sudden Sadie popped up from somewhere bringing people into the room. I was blacking out and then I was in the light, more black than light.

'n

19R-1

2

1

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

ļ1 12

13

14

15

16. 17

18

19

20· 21

22

23 24

25

26

27 28 "Do you remember, before you walked in the front door that you were cutting a screen horizontally and that later you removed the screen and entered through that window and that you then told Linda to go back to the car?

"I didn't cut no screen. I didn't tell anybody to do enything during the whole night.

How did you feel when you were hitting one of these fellows on the head with the revolver and stabbing him, as the record says?

"I was just hitting the body and stabbed him after he was already down on the ground and bleeding. Sadie kept stabbing him.

"The record ways, 'Tex was angry at Susan for losing her knife."

"I don't know.

Linds: felt that you were, because she had run to the bottom of the hill and hadn't stayed up by the Tate house while the murders were taking place? The record says that Linda started the car but you told her to turn it off and to 'push off' and that although you were behind the driver's wheel, Linda steered while you changed your clothes?

"No, I didn't tell anybody to do anything.

"Do you remember your driving to the house where you and Sadie and Katle washed the blood off?

HYRE.

"Do you remember what you were doing there?"
"We were just playing in the water, over our

7:

Ì0

.15

faces, just playing with the water.

"Do you remember whether anything else happened there?

"A man and a woman came out of this house. We told them we were getting a drink. I jumped under the wheel of the car and we took off. I wasn't driving too good, someone said, 'pull over,' and they started throwing clothes out of the car. I drove into a gas station to go to the bathroom. I came back out and got in the front seat, the girls drove.

"Was it at this point that you told Linda to wipe the prints of the two knives that you had?

"No, I never did tell anybody anything.

"Do you remember throwing a revolver over a cliff?

"When I got in the car, the gun was still with Sue, but I never saw it afer that. Charlie said, 'the girls know what to do.'

"The record says that you told Katie and Sadie to use the restrooms and wash themselves off better than they had done at the house where you were using the bose.

"No, I didn't tell them anything.

"How did you feel when you told Linda that you had taken \$70 from someone in the Tate House?"

"I didn't get any \$70.

24

25

26

27

28

'Why would someone say that you did, do you think?

"I don't know why,

"Do you remember where you got the line, 'I am the devil here to do the devil's work,' which Linda said you said in the presence of Charles Manson and the two girls that you had said to the people in the Tate house?

"I didn't say snything like that. I couldn't speak too good sometimes, other times okay.

"Do you remember whether you saw Manson that night?

"Yes, but I didn't talk to him.

"Again, as a matter of memory, was the situation pretty tense when, according to the record, you teld Mr. Manson that in the Tate house there was a lot of panic and that it was real messy and bodies were lying all over the place, but they were all dead?

"I didn't tell him that.

"Did the four of you all say, 'No,' when Mr. Manson reportedly asked if any of you had any remorae?

"I don't know if he asked that question or not; I was in kind of a blank state."

Then, beginning with Line 12 on Page 18, continuing, "Examiner's Note: Dislogue regarding the La Bianca murders:

"Do you think that when Miss Essabish said that you were all in the bunkhouse the night of the Tate murders, Mr. Manson said that you were going to go out again tonight, that last night was too messy, and that he was going to show you how to do it, that she was in general correct?

"Something like that.

"As I understand it, she said that you said,

"We need better weapons; the weapons we took last

night were not effective, they were not good enough."

"I didn't say that. We were just kind of following him.

"Do you remember it as Miss Essabian remembered it that, 'Manson entered the La Bianca house and returned to the car, he called Leglie, Katle and Tex out of the car'?

"Right,

do what we did last night?

"That he had tied up the people on the inside of the house, a man and a woman, and to go in and

"How were you supposed to get home?
"The girls said we were going to hitchhike back. Charlie had left.

Do you remember whether you and Laslie were told to hitchhike back to the ranch and that Katle was to go to the waterfall?

"He would always tell the girls things out of

27

28

19af.

my presence. The waterfall, that's where I got the belladonna; I was over there before sunrise.

"Just messing around. I was always high and I couldn't sleep. There was no 'why,' really.

"Do you remember Mr. Manson telling you and Katle and Leslie (as the record shows) 'Don't let them know that you are going to kill them'? And, 'Don't cause fear and panic in these people'?

When we got in the house, the people were all tied up and their heads were covered. No faces or anything showing.

"What kind of criticism or praise did Mr. Manson give you?

"I didn't hardly see Charlie, just a glimpse, until he told me to go to the desert place."

20° 

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: All right, Doctor, that covers the two nights; is that correct?

32.6. 线位置的16.

A That's correct.

Q How, in talking to Mr. Watson over a several day period, hearing him listening to his voice, taking into consideration the answers he gave to your questions, did you form the opinion that he was being completely truthful with you?

A I formed the opinion that he was being completely truthfully with me in many of his responses; but that some of his responses were not truthful.

Q Did you form the opinion, then, that in several areas he was lying to you; is that correct?

A I felt that he was responding in a way which would give a protective answer to suit his needs.

Q What, if any, effect do you think Charles Manson had on Mr. Watson?

A I think he had considerable effect on him.

Q Do you think that at the time of these murders that Watson was exercising his own free will when he stabbed and shot these people?

A He was doing what he was told to do, but he certainly, independently of what he was told to do, he exercised, I believe, exceedingly good judgment in accomplishing what he set out to do; and this was an independent thing, because there were several situations which occurred and crisis into which he was precipitated, where he had to use immediate judgment and where he had to make decisions, and those decisions were apparently very, very well suited to the purpose.

20£.

Q You feel, then, that he was exercising his own free will on these two nights?

A Well, he was doing what he was told to do, and there are lots of reasons for that; but he also, having been told what he was to do, he had to exercise independent judgment at that particular time and he was able to do that and he did it with dispatch.

18 -

20 · 

.25 .26 ,

Q Well, I don't want to quarral over the word "free will," Doctor, but I will have to ask you again: Do you think he was exercising his own free will when he shot and stabled these people?

MR. BUBRICK: Objection to it as being asked and answered.

THE COURT: Can you answer that? Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Well, he had been asked to do a job.

This is rather nebulous because it wasn't clear as to whom the job was to be done on and there was no specification as to how many people -- one or how many -- but he was to go to a specific place and kill everybody there and by reason of the fact that many other factors, including contract, enter into that particular picture, I believe that he exercised free will but with a sense of responsibility to the contractor.

- Q By contract you are referring to the agreement he had with Mr. Menson?
- A Agreement he had with Mr. Manson and going much farther back than that -- the agreement that he had when he originally joined the group and learned the rules and followed the rules and enjoyed the privileges of no responsibilities and of physical and sexual satisty, at catera.
  - Q Let's go into this in a little more depth.

Why do you feel that he killed these people on Mr. Menson's order or suggestion or what have you? Why do you think he followed Mr. Menson's suggestion? You can develop this in depth if you like.

20-2

. 13,

<u>19</u>

A Well, I believe he followed Mr. Manson's suggestion because, in the first place, as I say he was living up to a contract.

In the second place he was an individual who did not have the iron power of will that Mr. Manson obviously has. Also he had had various experiences which made him in debt to Mr. Manson.

- Q Could you develop all of these things?
- A Which were developed during the period of time he was at the ranch.

for a while and then went back to the ranch.

I can only presume as to the reasons and I do not think I seked him the particular question as to why he went back, but the evidence, so far as I am concerned, is perfectly clear that here he in return for a life of no responsibility, a life in the open, a life in a subculture which was easy in its physical experience, which gave him and others a degree of physical satisfaction seldom schieved except in various situations, but with an increasing number of our society — I believe that also that he recognized that when he was away he had no money.

He had by reason of his own choice, he had come out here and he had started school but instead of giving up his apartment and going back home where there was protection, and where there was comfort and where there was education, starting over again, he chose to give up school in order to maintain his apartment and when he maintained his apartment,

20-3

1 2

3

**4** 5

6

7

ġ

. 10

1Î

12

13 14

15

. : 16 17

18

1ġ

20

21 22

23.

24 25

26

27

then these other problems began to occur.

Further to the point, I spent a lot of time this last two weeks -- somebody will wonder where all of my hours come in, but I took all this material when I went on my vacation because I was told that I might be called back sometime in the interim, and I wouldn't have had a chance to go to my office to pick it up when I got in on the plane, so I took it with me and I also took with me Michener's new book "The Drifters."

That is a sorded tale or series of tales, if you have read it, but it tells about the drifters in no uncertain terms and gives the evidences and the reasons and the feelings that go with individuals who do not want to accept responsibility and who pay the price.

There are drugs in it. There is sex in it, but that is no different than it was 20 years ago in Papeete. Tabiti when it is a known fact that people -- some people who went over there, may have been drunk, may not, but nevertheless they were having intercourse in the streets. I know this for a fact.

And five years ago, I can show you from personal experience -- I didn't go there but I know that a lot of people did -- you go to Papeete, Tahiti and you go out from Quinns and you go out to Lafayettes --

MR. BUBRICK: If your Honor please, I object to this. I can't see the materiality of this.

MR. BUCLIOSI: If he is basing his opinion on something that he has read.

3

**4** 5

6

7<sup>.</sup> 8

٥

10

12 *(* 

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

28 24

25 26

27

28.

MR. BUBRICK: This is months -- this opinion was written months before what he is talking about.

THE COURT: This opinion that you gave in your report was not based on anything you read in the drifters.

THE WITHESS: This was confirmatory of what I had reported, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you consider Micheaer a psychiatrist?
THE WITNESS: No. I don't.

THE COURT: Or neurologist?

THE WITHESS: I don't consider him a psychiatrist or a neurologist but I consider him a very, very faithful reflector of hupan experience.

THE COURT: Any more faithful than Hemmingway? THE WITNESS: No.

MR. BURRICK: If your Honor please, if he feels in need, I will withdraw the objection.

THE COURT: What am I supposed to do now?

MR. BUILIOSI: I guess there is nothing for you to rule on, Judge. You may proceed.

THE COURT: Proceed, Doctor.

THE WITMESS: It is germane to the feeling that here we had a contract and if I may I would like to simply summarize this very rapidly, I hope.

THE COURT: Doctor, would you be good enough to explain to us what you mean by a contract -- he had a contract?

THE WITHESS: He had a contract, These people had a contract. They, some of them gave up all of their motor vehicle liceses, They gave up money. They gave their time

And so there were several that didn't want to do apything and they didn't do it, as I understand it.

MR. KEITH: I am going to object to the question -- or I am going to move to strike the doctor's answer. I don't recall any testimony in this case to that effect.

THE COURT: When you say testimony, you mean in this case there is that testimony?

THE WITHESS: As I understood it,

- Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Are you referring, Doctor, to the fact that you read the transcript of the previous trial?
  - A Yes.
- Q So when you make that statement about that Manson told people if they didn't want to do it, don't do it, are you referring to what you read during the previous trial?
  - A That is correct.
- Q And you took that into consideration, of course, in forming your opinion?
  - A I did.
  - Q Your opinion of Mr. Watson.

MR. KEITH: I will renew my motion to strike on the ground that it is irrelevant.

THE COURT: Well, the jury will be instructed on how to evaluate the opinions of experts.

Go shead, Doctor,

THE WITHESS! Tes, your Honor,

Another factor is that this all -- this was all exchanged for the opportunity to do as they wanted with each other, up to the point where the others did not object and

this represented obviously a basis of agreement.

There was a team spirit developed and so far as I can recall one matter of acceptance led to another.

The way of life was certainly accepted and the team functioned, as we read the record, with a higher fidelity each time, but at lowering levels of decency until finally in the lowest debauchery and grisliness imaginable, the experience of adventure, the use of cunning, the use of skill, the wanton use of knife and pistol and power and the thrill of sacrifice were all there, so far as I am concerned, and this might be reminiscent of several other circumstances in life's experience, but certain it is that these were all factors here.

- Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you feel then that he followed Manson's suggestion or order to kill these people because of the relationship he had with Manson, that he was getting certain things in return for his loyalty to Manson?
  - A That is part of the picture.
- Q How would you describe the relationship between Mr. Manson and Mr. Watson from a psychiatric viewpoint?
- A I believe that Mr. Manson was an authoritarian figure. He was and is apparently an extremely positive person.

He has demonstrated, I believe, matters of charisms, if you will, and obviously of leadership and it was extremely interesting, I think -- although most unfortunate I feel -- that the techniques which were used to achieve what I think of as the debridement of the individual's self respect was related to the fact that they were not supposed to have

ŀ

Ź

3

5

6

7

Ŕ

ġ

10

11

1Ż

13

14

15

16

17

18

.19

20

.21

22

23

24

25

inhibitions whatsoever.

They could do snything that they pleased at any time with anybody so long, as I say, the other was a consenting partner.

- Q Do you have a psychiatric name tag on this relationship between Manson and Watson?
- A The fact is that I did in my report and I spent no little time determining as to what that name tag should be in my opinion.
  - Q What is that?
- A And that name tag is a form of psychosis, which is folic a deux.
- Q Now, with respect to this folie a deux, you incorporated this condusion of folie a deux into your report; is that correct?
  - A I did.
- Q At the time you prepared your report had you read any other psychiatric or psychological reports with respect to Mr. Watson?
  - A Yes, I had,

是特殊人物的特殊

独立 对对 等别,

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

27

a deux?

Q	What	reports	were.	thosel
---	------	---------	-------	--------

Well. I believe one report was Dr. Abe, one report was Dr. Grahan, one report was Dr. Seymour Follock. There were several reports. I have read them since, of course.

- What about those from UCLA?
- I have since read those.
- Had you seen in any of these reports any reference Q to folie a deux --
  - A No.
  - -- prior to your coming to that conclusion?
  - No. I had not.
- Have you seen in any of the psychiatric reports even since you came to this conclusion a reference to folic a deux?

Well, if I may say so, I've seen oblique references to folie a deux, including all of the things that obviously --I say "all of the things" -- many of the things that are considered to be of an aberrant or bisarre response, which have variously been described as a form of catatonia or whatever.

- But you do /see the words "folio a deux" in any paychiatric report in this case?
  - No. sir.
  - Other them your own? 0
  - A. No. sir.
  - But those words are in your report? Q
  - They are.
  - Would you briefly describe what you mean by folice

A Folie a deux is, was for hundreds of years a relatively rare condition, in which an individual who has a particular conviction, a particular message, wants to propogate that and develop adherents to that particular belief, if you will, or way of thinking; it is almost always related to an inducer, an individual who has a strong personality.

It is almost always related, then, to one or more individuals who are wanting to be persuaded.

Q Do you feel that Mr. Watson wanted to be persuaded?

A I think he wanted to be persuaded. I think that was part of the picture.

He had had certain unsuccessful ventures and he heard about this particular nirvana and it was described and he decided to join; and there was, of course, also the factor of the drug use, which is obviously one of the factors in the picture, but that was secondary to the fact that he made the decision to go the route that he did.

Now, in folie a deux, we not only have the inducer but we have individuals who are -- who want to be persuaded, who want to be in a position where they can accept something.

In this case we had that situation.

Furthermore, if I may refer to the report -- I can't remember the page; I would like to have some help with the matter of the page, if you can remember it.

- Q What is the point, Doctor, what issue?
- A The issue is as to the very short but very pertinent description of folia a deux.

THE COURT: Try Page 49, about Line 20; 20, 21, Page 49.

THE WITNESS: 49, 20?

This, your Honor, was just a statement of the conclusion; bit it does not quite describe --

MR. BUBRICK: 48, your Honor, top two paragraphs, there is reference to that again.

THE WITNESS: Yes, on Page 48; but I am sure, Counsel, that I have a specific reference before that, and I beg your indulgence just a moment.

I believe it is on Page 28.

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Line 21 through 24?

A 21 through 24; and Lines on Page 29, Lines 10 to 14; then 17 to 20, if I may read those.

Q Yes.

A Line 21, Page 28: Folie a deux has been defined as a "psychosis simultaneously involving two or more intinately related persons, relationships, both biologically and environmental, a psychiatric entity characterized by transference of delusional ideas and/or abnormal behavior from one person to one or more others who have been in close association with the primarily affected patient."

Then we may go to Line 17 of Page 29 -- or, better, Line 14: Under the heading, "Discussion Ivan Norman Mensh writes," ... Coleman and Last report a number of 'contingencies' which must be available at the same time in order to disgnose the disorder:

- "1) An inducer, a paraphrenic holding a delusional scheme he is anxious to induce;
  - "2) Close proximity, usually for a number

ŀ

3

5

6 7

8

10 11

12

14 15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

25

of years, on the part of the highly suggestible individual; and

"3) An inducer who represents authority. Extreme poverty and economic distress, bringing satisfaction with reality, provide the background."

Then, as his Honor pointed out --

Page 48 and 49? Q

On Page 48, as counsel pointed out -- at least starting on Page 47, just one line, Line 31, Page 47:

> "The near-death of a buyer" -- that is, the ides of buying the program -- "the near-death of a buyer from the time he left Copeville (where he was coping) until the present time, the defendant has lived on the basis of the pleasure principle by 'buying' the dalliances of the inducer, enjoying the indulgences and satiety of the 'Family' life at the ranch and, paying a price as a wastrel far exceeding the 'riotous living of the prodigal son, is now, as that prototype did, and as the defendant himself told me 'asking for forgiveness' and desperately desiring to return to his father's home."

1

3

**4** 5

7

8

10

11

12

14

13

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27 28 Q Then you go on on line 7 --

A Line 7: From a psychiatric standpoint, albeit with compassion and understanding of the travail the defendant has gone through, he "sold his birthright for a mess of potage." He played the game, he learned the rules, he abided by the rules, he obeyed the coach.

The folia a deux was at one and the same time the method and the result of the abdication of responsibility and the establishment of rapport. The drug scene potentiated the picture but certainly did not cause it.

Page 49 --

Q What line?

A I believe his Honor referred me to possibly line 17.

Was that correct, your Henor?

THE COURT: No, skip 17.

THE WITMESS: I think, then --

- Q BY MR. BUGLIOST: That would probably cover the folia a deux situation?
  - A I think that would, in general,
- Q Let me ask you this, Doctor: In determining a person's state of mind at the time of a commission of a crime, what factors do you look to?

Do you understand the question?

A T. do.

Q Okay, what factors do you look to?

A Wall, in the first place I want to know as to whather the individual is conscious, whather the individual

21A-2

1

3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

13

16

17

18

19<sub>,</sub>

•

22

23° 24

25

26

27

28:

has awareness, whether the individual is responsive to his environment, what the motive was for doing what he did, what the mechanism was which was carried out which enabled him to do what he did, what his actions were --

- Q His conduct?
- A I beg your pardon?
- Q When you say "his actions." you mean his conduct?
- A His conduct and his activities, actions, conduct; also I'd went to know the mood he was in.

I always want to know, of course, the background and the foreground; that is, the events and situations leading up to those occurring at the time; what was said at the time; what he said at the time; and also what occurred afterwards, what various feelings there were afterwards, what deportment there was; and to know as to whether the things which were said and done by the individual in question were common sense under the circumstances or were cumning under the circumstances or were self-serving under the circumstances; any of those categories representing the shility to think and to react and to meet the situation.

Let me ask you this: In forming an opinion with respect to any defendant's state of mind at the time that he committed a crime, do you feel, as far as you are concerned, that it is absolutely essential and imperative that you familiarize yourself with all of the defendant's conduct and statements at the time of the crime?

A The answer may seem pat, but, assuredly yes; because, in fact, in this particular type of work it is a

21A-3

2.

1

3.

4 5

б

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

matter of tacit understanding and requirement that individuals read at least the transcripts before even examining the defendant.

This goes for any case, and certainly in every case it is necessary to know as much as one can of a lot of things I do not know, but as much as one can with the facilities sysilable as to the background and as to the individual's statements and as to statements of others that are appropriate and have relevance.

Q Tell me this, could you have formed an opinion as to Mr. Watson's state of mind at the time of these murders if you had no knowledge of what he did and said on these two nights of murder?

A I couldn't, no.

Q So it is absolutely imperative that you familiarize yourself with what he did and said; is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q Now, in view of this prerequisite, did you read Linda Kasabian's testimony at the last trial?

A I did.

Q And about how many pages did you read of her testimony?

THE COURT: I think one doctor said he read 46 transcripts of her testimony; is that correct?

MR. BUGLIOSI: He said he was furnished with 46 volumes, your Honor; I don't believe Dr. Tweed said he read 46 volumes.

In fact, Linda Kasabian's testimony doesn't come anywhere close to 46 volumes.

<del>*</del> 22		1
		2
		3
		4
		5
		6
		7
		<b>.</b> 8∙
		9
		10-
		11
•		<b>12</b>
		13
		14
		15
		16
	,	17
		18
		19

22

,23.

24

25

27

28

MR. BUBRICK: I am going to object to that,

BY MR. BURLIOSI: I didn't mean the exact number Q of pages, Doctor, but approximately how many pages?

THE COURT: Yes. The jury will disregard that.

I have no independent knowledge of that or recall of that.

- Was it in the thousands? 0
- À No.
- 0 Was it in the hundreds?

Well. I read many hundreds of pages. Yes, it was A in the hundreds because I have here "Page 104."

What page are you on?

- I am on page 47, I believe.
- Q 477

I think so unless I am confusing that with another -- this may be another witness' testimony. Forgive me.

No. this is Mrs. Kasabian's testimony beginning on 38, page 38, and that takes in page 38, 39, 40, up to 41, line 7, and then begins the Grand Jury Susan Atkins.

- It looks like here then, Doctor, correct me if I am wrong, starting on page 38 of your report, that would be page 4,956 of the transcript to page 5,517 --
  - Yes. I have that right before me.
  - Somewhere around five or six hundred pages?
- That is right. That is correct. I was looking at Susan Atkins.
- You read Linds Kasabian's testimony at the last trial before you formed any opinion about Mr. Watson's state

ı

3

5

6 7

8.

9

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

.21

22

23

24

25

26 ` 27

28

of mind at the time of these mirders?

A That is correct.

Q Did you read Susan Atkins' testimony at the Grand Jury before you formed any opinion as to Mr. Watson's state of mind?

A Yes. I did.

Q What, if anything, did you take into consideration in Susan Atkins' Grand Jury testimony?

MR. KEITH: I will object to the question on the grounds previously stated heretofore.

THE COURT: Yes. It will be the same ruling, Sustained.

MR. BUGLIOSI: May we approach the bench, your Honor?

(The following proceedings were had at the bench.)

MR. BUGLIOSI: The doctor says that one of the reasons

why he feels this man is lying is that Susan Atkins's testimony was consistent with Linda Kasabian's testimony.

He based his opinion very, very heavily. He has told me that.

THE COURT: Well, I have ruled before, after it got in once, Susan Atkins' testimony. I ruled on the second doctor I it would not permit to go in according to the Evidence Code that it is highly prejudicial and on that ground I am not going to permit the doctor to tell what he read of Susan Atkins' testimony before the Grand Jury.

Linda Kasabian was here. She restified. She has been cross-examined but I mean it is too dangerous to permit him to testify, reading what was testified to before at the Grand Jury, by a person who is not present here for cross-

14 -

1,5

examination.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Even if it is the basis for the doctor's opinion?

THE COURT: Yes. I would still hold under section 352 it should be excluded.

MR. BUGLICSI: The heart of this whole trial is the psychiatric testimony and this man's state of mind and here is a psychiatrist for the prosecution saying that he took this heavily into consideration.

THE COURT: I appreciate that but what you are doing, you are getting in by way of the back door what you can't get in by way of the front door.

MR. BUGLIOSI: All I can say, your Honor, is that the California Supreme Court, the highest court in this land, and highest court in this state has said this is proper. It is permissible. The authority is all on our side.

THE COURT: You show me a similar case where they permitted the doctor to testify as to such highly prejudicial testimony of a witness that was taken before the Grand Jury.

You show me a similar case.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think we can find cases. What is that case? Not Imbler -- 71 Cal. 2d.

MR. KAY: 64.

MR. BUGLIUSI: That is 64 Cal. 2d. I think there are cases, your Honor, where much, much worse things come in where a defendant's confession, when it is the strongest piece of evidence, the defendant's confession comes in that way.

THE COURT: That could be but here this girl was never

2 3

4

5

Ŷ

8, 0:

11

10

12 13

15

16

14

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

cross-examined here in this court and I would think that her testimony is highly prejudicial and under 352 I am not going to permit it.

MR. KAY: Can the doctor testify to his conclusions, in other words, that he concluded that Linda Kasabian and Susan Atkins testimony were consistent and that is something he took into consideration?

THE COURT: No, because that would be a conclusion based upon something this jury did not hear.

MR. KAY: But they did hear it once.

THE COURT: They heard it once and I am not going to let him say that Linda Kasabian and Susan Atkins were telling the truth.

MR. KAY: No, he is going to say -- well, he is not going to say that exactly but he is going to say that he formed the conclusion --

THE COURT: Enough for the jury to conclude that?

MR. BURRICK: Will you permit, your Honor, on crossexamination, the doctor to be asked if he knows Sadie Atkins
filed an affidavit stating that she had lied, without going
into snything that she said before the Grand Jury?

HR. BUGLIOSI: I brought this out.

MR. BUBRICK: I want to know whether this doctor knows that.

THE COURT: No. What you brought out was when she testified before the Grand Jury she had impunity and she testified one way and later on when she did not have impunity she testified another way.

MR. BUCLIOSI: No, no. I stated in the record, and asked Dr. Frank if he was aware that she signed an affidavit later saying that averything she said at the Grand Jury was a lie. That is in the record of the transcript.

In any event, your Honor, if the court won't let us, there is no way we can get it in, but I certainly feel that --

THE COURT: It should have never got in in the first place, as I said before. I criticized counsel for letting it go in in the first place.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It is the basis for an opinion. I query the court's interpretation of the word "prejudice" in 352. In 352 what I think the word "prejudice" means -- I don't think it has ever been defined --

THE COURT: To me it means one thing: To the detriment of the defendant.

MR. BUGLIOSI: But the genesis of the prejudice I think is all important.

When they are talking about prejudice I think they are talking about this type of situation, I really do: A person, let's say, is charged with murder and evidence comes in in front of the jury, let's say, that he is a homosexual.

All right. That type of thing has no bearing whatsoever on whether or not he committed this murder. It might cause the jury to dislike the defendant and as a result of disliking him, they are prejudiced against him. They are prejudiced against him.

I don't think they are talking about a situation

like we are dealing with here where the evidence that comes in is relevant to the issue in the case.

This is what I really feel the court means by the word "prejudice."

They didn't want the jury to be prejudiced against the particular person for things that don't involve issues in the case.

THE COURT: That is right, and in this case you are bringing out testimony of this Susan Atkins girl where I would have to tell the jary that the testimony he considered is not evidence in this case.

MR. BULLIOSI: But it is relevant.

THE COURT: But you are asking the jury to unscramble an egg.

MR. BUGLIOSI: But the point I am trying to make, it is relevant, ergo I don't think 352 applies. It is relevant.

THE COURT: I do. That is it, I do. That is my ruling.

MR. BUGLICGI: It is irrelevent -- I am sorry -- this testimony is relevent and because it is relevent, I am saying that I don't think 352 applies.

I think 352 applies to a situation where you are bringing in irrelevant evidence which tends to prejudice the jury against the defendant.

I think that is what the word "prejudice" means. I don't think that it means that it is harmful to the defendant on the issues in the case.

MR, KEITH: If it were irrelevant, it wouldn't be

27

25

26

```
on any grounds,
1.
      THE COURT: I have so ruled, Mr. Bugliosi.
3
5 .
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
1,8
19
20
21.
22
23
24
26
27
28
```

22A

1
2

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

3

on Mr. Watson's state of mind at the time of these murders, did you also read Susan Atkin's testimony at the Grand Jury!

0

5

6

7

8

9

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26.

27 28 Q Did you read any other testimony before you formed your opinion?

A I read the material in transcripts from Texas.

Q Are you referring to a statement by one Robert King?

BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Before you formed your opinion

- A Yes.
- Q A jailer back in Texas?

Yes. I did.

MR. BUBRICK: I think the fact that he referred to it is enough. I don't think we ought to be getting into the facts of that statement.

THE COURT: He is not going to get into the facts of that statement.

- Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Is that what you are referring to.
  a statement by Robert King, a jailer in Texas?
  - A In response to your question --
- Q This is when Mr. Watson was incarcerated after his arrest for these mirders?
  - A That is correct.
- Q You read Mr. King's statement before you formed your opinion?
  - A I did.
  - Q Did you read any other statements?
  - A I did read other statements.

Linds Kasabian, and reading these other various reports, including psychiatric reports, did you form any opinion as to whether Mr. Watson had the mental capacity to harbor malice aforethough? That is an intent to kill?

- A Yes, I did.
- Q And what is that opinion?
- A I believe he had that capacity.
- Q Is it your professional opinion that he did, in fact, intend to kill the victims in this case?
  - A Yes.
- Q Did you also form the opinion as to whether or not Mr. Watson at the time of these murders had the mental capacity to deliberate and premeditate these murders?
  - A Yes.
- What is that opinion?
  - A My opinion is that he did.
- Q Do you feel that he did in fact deliberate and premeditate these murders based on your reading the testimony of other people and talking to Mr. Watson?
  - A That is correct.
  - Q You feel that he did?
  - A I do.
- Q Did you also form an opinion as to whether or not Mr. Watson had the mental capacity to maturely? and meaningfully reflect upon the gravity of the contemplated set of killing?
  - A Yes.
  - Q What is that opinion?

? 

23f. 20

A My opinion was that he did.

Q You feel that he did materially and meaningfully reflect upon the gravity of the contemplated act of killing these seven people?

A That is right.

Q Let me ask you this, Doctor: With respect to deliberation and prededitation and materially and meaningfully reflect -- upon what facts did you have your opinion that Mr. Watson deliberated and premeditated these murders and materially and meaningfully reflected upon the gravity of the contemplated act? Upon what facts?

A Well, upon the facts that, in the first place, he accomplished what he set out to do.

problems, with, as I said before, with dispatch and with very acute reaction to a rapidly developing situation and he met each one of them appropriately to his purposes, starting with the individual who drove up in the automobile and surprised them as they were going over the fence.

2		

3

5

6

7

Š

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22<sup>+</sup>

23

24

25

And that was met with rapidly and without any prior coaching, because nobody knew that fellow was going to be even near the place; and then he had been directed to cut the telephone lines and he went up the pole, cut the lines and got down, and then went to --

- Q According to what he told you, he had been directed to cut the telephone wires?
- A He told me that he had been directed to cut the talephone wires.
  - Q By whom?
- A He had indicated that that was part of his chore --
  - Q That the girls told him to cut the telephone wires?
- A I took it that Mr. Manson had told him to cut the telephone wires.
- Q Is that in your report, that Mr. Manson told him to cut the telephone wires?
  - A I can't answer that; I'd be glad to look.
  - Q There is a reference on page 15, line --
- A There is a reference, if I may suggest, on page 13 at line 4:

What about your cutting the telephone

## wires?

We got overthere. I was laying in her lap. She shook me and told me I was supposed to cut the twlephone wires. I remember Linda handed the cutters and I was cutting the first wires on the pole" ---

26

27 28

Now, if the basis of your opinion was what Mr.

Watson told you if you didn't take enything else into consideration, you certainly may answer that way. If you took other things into consideration, that's what we want to hear.

- A I took Mr. Manson's --
- Q Mr. Watson's?
- A Mr. Watson's statements into consideration, of course.
  - Q Yes.
- A I took into consideration the statements of the other individuals whose testimony I had read ---
  - Q Referring to Linda Kasabian, Susan Atkins?
- I deduced that he had a purpose, that he carried out that purpose, that he had a purpose, that he had not in several instances that he had not told anybody anything ell night, I had to take that with some question because other testimony which was independently given, as I understand it, nevertheless coincided with each of the other's testimony as against the statement that he did not know,

Now, he may not have remembered, but he knew at the time; and consequently I took that into consideration. His actions were those of an individual who was able to meet a very difficult situation, extremely difficult, and yet he rose to the occasion.

He also at one time, according to one of the testimonies, and I have included it in here, was very irate with one of the girls for not having stayed and another one

3

4 5

6

.7

**, 8** 9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

25 26

27

28

for moving the automobile or not moving it appropriately. as he thought it should be done.

Now, this was right after the murders.

At the time of the murders he indicated that he was confused; he indicated that things happened very rapidly. that, he said, "The next thing I knew, I was walking into the door of the house and there Sadie was."

And then he said, "I looked and I had a gun in my

Well, in the first place, I am sure that he knew that he had a knife and I'm sure that he knew that he had a gun, and I'm sure that he knew that he had them before he happened to look down and just see that he had a gun in his hands: and then when one or two of the girls called for help. he impediately went and helped them; and then when they had done a lot of stabbing and when there was a question as to whether one or the other of these people were deceased, he made sure that they were.

Over and above that, he did not tell me, and I am not necessarily challenging the fact that he didn't tell me; but I can only say that I had a feeling that he could have told me; but some of the things that he did not tell me were things which were in very sensitive areas.

On the other hand, some of the things that he did tell me obviously were in sensitive areas and so there may have been an amneria, but the amneria, again, relates not only to the matter of drug taking, which he had been doing, but also to the fact that we forget what we don't want to

19 4

remember. This is partly by design and sometimes by natural response.

In addition to that, on the way home when he was caught washing his hands he gave answers which were consistent with a protective response in several instances.

He told them that they were just washing their hands or their faces. Well, obviously, they were cleaning themselves as much as they could all over; and also he told them that they were walking, but them the Webers, I believe it was, saw the automobile and they called him them as to what about that automobile; and then they started walking rapidly toward it and when they got in he drove off in a real rush.

All of this is consistent with an individual who knows exactly what he is doing; then, as I understand the testimony sine, there was a conflict there as regards who told whom to go to the rest room and get cleaned up more than they were, and I recognized the fact that there may be protective responses on everybody's part; but, nevertheless, the rest of the testimony gave me the distinct feeling that in spite of his prior experiences, in spite of the folice a deux, in spite of his drugs, he carried on.

In other words, he had developed a great tolerance and he carried on with the ability to meet situations both as regards the fact that he knew what he was doing, he had a mission, he completed the mission and met exigencies which nobody could possibly have naticipated, and he met them with a mechanism and with a facility which is really something to read.

Q What about Linda Kasabian's testimony that Mr. Watson told her to wipe the fingerprints off the knives and then throw the knives and clothing away?

What significance did you place on that?

A Well, I naturally took that into significance or into account.

He, himself, said that he had a gun and a knife in his hands and then he said, "I couldn't believe that I had done it."

This is about 10 days later that he made the statement -- at least, he made the statement long afterwards, but he said that 10 days later he couldn't believe that he had done what he did.

Then he also made some other comments which seemed to me to be thrown in as further evidence for me to understand that he was either blacking out or he felt small or he had some of these other very bixarre responses which didn't jibe with the rest of the capacities that he had to function as he did; and, therefore, I could put no credence in those.

Q Are you referring to any particular incident?

A He made the comment, I think he said, "I felt very small."

In fact, he says here, "I could just feel my body all sucked in like a monkey, no feeling at all."

Well, this has no pertinence as far as I am concerned, because in spite of that, if he did feel that way, in spite of that he functioned as an individual who is meeting a very difficult situation.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Does the court care to take the recess TIOW? THE COURT: Yes. We will have our afternoon recess now, ladies and gentlemen. Again, heed the admonition heretofore given. (Recess.) 

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

3

5

6

7

9

10 11

12 13

14

16

15

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25° 26

27

**28** 

THE COURT: People against Watson.

Let the record show all jurors, counsel, and the defendant are present. You may proceed.

- Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Doctor, do you feel that Mr. Watson was mentally ill at the time of these murders?
- A Mr. Watson had a psychosis at the time of these murders.
  - Q Folie a deux psychosis?
  - A Folie a deux, yes.
- Q And, of course, a psychosis does constitute mental
  - A That constitutes mental illness.
- Q Can a person be, in your opinion, be mentally ill and still be able to harbor malice aforethought and deliberate and premeditate and materially and meaningfully reflect upon the gravity of the contemplated act?
  - A Yes, he can.
- Q Do you feel that a person can be psychotic or schizophrenic and still harbor malice aforethought, deliberate and premeditate and materially and meaningfully reflect upon the gravity of the contemplated act?
  - A Yes, I do, and this has often occurred.
  - Q You say this has often occurred?
  - A Yes.
- Q You are basing this opinion of yours on your extensive prior experience?
- A Well, on such experience as I have had and on what the experience of the discipline, yes.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

## BY MR. KEITH:

- Q Doctor, you performed certain tests to determine Hr. Watson's intelligence; is that correct?
- A No. I did not perform the test to determine his intelligence.
- Q You asked Mr. Watson some questions in the form of aphorisms, did you not, and asked him to tell you what they meant?
  - A Yes, that I did.
- Q And one of them was attributed to Benjamin Franklin who said, "If you make honey of yourself, the flies will eat you." Isn't that right?
  - A That is correct.
- Q And Mr. Watson told you he didn't in ow what that ment?
  - A That is right.
- Q So that isn't a difficult thing or aphorism, is it?
  - A It is for many people.
  - Q For a person of normal intelligence to decipher?
- A It is for many people because some people thing concretely and those who think concretely have difficulty in making an analogy between the emotional posture, which would invite predatory action on somebody's part, and the fact that one is to make honey of themselves, so that the actual flies won't come in and eat one. That is concrete thinking and there are some people who do that and it is amazing.

27.

1	Q I don't understand your answer.
2	A I mean that literally.
3	Q What is concrete thinking?
4	A Concrete thinking is when you talk about a fly,
5	it is a fly. It isn't a person or it isn't an environmental
6	situation which can est you or can consume you.
7	Q In other words, you are telling us that Mr. Watson
8	in this instant couldn't even think concretely?
9.	A I didn't say that he was a concrete thinker.
ìò	Q I know you didn't say that. I am asking you: You
11	formed the opinion that he couldn't even think concretely?
12	A I will accept that, of course.
13	Q And concrete thinking is sort of primitive thinking
14	inn't it?
15	A That is correct.
16 <sup>.</sup>	Q In other words, Mr. Watson was unable to translate
17	flies into people and honey into some other well, it really
18	means that nice guys finish last; isn't that what it means?
19,	A That is a fair statement.
20	THE COURT: That is Leo Durocher.
21	Q BY MR. KETTH: I will recognize that, but it is a
22	good analogy to Ben Franklin's statement, isn't it?
23	A An excellent analogy.
24	Q And Watson couldn't figure that out, could he?
25.	A He had never heard that particular phrase before
26	or given it thought, no.
27	Q And you told us that Mr. Watson didn't know what
28	the saying, "The early bird catches the worm," that you felt

that he really did know what that saying meant?

A Well, I just came to that conclusion because I don't think there is anyone who hasn't heard that phrase.

展的外性原体性質

Sint Roman

1
2

**4** 5

6

Ż,

8

10

11

12

13

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 . 27

**28** 

Q He didn't tell you he had never heard the phrase, did he?

A No; and I should have asked him that.

Q And then Mr. Watson immediately went on to talk about digging worms around Copeville to go fishing, didn't he?

A Yes.

Q That's an inappropriate response to your question, wasn't it?

A I didn't think it was inappropriate at all; in other words, he --

Q. You didn't ask him, did you, about his experiences fishing in Copeville?

A No, but, you see, the very fact that he had an association with the worm and this took him back to the time when he fished in his uncle's pond -- and this is very relevant -- and that was a very nice answer. I thought.

Q That's an example of concrete primitive thinking, isn't it; he couldn't translate worms and birds into people's activities, but it took him back to his early days when he went fishing with his father; isn't that right?

A I don't think that's concrete, I think that's a good association, proving that he didn't have in that instance any brain damage.

Q Well, you didn't ask him to talk about fishing, did you?

A No; this was a wonderful thing, it was a spontaneous response and I appreciated that as being good rapport.

Q What you mean, good rapport, between you and

ı	
1,	also, the concept of a human figure or a tree figure.
2	Q Excuse me, I didn't mean to interrupt.
3	A , And that when that is accomplished in good pro-
4	portion, as his were, I was satisfied that he had been able
5	to do the things which that particular test was designed to
6	#hor.
7	Q Now, what did he draw, a man or a woman or
-8	couldn't you tell?
9	A . He drew a man.
10	Q Could I see the picture, please?
11,	Q Could I see the picture, please?
12	Q He draw just the bare outline of a man, did he
13 .	not?
14	A He drew the bare outline of a man and he put
15	clothing on the man and he has facial features.
16	Q There is no depth to the drawing, is there?
17	A No, there is not.
18	Q And the clothing is in no detail; isn't that true,
19	Doctor?
20	A They are in no detail except that the belt is
21	shown, the trousers are shown, the sleeves are shown, the cuffs
22	are shown.
23	Q Where do you see cuffs?
24	A Right here.
25	Q Well, what you call a belt is just the separation
26	between the pants and the upper garment; isn't that right?
27	A That's where a belt usually is, yes.
28	Q Nevertheless, there is just a thin line there,

isn't there; there is not a double line, is there?

A No.

Q There is no shoes on this person, is there?

A I considered that there were shoes for the simple reason that there are no toes.

Q Well, rather than belabor the point 😁

THE COURT: I was going to ask you, how do you tall a man or a woman today without a program?

THE WITNESS: That's why we have this.

Q BY MR. KEITH: There is no particular facial expression on the face of the man, is there?

A I would say that this was an individual who had a certain bland expectancy.

Q That is very nicely put; perhaps you could explain what you mean by bland expectancy, or is that self-explanatory?

elevated a little bit, he has a quasi smile, it is not a frown; his eyes are wide open; he is standing rather at attention and yet doesn't indicate he has any particular mood other than that.

Q All right. Now, insemuch as the outline of this men is in the upper left-hand corner of the page, could this indicate to you some anxiety on the part of the patient?

A In fact, it did indicate anxiety.

Q Does it also indicate depression, perhaps?

A Hore particularly anxiety; it could indicate a depression, but I didn't feel that there was as much depression as one might expect to find, because of the other test which I

2

3

-5

6

8

7

10 n

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

, 20. 21

2.22

23 24

25

**26** :

27 28 Tin.

Does the lack of detail to the drawing have any --Ø or, lack of depth to the drawing, have any significance to You. Doctor?

Really, while this under some circumstances can be a point -- and I am glad that you have made it -- nevertheless, one of the meet important factors in such a, you might say, stereoscopic or three dimensional drawing, where there are shadows and so on, would indicate an artistic ability.

Now, I'm not aware that Mr. Watson has a particularly artistic ability; but if he had and those who are artists, irrespective of what else is wrong or whether there is anything wrong, those who are artists almost invariably demonstrate their ability: and that isn't demonstrated here.

Is that the only significance you derive from the Ò lack of detail and depth, that Mr. Watson is no artist?

Well, that's one. I like to try to meet the obvious Tiret.

And then, also, the fact that he has good proportion. I liked that very much.

The fact that there is some motion suggested here. while he is standing. I will indicate that he is also obviously prepared to move in a direction toward his left.

- Q / Is this one of the tests you used to determine whether Mr. Watson was suffering from organic brain syndrome?
  - One of the tests.
- You came to the ultimate conclusion that Mr. Vatson At the time you examed him was not suffering from organic

l	
2	he
3	
4	bra
5	4
6 ***	
7	
8	•
9.	the
10	bac
1Î,	197
12	
13	
14	表集
15	
16	
17	abo
18	the
19	you
20	
21	:
22	que
23	*sk
24	
25	•
26,	
27	did
28	nosta C

	Q	And	didu '	t he	COME	to	ä ¢	ónc Li	sion	at	the	time
he	examined	Mr.	Watso	n, t	hat £	rom	the	neu	colog	lc#	l Ch	adings
he	belleved	that	Mr.	Wets	on wa	# 51	uffe	ring	from	410	orga	mic
bri	ain syndre	) șat								•	•	

- A Yes, he did, counsel.
- Q Do you disagree with Mr. Welter?
- A I didn't examine him at the same time.
- Q So you can't tell us whether or not you reached the same findings that Mr. Walters -- or Dr. Walters reached because you didn't examine Mr. Watson in March or April of 1971; is that correct?
  - A That is correct.
- Q So you don't dispute, do you, Dr. Welters' finding as of March or April of 1971, do you?
  - A I don't dispute it.
- Q Doctor, when you were asking Mr. Watson questions about the Tate-Le Biance homicides, had you already prepared the questions you were going to ask him? By that I mean had you written them out?
  - A Yes,
- Q And you didn't deviate at all, did you, from the questions that you had previously written out when you were asking Mr. Watson about the nights of the homicides, did you?

Do you understand my question?

- A I hope so.
- Q In other words, you stuck to your prepared script, didn't you, when you were asking Mr. Watson about what happened?
  - A I think I have explained that certain statements

26-2

1 2

á

4 5

6

Ť

ġ.

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 .

25

. :

28

were made in various parts of the transcripts and by various persons and I have made the statement that I modified those statements into the form of questions.

The questions I asked were verbatim reported in my report and that is why I indicated to Mr. Bugliosi that I could answer the answers from either one of the two documents, but I could only answer the questions from my own report.

- Q You asked Mr. Watson questions about the nights of the two homicides, the seven homicides, from a prepared list of questions that you yourself had written up; isn't that right?
- A Yes -- no, I am sorry. Those were not questions,

  Those were statements which were in -- and I then
  spontaneously maked him questions referable to each of those

statements and the questions were written before I got his answer, yes.

- Q That is what I was getting at,
- A I am sorry.
- Q So am I, if I was obtuse.
- A No. That is my mistake.
- Q Or abstract,
- A Mo, I was,
- Q You didn't ask Mr. Wetson at any time, did you, just to tell you in narrative form what he remembered about the nights of the Tate-La Bience homicides?
  - A Yes, I think I did.
- Q The questions you asked him are contained between pages 15 and 19 of your report; isn't that right?

3

5

б

8

ġ · 10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20.

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 .28

That is included. That is included. I think I did not ask him just to start in and tell me.

0 What happened.

Exactly what had happened in that sense, because I just asked him as to whether we might ask about those -about what went on and I felt that that particular series of questions covered the salient points and then I asked him also the question -- sometimes I got a little tired of writing too.

I asked him the question whether the material in the transcript was essentially factual and he came back with the statement "Something like that," quote unquote. I believe that is the verbatim report. I will be glad to look for it.

No. you don't have to look for it. I will take your word for it.

These questions that you prepared to ask Mr. Watson. were derived or formulated as a result of testimony that you read in the case that was given by Linda Kasabian; is that right?

That was part of it, yes.

Had you formed the opinion when you prepared these questions from Linda Kasabian's testimony that she was 100 percent telling the truth and a paragon of truthfulness?

- A I just asked the questions. No.
- 0 Based on what she testified?
- That is right.
- You didn't decide before talking to Mr. Watson. did you, that whatever Linds Kasabian may have said in her testimony was the gospel?

· 1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

ΙÒ

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

.21

A	No.
A.	****

- You had reservations about her testimony too. didn't Q you?
- I have reservations about my own. I'm sorry to gay.
- When you say you have reservations about your own, are you being amusing with us?
- I don't mean to be. On the other hand there are a lot of things that one would have an opportunity of saying if certain of the rules didn't exist, so I don't say that,
- At any rate, getting back to my original question, you considered Linda Kasabian's testimony with certain reservations, didn't you?
- I think that would naturally be true but I just asked the question on the basis of what I had been assured she had said.

## I understand that.

Doctor, in forming your opinion about Mr. Watson's mental state, did you determine as a result of your examination that he was probably a passive dependent personality?

- I think that this would come very close to a description although, of course, he was not so passive as that particular appellation might connote because he decided to strike out on his own like a lot of the rest of us did years and years ago.
- . Q. . You are talking now about when he left Texes to come to California?
  - That is right. That is exactly right.

28

25

	1
1	
2	
3	
4,	ŀ
5	
6	
7	
8`	
9	
10	
u	
12	
13	
14	Ì
15	1
16	
17	,.
18	*
] 19	}
20	
21	
22	
23	}

25

26

Q	But you were	of the opinion	, or are of	the opinion
that Mr. V	Vatson at the t	ime that he was	s living at	the Spahn
Ranch 1	let's talk abou	t that time	was a kind	of a
follower,	wasn't he?			

- I would say he was, yes.
- And at that time you would describe him as a Q passive dependent personality, wouldn't you? His underlying personality structure is what I am talking about.
  - I think that would be a fair assessment. Ά
- And passive dependent personalities are kind of O weak fish, aren't they, generally speaking?
- Well. I have seen so many passive personalities -- passive aggressive personalities.
- I am talking about a passive dependent personality. not a passive aggressive personality.
  - I mean --
  - There is a difference.
- A. Yes, there is a difference.
- Q And a considerable difference, isn't there?
- Q Did you come to the opinion that Mr. Watson when he became involved with Mr. Manson, was sort of an immature personality? Wouldn't that be a fair description?
- He was certainly lacking in experience but he learned fast, I would say. He matured rapidly.
  - What do you mean when you use the term "matured"?
- I mean to say that he was able to meet a lot of experience, which he hadn't had before and he didn't run away from that experience. He accepted it.

1;	Q You were talking about his experiences with
2	Menson and Manson's family, are you, now!
3	A That's part of it.
4	Q Well, did you ever read any testimony or hear
<b>5</b> .	day accounts from sources other than testimony about Manson's
ć	thought system?
7	Do you know anything about that?
8	A Well, I have I read the papers, of course.
9.	Q I'm not talking about newspapers, I am talking
10	about did you ever read the testimony of Faul Watkins or
11	Brooks Posten?
12	A I have no, I have not,
13	Q Did you ever read the testimony of Juan Flynn.
14	A That name sounds familiar. I will say that I
15	have in my dessier here not here, but in my office I
16	have statements which give a very good account of all that
17	particular material; and I rely on the press in many instances,
18	particularly when it is in quotes, and the quotes were ample.
19 .	Q Did you follow the Manson case scrupulously in the
20	newspapers?
21	A I did.
22	Q And you read capsulated form, I suppose, the
23	testimony of some, if not, all the witnesses in that case?
24	A A lot of them, yes, counsel.
25	Q For some reason were you particularly interested
26	in the Manson case?
27	A I didn't know but what I might be.
28	Q You didn't ask to be appointed in this case, did

1	
2	
4	

4

you?

A	道O。	I	certainly	did	not
7.00		-10	A		

- Q Well, as a result of your following all the newspaper accounts didn't you learn something of Manson's thought system, his philosophy, his way of life?
  - A Yes, I did.
- Q And did Mr. Watson ever tell you about what Manson preached and lectured to the family?
  - A Oh, yes,
- Q Dith't Mr. Watson tell you that he accepted Mr. Menson's thought system?
  - A Yes, he did. I think I have that in my report.
- you sort of summarize Mr. Manson's --
  - A No.
- Q -- thought system, whether you learned about it from the newspaper or from Mr. Watson or from reading testimony of other witnesses?
  - A No, there is not; I don't think so, at least.
- Q Do you know anything about what he preached, what Manson preached?
- A Well, the whole situation is so eccentric and it has so many ramifications which impinge on the structure of our society --
  - Q Well, did it disgust you, Mr. Manson's thoughts --
  - A I beg your pardon?
  - Q Did Mr. Menson's thought system disgust you?
  - A Some of it did and much of it did not.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

philosophy, vis a via his relationship with his family and with the so-called establishment, if you remember anything.

A Well, I will certainly say that -- and I think I have said this before, in all candor -- the reason that I write so much is that I don't remember so much and --

Q Excuse me, I didn't mean to interrupt.

A -- and I have -- I was prepared with background material as regards Mr. Menson and relations to the capsules, newspaperwise; but I have given that no particular concern for a long time, for the simple reason that I was not concerned and didn't have any occasion to be.

Q You don't think, then, that it is at all important about how Manson was able to dominate the members of his family through his preachings and lectures?

A Oh, I have already testified, counsel, that I felt he had a terrific charisms; that he had also a system of thinking which represented an eccentric but, nevertheless, well a very developed system of beliefs, those particular beliefs being acceptable to many, many more people in our particular culture; and yet, those beliefs being quite contrary to the accepted norm.

- Q Well, weren't those beliefs that Watson accepted
- A Well --
- Q -- together with other members of his family, Memson's family.

Tell us about it.

A Well, in general, they had to do with the fact

that people -- that, of course, there was no such thing as right or wrong, for instance; after all, human life, you should be willing to give up your own life and you could take anybody else's life, and that it meant nothing.

- Q That is a rather unusual belief, isn't it?
- A I indicated that he is -- he was the inducer; and the individual who formulated the particular concepts that he wanted to proselyte, and he was after as many followers as he could get.
- Q You formed the opinion that Mr. Watson swallowed that particular balief you have just expressed to us?
- A I have indicated that he espoused portions of it; how much of it, I am inable to state, but I know that, as I pointed out, and I certainly, spontaneously, stated it, that he liked the general idea of what he saw and felt and he was willing to pay the price, and so he learned the rules and he played the game and he listened to the coach.

T	
_	
2	

8 9

10

11

12 13

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

24

23

25

27

28

How, you just told us that Mr. Manson had a belief that there is no wrong. There is no right. It is not wrong to kill and there is no sin. There is no good. There is no bad.

I am going a little further then what you said. But that is part of that same Manson system, isn't it?

- A That is right.
- And that refreshes your memory a little bit, does 127
  - That is right.
- O To your knowledge, didn't the members of Masson's family accept that particular area of his philosophy? By "his" I am referring to Manson. They swallowed it, didn't they?
- They, as I pointed out before, individuals who wanted to believe it. believed it.

Those who didn't want to believe, still went along For instance, one of the girls is reported to have said. "I am a witch."

- Was that Linda Kasabian? Q
- That is right, but she also said. "I know I wasn't a witch but I was a good witch."
- But Linda Kasabian also testified in substance Q that she believed Manson, that she did at one time believe in what Manson told her about, there is so wrong and there is no sin and so on and so forth?
  - This is a very compelling personality, sir.
  - Q Wouldn't you say that an individual who believed

that particular part of Manson's thought system showed immature judgment?

A Well, considering the success that Mr. Manson has had with people, who are accepted as mature personalities --

- Q Who is accepted as a mature personality around bere?
- A Individuals who have had to meet Hr. Hasson's terms in court and out are individuals who are recognized as individuals of maturity.
- Q Whe do you know, Doctor, that accepted Manson's philosophy lock, stock and barrel, that you consider to be a mature, well-adjusted, strong, normal personality?
- I am not speaking of what they have accepted, but
  I am saying that by reason of the strength of his expression -and that is as meutral a word as I can use -- time and tide
  have waited on him.
- Q I don't understand your answer. Perhaps you can olaborate?
  - A I would rather not elaborate.

THE COURT: You don't mean he could walk on water, do you, Doctor?

THE WITHESS: No. but I'll bet he could swim.

THE COURT: This might be a good time for a recess.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we will recess at this time until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

Once again, do not form or express any opinion in this case. Do not discuss it among yourselves or with anybody else. Please keep an open mind and please heed what I told

you about the news madia.

MR. BUBRICK: I have to break the chain, but could I get an extra 15 minutes in the morning. I've been asked by one of the judges to appear personally.

THE COURT: We won't hold you in contempt. You can come

MR. KRITH: I was going to ask for the same indulgence.

I have an appearance tomorrow and I may be late, although --

THE COURT: What time can you be back?

MR. KEITH: A quarter of 10:00.

THE COURT: All right. Be back as soon as you can. 9:45 will be all right.

(An adjournment was taken until Wednesday, September 22, 1971, at 9:45 A.M.)

- 5

7

8

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22. 1971, 9:50 AM

THE COURT: Good morning.

Gentlemen.

MR. KAY: Good morning.

THE COURT: Doctor.

People against Watson. Let the record show all jurors, counsel and defendant present.

Mr. Keith, you may proceed.

MR. KEITH: Thank you, your Honor.

11

12

13

10

GROVNER K. BAILEY,

resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

14 15

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed)

16

BY MR. KEITH:

17 18

Q Dr. Bailey, at the close of yesterday's session, just to orient you, I asked you this question:

19: 20

"Who do you know, Doctor, that accepted
Manson's philosophy lock, stock and barrel, that

you consider to be a mature, well-adjusted,

22 23

21

And your answer was:

strong, normal personality?"

24

"I am not speaking of what they have accepted, but I am saying that by reason of

neutral a word as I can use -- time and tide

25 26

the strength of his expression -- and that is as

27

28

have waited on him.

"Q I don't understand your answer. Perhaps you can elaborate.

"A I would rather not elaborate."

Then the Court said: "You don't mean he could walk on water, do you, Doctor?"

And you said:

"No, but I'll bet he could swim," and that is where we left off.

Now, I really didn't get an answer to my question as to who you know that did accept Manson's thought system, yet was still a strong, well-adjusted, normal, mature personality.

A No, Counsel; and when I am in error, I am forthright to say so, in this respect, that I misinterpreted your question and, therefore, did not give you the answer.

The fact of the matter is that I was referring to many individuals of recognized authority and maturity who had been in contact with Mr. Manson, not in relation to the individuals at the ranch but in contact with him during the interim which has occurred since he, himself, I take it, was incarcerated; and those individuals have responded in ways which indicated that his aggressive attitudes and his brash --

2£.

j 20.

25

26

27

28

Q Is what, sir?

Is brash --A

0 Excuse me.

-- approaches to circumstance required the Ā careful and deliberate and prudent. I take it, consideration of those whom he challenged.

This was my thought in response to your question. which was not in response to your question, I'm sorry to say,

THE COURT: Will you now respond to this question, please. You know Manson's theory of helter skelter?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: And the bottomless pit?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: And the war of the races and all that? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: I think Mr. Keith wants to know: Do you know any normal healthy strong individual that also accepted his philosophy?

THE WITNESS: No! I personally do not know them, no.

BY MR. KEITH: All right. Thank you.

Doctor, did you form the opinion as a result of your examination of Mr. Watson that his judgment is obviously naive, then poor, then worse than poor, that his insight is impaired?

A I made that statement.

That is on page 4 approximately line 12 of your report, is it not?

A Yes.

]	ر من المنظم ا
1	Q When you say "then worse than poor," I take it
2	you mean awful, terrible, or seriously impaired.
3	A There have been times when it certainly was,
4	according to the facts of the
.5	Q According to the facts of the case as you know
6	them?
7	A According to the facts of the case as I know it,
8	including, of course, the hospitalization periods.
9	Q And did you also form the opinion that the
10	defendant's affect was as follows: That he was presently
11	cooperative I am also reading to refresh your recollection
12	from line 17 on page 4
13	A Yes, counsel.
14	Q "He was presently cooperative, somewhat depressed,
1Ŝ	that he is docile, somewhat apathetic and has obviously been
16-	unstable"?
17	A That is correct.
18	Q When you say "has obviously been unstable," I
.19	take it you are referring to his past life style?
<b>20</b> .	A Yes.
21	Q Therefore you formed the opinion that he was an
22	unstable person at the time he was under Manson's influence;
`23 ;	is that right?
24	A I believe that to be so.
25	Q Doctor, turning to pages 5 and 6 of your report,
26	you administered to him a Cornell index test of 101 items;
27	right?
28.	A Yes, counsel.

1	Q	And he responded to that test in many average
2	negatives;	is that a fair statement?
3	A	That is a fair statement,
4	Q	But the following affirmative answers were given:
5	Yes, I have	had a headache and I frequently feel faint; and I
6	am hot and	cold spells, et cetera, et cetera, and down farther
7	on line 29,	"Yes, I wish I had somebody to tell me what to do.
8.1		"I have to do things very slowly in order to be
9'	sure I am de	oing them just right.
10		"I would rather eat in my own home."
11		These are the answers he gave you to the Cornell
12	index test,	the affirmative answers?
13	A	That is correct.
14	Q	Is that a yes or no test, in other words, are
15	they the es	say style or the yes or no answer?
16	A	They are yes or no answers.
17	Q	So this isn't Mr. Watson's own language that I
18	am reciting	?
19	A	No.
20	Q	This is language that is contained in the Cornell
21	test itself	?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	Is that correct?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	For example, let's go to line 25 where you have,
26	"Yes, I wis	n I had somebody to tell me what to do," how is
27	that question	on couched in the test itself, if you can tell us
28	without thu	mbing through your voluminous records?

1	
1:	A I think I can give you that right at this moment.
2	Q Would you be kind enough to let me look at the
3	document, if you can locate it?
. 4	A More than happy to.
5	
6	
7	
8	
<u>و</u>	
10	₹
11 12	
12	
13	
15	
16	
17	
18 .	
<b>19</b>	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

3A

--A

.

28.

Q Now, could you tell us what the purpose of this particular Cornell test is, or Cornell index test?

You told us before, but doesn't it have to do with his physical well being rather than emotional?

A As I pointed out at the time, counsel, this has to do with many of the physical responses having to do with his nervous system; also having to do with questions of his response to his environment, notably, whether he had had any trouble with the law, whether he had taken dope regularly -- I think that's a direct quote -- whether he had had stomach trouble of a nature relative to his nervous system; and other factors which I think are apparent there.

This is the reason that I came up, also, with the next test, which I reported on, which is a matter of 100 questions and 88 items, in which he was asked to say "yes," "no," "sometimes," or, as I said yesterday, and as I asked him -- told him -- "If you want to say 'none of your business' that's all right with me."

- Q I notice in numerous responses on this test he circled not only "no," but also "yes," in answer to the same question.
- A A very excellent point; and this was due to the point -- the fact that I said, "If it is sometimes yes and sometimes no, you put it down as you feel," and he did.
- Q For instance, in answer to the question, "Do you often feel miserable and blue?"

He puts "yes" and "no."

I'm sorry I took the test away; you can't very

4

5

3

6

7

9

10<sup>.</sup>

12 \*

14

15

16 17

18

10

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

completed the two tests, the Cornell and the Mooney test?

A I believe not, except when he made, in response to his physical symptoms, which would be the next question after. "Are you generally emotionally unstable?"

To which he answered "No" and "Yes," I say, "Do you have any physical symptoms?"

And his answer was "Yes," and then he wrote on the back of the page: "Eating, spit up most foods, lay on stomach, some things can't eat, most not, stomach pains, chest pains, hemorrhoids, light foods and juices, spit up oil and sweets; tender stomach; dry raw foods can eat."

Q Did he, in response to one of the questions on the Mooney test, did he tell you that he lacked self-confidence and wished he were a child again?

A Yes, he did.

Q Incidentally, did you tell us yesterday you thought Mr. Watson was feigning in the county jail just before he went to Atascadero?

A Yes, I did.

Q Was that opinion on your part derived from a study of the charts of the infirmary in the county jail records?

A It was derived from that and also from the general facts which, as I pointed out yesterday, amounted to a method by which he could obtain the equivalent one vote for one man; in other words, one man in one room, and he got his room.

Q Now, I am talking about -- maybe we are talking

about different periods -- I'm talking about September and October of 1970 when he was in the county jail here before he was transferred to Atascadero. Did you think --That's what I am talking about. 5, All right. Could you turn to page 25 of your report? Page 25, counsel, yes. Do you see these -- apparently you excerpted from the infirmary file certain remarks made by deputy sheriffs or hospital attendants or the doctors there; is that correct? That is correct,  $2\hat{2}$ 

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

26

27

28

Q

····		
	Q	This Page 25 doesn't contain all the reports of
the j	11?	
	A	No.
	Q	During this period of time, September and October
1970;	is th	at correct?
	A	No, it does not, Counsel, but in my opinion it does
high1	ځ.	he postures and attitudes and circumstances and is
truly	refle	ctive of the
		Of feigning?
4	A	No truly reflective of the chart. I didn't
		thing on the chart, but I wrote those things which
	applic	
	Q	Do you see this entry on 9-30-70 on Line 14?
	A	What page?
	Q.	Line 14, Page 25, under date of 9-30-70? That
would	be Se	ptember 30th, 1970?
	A	Yes. I see that.
	Q	It says "Apparently was violent. Hit his head
and b	ody ag	ainst wall. Mentally disoriented. Head and neck
sympte	oms no	evidence of injury."
		Do you see that?
	A	Yes.
	Q	Does that indicate feigning to you?
	A	Not necessarily, no.
	Q.	And do you see the entry starting at your Line 21,
dated	10-14	-70, again on Page
	A	Yes, I do.

10-14-70, at 10:30 -- I guess that is 10:30 p.m. --

1	will sasume	a posture and maintain that posture without visible
2	interest in	activity.
3	Q	You say assume a posture. Do you mean just lie in
4	one position	n?
5	A	This would be one of the evidences.
·6	Q	Is this what Mr. Watson did?
7	A	That is what he is reported as having done.
8	Q	You didn't see him then?
9	A	I did not see him.
10	Q	Was he reported to have assumed that kind of a
iı	posture?	
12	A	It said that he had assumed a fetal position, I
13	believe.	
14	Q	And just laid there?
15	A	Just laid there.
16	Q	Didn't get up to go to the bathroom or eat or do
17	anything?	
18	A	That is right, none.
19	1.1.7 <b>Q</b>	Didn't they have to feed him by tubes?
20	1 / M A	Yes.
21	Q	According to the reports?
22	A,	According to the reports, they did, but you see
23	there are a	lot of other circumstances which would make that
24	not necessa	rily, although a catatonic state, not necessarily
25	related to	s schizophrenia, because he didn't have schizo-
26	phrenia.	
27 👾	Q Q	Doesn't have it now?
28	A	Didn't have it.

1	L	Q	Pardon me?
2	:	<b>A</b> .	Didn't have it.
8		Q	Didn't have it at any time?
4	,	A	Not schizophrenia,
5	,	Q	What is schizophrenia?
6	5	Å	Schizophrenia
7	7	Q	It is a mental disease?
8	3	A	It is a mental disease but he didn't have that kind
g		of a menta	l disease.
, 10	<b>,</b> '	Q	How can you tell he didn't have that kind of a
13	ľ,	mental dise	ase?
12	2 ,	A	Well, he doesn't have it now.
18	3.		
14	ŀ	•	
15	5	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
16	5 .		
17	7		•
18	В	,	
19	9		
20	0		•
2	i		
2	2		
2	3		
2	4		:
2	5	,	
2	6		
2	7		
2	8		
		1.	

2

3

**5** 

7

9

R

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

.25 26

-27

28

Q Ever? That didn't mean he couldn't have had it a couple of years ago?

A No, it doesn't, Counsel, but he doesn't have any history of the recurrent episode of schizophrenia, which include not only the idea of withdrawal, but which include delusions and which include difficulties so far as willingness to participate in situations.

- Q Is a symptom of schizophrenia a delusion?
- A One of the symptoms.
- Q Having delusions?
- A Yes, one of the symptoms.
- Q What are some of the other symptoms? In other words, what would you expect to find in a schizophrenic? I will withdraw that.

There is more than one kind of schizophrenia, isn't there?

- A Oh, there are several kinds of schizophrenia.
- Q Have you ever heard of an undifferentiated schizophrenia?
  - A Yes, I surely have.
  - Q Have you ever heard of a paranoid schizophrenia?
  - A Yes.
  - Q Any other kind?
  - A Hebephrenic schizophrenia.
- Q What symptoms do you find in undifferentiated schizophrenia or is it impossible to give us some of the symptoms because they are so varied?
  - A I don't think it is impossible to give the symptoms.

2

7

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

.23

25

26

27

28 (

The schisophrenic will be an individual who, in the first place, finds it difficult to meet the need of his environment. may be precipitated into an acute episode of delusion, hallucinations.

He may find it increasingly difficult to attend to his ordinary interests and his duties. He may withdraw and he frequently will have a repetitive situation, or recidivistic, in which he will have a free period of no difficulty whatsoever and then will lapse back maybe six months later, two or three years later into another episode of withdrawal and where he will find it increasingly difficult to meet the necessities of civilian experience, maybe.

- Aren't you pretty well describing Mr. Watson? Q
- A No. I am not.
- Someone who finds it difficult to meet the needs Q of his environment? Isn't that Mr. Watson all along?
- There are many people who find it difficult to meet the needs of their environment.
  - This is just one symptom, apparently? Q
- Yes. There are many people that have that symptom who are not schizophrenic.
  - Q But you gave us a list of symptoms.
- That is right. Schizophrenia is, as I say, it is very difficult to state unequivocably what represents an undifferentiated schizophrenia, although I am making a real attempt to.
- Let's assume Mr. Watson thought Manson was Jesus Christ or God or the Devil; isn't that sort of a delusion?
  - That is a belief.

3

4

5

7

9

10

12 ·

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

24

26

27

28

Q And isn't that an erroneous belief?

A It is an erroneous belief, but a lot of people make mistakes.

Q But isn't that also an erroneous belief that is, in Mr. Watson's case at that time and at that place, not amenable to logic or reason?

That's a delusion, isn't it, when you have an erroneous belief that can't be changed by logic or ressoning?

A Well, we are talking about two different things, I believe, Counsel.

In the first place, I'm talking about the situation as it regards; the chart and in speaking in terms of schizophrenia, this represents one of the factors; a delusion is one
of the factors in schizophrenia, but, as we know, his acquiesMr.
cence to/Manson's contentions was not based on schizophrenia;
it wasn't based on a delusion, it was based on the fact that he
wanted to believe a particular authoritarian figure, which he
did.

Q Isn't that just one facet of Mr. Watson's relationship with Manson, that as far as you are concerned that he wanted to believe in an authoritarian father figure?

That isn't the whole story, is it?

- A No, that isn't the whole story.
- Q In your opinion, do drugs enter into the picture at all, in producing Mr. Watson's psychosis?

A They don't enter into the picture in producing his psychosis. They enter into the picture, but not in producing his physosis.

Q Do you feel that the drugs Mr. Watson told he took were just very incidental to the total, whole picture that we have been discussing?

A I don't think they were incidental but I don't think that they were of such a magnitude that it changed Mr. Watson's ability to respond or that it changed his ability to respond to his own conscience, which I believe to be, sir, the basic problem with which we are dealing.

Q Wasn't it your belief, or isn't it your belief, that Mr. Manson set up rather systematically to destroy the conscience of his followers?

A Yes, I believe he did; that was his method.

Q Do you recall his telling, or allegedly telling the people after they returned to the Tate house, "Do any of you have any remorse?" and they were all supposed to have said, "No"?

A I recall.

Q Is that illustration of Mr. Manson's technique in seeking to destroy the conscience of his followers so they'd do that he told them to do without any question?

A I believe that's certainly true; and he certainly reinforced that effort by giving them a question which gave them a chance to say audibly so that they could hear themselves say the answer that he hoped they would give.

Q Do you think fear played a part in Mr. Manson's program to dominate these people and get them to do what he wanted them to do?

A' I couldn't -- I couldn't --

Α		

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

t '11 ⋅

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2б

Q BY MR. KEITH: Doctor, turning to page 26 of your report, line 8, beginning at line 8, under subheading B -capital B, do you see that?

28? A

Q Yes, page 26.

Ă Yes. Line 8?

Q Do you see this: "The indiscriminate, non-medical use of unmeasured but often-told unknown combinations of dangerous drugs whose affects, singly or in inordinate combination. I find myself unable to assess or to predict. I defer to toxicologists, neurophysiologists for valid value judgments and opinions in this regard."

Do you see that statement, Doctor?

Yes, I made that statement.

Do you mean, are you telling us in that sort of language that you really can't form a valid opinion as to what effect the drugs may have had on Mr. Watson simply because you are not experienced in the field of drug abuse?

I'm not as experienced as many are; and I make that forthright statement.

So, your forthright mawer, then, is that you are Q unable to evaluate the effect of the drugs on Mr. Watson's personality, character, mind and body?

I'm certainly making that statement, for the simple reason that I don't know how many drugs he took.

I have no idea as to what the dosage was -- they were, as you know, either given by Mr. Manson or self-taken by Mr. Watson.

27 28

Q Well, excuse me; I didn't mean to interrupt you --

A I don't know what that unknown combination of drugs do to each other; some negate each other. We know this in general medicine; we know that some medications will counteract the effects of others.

We know that each individual may have a personal or individual response to a certain drug, an allergy or something of that sort, where others do not.

We know that in some combinations, under some circumstances of dosage, certain drugs have certain effects. Otherwise, where we do not know how much, how often or in what combination, I would be presumptive to say.

Q Let me assume something, Doctor: Let's assume that Mr. Watson between, let's say, the fall of 1968 and through August or so of 1969 was a chronic user -- a chronic user of LSD.

Now, bearing in mind Mr. Watson's personality, underlying personality structure, as you have found it to be, do you have an opinion as to what effect the chronic use of LSD might have on his mind?

A I can only judge that by the condition in which I found him and found his mind.

Q And you have no knowledge, then, of generally speaking of what the effects of the chronic use of LSD are or may be on a passive-dependent person?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I would object to that question; it is irrelevant.

We are only dealing with Mr. Watson here, your

2Ì 

26<sup>.</sup> 

28.

Honor, not the people in general; but what effect the drugs had on Mr. Watson.

MR. KEITH: I'm trying to determine his expertise.

THE COURT: Overruled. I will permit the doctor to answer.

You can answer that, Doctor.

THE WITNESS: Well, I would have to have and do have a general idea, of course, as to the fact that marijuana and LSD, chronically taken, have a very, very great effect on some people and on other people they develop a tolerance for drugs and function, as in the case of Mr. Watson, very, very adequately.

- Q BY MR. KEITH: Well, when people develop a tolerance, all that means is that they have to take more of the same thing to get the same effect; isn't that right?
- A If you are speaking in terms of those addictive drugs, that would be true; but here we have a situation in which he hasn't had any drugs since he was -- that is, of anything of that nature -- since he was hospitalized, nor since he has been incarcerated.
- Q I grant you that, he hasn't had any drugs of any nature since at least December, 1969 -- I was going to say '70, I knew that didn't sound right.

So, you can't give us an opinion as to how the chronic use of LSD may have affected Mr. Watson's mind; is that right?

A I can only give you an opinion as to how I find Mr. Watson and his mind at the present time.

5A-4

-

. 25

28.

Q Today?

A Well, during my examination.

Q All right, within a few months ago?

A Yes, correct.

Q Doctor, let's turn to the top of page 28 of your report, if we may,

You see No. 9, paragraph 9, "Examiner's note:
Argument:."

Then you say: "The forest becomes more clearly discernible when we can define the perimeter as well as the parameter of the underbrush as well as the trees. To put it in a mathematical context: Not only is the whole the sum of all its parts, but the analogy of a parameter has signal application here: A parameter is defined as, 'An arbitrary constant characterizing by each of its particular values some particular member of a system of expressions, curves, surfaces, functions, etc.'"

Can you tell us at all what you meant by that paragraph?

I can't understand a single word of it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: You don't mean that, Max; you don't understand the word "the"?

MR. KEITH: Not in this context.

THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the perimeter of anything is the limitation of a given area or a given body or a given idea; and it may be square, it may be round, it may be irregular, but it is the containing line. That, of course, is the perimeter.

oe

Now, the parameter, as we go on to say there, the parameter has to deal with the inside contents, whether the situation is a forest or whether it is underbrush; in other words, whether the trees are trees or whether this woodland, so to speak, is a matter of all trees and no underbrush or a matter of it is underbrush and glades, or what it is, speaking in terms of analogy of the forest; and the parameter, as we go on to say on line 8:

"One of the curves and some of the values in the psychiatric understanding of the parameters in this case are the constellation of symptoms which gradually evolved into the at one time relatively rare diagnostic entity, folical deux."

By this we mean that there are certain factors there in which, starting from the personality structure and starting from his past experience, certain areas his psychological makeup grew; others tended not to be as fully developed.

This constitutes parameter, if you will.

There are certain areas in this analogy which didn't appear at first as part of a psychosis; it appeared as a matter of behavior or it appeared as a matter of response or it appeared as a matter of circumstantial response, shall I say, and these things did not become apparent as a system.

3

ð

5

6

8

9

11,

, 10

12, 13

14

15 #

17

18

19 20

21

22· 23·

24

25 26

27

28

They were not apparently related until gradually they did become a well-defined psychiatric entity and that entity was in my opinion folie a deux.

I hope -- I have tried to explain that,

- Q Thank you, Doctor. Could you tell us what your understanding of the medical term psychosis is?
- A A psychosis is that condition which has to do with the change of the total, or a portion of the personality from the normal and in which most of the factors of ordinary integration, shall we say, are modified and where the tendency is to have an unreal view of what are generally recognized as normal appreciations.

Psychosis may be characterized by many features. We have various types of psychoses.

- deux?
- A Folie a deux is a very unusual type, actually. The most usual types are schizophrenia and the cyclothymias, which are characterized by manic depressive psychosis.

We have a psychosis of postpartum psychosis following pregnancies where there are changes in relation to the glandular system.

Q I am speaking more of the -- never mind.

Don't you find it difficult, Doctor, to equate a person who is psychotic, as you found Mr. Watson to have been on the nights of these homicides, to a person who is maturely and meaningfully able to contemplate the gravity of his, or to reflect upon the gravity of his contemplated act?

.

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

12

13

14.

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22: 23

24

25 ' / \$ 26.

27

A No.

A Commence of the Commence of

Q You find no difficulty in making that transition whatsoever?

A There is no transition so far as I am concerned for the simple reason that this psychosis we are talking about is folie a deux, which is quite different than the psychoses of schizophrenia or of manic-depressive psychosis.

Q What is the difference between this psychosis as you found and schizophrenic psychosis?

A Well, there is such a difference that in the diagnostic formulary of the American Psychiatric Association, they find no place under schizophrenia or manic depressive psychosis for this particular diagnosis and it is included under the item 299, which is the receptacle, shall I say, for unusual psychotic states which are not included in the main and most frequently and most common types of psychosis.

Q Would a layman's term for psychosis generally be crazy?

A It usually used to be.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Object as immaterial and irrelevant.

THE COURT: He has answered the question. He said it used to be.

Q BY MR. KEITH: Doctor, does every psychotic exhibit certain common symptoms in your opinion, regardless of whether it is a manic-depressive or a folic a deux psychotic or a schizophrenic psychotic?

A No, they don't have to. That is the differentia-

Q You told us that your definition of psychotic was a change from the normal to -- what was that again? I tried to write it down but I couldn't write fast enough.

Q Well, in a psychosis there is a, as I said, there is a change in the personality and the individual also has matters of depersonalization, in which there are changes, in many instances, giving unreality feelings, or there may be conditions in which there is a hypermanic state, in which the individual simply is extremely active without any good reason, or there may be delirium.

There are many, many evidences in the psychoses, but the differentiation and the reason for this particular definition and this particular diagnosis of folie a deux is that the individual is able to do anything that he is, from a physical standpoint, able to do.

He is able to make decisions. He is able to think. He is able to act but this gives the basis for or the reason for the manifestations which, as I pointed out, in the parameter analogy, otherwise it would be very difficult to classify, but this classifications meets each of these criteria, but the individual is within that psychotic situation not involved as he is in the schizophrenia.

For instance, none of these activities of Mr. Watson were done because he was under the delusion that he was somebody else.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

12

13 14

15` `.\*

16 ;

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26.

27

28

It was not done under the hallucination that he saw two people instead of one or that he heard voices. He didn't hear voices. I am talking about at the time of the incidents.

He had no psychotic manifestations at that time and it was not done, therefore, under conditions of schizophrenia or of manic-depressive. He still has the, as I testified yesterday, he still has the affect of the psychosis.

He will continue to have this until he gets out of the stress situations and the apprehensions and the fears and the predicament in which he is continually by reason of such a situation as this this morning.

This doesn't do him any good. I am speaking now personally -- the elements of examinations and of the trial -- but when he is freed from this, he has already expressed the fact that he wants no more part of that other life.

He has already asked for forgiveness. This indicates the degree of his conscience and it also further explains why he was able to do what he did, even though he was told to do it. It explains why he was able to do it because some of the people were told to do it and they didn't do it, but he did and he could by reason of certain responses to his own conscience.

- Q At the time he did these things, killed those people, he was psychotic; right?
  - A He was no more psychotic then than he is now.
- Q But you just told us that he was suffering from a psychosis.

1	
2	

4

5

7

8

Q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

A He is.

Q At that time.

now.

A He was. He is suffering from the same psychosis

Q You mean he is still psychotic now?

I say --

A That is what I said.

Q And he still is suffering from the folie a deux psychosis?

A Yes, he is, and he will be until he gets out of this particular circumstance in which he is in jeapordy and until he gets out of all influence from those individuals who were at the ranch.

Q A psychosis isn't any laughing matter, is it, Doctor?

A No, it isn't.

'Q It is a severe mental disorder, isn't it?

Is called a psychosis because it is a different response than the response of an individual who had no compelling factors. Admittedly Mr. Manson had a very profound effect -- I think we have used the word in our report -- he had a profound effect and yet at the same time the mechanism by which this was all achieved is the receptacle. It is the skeleton, if you will, on which the reactions are draped, if you want to use the term.

Q Doctor, do you believe that a mature, well-adjusted, strong personality would become the passive person in the folie a deux psychosis, which is characterized by dominance

of an older figure, usually, older person?

A The individual \*- when I use the term maturely, I indicate that at the time that this occurred Mr. Watson knew what he was doing,

- Q You are not really answering my question.
- A May I have it again?
- Q My question was: In your opinion could a strong, well-adjusted, mature individual become the victim of folic a deux, that psychosis known as folic a deux, by being the passive party and being dominated by the dominant figure of the two? That was badly put.
  - A I think it was very well put.

I think that the answer to that would be yes, but we have to remember that Mr. Watson himself was contributing to the assumption of this role on the part of Mr. Manson because Mr. Watson, as we pointed out, was interested in that kind of a life style.

- Q Doctor, you did a good deal of research, didn't you, into this very interesting phenomenon that we have been discussing?
  - A I did some, yes.

2

4

5 6

7

8.

9

10 11

12 ~

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

it?

Q And you read an article that you quote from -here it is on Page 28, "In the 1965 edition of 'Encyclopedia
of Aberrations'" --

MR. BUGLIOSI: What line are you reading from?
MR. KEITH: Line 11, Counsel.

- Q Are you with me, Doctor?
- A Yes. I am.
- Q Did you read an article by Edward Podolsky, M.D.?
- A Yes, I did.
- Q And he quotes from Dr. Mensch, M-e-n-s-c-h?
- A. Yes, Counsel.
- Q And the next paragraph, I don't know whether you are quoting from Podolsky or Dr. Mensch, it doesn't make a great deal of difference -- do you recall?
  - A It was Dr. Mensch.
- Q And it says here -- incidentally, did you consider this Dr. Mensch's quotation that you have reproduced here in forming your analysis?
  - A Yes, I did.
- Q And did Dr. Mensch say that "The prominent factors of association, dominance and submission, relationship, pre-psychotic personality, sex and age, type of delusion, and homosexuality are discussed. Emphasis is placed on the etiological factors and explanatory mechanisms, including identification, hereditary and environment, imitation and sympathy, and shock and strain"?

You quoted that paragraph from Dr. Mensch, I take

1	A Because that's what the record shows.
2	Q That is what the record what record?
3	A The entire record of life on the ranch.
4	Q It shows that there was this agreement you talked
5	about yesterday whereby one family member would give up certain
6	things in exchange for other things?
7	A A disagreement?
8	Q A disagreement? I don't think I used the word
9	A You used the word
10	Q If I said "disagreement," I misspoke. I said
11	"agreement."
12	THE COURT: You mean to say agreement.
13	THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon. This is an agreement,
14	yes; that was part of the deal.
15	Q BY MR. KEITH: Where did you did you hear about
16	any contract or agreement from Mr. Watson?
17	A It is inherent in the state of affairs that when he
	had a choice, he, as I said yesterday, he left for a while but
19	then he came back.
20	Q That was because of Manson's magnetic pull, wasn't
21	it?
22	A I'm not able to state that that was entirely due
23	to Manson's magnetic pull, because after all, Manson's magnetic
24	pull was
26	Q Figuratively, I mean.
27	A was greatly potentiated by all the pleasant
8	habiliments which the ranch life, itself, insured.
~	Q One of the features of folie a deux is submission,

1	isn't it?
2	A Yes, it is, Counsel.
3	Q On the part of the passive member of the twosome;
4	isn't that right?
5	A This is true.
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	·
11	
12	,
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	•
18	
19	· ·
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	<b>本</b>
27	
28	
40	

7af,

7A		1
		2
		Ś
•		4
,		5
		6
		7
		8
		9
•	3	0
	]	1
	]	2
	j	3.
_	]	4
	1	5
	1	6
	1	7
·	]	.8

And isn't one of the other features of the Q psychosis that the passive individual is also highly suggestible?

It is -- well, to the extent that the individual is a passive individual, that would be true of anyone, I would say, yes.

Look on page 28 of your report. I think you Ò quote Dr. Mensch further --

> Yes, line 10. A

It says here on line 10, "Examiner's note." Q That "Examiner note" that is your language, isn't

That's correct.

And it says -- apparently you read quite a bit Q of Dr. Mensch's work on the subject --

I did.

1t?

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

2**8** 

-- of this psychosis; is that right?

I did.

And he apparently is recognized in the field, in this particular narrow area?

In this area, yes.

Q And he says, you say, "The author, Dr. Mensch goes on to say, 'Distinctions between the four commonly accepted types are made in the following terms. The imposed type involves the transmission of delusions to the mentally sound, with the delusional trends not elaborated by the second person, but accepted with little resistance and with the disease in the second person disappearing after separation

1 2. of the two patients. "

Did you consider that phrase of Dr. Mensch in your analysis and evaluation of Mr. Watson?

- A Yes, I surely did.
- Q And doesn't that pretty well, that phrase right there, describe the relationship between Manson and Watson?
- A That pretty well describes it, but there is a statement there which is further elaborated and somewhat -- and, in fact, clarified by another statement which I quoted.
  - Q Is this starting at line 17?
  - A No, this is going back.

This is going back to page 28, line 21. I quoted this yesterday:

"Folie a deux has been defined as a 'psychosis simultaneously involving two or more intimately related persons; relationships, both biological and environmental; a psychiatric entity characterized by the transference of delusional ideas and/or'" --

Now, the important point there is the slash between "and" and "or." -- "'abnormal behavior from one person to one or more others who have been in close association with the primarily affected patient."

Now, this man, Mr. Watson, did not have delusions; he had abnormal behavior, but not delusions.

- Q What makes you think he didn't have delusions?
- A He didn't have any delusions when he was -- at the time of the incidents.

1	Q Let's assume he thought he was Manson; wouldn't
2	that be a delusion at the time of the incidents?
3	A That he thought he was Manson?
4	Q * ¥es.
5 .	A I have no information that he thought
6	Q I'm just giving you a hypothetical question. Let's
7.	assume, just assuming
8	A All right. Then, I take it, you want me to assume
9 .	that he says, "I'm the devil here to do the devil's work"
10	Q I haven't gotten to that.
ni	THE COURT: Doctor, just one at a time.
12	Answer his questions, please.
13	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
14	Yes, if he assumed that he was Manson but I
15	have no information that he did.
16	Q BY MR. KEITH: All right, that's the purpose of a
17	hypothetical question, when you don't have any information on
18	the subject.
19	Let's also assume at the time that let's assume
20	this, that he heard Manson talking to him during the Tate
21	homicides, when, as we know, Manson wasn't there: Wouldn't
22	that be evidence of a delusion?
, 23	
<b>24</b>	
25	
26	
27	
28	· ·

8R-1

23.

MR, BUGLIOSI: I don't believe there is any testimony from Mr. Watson at the time of these murders he thought he was Charles Manson. There was some testimony about confusion of identities, but I think, by and large, his testimony was he kept hearing in his mind, not the actual voices, but the directions from Manson. So I would object to that hypothetical as not based on the evidence, your Honor.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

THE WITNESS: May I have the question again?

Q BY MR. KEITH: Let's assume that he thought he heard Manson talking to him and giving him directions at the very time he was stabbing the people at the Tate residence.

That would be evidence of a delusion?

A Well, that would be -- that would be, if true, that would be evidence of a hallucination, an auditory hallucination, although he didn't tell me that.

THE COURT: Doctor, did you ask him whether he heard voices or heard directions at the time? As I take it from your testimony yesterday, you told us you did not ask him to relate in narrative form what occurred, but you took excerpts from other persons and asked him "The record shows this. Is it true?" Is that correct?

THE WITNESS: That was correct.

THE COURT: You did not ask him if he heard voices, did you?

THE WITNESS: If I --

MR. BUGLIOSI: May we approach the bench?

THE COURT: Yes, sure.

2

3

7

9

10 11

12

13

14

15, 16

17: 18

19

.20 21

22

23

25

26 27

28

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

MR. BUGLIOSI: These defense attorneys, in my opinion, are perfectly competent to ask defense questions.

It is obvious from the tone of the Court's voice. by the nature of the questions that these are defense questions.

I strenuously object to this. This has been going on day after day after day. This is a fury trial.

Mr. Kay has also noticed -- we are both experienced prosecutors -- that when our witnesses are on that stand, like this witness here, there are two types of looks on the Court's face.

And I am saying, as an officer of the court. No. 1, there is a look of disbelief or a look of mockery and laughing. I do not find that when defense witnesses are on that stand.

I would ask the Court to let the defense attorneys conduct the cross-examination. I am shocked. That is all I can say. I am shocked.

THE COURT: You may remain shocked, Mr. Bugliosi, asked questions and I intend to ask questions, whether they are defense question or prosecution questions.

I cannot change the look on my face. God gave me I want to keep it. You can remain shocked, but I that look. intend to ask questions.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I notice there is a difference between the look on the Court's face and it is not just my view but it is Mr. Kay's view.

. 

. .

-

.  THE COURT: You yourself have been laughing at times at this man.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, there is no question about that, and I also laughed at the prosecution witnesses and the defense witnesses if they say something funny.

I see a smile on the Court's face indicating to me that the Court does not believe the witness, the witness testimony, and Mr. Kay has formed the same opinion.

I have not heard the Court ask one question of a defense psychiatrist which I could construe, as an experienced prosecutor, as being a prosecutorial question.

I think on many occasions the Court has asked the prosecution witnesses, in my opinion as an experienced prosecutor, defense questions and I think this last one is one of them.

THE COURT: Well, as an experienced judge, I intend to ask questions that clarify. If I don't understand, I intend to ask questions.

I have done so before and I will continue to do so, regardless of your experience.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I know the Court is going to continue to do so. I wanted to state on the record that it is against the objection of the prosecution in this case. There is a definite tone here and the Court --

THE COURT: This man yesterday testified that he did not ask this man to give a narrative form. He asked him specific questions based upon someone else's testimony and now he says he did not tell him he heard voices. He didn't give him a

chance to tell him he heard voices.

MR. BUGLIOSI: There are two defense psychiatrists, your Honor, I think they are perfectly capable --

MR. KAY: Attorneys.

MR. BUGLIOSI: There are two defense attorneys. They are perfectly capable of conducting the cross-examination.

The problem is this, and it is extremely serious, and I cannot emphasize it enough. I am not concerned about the inciseveness of your questions. They don't bother me but what I am concerned about is this jury getting the impression that the Court is in sympathy with the defendant.

The judge by his questions, by the tone of his questions, by certain things he said to the prosecutor seems to be unconsciously sympathetic to Mr. Watson. This is what I am concerned about.

THE COURT: I intend to instruct the jury that nothing that I have said or any questions that I have asked is any indication that I believe or disbelieve any witness.

MR. BUGLIOSI: You see, if I were the only person that had this opinion, then I would say that I am wrong.

I hate to use the psychidelic term, but these are vibrations that apparently are being picked up by a lot of people other than myself.

Now, there is a lot at stake here. There is a lot at stake.

THE COURT: Yes, there is a man's life at stake here. I appreciate that, and I also appreciate he took seven lives, but this man is entitled to a fair trial.

MR. KAY: And so are the People. 1 MR. BUGLIOSI: No question about that. 2 THE COURT: And I will give it to him. 3 MR. BUGLIOSI: No question about that. THE COURT: And as you have mentioned the People are 5 entitled to a fair trial, too. You have already accused me, or questioned my integrity, so that doesn't bother me what you 7 said at all, but I am going to ask questions. I have done it before. I intend to do it. If they offend you, I am sorry. MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you, your Honor. 10 (The following proceedings were had in open 11 12 court, in the presence of the jury:) THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to have 13 a recess at this time. Heed the usual admonition. 14 (Recess.) 16 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

9f.

ъ

THE COURT: People against Watson,

Let the record show all jurors are present; all counsel and the defendant are present.

Mr. Keith, you may proceed.

MR. KEITH: Thank you. Doctor -- your Honor.

Q Doctor, yesterday you told us that in your opinion Mr. Watson was able to exercise some degree of free will.

Does that adequately reconstruct your testimony?

- A Yes, I think it does,
- Q Isn't one of the features of folic a deux that the passive member of the group, or the twosome in this case, that his free will is seriously impaired by reason of the domination of the dominant member of the duo?

A It is seriously impaired, but it wasn't impaired to the point where he couldn't act independently.

Q Isn't the very keynote of folie a deux a relationship where the passive member is completely dependent upon
the whims and wishes and desires and thought system of the
dominant member?

A I think that when you say "completely," I simply can't accept the idea of "completely."

The very fact that, as I say, he has -- he received emoluments for the submissiveness, which he was certainly encouraged to have, was part of the picture; and, of course, referring again to what he has had to say to me, and I used that, of course, in my estimation of his posture and his attitudes and his abilities to respond, dependently or independently of the situation.

9-2

.2

ŕ

6.

חר

I asked him many other questions which I have not had an opportunity to testify to, which were related not to a structured series of questions, which have been previously reported, but were my own stimulus to him was the question, "So?", and then he was invited, by inference and implication, to tell me anything that he would; and he did specifically in regard to not only that time but the time before and after.

I have several pages of that material where there was no structured question.

Q All right; but that indicates that Mr. Watson, when you talked to him, was able to carry on a narrative conversation with you without any stimulus on your part; isn't that right?

A That's true.

1	
-	

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 .

21

22

23.

24

25

26

27

Q That didn't have anything to do with his dependency upon Manson, does it? The fact that now he is able to carry on a conversation with you in narrative style?

- A The very fact --
- Q In response to nonleading questions.

A The fact is that as he himself has said he is hopefully out from under the immediate influence and also he himself is on record, I believe, as saying that he does not quote "go along with Mr. Manson" unquote at the present time but this does not change the fact that he is still under, obviously, under duress.

He is still under the cloud and so long as this circumstance persists, he will continue to have some of his responses of psychosis, but this doesn't mean that he doesn't know who he is, what he is doing and so on.

Q Doesn't the record in this case that you have read and considered, as well as other sources of information that have been available to you, such as newspaper reports, indicate that Manson's followers did everything he told them to do?

A In general that is the response, although he also told them, as I --

Q All right. Let me ask you another question.

Doesn't the record in this case indicate to you that nobody ever disobeyed Mr. Manson except on a few occasions, very few occasions?

A I think that this is true. If they did, they got out.

Q Yes, the record indicates that the people that

didn't go along with Manson left his organization sooner or later; isn't that right?

- A That is correct.
- Q And that there were some people, a few people, that never were taken in by Manson but stayed anyway just by reason of other inducements or factors that may have existed; isn't that right?
  - A I think the record shows that.
  - Q Jaun Flynn is one of those people?
  - A That is correct.
- Q And doesn't the record show in this case, Doctor, that Manson's family did what he told them to do in general without criticism of Manson or without weighing the pros and cons of Manson's direction?
  - A Yes. I believe that to be so.
- And with respect to the homicides themselves, in your opinion didn't Watson go out and kill seven people without weighing the pros and cons, without weighing the reasons for or against killing people -- just went out and did it?
- A He went out and did it. He was told that that was what he was to do.
  - Q And he did it.
  - A And he did it.
- Q He didn't sit there and say, "Now, Mr. Manson, I don't think we ought to do this. I don't think that is the right thing to do is to go out and kill a bunch of people just to start a black-white revolution"?

.2

3

4

U

"

8

9

10

11 12

13

14.

15<sub>.</sub>

17

18.

19 20

21

22

11

23

24 25

26

**27** 

28

MR. BUGLIOSI: This calls for a conclusion of what was on Mr. Watson's mind.

This witness, your Honor, I don't think would have any way of knowing whether Mr. Watson went through that mental process. I object to it upon that ground.

MR. KEITH: I am asking him his opinion.

THE COURT: I will allow him to answer.

THE WITNESS: My opinion would have to be based on what we know from all sources and also from much of the material that Mr. Watson gave me as his own response to my merely stimulus question of "So?" "So?" "So?" This was equivalent to a narrative which I have not had the opportunity of describing.

Q BY MR. KEITH: Let me ask my question again.

In your opinion did you believe Mr. Watson critically weighed the reasons for and against going out and killing the people at the Tate residence and the La Bianca residence when ordered to do so by Mr. Manson?

A I think Mr. Watson didn't know why he did it, along with the fact that he was told to do it, but I don't think he knew why he did it, but I think I know.

l-1	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	; 7
	8
	9
	10
	1 <b>ì</b>
	12
	13
<u>.</u>	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25

27

28

Q	Pardon	me;	I	didn't	: hear	that.
---	--------	-----	---	--------	--------	-------

A But I think I know.

THE COURT: Let's get this clarified. You say you don't think Watson knew what he did -- meaning what?

THE WITNESS: I said, I don't think Mr. Watson knew why he did it, other than the fact that he was told to do it.

THE COURT: When you say "it," you mean killing these people; is that what you mean?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

THE COURT: But you say you know?

THE WITNESS: I think I know.

Q BY MR. KEITH: Doctor, you told us yesterday, I believe, that Mr. Manson used certain techniques to achieve the debridement of individuals' self-respect -- this is what my notes contain.

A That's correct.

Q Is "debridement" a surgical term, meaning cutting away the flesh, dead flesh or diseased flesh?

A In that sense, it is a surgical term, yes.

Q How did you use it?

A I used it in the sense that taking away those particular areas of self-respect; but at the same time, giving an opportunity for certain inhibitions to be removed, and this represents, in my orientation, the removal of certain restrictive attitudes on the part of any individual.

Q By that you mean Watson taught his followers that anything you deal is all right, just fine, just lovely, just go shead and do what you want?

1	Isn't that what you are telling us?
2	A In a sense, but he also, as you know, was a past-
3	master
4	Q I said 'Watson," I keep I'm sorry I was
5	just informed go ahead.
6	A Would you repeat your question?
7	Q Yes. When you were talking about Manson using
8	certain techniques to deprive an individual of their self-
9	respect, tell us what you meant by that.
10	A That's what I meand, a debridement of the individ-
11	u al's feelings as regards certain responsible situations.
12	Q Feelings with regard to the rights of other people?
13	A Yes, and yet they recognized rights of other
14	people. They recognized their own rights; they recognized, for
15	instance, the fact that when somebody was asked, "Well, did you
16	do all these things right out in the open?" and they said, "Well
17	no, no, we didn't, because that wouldn't be right."
18	Q You were talking about running around naked
19	A That's correct.
20	Q at the Spahn Ranch?
21	A That's correct.
22	Q They didn't do that out in the open in plain view
23	of passersby; is that what you mean?
24	A That's right.
25	Q And they did
26	A And they gave that as that as the reason; so they
27	had knowledge, but they ignored the knowledge.
28	O But Manson, undertook, in your opinion to alter the

moral values that these people, as followers, once held; you say that --

A There is no doubt about it.

Q And he also altered any, which you might say, normal goals or what they once had, normal ambitions?

A Yes, by their permission. They contributed.

Q Well, Manson's family went along with this?

A Yes, but each, individually being happy and content, and within limits, content -- satisfied, possibly, but there is a difference.

Louis Untermeyer once said, "May I be content but still unsatisfied."

Now, in that connotation, contentment is a situation, inwardly, Mr. Watson did not have. He had satisfactions -- it was the other way around, he had satisfactions galore, but he had a discontent within himself; and this discontent preyed on his conscience because he has a conscience, irrespective of what he accepted, he still has a conscience and this conscience was not erased, because, although it went underground his conscience, nevertheless, was the thing that made it possible for him to do what Mr. Manson told him to do.

Others couldn't do what Mr. Manson told them to do.

Q His conscience became submerged, didn't it --

It did.

Q -- during the period of time when he was with Manson?

A so it did, but he still --

Q. His conscience didn't really operate at that time, did it, effectively?

12f.

	,
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	ŀ
6	
7	1
8	
9	
10	
10	
IJ	
12	
13	
14	
15	ļ
16	
17	
18	
<b>19</b>	
2Ô	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	-
26	

28

Q'	Did you ever read any testimony or receive any	
information	whereby one of Mr. Manson's concepts that he	
preached to	his followers was the death of the ego or loss o	£
the identity	y or ego destruction?	

A I realize -- I don't have an exact quote but I know that was part of the program.

- Q That was part of his program?
- A Part of his program.
- Q Was it also part of his program to your knowledge that Manson and his followers considered themselves as one homogeneous mass, that each was the other and they were all sort of the same person?

A His idea was to make them homogenous and homologous. Homogeneous, homologous, and analogous.

Q All right. In your opinion didn't Mr. Manson use drugs to effectuate his purposes or to facilitate the results he wanted to achieve?

A He did. Exactly as was reported in that poem
"The Lotus Eaters," where Tennyson says: "All things always
seem the same and the land of the lotus eaters was always
afternoon."

Q None of Mr. Manson's thought systems or philosophies are original with him, are they? Always somebody else who has had these same ideas. I don't mean to suggest that --

A Well, I think that in any culture, and particularly in a culture in an area of time in which we are having a cultural revolution, irrespective of any political revolution, but a cultural revolution, it is immediately apparent that

ļ

y

those who are interested in affiliating themselves with the changes -- and as we know youth is -- we have to recognize the fact that within youth itself there is not a generation gap, but a gap of ideation.

So consequently we have individuals who are very active in their protest, we will say, and those who have their own feelings, which are counter -- not as regards other generations, but as regards their own.

I mention this because in a cultural revolution individuals arise who come from widely divergent psychological, ideational, political, sociological viewpoints and they are just as strong in their beliefs and just as strong in their chorisms as those who come from, we will say, the traditional areas of educational experience and consequently those individuals are no less compelling in their presentations, and they may be to an extent right. So who is to say?

I certainly have no bias in that regard. I want to be sure I don't but in relation to what we know, we would have to say that there are certain individuals who, by reason of being different than others -- maybe they are eccentric, if you want to use the term -- I prefer to -- they may be eccentric, but the only reason, for instance, that homosexuals are different than other people is because -- I mean to say so far as attitudes toward homosexuals -- is because most people are heterosexual and it is like the fellow who said, "You can put me in jail but here I am."

In other words, he was out-voted.

It is a matter of balance. So consequently many

of the things which Mr. Manson says have a great element of truth in them, but unfortunately the fact that they become antisocial and predatory, and the fact that they go around stealing garbage and credit cards and other things, and money to substantiate their particular life style, this is -- I am just a doctor, I'm here to report -- that is nevertheless just prejudicial to not just the peace and quiet, not to law and order, but it is part of the cutting edge and some of those things are related to a cultural change, not to a psychosis.

THE COURT: Would you read the question, please, Mr. Reporter.

(Record read by the reporter.)

1@'12A

·--

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

A.	1
)	Ź

-- 20 ₹

ĵ 

Q BY MR. KEITH: Thank you for the discourse. I appreciate it.

Doctor, what professional societies are you a member of?

A I am a member of the American Medical Association, California Medical Association, Los Angeles Medical Society, a member of the Hollywood Academy of Medicine.

I am a Fellow of the International Association of Angiology.

T am a Fellow of the American College of Neuropsychiatrists. I am a member of the World Health Organization.
I am a member of the American Association of Science.

I am a member of the Division of Neurology and Psychiatry of Los Angeles County Medical Association.

I am a member and a Fellow of the American Association of Mental Deficiency.

I am a member of the Mental Health Association, with its offices in London. Several things I am not a member of but I am a member of those.

Q You were an osteopath originally; is that right?

A I had my D.O. degree in 1926 as a physician and surgeon and have been a physician and surgeon since that time.

By reason of the laws of California I became an M.D. in 1962.

Q You didn't have to take any tests then to obtain your M.D. degree?

A I did not. This was automatic.

3

2

5

6

В "

10

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

25 26

27

28

Q Did you ever undertake a residency in psychiatry?

A I pointed out yesterday that I did not. I have precepteeships.

Q And by that you mean you apprenticed to Dr. Merrill for five years?

- A That's right.
- Q Or some period of time?
- A That, I did.
- Q And how long ago was that?
- A That was from 1928 to 1933 -- whatever.
- Q And when did you start using the term "neuropsychiatry" on your letterhead?
  - A In 1935.
- Q Is there any difference between neuropsychiatry and psychiatry?

A No. I was a neurologist and a psychiatrist, so I combined the two.

- Q And do you also perform surgery as a neurosurgeon?
- A Yes, I did.
- Q You don't do that anymore?
- A Not since three years ago. I retired from neurosurgery.
- Q Did you ever have any professorships other than emeritus professorships?
- 5 A. I will say yes to that because -- and I'm not being facetious about this -- but if I hadn't had, I couldn't, of course, been emeritus.

I was professor of the discipline at the College of

20

21

22

23

24

粉黄石 交通流电动机

•	Q	What	unexpec	ted crisis	aros	e wi	thin the	È
Tate	residence or	the La	Bianca	residents	that	Mr.	Watson	met
with	dispatch the	t you k	now of?					

A In the first place, he had no idea of how many people were going to be there, and yet he so comported himself and everyone who was there was dead.

Doesn't, having no knowledge of how many people who might be there, bearing in mind there could have been a large party, show rather immature judgment and reflection on Mr. Watson's part in going to a house where he had absolutely no idea of who was going to be there. He could have been met by 10 people with loaded shotguns and got his head blown off, but he still went in.

Doesn't that show rather stupid, immature meaningless thinking?

I would certainly say that he was armed and he had a party and he knew exactly what he was going to do. In fact, he knew the structure of the house, as I understand it.

Yes, he had been there before.

He had been there. He knew. He had cased the place.

Q Are you trying to tell us that he cased the place for the purpose of coming back later and killing these people?

No. I am not. . A

He had just been there for a social visit a couple of times.

That is correct, but he knew where he had been and he was not foreign to the situation and he, granted as I say,

no question about it, he was told to go and kill people, but he had to act with independent volition and independent cognition. He had to know.

- Q In your opinion, he knew he was killing people?
- A That is right.
- Q That he intended to kill people there because Manson told him to kill these people?

A That is true, but he also had to have the capacity to react to situations that he nor anybody else could possibly foresee.

Q How does this show mature and meaningful reflection on the gravity of the contemplated act, the fact that he was able to accomplish what Manson told him to do -- kill everybody there, without getting himself killed?

A Well, because he was able to act in a protective way, as well as acting to protect the girls, because he was called to protect the girls and he responded to their protection or to their requests.

Q This doesn't have anything to do with weighing the pros and cons or the reasons for and against killing people in the first place, does it?

know why he was able to kill, but he did.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Would the Court care to take a recess

THE COURT: Yes. We will have a recess at this time, ladies and gentlemen of the jury until 1:30. Once more, head the admonition previous given.

(Recess.)

ļ

2

3

5

6.

7

8

9

10

11

**12** 

13 14

> 15 į

16

. -

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

**28** 

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1971; 1:30 P.M.

THE COURT: People against Watson.

Let the record show all jurors, counsel, and the defendant are present.

All right, Mr. Keith, you may proceed.
MR. WEITH: Thank you, your Honor.

#### K. GROVNER BAILEY.

resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

## CROSS-EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)

### BY MR: KEITH:

Doctor, just a few more questions: I believe you told us yesterday -- correct me if I am mistaken -- that one of the reasons you thought that Mr. Watson was able to maturely and meaningfully reflect upon the gravity of his contemplated act was that he had no prior coaching -- just one factor that you may have considered; that is my recollection of your testimony.

A When you asked that question I thought I had already made a reservation --

Q Maybe I did; maybe I am being redundant.

A No, I didn't mean it that way; but when you asked that question -- obviously he had been coached -- he was told what to do, but he had not been coached in exactly how he was to meet each of the situations which he, according

to what he was supposed to do and what he intended to do, he was able to do.

He was not coached in what to and how to react to each of the situations that he faced.

In that sense, he was not coached, no.

Q What situation did he face other than going there and doing what he did?

MR. BUGLIOSI: This has been asked and answered, your Honor.

THE WITNESS: The situation -- I thought I had answered some of it --

Q BY MR. KEITH: All right, all right --

A This morning as regards having been faced with several unsuspected situations --

Q You told us about the Parent boy driving up in the car?

A That's right; that's right,

<b>#16</b>		1
		2
		. <b>3</b>
•	1 7	4.
•	1 2	5.
		Ģ
		7
		8
		ġ
		10
		11
		12
;		13
		14
		15
		16.
		17
		18
		19
		20
		21
		22
		<b>2</b> 3
		24
		25

27

28

<sub>2</sub> <b>Q</b>	And 3	you told	us that	Mr.	Watson,	of course,	would
have no	idea how	many pe	ople wer	e iņ	that ho	use.	
	Treso						

- When he got there.
- Yes. counsel.
- And you told us about cutting the telephone wires.
- Which he may have been instructed to do. I take it that he was.
  - Pardon me?
  - I take it that he was told to do that.
- Q Everything happened very fast he told us. That was a factor you considered?
  - That was a factor that I considered.
- And everything was rather confused at the time with people running around and yelling and screaming.
  - I am sure it was.
- Does the rapidity of the action -- and by action I am referring to the actual homicides themselves, the actual stabbings, indicate in any way to you mature and meaningful reflection?
- Yes, in that he knew what he was going to do and he did it and therefore accomplished what he was intending to do.
  - Ó He was told what to do and he went out and did it.
- Yes, but he had to exercise independent judgment as to when and where and how it was to be done because he shot some. He stabbed some.
  - Q He was given a knife and gun, wasn't he?

1

3

5 6

8.

10

12

11

14

13

16

15

17 18

19

20

**22** 

23

24

25° 26

27

28

A.	That	is	correct.

Q And the evidence indicates to you, obviously, that he knew how to use a knife and a gun?

A It does.

Q Did you take into account all the multiplicity of wounds suffered by the victims in this case?

A Yes, I did.

Q And doesn't the very multiplicity of the wounds appear to you to indicate perseverative action, repeated senseless action?

A It wasn't senseless in accomplishing his purpose.

Q In accomplishing his purpose?

It wasn't senseless. It was repetitive but as I testified this morning he didn't know why he did that repetitively.

Q In your opinion, weren't the very crimes themselves senseless, knowing what you know about the case?

A Knowing what I know about the case, they were senseless from the standpoint of being not directed to a person in the sense of someone who has done something to somebody and they retaliate. That was entirely coldblooded. That was entirely senseless, but it was not without reason that he himself was able to do it even though he had been asked to do it. The reasons are accult but they are there.

Q Do you mean the reasons that Mr. Watson had somehow lie in the supernatural?

A Not in the supernatural.

Q When you say occult --

1	A Occult in the sense of not seen as yet.
2	Q And not understood?
3.	A I think I understand them.
4	Q You may but I mean
5	A I said this morning that he did not understand
6.	why.
Ż	Q Ordinarly when people are killed by somebody
8	else, it is for reasons for personal gain or revenge or
ġ.	hatred as you told us about; is that right?
10	A In most instances, yes.
11	Q And that sort of purpose wasn't present in this
12	case so far as Watson is concerned. Didn't you form that
13	opinion?
14	A So far he knew, it wasn't.
15	Q So far as he knew on a conscious level?
16	A That is right.
17	Q Doctor, getting back to psychosis again, when
18	you speak of psychosis, do you speak of somebody who is
19	generally divorced from reality, somebody who is not normal
20	mentally?
21	A There is a difference, sir, between being divorced
22	from reality.
23	Q Or has suffered a severe break from reality?
24 95	A There is a difference between that and the
25 26	psychosis which has been delineated and to which we have
20 27	testified as being present in this case.
	Psychosis has to do as we have said, and as we
28	know, with unreality, with being out of touch with reality,

but this particular definition, if you will, labeled psychosis, but being a receptuale, as I think I said before, or a skeleton, on which can be placed a series of incidents and motivations, which do not appear related at first, but which gradually can be formulated into a behavior pattern -- but this has not necessarily a relationship to the knowledge of right and wrong. Of course that is something else again.

Ļ

Ś

8.

28 ,

Q	We are not discussing that
A	I appreciate that
Q	now
A	but this psychosis is not, as we have pointed
out, relat	ed to, necessarily, a delusion. It is a condition
in which t	he individual is kinked, if you will, they are
cornered b	y the milieu and by the dominance which you have
emphasized	, also, of the authoritarian factor.
Q	And they are operating with impaired judgment and
impaired p	erception and impaired ideas?
, <b>A</b>	This is part of the picture.
Q	And the passive member has a dependency, as you
have said,	toward the dominate figure of the duo?
A	In general, that would be a fair statement, yes.
Q	In addition to your reading of Mr rather,
Doctor Ive	n Mensch's article and Dr. Podolsky's, did you also
read some	works by Lasegue and Fabret, Hoffbauer, Seguin and
Ireland an	d Tuke and Pike?
	I am referring to Page 28 on Lines 25 to 29 of your
report.	
MR.	BUGLIOSI: May we approach the bench?
MR.	KEITH: I am going to don't worry.
MR.	BUGLIOSI: I am not interested in that gratuitous
remark by	Mr. Keith. May that be stricken from the record?
May we app	roach the bench?
THE	COURT: I didn't hear the remark, but if you want to

approach the bench, you may do so.

to the second

(The following proceedings were had at the CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES i

2° 3

4

5

7

8<sup>.</sup> 9

10

11

12

13

14

*‡* ነሪ፣

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

28

27

outside the hearing of the jury:)

MR. KEITH: Mr. Bugliosi anticipated me. I was going to ask him if he read these articles where the folic a deux was called "infectious insanity," -- so on; you can read it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: "Reciprocal insanity," "double-insanity."

MR. KEITH: Because I knew "insanity" is a dirty word in this phase of the case, but nevertheless, these are the names of the articles.

MR. BUBRICK: Particularly, Judge, in view of the definition that he gives to the term "psychosis."

MR. BUGLIOSI: The bivalence --

THE COURT: Just a minute.

between psychoses of this order, and he seems to draw the condition, the folie a deux type psychosis -- and I think we ought to have a right to show some of the English translations of folie a deux, these are referred to in the second last paragraph on Page 28.

MR. BUGLIOSI: If the only relevance, your Honor, is the English translation, I think it is overwhelmingly outweighed by the fact that insanity, the issue is insanity, the word "insanity" should not be injected into the first trial.

Now, these are words used by men back in the 19th Century. Insanity is not an issue in this case; they are just trying to squeeze something in here about an English translation --

MR. KEITH: He is using the same words that he is putting the definition on him in 1971 which we think is consistent with

1

the very article he quotes from and he cites as authority for his definition on folie a deux.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your own psychiatrists, also spoke of folie a deux as being a psychosis. There is no inconsistency, they all say it.

MR. KEITH: Are you trying to say it is detached from insanity?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Insanity is not an issue during the first trial.

THE COURT: Gentlemen, all the psychiatric testimony just leaves me cold. To me it is a lot of gobble-dygook and double-talk, see; but I do know the Supreme Court has said that in this phase of the case all evidence of insanity must be eliminated.

Now, the doctors who testified, no doubt some of them, although they didn't use the word "insanity," said this defendant is insane, without using the very word.

This doctor is pretty tough to follow. Now, you want to ask him whether he read their definitions of folic a deux?

MR. KEITH: Yes, exactly.

THE COURT: All right, tell you what you do: Supposing we do this, asking whether he read the definitions by Lasegue and Fabret.

MR. KEITH: And so on?

THE COURT: -- without going into what they are; and ask him, "Do you agree with those definitions?"

MR. KEITH: All right.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Okay, but --1 MR. KEITH: Except, I can't do much about it if he does --2 At this stage, I don't see what --THE COURT: 3 MR. BUGLIOSI: I see your point. I see your point. MR. KEITH: 5 I thought the Court was implying that if MR. BUGLIOSI: 6 the witness did say that he was agreeing with it, then at that 7 point, the Court would permit Mr. Keith to go into the words 8 used, but apparently the Court hasn't said that. 9 I don't know how to get around it, to tell 10 THE COURT: you the truth. It just leaves me cold, as I said before. 11 12 MR. BUGLIOSI: I agree with the Court on that; but these 13 are words which I do not think should be interposed into the 14 first trial, and I think they would only tend to confuse. 15 -THE COURT: The Supreme Court has so said; but, now, you 16 take the paragraph above that. The transference of delusional 17 ideas" -- now, this guy says that if Watson believed that 18 Manson was Jesus Christ, that is not a delusion, it is a 19 belief. 20 Now, that is his definition of how he gets away 21 from it is a delusion, by saying it is his belief. It is not 22 a delusion. 23 Frankly, to me most of the psychiatric testimony is 24 a lot of double-talk, is gobbledygook; and, like I said before, 25 it leaves me cold. 26 I wish we could get slong without it, but I guess 27 we can't. 28

MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. KAY: Judge, could we have just a moment, because the doctor from Atascadero is on the phone and wants to talk to Vince just a second.

THE COURT: Go shead, talk to him.

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

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Keith, you may proceed.

Q BY MR. KEITH: Doctor, in your opinion has the defendant Watson more than learned his lesson and do you believe that in the environment of his family at Copeville he would again be able to cope?

A I think I --

18f.

MR. BUGLIOSI: This is irrelevant, your Honor. 1 THE COURT: Sustained. MR. KEITH: I have nothing further. 3 4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. BUGLICSI: 6 7 Q A few questions, your Honor. Doctor, are you also a brain surgeon? Я 0-Yes. À 10 You have actually performed surgery on the brain? 0 11 A Yes. 12 And from your neurological examination of Mr. 0 13 Watson, you couldn't find any evidence of brain damage? 14 In the examination which I gave him. I found no 15 evidence of brain damage. 16 But you were aware of the EEG at UCLA which 17 indicated some mild brain damage? 18. I was also aware of the one at Atascadero which 19. says there was none. 20 THE COURT: Doctor, please enswer the question. 21 THE WITNESS: I am sorry. 22 THE COURT: Please answer the question put to you. 23 THE WITNESS: Yes. 24 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: You were also aware of the EEG · 25 up at Atascadero? 26 A Yes 27 Which indicated no brain damage? 28 That is correct,

18-2

5,

g

18A

, 28 · Q I believe you testified that you thought you knew why Mr. Watson killed these people when Manson told him to do so.

Will you please tell the jury what your opinion is on that?

A Well, in the first place, I believe I made a statement a long time ago, and if I may please refer back to one of the pages in which I indicated that at the time he decided to leave home and decided not to go back home when he found that he could not support both his apartment and his schooling and chose to keep his apartment and gave up his schooling and then fell into these other situations -- that at that time he made a decision.

Now, this decision had to be based on expediency and on his expectancy of his future and he left Texas for California.

He had a certain element of shame, which is a matter of conscience, because he was ashamed to tell the folks why he actually stayed out here.

He eventually did not keep in contact with them, although now he does.

1.8A

.9

Į3

Ì7

The element of conscience has come through this thing very clearly and all the time that he was giving up certain prerogatives, as I discussed this morning with Mr. Keith, his conscience was being eroded, but it was not eroded completely by any means. So that he began more and more and more to hate himself. This is conscience -- to hate himself.

He deplored the situation in which he was and yet he loved it, if there might be a dichotomy of feeling and thinking.

The more he deplored the state he was in, although he went along with it, the greater the tensions built up within him and when he was told to do something of this nature he did it, but he did it — and again responding to Mr. Keith's question — he did it with a viciousness that was more than necessary, inasmuch as some of them were already dead, as I understand it, or they were practically so — and at that particular time the hate that he had for himself was externalized into not against a person, a named person, but against the individual in the corporate mass, so to speak, and he was able then to satisfy the hate which he had against himself and externalized it against the objects of his anger.

He was able to do that only because of this factor. If he hadn't had that factor built up within himself, he would have been like many of the others who would have said, "I can't do it," but he did it and when he did it, he overdid it and he overdid it because this relieved stress within himself.

18A-2

13 ,

 He didn't hate these people that he killed, as he says he killed them. He didn't hate them but he himself was relieved of this stress within him, even to the point where -- he didn't tell me this but it is reported I take it authoritatively and it has been accepted in the testimony by one of the girls who said he said, "Gee, this is fun."

Now, when somebody under those circumstances says, "Gee, this is fun," this isn't an individual who is acting only because he is told to do something.

It is because by this act he has been relieved of a hate within himself, even though he knows this is wrong to do.

Now, added to that the next factor we hear -- and this is also I believe a matter of testimony -- that when one of the girls was asked as to how Tex reacted, she said he reacted or acted as if he had been through a traumatic experience.

Now, one can only be through a traumatic experience if one has knowledge of the experience and has had a pang of conscience as regards the fact that this has been accomplished and although in one sense at the time it made him feel better, at the time also, or just subsequent to that, he had had a traumatic experience because he had gone through this and it is very difficult to say he had come out a better man, but from the standpoint of his own inner tensions, he was relieved.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you, Doctor. No further questions.

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

# BY MR. KEITH

Q Doctor, in a nutshell, your theory is that Mr. Watson hated himself so he took it out on these other people that he killed.

A He was able to do what he was asked to do because this gave him -- this he externalized, yes.

There are cases in the literature which cover this point exactly.

- Q But I believe you told us, I think I am being accurate, that Mr. Watson himself didn't understand or realize on a conscious level any of this hatred that he had with anyone.
  - A Yes, that is correct.
- Q I believe you told us that he didn't have any idea why he did such a thing other than being told to do it.
  - A That is what he told me.
- Q Did you evolve this theory of Mr. Watson's subconscious hatred of himself from your reading in the literature?
  - A Yes.
  - Q Or experience?
  - A From my reading in the literature.
- Q What literature did you read to evolve this theory of the homicides?
- A Dr. Ruo Tolo reported the examination of four murderers and near murder, which case reports --
  - Q Where is that article published?

A That article is published in "Progress in Neurology and Psychiatry" by Spiegel.

Q Is that a book or --

A It is a book, yes, counsel.

Q When was it published, if you know?

A Volume 25, 1970.

Q That man's name is -- I am sorry.

A Ruo Tolo.

Q R-u-o-t-1-o?

THE COURT: T-0-1-0.

Q BY MR. KEITH: Any other literature that you read in helping you or assisting you to evolve this theory of subconscious inner hatred?

A No, frankly, there wasn't.

I know that by previous experience, in general, an impression I will say, that there have been cases in my own experience in which we know that individuals have evolved an inner hatred. They have had internal conflict for many reasons and those have been externalized against individuals.

Q Let's assume, Doctor, that in or about September or early October 1969 he was ordered by Manson to kill a couple of other people and didn't do it.

Would that still square with your theory of inner hatred or had he already satisfied his inner hatred by doing what he did on the Tate-La Bianca nights?

A If I might ask again what is the time relationship there?

Q This would have been, we are assuming now that Mr.

ġ

. 

. 25<sup>\*</sup>

Watson was asked to kill a couple of other people and he didn't do it in or about September or October 1969, a month or two after the Tate-La Bianca homicides. This allegedly occurred up in the desert at Barker Ranch. Six weeks after.

A This can have a bearing. I don't know that I knew of that, but in any event, he certainly had expressed -- and I don't use the term "vented," I used the term "expressed" -- he had expressed this inner tension and inner hatred of himself.

Now, to vent something, I take it one does that on purpose, but it is a fact that, after all, there was ventilated, if you will, the condition of stress, which he expressed at the time of these two succeeding nights of orgy -- and it may well be that following that expression there was released, or reduced, there was reduced this degree of inner hate of himself, but he still hates himself because he has begged for forgiveness.

MR. KEITH: I have nothing further.

MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions,

THE WITNESS: That's when this --

THE COURT: This girl described it as such?

THE WITNESS: He had been hurt before. He had been hurt before by these affronts to his pride.

He had not been able to express himself against it because he had already made a contract in his thinking; but he was -- he had a traumatic experience when he did what he did and realized that this had occurred; and this unnerved him and this was a traumatic experience as to him, because he had done this, he didn't know why; but it, nevertheless, was a traumatic experience and she related it to that point.

THE COURT: And that must have been from one of the girls who was present at the time; is that right?

THE WITNESS: I believe so, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you took her expression "traumatic experience" as coinciding with your definition of what a traumatic experience is?

THE WITNESS: That's right.

THE COURT: I have nothing further.

MR. KEITH: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Thank you, Doctor; you may be excused.

Doctor, did you want this back or do you want me to keep it?

THE WITNESS: If you wish, you may keep it.

THE COURT: May I?

THE WITNESS: Please.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. BUGLIOSI: People call Jeanne Mallett.

THE CLERK: Will you raise your right hand, please? 1 You do solemnly swear that the testimony you may give in the cause now pending before this court shall be the 3 4 truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you 5 God? 6 THE WITNESS: I do. 7 8 JEANNE MALLETT. 9 called as a witness by the People in rebuttal, testified as 10 follows: 11 THE CLERK: Thank you; take the stand and be seated. 12 and would you state and spell your name, please? 13 THE WITNESS: Jeanne Denise Mallett, J-e-a-n-n-e; 14 Denise, D-e-n-i-s-e; Mallett, M-a-1-1-e-t-t. 15 THE CLERK: Thank you. 16 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 19 0 Miss Mallett, do you prefer to be called Denise? 20 A Yes. 21 Q As oppossed to Jeanne? 99 Yes. 23 Q Denise, you presently live in Texas? 24 A Yes. .25 And you flew out here to testify? Q · 26 A Yes. 27 Q How old are you? 28-21. A

Q ´	I take it you know the defendant, Charles Tex
Watson?	
À	Yes.
Q	When did you first meet Mr. Watson?
A	In about 1965.
Q	Where were you living at the time and where was
he living	
A	I was living in Dallas and he lived in Copeville.
THE	COURT: Excuse me. Can you hear the lady?
Q	BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Can you sit up a little closer,
Denise, a	nd we'll move this.
•	You were living in Dallas and he was living in
Copeville	?
Å	Right.
Q	How far is Dallas from Copeville?
A	About 35 or 40 miles.
Q	And how did you happen to meet Mr. Watson?
Å	I was spending a summer at my grandmother's and I
met him t	brough friends or a cousin.
Q	Where did your grandmother live?
A	In Farmersville.
Q	How far is that from Copeville?
A	I believe it is about seven miles.
Q	So you were only fourteen or fifteen at the time?
A	Yes, sir.
Q	Was this the summer of 1965?
Q A	Yes, sir, I believe so.

1	boyfriend-g	irlfriend relationship with Mr. Watson?
2	A	Something of that type.
3	Q	Well, did you ever date him?
4	A	Yes, some.
5	Q	You saw him frequently during the summer of 1965?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	Did you see him during the fall and the winter of
8	1965?	
9	A	I'm not real sure. I might have seen him a couple
10	of times du	ring that year.
11	Q	How about 1966; did you see him again then?
12	A	During the summer.
13	Q	Again, in Copeville or Farmersville?
14	A	Right.
15	Q	Pardon?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	In Copeville and Farmersville?
18	A	Right.
19	Q	And you continued to date Mr. Watson?
20	· <b>A</b>	Something of that type, yes.
21	Q	You went with him; is that correct?
22	A	Well, I wouldn't say that. We were friends or
23	whatever, y	you know.
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

19a.f.

1	Q You were not going steady with hi	Lm?
2	A No.	
3	Q But you would on occasion go out	on dates with
4	him?	
5	A Yes.	
6	Q What about the winter or the fall	l, winter and
7	spring of 1966, did you see him then?	
8	A '66 or '67?	
9	Q I'm sorry, '67.	
10	A I don't believe I saw him that wi	inter, I'm not
11	sure.	
12	Q What about the summer of 1967?	·
13	A Yes, I saw him during the summer	of 1967.
14	Q Where did you see him?	
15	A In Dallas.	
16	Q Was he living in Dallas at the ti	.me?
17	A Yes.	
18	Q And you were also living in Dalls	as?
19	A I was visiting friends in Dallas.	
20	Q Did you see him frequently in the	summer of 1967?
21	A I was only in Dallas for about si	x weeks.
22	Q Did you see him quite frequently	during that
23	six-week period?	
24	A Yes, maybe not the whole six week	ts, but I saw
25	him frequently.	
26 27	Q Now, you are aware that eventuall	y Mr. Watson left
28	for California?	
20	A Yes.	

19A

Q Do you know approximately when he left for 1 California? 2 It must have been late that summer in 1967. Α 3 The summer of 1967? 0 A Yes. 5 Now, prior to his coming to California when was 0 6 the last time you saw him? 7 In August of 1967. 0 In Dallas? 10 Yes. During that period of time, primarily the summers 11 12 of 1965 and '66 and 1967, how would you describe Charles Tex 13 Watson? 14 A He was always very mannerly and happy. 15 Q Would you say he was a lot of fun? 16 A Yes. Ò Did you have a good time with him? 18 Yes. 19 Q Would you characterize him as being somewhat 20 carefree? 21 A Yes. 22 0 Now, after you last saw him in August of 1966 23 when is the next time you saw him? 24 In November of 1969. 25 Where did you see him at that time? 26 I saw him in Farmersville. 27 And how did you happen to see Mr. Watson in 28 November of 1969 in Farmersville; how did it come about?

19A-2

ļ.		•
1	A	Yes.
2	Q	But, apart from that he looked great?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	What about his personality?
5 ·	A	Well, he seemed he seemed pretty well the same;
6	he had a lo	t of new ideas and things, but other than that he
7	seemed, you	know, he seemed pretty much the same.
8.	Q	When you say he seemed pretty much the same, did
9	he again ap	pear to be carefree?
10	Α.	Well, I don't know whether I would use the word
.11	"carefree"	or not; but he seemed pretty, you know, just a
12	normal pers	on.
13	Q	Did he seem to be happy?
14	A	Yes, some of the time.
1,5	Q	You had fun with him?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	Was this on a Sunday that he came over to your
18	grandmother	's place in Farmersville?
19	A	Yes, sir.
20	· Q	Did you see him the next day?
21	A	Yes, sir.
22	Q	Where did you see him the next day?
23	A.	We went to Denton.
24	Q	How far is Denton from Farmersville?
25	A	About 30 or 40 miles, I believe.
26	Q	And you were staying overnight at your grandmother's
27	place?	1.
28	A	No, I was in Dallas and I came to him home.

١ ١	
. 1	Q Where?
2	A In Copeville.
3	Q Okay; so you met him, then, this would be a Monday?
4	A Yes, sir.
5	Q You met Tex at his home in Copeville?
6	A Yes, sir.
Ť	Q And then you and he went where, now?
8	A To Denton,
·9·	Q What was the purpose of your going to Denton?
10	A We went to visit some friends,
11	Q Your friends or his friends?
12	A My friends.
13	Q Did you do anything that afternoon?
14	A yes, we spent the afternoon at the Holliday Inn.
15	THE COURT: I didn't get that.
16	(Record read.)
17	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Did you engage in sexual
18	intercourse with Mr. Watson at the Holliday Inn?
19	A Yes, sir.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	•
25	
.26	
27	
28	

19B

1	
<b>'2</b>	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8.	•
9	,
10	
11	
12	
13.	
14	
15	
16	
17	
<b>18</b> '	
19	
20	
21	•
22	<b>,</b> •
23	
24	
25	

27

28

A) Q	Did you	ı have	sexual	interco	urse	with	Mr. W	atson
before he	came out	to Cal	ifornia	or was	this	the	first	time
you had ev	er had s	exual i	ntercou	rse wit	h hin	?		

A I'd say this was the first time we had ever had sexual intercourse, but there had been sexual relations before.

Q Did you notice any difference in Tex, from a sexual standpoint, since you had last seen him?

A He was rather animalistic, I would say. I don't know, it was strange.

Q Was he kind of aggressive?

A Yes.

Q Vigorous?

A Yes.

Q Now, after the afternoon at the Holliday Inn, what happened next?

A We went to -- I took him back; he went back to Copeville and I went back to Dallas.

Q . When is the next time you saw him?

A T believe it was on Thursday.

Q Of the same week?

A Yes, sir.

Q 'Where did you see him at that time?

A I saw him at his home in Copeville and then he came to Dallas later on that night.

Q How did you happen to get to see him; in other words, did you call him, did he call you?

A This was Thanksgiving and I'd spent the day at my grandmother's; then I stopped by his house on my way home

1	and he came	to Dallas that night to my home.
2	Q	Did you know that he was going to come to Dallas
3	that night?	·
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q	And this would be Thanksgiving night?
6	A	Yes, sir.
7	Q	Did Tex visit with you at your mother's place?
8	A	Yes.
9 .	Q	How long did he spend with you?
<b>1</b> Ó	A.	He spent the evening, about 6:00 to 11:00 or 11:30.
11	Q	Were you inside the house all night?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	You didn't go any where?
14	A	I don't believe so.
15.	Q •	What about two days later, a Saturday; did anything
16 -	happen on t	hat date?
17	A	Yes, he called and he came to Dallas that
18	afternoon.	
19	$\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{Q}$	So you were in Dallas and he was in Copeville?
20	A \	Right.
21	Q	He called you on the telephone; is that correct?
22	A	Yes.
23 24	Q	He said he wanted to see you?
25	A \	Yes.
25	Q	So he drove to Dallas; is that correct?
27	<b>A</b> .	Yes.
28	Q	What did you do in Dallas that day? This would be
20	a Saturday,	the Saturday following Thanksgiving.
	,	· ·

1	We drove around a bit in Dallas, stopped and got
2	a beer.
3	Q Did he get the beer or did you get it?
4	A He did.
5	Q Okay.
6	A And we went to a park and talked for a while and
7	then we went back to my home and spent the evening there
8	watching television.
9.	Q Then he went back to Copeville?
10	A Yes, sir.
j1	Q What about that Sunday, the following day; did you
12	see Tex again?
13	A Yes, I went to his home in Copeville and we
14	spent the afternoon at the lake.
15	Q There is a lake there near the
16	A Yes.
17	Q outskirts of town?
18.	A Yes.
19	Q Did you talk with Tex at that time?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Did you talk about any plans that you and he may
22	have had for the future?
23	A Well, he was discussing going back to California
24	and I was thinking about going, also.
25	Q Did he say he was interested in going to any
26	particular part of California?
27	A He said something about northern California.
28	Q He didn't say he was going to Southern California?

He spoke -- he seemed to be very impressed with

		1
1	Q Did he tell you that he met anyone in California	ŀ
2	who in his opinion was kind of a supernatural being?	
8	A No, sir.	
4	Q Did he talk to you about being in the wig business	
5	out here in California?	
6	A Yes. He mentioned that.	
7	Q What did he say?	
8	He was combing my hair one time and he just	ŀ
9.	mentioned that he had been in the wig business.	
10	Q Did he mention drugs to you?	
11	A Yes, we discussed it.	
12	Q. What did he say?	
13	A He said that he had, you know, used a lot of drugs,	
14	mainly acid, and that he used to take massive doses.	
15	Q Of acid?	
16	A Yes.	
17	Q Did you ever smoke marijuana with Tex?	
18	A Yes.	ŀ
19	Q Back in Texas?	
20	A Yes.	ľ
21	Q In November of 1969?	
22	A Yes.	
23	Q Now, you say that Tex seemed to be impressed with	
24	California?	
25	A Yes.	
26	Q How did you get the impression that he was impressed	19
27	What did he say that led you to that conclusion?	
28	A Well, it just seemed like he had a good time here.	

·1:	14.	<b>. A</b>	No. sir.
2		Q	You enjoyed being with him; is that right?
3		<b>A</b> a	Yes
4	* *	Q -	And he enjoyed being with you?
.5	» <del>?</del>	A	I guess so, or he wouldn't have been there.
6		; *	
7		•	
8			*,*
9		,	
10			
11		•	
12	<u> </u>  -		
13			•
14	,		
15			
16	:		
17			
18	t.		•
19.			
20			
21 22			
23 <sup>,</sup>			
24 24			
25	,	ı	
<u>2</u> 6	<b>;</b> ;	,	•
27			
28	1		
	<u> </u>		•

20af.

### 20AR-1

ŗ.	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
<b>9</b> :	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
. 28	

think you told us he drove a number of miles on a number of occasions to be with you; is that right?

- A Yes, sir.
- Q So the two of you got along pretty well; is that right?
  - A Yes.
  - Q I take it he was not violent toward you?
  - A No.
  - Q He didn't hit you or best you?
  - A No.
  - Q Or abuse you in any way?
  - A No, sir.
- Q When you were asked whether Charles seemed carefree after he got back from California, you were kind of
  hesitant there for a minute. Was it because he was in fact
  not very carefree after he got back?
- A I was only with him for that one week and I wouldn't be able to describe it as carefree.
- Q Didn't he seem a little -- I am sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt.
  - A That is okay.
- Q Didn't he seem a little more serious than he had been previously?
- A Yes. I would say he had a lot of new ideas. People change, you know. I hadn't seen him for two years.
- Q Did he seem to be sort of preoccupied with those new ideas?

- 4	·[	
1	A No	, sir.
2	Q Di	dn't he spend a great deal of time talking about
3	his California	experiences?
4	A Ye	8.
5	Q He	talked about this hole in the ground, the bottom
6	less pit, so t	o speak?
7	A Ye	₿.
8	Q An	d the revolution that you have told us about?
9.	A Ye	8•
10	Q As	a matter of fact, he repeated that a number of
11	times, didn't	he?
12	A No	mainly just on one day he was explaining the
13	whole thing to	me.
14	Q Ot	her than that, was it just a lot of small talk?
15	A Ye	s, sir.
16	Q Be	tween the two of you, sort of personal between
17	the two of you	<b>?</b>
18	A Ye	s, sir.
19	Q Wa	s there anything unusual about the marijuana
20	smoking experi	ence that you had with him there in November of
21	1969?	•
22	A Wh	at do you mean by unusual?
23.	Q Dò	you remember how you described it, or did you
24	ever describe	it to anybody?
25	A De	scribe how he acted?
26	Q Ye	5.
27	A Th	ere were times when he was a bit strange.
28	O Wh	ile under the influence of marijuana?

1	A Yes.
2	Q As a matter of fact, you said at one time he acted
3	crazy, didn't you?
4	A Yes, but not yes, I believe I did say that.
.5	Q What?
6	A I did say that.
7	Q What did you mean by that?
.8	A I think strange is the best word to describe it
9	different.
1Ô	Q Didn't you say he kind of flipped or something
11	when he was stoned; is that right?
12	A Yes. He was different than he was.
13	Q You mean he was different when he was stoned than
14	he was when he was sober?
15	A Sometimes.
16	Q How many times did you smoke marijuana with him
17	during that week and a half?
18	A Only two or three times.
19	Q Two or three times?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Were they all on the same date?
22	A No.
23	Q Or on separate occasions?
24	A Separate occasions.
25	Q And would his reactions under the influence of
26	marijuana be the same on each of these occasions?
27	A No, sir. There were only a couple of periods
28	during each you know, during a couple of times maybe that he

1	acted	a little, you know, strange.
2		Q Were you smoking marijuana at the same time that
3	he was	?
4		A Yes.
5		Q On each of these two or three occasions?
6		A Yes, sir.
7		Q Was there anything he said or did to you that was
8	differ	ent while he was under the influence of marijuana on
9	these	occasions than otherwise?
10		A That he specifically said?
n		Q Yes, or did.
12		A No. sir. I can't think of anything specific.
13		Q Just a sort of feeling that you had?
14		A Yes,
15		Q That when he was stoned he sort of flipped out?
16	· .	A Yes.
· 17		Q At any rate, even though he was sort of flipped out
18	while	he was on marijuana, that didn't particularly make you
19	fearfi	al of him, did it?
20	•	A No, sir.
21 -	*	Q As a matter of fact, you talked about coming back
.22.*	to Cal	lifornia with him, didn't you?
23	$\left[ -C\right] =$	A. Yes.
24	1	Q Who used the term "Northern California"?
25		A We were talking about going where it snows. It
26	snows	in Northern California.
27		Q Didn't you know that there might be snow in the
28	mount	ains in Southern California?

- 1	·
1	A I'm not very familiar with California, actually,
2	Q Was that the real subject matter of your discussion
3	about going to California where it snows?
4.	A The subject matter of everything we talked about
5	or just when we were talking about that?
6	Q Going to California, I mean.
7	A Yes. We talked about going to Northern California.
8	Q Did he use the term "Northern California" or
·9·	"going to California where it snows"?
10	A I believe he used the term "Northern California."
11	Q Do you know where the Owens Valley is in Califor-
12	nia?
13	A No, sir.
14	Q Did you ever ask him what he meant by "Northern
15	California"?
16	A No, sir.
17	Q Ever ask him what cities that might be close to?
18	No.
19	Q But you were willing to go there anyway; is that
20	correct?
21	A. It was nothing definite. It was just something
22	that we discussed.
23	MR. BUBRICK: I have nothing further.
.24	MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions.
25	THE COURT: Thank you. You may be excused.
26	MR. BUGLIOSI: May the witness be allowed to return to
27	the State of Texas, your Honor?
28	THE COURT: Go ahead if she wishes.

	1	A Well, I serve as magistrate on the misdemeanor		
	2	court in Collin County.		
,	3	Q How long have you been a Justice of the Peace?		
	4	A Since the 1st of August, 1970.		
	5	Q Before you were a Justice of the Peace, what was		
	6	your occupation?		
	7	A I was the deputy sheriff of Collin County and		
	8	acting jailer.		
	9	Q And while you were the jailer for Collin County,		
	10	did you come in contact with Mr. Charles Watson?		
	11	A Yes, I did,		
	<u>12</u>	Q And was he a prisoner under your control?		
	13:	A Yes, he was.		
	14	Q How long a period of time was he under your control?		
	15	A Approximately eight or nine months, from the latter		
	ĵ6	part of November 1969 through the first of August of '70.		
	17 '	u . •		
	18			
,	19			
, r	20			
	21			
	22			
	23			
	24			
25				
	26 27			
	28			
	<i></i>			
		1		

ĺ

3

5

6

7

8

9

1Ò

11

12 13

14

15

16. 17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

Now, during the 9-month period -- well, would Q you describe the cell that Mr. Watson had in the jail -- first. was he by himself?

Yes, sir, he was by himself.

No other prisoners in the cell? Q

No. sir. A

Q All right.

Will you describe the cell: What was in there, the makeup of the cell?

Well, the cell was approximately 8 foot wide with 10 feet deep. It did have two metal bunks, one above each other.

There was a shower stall, a commode and a layatory.

Q Did Mr. Watson have anything in there for his personal entertainment?

Well, there was, after a time that he was there, there was a television brought in; he also had a record player and a radio. There was also a small styrofoam ice chest.

THE COURT: What is that last one?

THE WITNESS: A styrofoam ice chest.

BY MR. KAY: Now, what type of things would Mr. Q Watson eat while he was there?

Well, he didn't eat the regular food that we served through the jail, to my knowledge. The tray, we'd put the tray up there and it would usually just sit there and then he would send out or his mother or one of his relatives would bring him certain types of food, such as dietary food, cottage cheese, honey, fruit juices.

1	Q. On various occasions did he ask you to buy food for
2	him?
3	A We would go to the store, which is right around the
4	corner, for him.
5	Q What type of things would you buy?
6	A Well, it used to be the dietary type of foods,
7.	such as cottage cheese, honey.
8	Q The whole time that Mr. Watson was in jail did
9	you ever observe him to eat mest?
10	A Not to my knowledge.
11	Q How would you describe Mr. Watson's behavior
12	during the 9-month period that you were there?
13	A Well, if you I'd describe it as an ideal
14	prisoner, because there was never any trouble, or he never
<b>15</b> .	Q You'd say he was very well behaved?
Ì6	A Yes, he was a well behaved person.
17	Q Did Mr. Watson ever have any emotional problems
18	while you were there in the 9-month period?
19	A Not that it would show.
20	Q Well, did he ever yell or scream or beat his
21	head against the wall or make any racket?
<b>22</b> .	A No, sir; he would always, if he wanted something,
23	he'd usually tap on the door and one of us would go see what
24	he wanted and he'd ask for it in a mannerly
25	Q Did he always show you a lot of respect?
<b>26</b>	A Yes, he did.
27	Q How did he address you?
28	A As'Mr, King."

1	let him do it, if he wanted to.	
2	Q Did he read magazines and newspapers?	
3	A Yes, he did.	
4	Q What type of magazines did he read?	
5	A Well, it was more the monthly type magazines.	
6	There was a U. S. News and oil report, and possibly a Life	
7	or something like that in there.	
8	Q What about the newspapers?	
9	A Well, it was usually the daily newspapers that	
10	we would give him. They'd come to the jail and usually of	}
11	an afternoon or something we'd put the papers in to him.	
12	Q Did his mother ever bring newspapers to him?	
13	A Yes, she did.	
14	Q How many visitors would he usually have every week	?
15	A Oh, I'd say two to three, probably; maybe twice a	
16	week, something like that.	
17	Q Did you ever notice any bizarre conduct on Mr.	
18	Watson's part during this 9-month period, well, that he was	ļ
į9	under your control?	
20	A No, sir, I didn't.	
21	Q Did you ever have any conversations with Mr. Watson	n
22 23	during this period?	,
23, 24	A Yes, sir.	
2 <del>5</del> 25	Q Numerous conversations?	i
25	A Well, not numerous, but we would when I'd be	٠
27	back there we would talk occasionally.	
28	Q During these conversations you had with Mr. Watson	
Ž	did you make any assessment of his intelligence?	•
	·	

1	A Well, he could carry on an intelligent conversa-		
2	tion with you.		
3	Q Did he seem intelligent to you?		
4	A Yes, he did.		
5	Q Did he ever seem crazy to you at all?		
6	A No, Sir.		
7	Q Did he ever in any way seem mentally ill, to you?		
8	A' Not to my knowledge.		
9	Q Did you see Mr. Watson on September the 11th,		
10	1970, the day he came back to California?		
11	A Yes, I did.		
12	Q Did you notice anything on that day of a change		
13	in his hair style?		
14	À No.		
15	MR. KAY: If I may have just a moment, your Honor?		
16	Q Did you give a statement to Mr. Tom Ryan, the		
17	County District Attorney in McKinney, Texas?		
18	A Yes, sir, I did.		
19	Q And you gave that statement on the 27th of		
20 or	October, 1970, approximately?		
21 22	A Approximately; I don't remember exactly the date.		
23	Q And Mr. Ryan is now Judge Ryan, he's		
25 24	A Yes.		
2 <del>5</del> 25	Q He's a superior court judge there?		
26	A A district judge.		
27	Q A district court judge?		
28	THE COURT: Will you show counsel what you want him to		

### CROSS-EXAMINATION

	1
	1

BY MR. BUBRICK:

2

3.

4 /

4,7

· 5

**4** 

•

8

9

10 ^-

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26 27

28

Q Mr. King, Charles has a relative who runs the jail that you worked in at the time in 1970, doesn't he?

A The sheriff of Collin County.

Q The sheriff of Collin County is Charles Watson's uncle; right?

A I believe so.

he was in his own home ground, so to speak, wasn't he?

A You could say that.

Q Everybody in town pretty well knew Charles, didn't they?

A Well, not everybody in town. You could have taken Charles out of the cell and walked him around the county court-house and they wouldn't have known who he was.

Q But his uncle knew who he was?

A That is right.

Q And so did the other members of the family; right?

A Yes.

Q And people who visited him?

A Yes.

Q Now, you were the jailer as I think you have told us; is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q During the nine months that you had Charles up there, Charles Watson, up there in jail, you never called him a killer, did you?

1	A No, sir.
2	Q You never called him "Charlie Manson," did you?
3.	A No, sir.
4	MR. BUGLIOSI: Irrelevant, your Honor.
5	MR, BUBRICK: Oh, come.
6	THE COURT: I will allow it.
7	Q BY MR. BUBRICK: You never did anything like that,
8	did you?
9	A No, sir.
10	Q You never forced him to est food you served him on
11	the tray, did you?
12	A No, sir.
13	Q If he didn't want to eat, you just took it away,
14	didn't you?
15	A That is right.
16	Q There were no other people around the cell block
17	so far as you knew screaming at him, were there?
18	A Not to my knowledge. There possibly could have
19	been, but right up above his cell there is a window way which
20	goes to another tank upstairs, another cell block, and there
21	was prisoners up there and usually most of all of them knew
.22 '	who was down below and there might have been some comment to
23	him there.
24	Q But you never heard anybody saying, "If you don't
25	testify for Charlie Manson, we'll fix you," or things of that
26	nature, did you?
27	A No, sir.
28	Q No threats were directed against him while he was

r	an inmate of	your jail, so far as you know?
2	er y <b>i</b> Angal	No, sir.
3	Q	What sort of clothes did he wear, Mr. King? Was
4	it the jail	clothes or was it civilian clothes?
5.	Å	It was civilian clothes.
6	Q	And they were always neat and clean, weren't they?
7	<b>.</b>	Yes, sir. His mother would bring them.
8	Q	Would bring in them almost every other day, wouldn't
9	she?	
10	A	I would say about twice a week.
11	Q	Didn't somebody from the family visit every other
12	day?	, ·
13	A,	Not every other day.
14	Q	Whenever they visited, they brought him clean
15	clothes and	took back the old clothes, didn't they?
16	A	That is right.
17	Q	He never washed any clothes in jail, did he?
18 :	<b>A</b>	No, sir.
19	Q	And the same with food, there would be some, you
20	know, fairl	y decent quantities of food brought in from time
<b>21</b> ·	to time, wo	ildn't there?
22	A	Yes, there would.
23	Q	And then he would eat that and then the next visit
24	something w	ould be brought to him, wouldn't it?
25	A	There would.
26	Q	Did you ever see him spit around the floor in your
27	jail?	
.28	A	No, sir.

1	Q Pretty clean, wasn't he?
.2	A Yes, he was.
3	Q He showered regularly?
4	A Yes, sir.
5	Q And he could take a shower any time he wanted to,
6	couldn't he?
7	A Any time.
8	Q Didn't have to wait in line?
9	A No, sir.
10	Q And he wasn't told he could shower once or twice
11	a day either, was he?
12.	A No.
13	Q When/did talk to him, Mr. King, what did you talk
14	about?
15	A Years later the local events as maybe the football
16	games here in the latter part of '69 and weather conditions or
17.	things of that sort.
18	Q Just a lot of little small talk, right?
19	A Yes.
20	Q Did you ever get involved with him in any philo-
21	sophical discussions?
22	A No, I never did.
23	Q Ever talk about world affairs?
24	A No, sir.
25	Q Ever talk about world leaders?
26	A No, sir.
27	Q Or, you know, the difficulty the United States is
28	in at the moment, you know, monetarily, unemployment, things of

ī	A THAT 18 FIGHT.
2	Q Were there three of them? Was there a 24-hour
3	shift?
4	A Well, I left at 4:00 in the afternoon and there
5	was from 4:00 to 8:00 there was another, usually one of the day
6	men were still there and then the night man came in at 8:00.
7	Q 8:00 at night?
8	A Yes, sir.
9	Q Was Charles ever in a cell with anybody else in
10	the nine months that you were there?
11	A No, sir.
12	MR. BUBRICK: I have no further questions.
13	
14	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
15	BY MR. KAY:
16	Q I take it, Judge, that you stopped being the
17	jailer on August the 1st, 1970?
18	: A Yes, sir.
Î9 <sub>(</sub>	Q And how was it that you happened to see Mr. Watson
20	on September the 11th?
21:	A Well, I had some business in the courthouse that
22	morning and on the way to McKinney from where I lived, which
23 24	is in the southeast part of the county, I heard a radio broad-
,	cast that he was being transferred back to California that day,
25 26	so I just stopped by, went in and went back and talked to
20 27 .	Charles for a few minutes, just sort of to bid him goodbye
21 . 28	and wished him whatever might come of this thing.
	Q I take it his uncle is still the sheriff?

i	A Yes.
2	Q How long has he been the sheriff?
3	A Since the first of '69.
4	Q So you would say generally that all and all Mr.
5	Watson was treated pretty well back there, wouldn't you?
6	A He was treated well.
7	MR. KAY: I have no further questions.
8	
9	RECROSS EXAMINATION
10	BY MR. BUBRICK:
11	Q Mr. King, does he look any different now than he
12	di that day he left Collin County for Los Angeles?
13	A Not much difference. As a matter of fact, he
14	looks like he may have on the same cost.
15	Q Does he look about the same in weight?
16	, A Yes.
. <b>17</b> ,	Q Do you have any idea what he weighed when he left
18	McKinney?
19	A I would say approximately 120 or 125.
20	Q As a matter of fact, when he left you wished him
21	luck, didn't you?
22	A Yes, I did.
23	MR. BUBRICK: I have no further questions.
24	MR. KAY: Nothing further.
25	THE COURT: Thank you, Judge, You may be excused.
26	MR. BUGLIOSI: Does the Court wish to take a recess?
27	THE COURT: Yes. We will have our afternoon recess at
28	this time.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we will have our afternoon recess at this time. Once again, please heed the usual admonition. (Recess.) 23f. 15° , 16 2Ž .28

1

2

3

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: People against Watson.

Let the record show all jurors, counsel and the defendant are present.

MR. BUGLIOSI: People call Stephanie Schram,

THE CLERK: Raise your right hand, please.

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

THE WITNESS: Yes.

# STEPHANIE SCHRAM,

called as a witness by the people in rebuttal, testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Thank you.

Be seated, and would you state and spell your

name, please.

THE WITNESS: Stephanie Schram; S-t-e-p-h-a-n-i-e;

S-c-h-r-a-m.

THE CLERK: Thank you.

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q How old are you, Stephanie?

A 19.

Q And you know the defendant in this case, Charles

Watson?

A (Nods head.)

1	Q.	You have to answer out loud.
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	You also know Charles Manson?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	When did you first meet Mr. Manson?
6	; <b>A</b>	On, I think, the 3rd of August, a Sunday, in
7.	Big Sur.	
8 .	Q	August 1969?
ð	A	169.
0.	Q.	And was he driving a truck at that time?
1	A	Yes.
<b>Ż</b>	, Q	And did you start going with him from that moment
3	on?	
4	, A	Yes.
5	Q	Okay.
6		Where did you meet him in Big Sur, a gasoline
7	station?	
8	· A	Yes,
9-	Q	So he took you on the truck with him and you
0	started liv	ing with him?
1	. A	Yes.
2	Q	Did you remain in Big Sur for any period of time?
3		Yeah, about three or four days,
4	Q	Was he alone at the time?
5	. A	No, he had two guys with him.
26·	Q	Okay.
27	,	Did they remain with him while you were with him
28-	in Big Sur?	

23-3 For about a day. A #24 Q Then the remainder of the time you and Manson were alone? A. Yes. б 5 

1	Q	This truck that he had, did it appear to be a
2	baker van?	
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	White or cream colored?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	Rather old? About a 1952?
7	Α ,	Yes.
8	Q;	Ford?
9	Α	Yes.
10	Q	Where did you and Mr. Manson go from Big Sur?
<b>11</b> · .	1: A.	We spent about three days in Big Sur, then we
12	went down t	o the ranch.
13	Q (i	Spahn Ranch?
14	A	Spahn Ranch.
15	'Q -	When did you arrive at Spahn Ranch?
16	A	I guess about the 5th or 6th, the 6th of August.
17	Q	Of August 1969?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Did you go anywhere from there with Mr. Manson?
20	A	Yes. Then I went down to San Diego.
· <b>21</b>	Q	With Mr. Menson?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	Who was in San Diego?
24	A	My sister.
25	Q	Why did you and Mr. Manson go down to San Diego?
26	A	To get some clothes, things to live with.
27	Q	And when did you leave Spahn Ranch for San Diego?
28	A	On the 7th of August.
	1	and marker to have some number of the second

.1	(1) (1) Q	August the 7th, a Thursday, 1959.
2		About what time of day did you leave Spahn Ranch
3	for San Die	go?
4	A	Sometime in the morning, probably about 10:00,
5	something l	ike that, I think.
6	Q	About 10:00 a.m. then on Thursday, August the
7	7th, 1969 y	ou left Los Angeles with Mr. Manson en route to
8	San Diego.	
9	, <b>A</b>	Yes.
10 ,	Q	Is that correct?
11	· <b>A</b>	Yes.
12	Q	En route did Mr. Manson get a traffic ticket?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	And where was that near?
1,5	A	Oceanside.
16	·Q	About what time of day was it?
17	Å.	It was in the evening.
18	Q	This would be August the 7th then?
19	, A.	Yes.
20	Q	In the evening, 1969; is that correct?
<b>2</b> ]	A.	Yes, sir.
22	Q	Then you arrived down in San Diego that evening?
23	A	Yes, sir.
24	Q	And you went to your sister's place?
25	A	Yes.
26	Q	And you picked up some clothing there?
27	A	Yes.
28	Q	Did you stay overnight at your sister's place?
•	{	

i	
ı	A We spent the night in San Diego but not at my
2	sister's.
3	Q So you and Mr. Manson had stopped at your
4	sister's place but then you went to San Diego and spent the
5	night there?
6	A Yes.
7	Q In San Diego inside the truck?
<b>8</b>	A Yes.
ġ.	Q Did you ten eventually return to Los Angeles?
10	A Yes.
11	Q When did you return to Los Angeles? When did you
12	leave San Diego for Los Angeles?
j3	A The next morning.
14	Q That would be August the 8th, 1969?
15.	A Right.
16	Q Friday?
17	A Yeah.
18	Q About what time of day did you leave San Diego for
.19	Los Angeles?
· 20	A The morning, early.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27 60	
28,	.\ 

25R-1 Q Approximately. 'n A 8:00 or 9:00 o'clock. And approximately what time did you arrive at Q 3 Spahn Ranch on Friday, August the 8th, 1969? Around noon, something like that. À 5 Well, if anything, was it before moon or after Q 6 noon? A After. R So, it would be after 12:00 o'clock? Q o Yeah. 10 Do you remember telling me at an earlier time that Q 11 it was around 1:00 or 2:00 o'clock? 12 No. 13 Q In any event, it was after 12:00? 14 Yeah. 15 And then you started to live with the family for Q 16 a period of time? 17 18. Yes. You eventually went up to Death Valley with them? 19 20 Yeah. , 21 Now, with respect to Mr. Watson, did you ever have any conversations with Mr. Watson while you were living at 22 23 Spahn Ranch with the family? 24 Not very much, just a little. A All right. Would you relate what those conversa-25 26 tions were? 27 MR. BUBRICK: Could we know when, your Honor, some

28

foundation?

1	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Would this be in August of 1969?
2.	A Yes.
3	Q In Spahn Ranch?
4	A. Yes.
,5	Q All right; you may continue.
6	A The only thing I can think of that I ever talked
7	to him about is that I was a little bit hung-up with the past
8'	and the future; and I can recall him sometimes saying to me
9	that it wasn't very cool to be thinking about anything except
10	what is happening right now.
11	Q Mr. Watson told you this?
12 <sup>.</sup>	A Yezh.
13	Q On more than one occasions?
14	A A couple of times.
15	Q Would you ask him for his advice or
16	A No.
17	Q or would you be saying something then he would
18	talk?
19	A I'd be saying something or thinking something, and
20	he could tell.
21	Q Then he would say that to you
22	A Yesh,
23	Q "Just be concerned with the present"?
24	A Yesh.
25	MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you. No further questions.
26	
27	
28	·

before you came back?

A Right.

MR. BUBRICK: I have nothing further, your Honor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Just one more question.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q You say that Mr. Manson was driving what appeared to be a baker van, a white baker van, when he picked you up in Big Sur.

Was he also driving that same truck when you got the ticket in Oceanside?

A Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you.

No further questions.

THE COURT: Thank you, you may be excused,

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have a stipulation. May it be stipulated that Officer Richard C. Wills of the California Highway Patrol be deemed to have been called by the People in court, was duly sworn and testified as follows:

That on August the 7th, 1969, at approximately 6:15 p.m., he gave a traffic ticket to Charles Manson while Manson was driving southbound near Oceanside, California, and that Mr. Manson was driving a 1952 Ford baker van, plain colored?

So stipulated?

MR. BUBRICK: Yes, I will so stipulate.

28

#26

•

9 -

MR. BUGLIOSI: May we approach the bench, your Honor.

(The following proceedings were had at the bench.)

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have to apologize, We ran out of witnesses again. I had a psychiatrist that just came in from Atascadero, but he is not available right now. He just came in about a half an hour ago. I have no one else to call right now. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: All right. As I said before those things happen. We can anticipate those things. We will recess.

What time can we start? 9:30?

MR. BUGLIOSI: 9:30.

THE COURT: All right.

(The following proceedings were had in open court.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, again we will recess at this time to 9:30 tomorrow morning.

During the recess do not form or express any opinion in this case.

Do not discuss it among yourselves or with anybody else. Please keep your minds open and remember what I advised you about the news media. Thank you.

(An adjournment was taken until Thursday, September 23, 1971 at 9:30 a.m.)

3.

13.-14

16

. 18

2

2:4

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES