TO CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Life Term Parole Consideration Hearing of:

LESLIE VAN HONTEN.

10

10

12

13

74

15

24

23

GDC Mamber W-13378

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN FRONTERA; CALIFORNIA

ORGNAL

MEDNESDAY, JAMUARY 31, 1979

9:50 A.M.

Diane M. Holmback CSR License No. 4022

MINISTRESENTA

Ms. Ruth L. Rushen, Presiding Member

Mr. Rudy V. DeLeon, Board Member

Ms. Jeanne F. Sides, Board Hember

Array S

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

10

11

12

23

13

16

17

18

19

20

ZT.

22

23

24

ALSO PRESENT:

Me. Leslie Van Routen, Inmate

Attorney for Inmate Van Houten:

PAUL J. FITZGERALD, Esq. 424 South Beverly Drive Beverly Hills, California 90212

District Attorneys for People of the County of Los Angeles:

DINO JOHN FULGONI.
Head Deputy District Attorney
Norwalk Branch Office
12720 Norwalk Boulevard
Norwalk, California 90650

STEPHEN R. KAY Deputy District Attorney 825 Maple Avenue Torrance, California 90503

Mr. Richard Brooks, Staff Writer The Sun-Telegram

399 D Street

San Bernardino, California 92401

Ms. Judy Frutig, Assistant to Mr. Fitzgerald

Mr. Manuel Jimenez, C&PR

Ms. Doris Jefferis, Assistant C&PR

Mr. Gilberts Vasquez, Correctional Counselor II, CIW

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

2		the second of the second		7416
	Proceedings	v ,		\$ &
*	Phase I - Commitment Offense and Pre-Conviction Factors			e, en
	Phase II - Post-Conviction Factors			48
7	Phase III - Parole Plans			79
é	Afternoon Session		, Mr.	87
8	Closing Statement by Mr. Kay	, , w		87
9	Closing Statement by Mr. Fulgoni			93
10	Closing Statement by Mr. Fitzgerald		ŭ.	97
	Closing Statement by Inmate Van Houten			112
2	Recess		•	119
	Resumption of Proceedings for Findings of the Board	*		120
5	Adjournment Certificate of Reporter	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		125
•		.*	•	4
8		**************************************	/	
9				, g .
0			4	
			*	
		. Neps.	*	

<u>PROGEDING</u>

--000--

The place is the California Institution for Women at Frontera, California. And the case today is Ms. Leslie Van Houten, V-a-n H-c-u-t-e-n, W-13378.

ask each person in the room to state his name, his function, spell the last name and, when we get to you, Ms. Van Houten, will you also give us your CDC Number.

My name is Ruth Rushen, R-u-s-h-e-n, Board Member presiding in this case. And we will go to my right.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Jeanne Sides, S-i-d-e-s, Board Member.

MR. KAY: Stephen Kay, K-a-y, Deputy District Attorney, Los Angeles County.

MR. FULGONI: Dino Fulgoni, F-u-l-g-o-n-i, Los Angeles County Deputy District Attorney.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Leslie Van Houten, V-a-n
H-o-u-t-e-n, W-13378.

MR. FITZGERALD: Paul Fitzgerald, the attorney for Leslie Van Houten.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Spell your last name MR. FITZGERALD I gave her a card.*

F-1-t-z-g-e-r-a-1-d.

24

10

6 AN 1

12

13

.14

15

16

16

19

20

21

22

MS. FRUTIG: Judy Frutig, F-r-u-t-i-g: I'm here to assist Mr. Fitzgerald.

MR. JEFFERIS: Doris Jefferis, J-e-f-f-e-r-i-s.
Assistant C&PR.

MR. VASQUEZ: Gilbert Vasquez, V-a-s-q-u-e-z, Correctional Counselor II, CIW.

MR. JIMENEZ: Manuel Jimenez. I'm the Classification and Parole Representative for the institution. Jimenez, J-1-m-e-n-e-z.

MR. BROCKS: Richard Brooks. I am with The Sun Reporter.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

22

24

25

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Rudy DeLeon, D-e L-e-o-n, Member, Community Release Board.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Thank you. This hearing is being conducted pursuant to Penal Code Sections 3041 and 3042 and the regulations of the Community Release Board governing parole consideration for life prisoners. The purpose of today's hearing, Ms. Van Houten, is to consider your suitability for parole.

It is necessary for us to conduct this hearing under the revised procedures enacted by the Legislature, effective July 1, 1977. These procedures are applicable to all prisoners under a life sentence.

We will be considering the number and the nature of the crimes for which you were committed to state prison, your criminal history or lack of it prior to your commitment, and your behavior since your commitment.

We will reach a decision today and inform you as to your suitability for parele or not. If you are found suitable for parele, we will give you our reasons for finding you suitable. And if there are any special conditions, we will give you those, and we will also state to you the time you are to be confined in prison.

If we find that you are unsuitable for parole, we will give you our reasons, and we will make suggestions as to what you can do in the future when you, again, present yourself to the Community Release Board.

We are not utilizing any confidential information today. All of the material which we have, your attorney should have access to this. And we will ask him, before we begin the hearing proper, if this is true, and we will move from that point.

I will now make inquiry of Mr. Fitzgerald if you have had proper notice of this hearing; if you have had an opportunity to prepare for the hearing; have you had an opportunity to confer with your client; and are you ready to proceed today?

I have had ample opportunity to interview and townsel my client, and I have done so. I must say, however, that the

restricted me in the preparation of this hearing. I attempted through communications with the Community Release Board in Sacramento, to determine the identity of the persons who were going to be at this hearing today, and I was refused such information.

Because Ms. Van Houten had two co-defendants, who are inmates of this institution and who have previously had hearings, I attempted to obtain transcripts of those hearings, to determine -- to determine several things, to determine, number one, whether the persons, members of the Board who were present at that hearing, were likely to be present at this hearing in terms of matching the identities; two, to determine what facts, if any, were used in that hearing concerning the same crimes for which Ms. Van Houten was convicted; also, to determine questions that were asked by the Board and information the Board received in that connection.

A perusal of the rules of the Community Release
Board clearly indicates that any member of the public is
entitled to a transcript of the proceedings 30 days after
the conclusion of the hearing. I was informed by the
Sacramento office of the Community Release Board that, while
such proceedings -- while the proceedings were transcribed,
they were not available, because the Community Release Board

did not have personnel to duplicate the transcripts. So, ultimately, I was unable to produce -- I was unable to obtain copies of what I considered to be very relevant, very important, and very material information in connection with this hearing.

2.

à.

petitioned in writing to present this Board with a witness, a psychiatrist, Dr. Michael Coburn, a psychiatrist who was a staff psychiatrist at this institution in 1971, who not only interviewed and met with Ms. Van Houten in 1971, but saw her in many of the succeeding years, and saw her as recently as several months ago. I felt this information was extremely important and the presence of this witness would be extremely important on the issue of the suitability that is to say whether or not Ms. Van Houten poses an unreasonable risk of danger to the public.

and to testify. I was also refused permission to have that witness present. I felt that it was very interesting that, while I was required to make these requests in writing, my request was denied orally; by telephone, by a clerk in the Community Release Board office. And when I asked to speak with a Board member about it, the permission to talk to that member was refused.

I also requested that certain members of

I was informed that no members of the public can attend, not even the prisoner's family. Yet, when I arrived here.

I see that there is a member of the media present. I find that to be paculiar, if not downright unfair and unreasonable, that the media should be present and the defendant's own-family can't be present, nor can sophisticated, knowledgeable psychiatric observers be present.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Having registered your complaints, are you ready to proceed?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, I am.

17.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN. All right. Ms. Van Houten, have you had proper notice of this hearing? You knew within 24 hours that you would be coming to the hearing today? Have you had an opportunity to peruse your file in re Olson; and have you had an opportunity to confer with your attorney; and are you ready to proceed?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes, I am.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay: I will ask the D.A.'s office from Los Angeles County -- I will be asking these questions collectively so we don't have to go through it each time -- if you have had proper notice of this hearing; you have had an opportunity to prepare; and are you ready to proceed?

MR. KAY: We are.

tot satisfied with our findings today, you have appeal rights under Section 2050 of the CRB rules. Any decision we make today will not be final for 60 days, pursuant to 3040 of the Penal Code. The purpose of this section is to give the public time to review our decision and make any input it wishes to make.

This hearing is for the purpose of determining suitability for parole. It is not to retry the case. We will not be addressing any issues of guilt.

I would ask that we respect each other, so as not to have an adversary proceeding. This is an administrative hearing and not a court of law. Each person will be given ample opportunity to present his side.

I will ask that we not interrupt each other. If you have objections, note them. When the person is finished speaking, state your objections, and we will either rule on them at that time or call a recess and deliberate and rule on the objections. In that way, we may have an orderly hearing and confine our real concern as to the finding of suitability.

The hearing will be in three parts. The first , will concern itself with the commitment offense and your history prior to the offense, both social and criminal. I will be headling that part of the hearing. I will read into

*

*

. 8

-

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

22

23

24

I will name, which are in this packet. At the close of that reading into the record the facts of the offense, the District Atterney's office will have an opportunity to address itself to the facts of the offense, confining itself primarily to what happened, adding anything that they want into the record as to the actual offense. When they have finished, your attorney will have an opportunity to do the same.

Counselor, are -- strike are. Have you decided whether Ms. Van Houten will be addressing the Board personally today?

MR. FITZGERALD ... She will.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

.19

.20

23

22

28

.14

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. Will you stand and raise your right hand?

(Thereupon Inmate Beslie Van Houten was, by Presiding Member Rushen, sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.)

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: I do.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Then, at the close of whatever your abcorney wants to say, or however he wants to present it, you may have an opportunity to speak to the facts and say anything you wish in terms of enlightening the panel as to your culpability. Again, I say we are not addressing

the laswe of guilt.

record as to your social and criminal history. You will have an opportunity to comment on that and make any input that you wish to make. The D.A.'s office may also have some comment it may want to make on that. At any time during the hearing, the panel members may want to ask questions.

question that he wants asked, you will not be addressing the D.A., and the D.A. will not be addressing you, you or your counsel. You will funnel your inquiries through the panel members.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: (Inmate nods head.)

phase, we will probably recess. When we return, we will go into the post-conviction factors. Mrs. Sides will be handling that part. This will include all of your activities since being confined in the institution from your original date. It will also include a review of the psychiatric findings. You and your counsel will have ample opportunity to discuss and add anything you want to those reports.

We then will go into your parole plans. Mr. DeLeon will be handling that part of the hearing. And again, you and your counsel may make any comments you wish.

At the close of that, we will ask the D.A. to make

his closing statement, whether this time, he may make a recommendation, if he so wishes, as to your suitability. If he siso, if he sisted a recommendation for suitability, he siso, if he wishes, may make a recommendation as to which matrix you fall under

4

10

. 12

12

14

15

17

18

1争

20

22

24

25

INMATE VAR HOUTEN: (Immate node head.)

will close the hearing. He will be speaking, I'm sure, to your auttability and enything else he wishes to tie in at that point. Then, your turn will come, and anything you want to say about whatever, you will make any comments you want. This is your hearing, and you are to have an opportunity to be heard. We then will/recess and deliberate, call you back and tell you our findings.

turrent Board report. Now, we understand that the CDC rules indicate that if your admission is six months, they don't have to write a Board report. But we do we feel we want up-to-date information today. So, we'do have CDC staff here. And as they address the Board, at any time when they finish, you will have an opportunity to make any comments.

So, I would like at this time for the CDC staff to stand. We will owear you in collectively so that we don't have to go through this each time.

(Thereuson Staff Members Gilbert Vasques.

borin Jefferia, and Manuel Jimenez vere, by Presiding Member Rushen, eworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.)

M. VASQUEZ: I do.

MS. JEFFERIS: I do.

M. JIMENEZ: I do.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Are there any questions as to procedure?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah. Do you have a tentative sort of schedule? Will we be here over the noon hour and into the afternoon?

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: That depends on you, counselor.

MR. FITZGERALD: All right.

(Laughter.)

10

2

12

13

14

養養

櫷.

171

18

19

20

22

23

24

13

then, the legal status, I have taken all of the information from the Cumulative Case Summary, which contains the transcript of the cross-examination by the D.A., the Appellate Court decision reversing the first conviction, the Abstracts of Judgment, and the indictment. The legal status: On August 17, 1978, the prisoner was received in prison pursuant to Penal Code Section 1168 for a violation of PC Section 187, Munder One, Count VI; violation of PC

Section 187, Murder One, Count VII; and violation of Penal Section 182.1, Conspiracy to Commit Murder One, Count VIII, under Case Number A-253156. The controlling minimum eligible parole date is August 17, 1978.

. 3

m.

Ya

The prisoner was originally received in prison on April 21, 1971, pursuant to Penal Code Section 1168 for a violation of Penal Code 187, Murder One, Counts VI and VII, and violation of PC 182.1, Conspiracy to Commit. Murder One, Count VIII, under Case Number A-253156. The judgment of * conviction was reversed for retrial by the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Crim. Number 22239 and 24376 on August 17, 1976. On August 11th, 1978, after a retrial, the prisoner was resentenced to state prison on Counts VI, VII, and VIII.

Statement of the Facts, in summary: All of the commitment offenses under Case Number A-253156 stem from two successive multiple homicides of the ing in Los Angeles County between 8/8 through 8/IC. 19. Murder One, Count VI, refers to victim Leno, L-e-n-o, A. LaBianca, L-a B-i-a-n-c-a. Murder One, Count VII, refers to victim Rosemary LaBianca. Conspiracy to Commit Murder, Count VIII, refers to the crimes and offenses related to the charges set forth in Counts I through VII: Murder One, Count I, victim A. Welger, F-o-l-g-e-r; Count II, victim W. Frykowski, F-r-y-k-o-w-s-k-i; Count III, victim S. Parent; Count IV,

victim S. Polanski, P-o-l-a-n-s-k-i, and Count V, victis
J. Sebring, S-c-b-r-i-n-g.

Charles Manson, B-33920; Susan Atkins, W-8304; Patricia Krenwinkel, W-8314; Charles Watson, B-379999; and Linda Kasabian, dismissed. The prisoner was not charged in these counts.

STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY

. 18

knowledge that her co-conspirators and crime partners had killed five people on August 9, 1969, set out to kill more people. The group drove around for about four hours and randomly selected and discarded targets until they settled on the LaBianca house. They entered the residence, tied up the victims, covered their heads with pillowcases, and killed them. The prisoner was an active participant in the murders. She held Mrs. LaBianca down on several occasions so that crime partner Krenwinkel could stab her. When Krenwinkel's knife bent during her attempt to stab the victim, the prisoner called for Watson to come in and assist with the killing. The prisoner also stabbed the victim.

After the murders, the prisoner wiped off fingerprints, took property from the location, and, upon her return to the Spahn Ranch, she burned evidence which could possibly tie her into the murders. Leno LaBiahca died of multiple stab wounds to the neck and abdomen.

Rosemary Labtanca's death was ascribed to multiple stab wounds to the nack and trunk.

At this time, I would ask the D.A. if he has enything to add to those facts.

this part of the hearing, you said you were interested in her social background, too, before the fact. Would you be interested in me going into that as to what --

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Not at this point.

MR. KAY: Not at this time?

Ţ

10

Mental Market

14

15

16

7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Just the facts of the case, if you have anything you want to add to that.

MR. KAY: I think, in summary, you were very accurate in what you had stated. I know that I submitted the cross-examination, which you have read, that set forth these facts. A number of things I would want to add, just a few, number one, is that Ms. Van Houten was not on narcotic or dangerous drugs at the time of the murders. She did, of course, have full knowledge of what had happened at the Tate house, although she had nothing to do with that. And I want that to be clear on the record. And I believe that she had nothing to do with that.

She knew at the time period that the family was going to be involved in murders. And she, on her own, had decided that she wanted to participate in this conspiracy to

participate. When she found out about the murders at the Tate house, she expressed and felt disappointment that she was not selected to go along for the Tate murders and that she was hoping that if the members of the family went out again to participate in murders that she would get to go along and participate in those murders.

2 2

She even, after the Tate murders and before she went out on the night of the LaBianca murders, watched news accounts on television about the Tate murders. And so, she was fully aware. And Patricia Krenwinkel had filled her in on the horror that had taken place at the Tate house.

On the trip that did last for about four hours, and they made stops at several places -- a small home off of the Fair Oaks offramp in Pasadena, and they stopped in front of a house and didn't kill the people there. And then, there was another house in South Pasadena, a church, they stopped at a Congregational church in South Pasadena with the intent to kill the minister and string him up to the cross in front of the church. But the church -- it was late at night, and the church was locked, and nobody was there.

So, they left.

Outside of the -- when they finally ended up, after their long journey, at the LaBianca house, nobody knew the LaBiancas. Nobody -- these were complete strangers to

everybody who participated in this crise.

瘾

Manson, apparently, went in the house first and tied up the LaBiancas and assured the LaBiancas that nothing was going to happen to them, that it was just a robbery. He came back outside and asked Ms. Van Houten, Patricia Krenwinkel, and Tex Watson, to get out of the car. They had a meeting at the back of the car where Manson told them not to cause fear and panic like the night before and not to let them know that you're going to kill them. He told them that there was a man and a woman at the house, and he had tied their hands.

Ms. Van Houten, Mr. Watson, and Ms. Krenwinkel then went in the house. Ms. Krenwinkel went to the kitchen and got a knife for herself and one for Ms. Van Houten. And then, they -- Ms. Van Houten and Ms. Krenwinkel took Mrs. LaBianca into the bedroom for the purpose of killing her. They -- Ms. Van Houten held Mrs. LaBianca down. Mrs. LaBianca then heard the streams, or the sounds of Mr. LaBianca in the living room getting stabbed by Mr. Watson, at which point she bolted up from the bed and cried out her husband's name, at which point Ms. Van Houten then wrestled her down on the bed again, pushed her down, and held her. At that point, Ms. Krenwinkel stabbed Mrs. LaBianca, but the knife blade bent. Ms. Van Houten then went to the door of the bedroom and called for Watson, knowing that he had entered

the residence with a big bayonet. Matern then came in and atabbed Mrs. LaBianca. No. Van Hosten participated in atabbing Mrs. LaBianca, else.

Lower to Mrs. Labianca, and I see't disprove that. Ms.

Van Houtes: claims that she stabled Mrs. Labianca in the lower backand the buttocks. Mr. Watsen, at his trial, took a different tack, but they were the only ones there. And I can't prove or disprove who inflicted the fatal blows, "although Ms. Van Houten clearly did participate in stabbing Mrs. Labianca.

10

* 2

12

13

16

17

1.0

争

24

21

11

23

fingerprints. She and the other crime partner, by the testimosy, apparently had something to est out of the refrigerator in the house after the murders. And I think Mr. Watson, and possibly Ms. Krenwinkel, took a shower. Mr. Watson definitely took a shower there, and Ms. Krenwinkel possibly.

Ven Houten got been to the ranch, she immediately took off ber own clothes and burned them, the clothes that she wore, plus a pure that had been taken from the Labiance's. And then, she was another girl counted some money that to. Van. Houten had taken from the location, or at least when they got back to the ranks, He. Was Houten had the money in her

possession. And she and this other girl, Dianne Lake, sat on the bed counting it.

they hitchhiked back to the ranch. Apparently, he was curious and came looking for Ms. Van Houten to see if she really did live at the Spahn Ranch, because in the car they had told him they didn't live at the Spahn Ranch. And when Ms. Van Houten saw the car pull up outside, she hid herself under a bedsheet on the bed so that the man wouldn't see her, because she didn't want to be connected to these murders.

9 1

I think that as far as the facts of the crime, everything else you said covers it pretty carefully, except for the motive for these murders. You didn't go into that. The motive is that the participants wanted to start a black-white race war and that these murders were going to be blamed on blacks in hopes that the whites would retaliate against the blacks and that there would be a big race war.

As a matter of fact, Mrs. LaBianca's wallet was taken by Mr. Manson after he went in. And Mr. Manson had this wallet planted in an area near Pacoima, which he felt was a black area. And he hoped, and expressed this hope, that a black person would find this wallet in the service station restroom and use the credit cards in Mrs. LaBianca's name -- well, there were a number of credit cards -- and

therefore, get blomed for the murders.

1.7

Helter-Skelter philosophy, that in the black-white race war, the blacks would win and kill all the whites, except for Manson and the family. And he would escape to a hideout in the desert in the Death Valley area, which they named the Bottomless Pit. And they were going to stay there until the revolution was over. And they felt that the blacks, being not smart enough to control power, once they had it, would look to the only whites left to turn over power to them after the revolution was over. And, of course, the only whites left would be Manson and the family. And he would take over power and kind of rule, at least the United States. It was never clear whether this was to be the whole world, but at least the United States.

Tex Watson, who was the leader at the time of the murders, as far as the leader at the locations, was Ms.

Van Houten's boyfriend at the time. They were very close, so that the people that she was with at the LaBianca house, Tex Watson was her boyfriend, and Patricia Krenwinkel appeared to be her best friend in the family.

Wait a minute. Just a minute. I think that's really all I need to add right now.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. Counsel?

MR. FITZGERALD: I believe he stated that she

There is only one - there was only one victim that was tied, and that is Lene Lablanca. And he was tied by someone other than Ms. Van Houten. And he was not tied up in Tablanca. Van Houten's presence. Probably, Manson tied-up Leno Lablanca when he was in the house before they arrived.

down Rosemary LaBianca on several occasions. The evidence produced at the various trials does not reflect that she was held down on several occasions by Ms. Van Houten.

MR. KAY: (Indicating by gesture twice.)

MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Kay indicated that he could not prove, nor disprove, that Ms. Van Houten stabbed.

Mrs. LaBianca while Mrs. LaBianca was alive. She was convicted because of her role as an aider and abettor. It is clear that the participants most responsible for the death of Mrs. LaBianca were Tex Watson, who ultimately killed her with the bayonet, and Ms. Krenwinkel. It was not Ms. Van Houten. Furthermore, Ms. Van Houten did not physically participate in the death of Mr. LaBianca. He was killed outside of her presence by Tex Watson.

Mr. Key said they are food in the house after the killing. That is absolutely not true. It is not verified by any of the evidence produced at any of the three trials.

Additionally, it was quite clearly demonstrated during the

trial, as you are probably aware having read Mr. Kay's cross-examination of Ms. Van Houten, that she stabbed Mrs. LaBianca was dead.

\$

' 23

of guilt. We clearly recognize that Ms. Van Houten has been convicted of conspiracy to commit murder and has been convicted of murder. But it should -- the point I want to make clear is that she was convicted on the basis of her assistance and help to others and was not the prime mover in this killing.

I think it's also important to note, and it has been sidely reported and is becoming now almost a matter of common knowledge, that the Manson family was directed and orchestrated by one Charles Manson, and that Leslie Van Houten, as well as other members of the Manson family, were under the domination and influence of Charles Manson.

And it is extraordinarily unlikely that without Mr. Manson's influence, that these crimes would have been committed.

It was Manson that selected the house.

Mr. Kay said that the group went around at random selecting victims, tending to imply that Ms. Van Houten had some decision-making power in this random selection of victims. She did not. It was Charles Manson who was physically present who selected the various locations. Ms. Van Houten, at no time, was a policymaker in the Manson

tamily or a policymaker in any killings.

. ***

10

81

12

13

14

15

16

49

18

19

20

11

22

73

24

23

Terent trial and the trial before that. She has testified, and it is uncontradicted, that she only stabbed Rosemary LaBianca after Mr. Watson put a knife in her hand and told her to do scenething. She did wipe off -- busy herself wiping off fingerprints at the location, but she did not participate in any of the more ghastly aspects of that crime scene. She did not participate in any blood writing on the wall or any mutilation of any of the victims, either before or after death.

BOARD MEMBER DELEON: Now -- pardon me -- prior

to the commitment offense, you were at the Spahn Ranch?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Did you have an opportunity to involve yourself in any of the previous acts by your crime partners?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: I'm not sure what you mean:

BOARD ASMBER DeLEON: Were you invited to

Darticipate?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: To go the first night?

INMATE VAN IDUIEN: No.

SOARD MEMBER DeLEON: And then, on the second

night, were you asked, or did you request to go?

I believe in what he was saying. And I said, "Yes." And then, I was told to get in the car and go. Prior to that, he had asked all of us to, uh, decide in ourselves if we believed enough in him, you know, to go br, you know, go along with Helter Skelter.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Now, you did not use any drugs on that night?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Not on that night.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: The night of the LaBiancas?
INMATE VAN HOUTEN: No.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: And what did Manson say when he came back to the car after, apparently, making the first entry into the --

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: He came out to the car, and he looked in, and he -- I don't remember exactly who he said first. I do remember he hesitated between Susan and I. And then, he asked me to get out along with Pat and Tex. You know, I don't remember if he said Tex or Pat first or me, but then he said to get out, and I did.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: And when you went into the residence, what did you find there?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: We walked in the front door, and they were both sitting on the couch. It was kind of a

nireular couch. And I -- I don't have a clear memory of hands tied or anything like that. There was -- they were sitting there.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Who directed Mrs. Labianca into the other room?

into the other room. So, Pat and I took her in.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Into the other room?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: You put her on the bed?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: She -- well, we asked -- it's hard to remember.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Was she on the bed when she was stabbed?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yeah. She ended up on the bed, but I don't remember if she just sat on it or, you know.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Did you have a weapon at that time?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Pat had gotten kitchen knives, but I don't remember having one in my hand at the time, because I was holding her down when Pat was going to stab her.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Was she struggling?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: All that is covered in the

25

10

12

13

14

14

16

18

19

20

21

cross-exemination.

ascertain your position as to having the position of leadership or being a follower.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: I was following.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: If you had a leader there, who would that leader be?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Tex. I wasn't functioning well under the situation.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: You mean you were not acting without commands?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yeah. I wasn't -- I was panicked. I wasn't comfortable in the situation, you know. I don't know what to say in that area, but --

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: I see. That's all right.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: You know, in our minds we had been thinking it was like, oh, a war-type situation to go out and do this thing. And then, being there, adrenalines were going. I wasn't functioning well.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: After the death of the victims, what was the next course of action in leaving?

inmate van Houten: Well, Charlie had wanted to make it really horrible, like he kept talking about putting eyeballs on the walls and that kind of thing. And I knew I had touched a lemp, and I - this is how I remember it.

.25

6

1

8

10

Spinos Spinos

12

13

. 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

13

I remember that, I think, I said to Pat, "I touched the lamp."

And the said, "Wipe off prints."

shower. And I didn't go back into the living room until we were leaving. And then, that's when I saw the writing on the walls. And I glanced and saw Mr. LaBianca.

And then, as we were leaving, I don't remember who did it. I know I didn't. Someone opened the refrigerator up and took out chocolate milk and cheese, and we'left.

10

90

. 12

13

多毒:

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

back?

there.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: And you took that and left?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Uh-huh.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: And then, you hitchhiked

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes, we stayed in the bushes until the sun came up, and then we hitchhiked home.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Now, you didn't shower?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: No. I wanted to get out of

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Did you have bloody clothing, or was there blood on your --

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: No, I didn't. But Charlie had told all of us to change our clothes. And Tex's zipper broke on his pants. And so, he told me to give him his and take a pair of Mrs. LaBianca's shorts or whatever. It ended up

that I wore a pair of shorts. And I had told Tex that I didn't have anything on me, so I probably didn't need to change my clothes. And he said that that's what we were supposed to do. So, I was to change them anyway. So, I gave Tex the other pants that I had brought.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: I see. Okay. I have nothing further.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Mrs. Sides?

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: I have no questions.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: I have two. You say -I understood your attorney to say that you stabbed Mrs.
LaBianca after she was dead.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

3

. 6

COT THE

10.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

28

24

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. Would you just go over that again, for me?

and the knife bent, I called to Tex in the other room. And I don't -- and I never have been able to, even in all of the times that I've regone through this in my mind, I -- all I remember is standing there in the doorway of the bedroom and looking out into a den area. And I don't remember Tex getting into the bedroom or passing me or anything like that. But after I turned around, and he had killed Mrs. LaBianca, she was laying on the floor. And he handed me a knife, and he said, "Do something." And so,

1700 COLLEGE TOWN DRIVE, SUITE 213

I stabled Mrs. LaBianca on the back several times. I think it was either 10 or 14. I don't remember.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. Now, in holding her down, if I understood what you said, somehow or other she wound up on the bed.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes, I don't, you know -- we may have told her to sit on the bed, get on the bed. I don't remember clearly.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay. But you remember holding her, and Krenwinkel was stabbing her?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: She tried, yes.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay. Now, during this time, did she, Mrs. LaBianca, attempt to get up?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes, she did.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay. And did you have to put her back down, or she never did get up, or what?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: She got half up, and then at the time she was getting up, I went to hold her back down, and then that's when Pat stabbed her, and the knife bent.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Uh-huh.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: And then, I got up and went to get Tex.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHER: Ckny.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: It all happened an a series

23

22

3

Section 1

10

12

. 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN; All right. She's on the bed, and you're holding her down, and Pat stabs her once?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: And the knife bends?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: And you get up?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yeah. I was already standing.

I just -- I left.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: And you go to call him?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. You don't touch her anymore; is that what you're saying?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Not until she was laying on the floor.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay. Now, when did the struggle -- I think I read somewhere where there was a struggle taking place. Was all of this during the first hold down?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Fes. it all happened very rapidly.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay. To the best of your knowledge, what aroused the man's curiosity that came to Spahn's Ranch the next day?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Well, he came the very same

25

day.

10

12

13

14

15

.16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

PRESEDING MEMBER RUSHER: OLDY.

Spahn's. He was a strange, little man who had like blinking red lights on his car. And he was an odd person. And when we were going up Topanga, he said he knew of Spahn's and had been there different times, and did we live there?

And we said, "No," and had him drop us off down at the bottom of the Santa Susana Pass. That's the turnoff road. And then, probably a few hours later, he ended up coming up. I didn't -- I wouldn't know if it was to check to see if I was there or not.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Uh-huh. Okay. Now, the chocolate milk and what was taken from --

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Cheese.

12

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

25

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Cheese? Okay. When was that eaten?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: While we were in the bushes.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Did you eat any of it?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes. I think I drank a little

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Madam Chairman, you did raise an issue I need to clarify for myself. Did I understand you to say that Pat originally took two knives from the kitchen?

· INMATE VAN HOUTEN: This is something that I have

been confused about, I thought so, but them I don't remember ever laying one down.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: I thought I heard you make that statement, that she brought two knives out.

of her in my mind at the kitchen drawer getting two knives, but then, when I was holding Mrs. LaBianca down, I didn't have the knife, because I was using both hands. So, I'm -- I'm -- I don't remember, you know, being in possession of one when the events came down, but I remember her getting two out. So, I'm confused myself on that.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: You observed her use only one knife?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

8

*

10

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

22

24

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: And you don't recall what happened to, the second knife?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: No.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Okay.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: You know, I would assume I had it, but I was using both of my hands when I was holding her down. And I didn't have the knife again until Tex handed me the knife and said, "Do something." So, I --

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: All right.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Moving, then --

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: I have one more question.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right.

ENARD MEMBER DALEON: Now, how did you ascertain that she was dead, Mrs. LaBianca was dead?

because she was just lying there, not moving, not making the kinds of spunds that Mr. LaBianca was. She seemed dead.

Later on, going through the trials, the wounds that I did inflect were, I think, postmortem, which means she was dead.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Was she bleeding at the time; do you recall?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: I remember there was blood, but not from the wounds I was making.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: I see. You said all this took place within a short period of time?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

10

12

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: The stabbing and time of death?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: It seemed -- yeah, in remembering it, it all seems very fast.

BOARD MEMBER Deleon: How long would 'fast' be?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: I -- I can't estimate. You know, minutes. It all happened very quickly. I couldn't -- I couldn't really give an estimate, because I don't know, you know, how true my perspective is on it.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Okey.

priors, we'll take your criminal history first. And, of course, it is exceptionally minimal. According to the CII Sheet, it shows that your first arrest was in April, 1969, for GTA. And that was dismissed due to insufficient evidence. And four months later, there was another GTA, and you were released on that. And then, September of 1969, you were arrested for burglary, and you were released. When arrested in Independence in October of 1969; the charges for the grand theft were dropped, according to the probation officer's report, because of the homicide charge.

Does that, to the best of your knowledge, sum up your actual contact with the law?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

10

11

12

14

16

17

18

20

22

24

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. Now, in looking at your social history, continuing on the law violations, it does say that you started use of drugs at a relatively early age. I believe you were in high school?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: And how do you account for your using the drugs? As I can see, up to the time of your arrest on this offense, and not having been involved with the police, how did that happen?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: I really don't know, other than before -- before Irgot to Spake's Ranch, it was always just my

boyftiend lived with the man that was dealing mostly grass and LSD. So, I would assume if -- for one thing, I never went to the street to get the drugs which would, you know -- I wasn't in that environment. And the drugs weren't, well, like heroin or --

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Hard narcotics.

Ţ

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: -- mescaline or something like that: I mean, methodrine. I tried a little methodrine, but I stopped. I didn't think criminally at the time of the methodrine. And it was so expensive, so that could have been one reason, too. I never broke the law to acquire drugs.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay, Looking at some of the activities that you participated in at the ranch prior to the murder, would you comment on the burglaries and how you lived at that time?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: I didn't do --' I didn't do many of the burglaries. I wasn't -- until that night, I wasn't really in, I don't think, that much of Charlie's confidence to be asked to do the kinds of burglarizings. And those burglaries were -- well, let's see. One time, and I don't remember too -- the guys did most of the burglaring. I think, and I remember one time they came back with some antiques, and another time with a telephone truck with wires and that kind of thing on it. They were probably odd burglaries. It

wasn't like TV sets and, you know, fencing or anything like that. They were strange burglaries. /Credit cards.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN / Uh-huh. All right. Now, prior to that, leaving now the criminal element of this and going into the strictly social, you had a fairly stable situation at home. From what I can gather from the various reports, you lived with your mother, who was divorced?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Uh-huh.

4

3

6

. 9

10

12

18

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: And you participated in school activities. You were homecoming queen, and class secretary, and you belonged to the Blue Birds. And you did all of the things that children of middle-class families, I guess we would say for lack of a better word, participate in. In the latter part of high school, you started having some ' difficulties. Would you like to speak about that?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yeah. I think it was in my junior and senior year. And ? -- I'd grown dissolutioned with the kind of scene I was in. I was seeing a lot of friends of mine -- I thought that they were changing with the social status, which I was right in there with. Like you said, I was very active. I was a winner.

I -- I started to go to public dances, and I met Bobbie Mackey, I hanknown him -- well, I had liked him in M | earlier years; but we started to go together more intensely. And he had been hanging around with older people that were

taking acid.

2

3

6

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

24

I came home one day, and my brother and his friends were smoking marijuans, and I was curious, and so I tried it. And that was the first time I tried marijuana. And then, when I was with Bobbie Mackey, we -- he turned me on toacid, and I started to take that. And I just hung around with people from Pasadena instead of Monrovia, my high school. And pretty soon, I just grew further and further away from the high school environment and hung with the older kids and took drugs.

PRESIDING -MEMBER RUSHEN: You did graduate, though; didn't you?

* INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes, I did.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. And wanted to say that even after high school, she completed a year --

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: We're going to get there.

MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. I didn't want the

impression created that she deteriorated, boom.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: No. All right. So, but you did manage to finish high school?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Now, I also saw your mother made a statement that she sought therapy for the family. What was that all about?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Un-huh: Well, you know, that

that well known. She and my father had seen a marriage counselor. And she continued, you know, to see him in a therapeutic way. My mother is into therapy, for one thing.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Uh-huh.

a unit, we could deal with the separation and the divorce better by seeing a family counselor. That's how I remember it:

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: "Uh-huh. She said after about five trips it wasn't working out, and so she quit.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: No.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Do you have any thoughts about that?

us. And I know, for one thing, I resented what I considered a foreigner into our family.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Un-huh.

office, I can remember that the meetings were very strained and no one talking. And it was more of a hostile, we-have-to-be-here type thing than, you know, a learning experience.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay. Then, you graduated, and the decision then was that you go and live with your father?

雪

10

7.9

12

13

14

14

18

high school, I had gotten pregnant. I think it was in the beginning of the school year, either October or November.

And I had an abortion. And after that, Bobbie and I decided that we would become Yogic monks and nuns. We went from the acid into, you know, heavy Yogic religion. And so, I was waiting. I had to take the lessons for a year before they would allow me to become a renunciate and live on the grounds and all that.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Right.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: So, I asked them what they wanted me to do, and they said the best thing to do would be the go to the, you know, business college and get secretarial training. And my father jumped at the chance just to get the vocation for me. He wasn't that happy about, you know, the renunciate. My mother was very unhappy about that.

But, that's what got me initiated into the business college. Then, halfway through the business college, I quit going to the Yogic -- I quit being as heavily into it as I was. I stopped it, and I continued with the business college

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. And the records indicate that you did an outstanding job there, and you obtained your certificate --

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN; -- as a legal secretary.

All right. And then, I didn't see where you ever got a job. It seems like something happened, and you can bring us up to date on that. What happened to cause the break between getting the job and going on? Do you want to start from that point?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes. Towards the end of business college, I started to smoke. Oh, the whole time I was in the self-realization, I didn't take drugs or smoke marijuana. I laid off.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Uh-huh.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: So, then, towards the end of business college. I was smoking weed again. And I had taken some acid. And I went to look for a job in Victorville where this girl said that we could live at her parents' ranch. My father said I could continue to live under him and look for a job, but I was feeling like I wanted independence. And the girl hadn't been honest with me, and her parents hadn't really been that happy about us going there. So, then I went to San Francisco to take --

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Well, wait a minute now. You're jumping a little far. So, you went to Victorville --INMATE VAN HOUTEN: -- to look for a job. PRESIDING ARABER RUSHEN:

- and applied for a

job.

2

10

2 2

12

15

16

17.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes. But Victorville was even

smaller then than it is now. I think there was like one bank, and they didn't need anyone.

2

10

1

12

13

14

15

16

10

19

20

21

22

29

24

25

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right.

turned out that her parents didn't -- there were three of us. I think her name was Marlo, that was the girl whose parents owned the ranch. And then another girl named Heather -- no, Dee. And she had a baby named Heather. They were from San Francisco. And she had married a guy that I had ran around with in Pasadena in my old LSD-kind of group. His name was Duncan. And she needed to go back up to San Francisco. So, I drove her up there. And I applied at Kelly Girl, and I, you know, made the application.

But within a matter of a week or so, I met Bobbie Beausoleil and Catherine Share, and that's when I dropped out and traveled with them and ended up at Spahn's.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. Mr. D.A., do you have any comments or anything you want to add to this portion of the hearing?

MR. KAY: Just a couple of things about the life in the Manson family. The evidence that came out at the trial was to the effect that Manson philosophized right from the time that Ms. Van Houten joined. And Manson was talking about physically killing people from the very beginning. As one witness said, he started talking in

the remet of 1968. Me. Van Houten joined about September, probably the latter part of September or the first part of October.

-

7

8

10

Same Same

12

13

.14

15

16

18

19

20

23

24

Mr. Manson would -- had a very anti-establishment philosophy. And all of -- Ms. Van Houten and the others all shared that philosophy. Mr. Manson wanted to create a master race of white people, and he -- his hero—seemed to be, in his philosophy, Hitler. And he would talk about how brilliant. Hitler was for what he did to the Jews. And the people that lived in the family seemed to accept this. Nobody disagreed with him. And there were a number of people that came in contact with the family that would leave, but the hard-core people, as Ms. Van Houten was, stayed on and seemed to accept this philosophy and live and be happy as members of the family.

at the beginning. That didn't start until around in January of 1969. And then, it got more intense, leading up to the murders. But that was not an original philosophy when Ms.

Ms. Van Houten is a very intelligent person. She has always done well in school. She has a high IQ. At Sawyer's Business College, when she attended, she was in the top of her class and graduated as a certified legal secretary. She's been tested to have a superior IQ in the

and 125, depending upon the different times she has been tested. When she was brought to Frontera right after the trial, originally back on April 21st, 1971, she was tested shortly thereafter and found to have a 121 IQ, which, again, would put her in the top five percent.

I think per my knowledge of the Manson family, Ms. Van Houten was certainly the most intelligent of any of the members of the Manson family and had, probably, the best upbringing and certainly knew as well, if not better than, any of the others, that what she participated in was wrong. I don't have anything to say other than that.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay. Counselor?

A COLOR

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. Just a couple of comments. We agree that she is clearly bright and has an excellent education. During the course of her last two trials, six psychiatrists testified to her very confused mental state at the time of the commission of these offenses and before.

The institutional file reflects early psychiatric interviews with Ms. Van Houten, when she arrived at the institution, which described her as very confused and very disoriented, and clearly very muddled in her thinking. The institutional file that's available to you reflects that it wasn't until she was here approximately a year and a half that she apparently began to betoxify and to get her thinking

and her mental and emotional state is order. So, while it's quite true that she was very bright, she also was in a very disorganized and crippled state of mind at the time of the commission of these oftenses and her association with Manson.

Also, while it is true, of course, that she's very bright, the CIW file as well as all other indications, clearly indicate that she was strictly a follower and not a leader and, as I mentioned before, not a policymaker. She was a soldier.

E COL

#

12

. 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

27

22

23

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Mr. DeLeon?

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: How do you feel about your social background as a contributing factor to the events that followed your childhood experiences? Do you feel that there is a causal relationship there?

like the mid and late sixties, and looking back on iv, I see that there were quite a few middle-class kids; or teenagers, that were questioning and taking the drugs. And I, you know, I was one of them. And, you know, some made it out of the situation with little damage, you know, and I ended up causing damage, and, you know, hurting everyone in general.

I did not and I don't feel I ever really had any hatred or hostility towards the establishment. I think at that time period, we just felt that people -- and I say "we"

```
because there was: a lot of flower children, even though
     when I got with Charlie, you know, he knocked the flower
 2
     children as Weing too passive. But up until then, it wasn t
     -- it was just that people hadn't seen the gentler side.
               It's so hard to describe now in the middle of the
     -- or going into the eighties -- that time period, but
     in thinking back, I think sometimes maybe I almost had to
     much going for me and that at that time I just started to
     put myself down. I -- alidated guys that weren't equal to-
    me and, you know, loosers that were into their cars more than
10
    books, you know, a couple times. I don't know exactly what
9.9
    the question is, but am I answering it?
12
              BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Well, all right. When you
13
   identified with your peers, when you were part of this group,
14
    you know, with your peer group
             . INMATE VAN HOUTEN: You mean at Spahn's ?
          BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: . -- at the Spahn Ranch --
             , INMATE VAN HOUTEN: (Inmate nods head.)
            BOARD MEMBER DeLEON; -- and predominently the
    individuals within this group were anti-social, you know,
   or apparently -=.
             INMATE VAN HOUTEN: (Inmate nods head.) .
22
```

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

-convicted. And you had a great deal of notoriety, a great

And from there, you were arrested and prosecuted and

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: -- had anti-social feelings.

receives. And then you go into the institution, and then you come into the institution.

3

12

13

16

17

18

19.

. 20

21

22

23

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: (Inmate nods head.)

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: And then in the institution, there is another peer group, you know, and a great many of those individuals are anti-social, right?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: '(Inmate nods head.)

is, you know, you have not had any exposure, other than the five months of freedom that you had when you were out on bail, to society. But yet, you really knew you were being carefully watched at that time and your behavior at that time was relatively monitored and looked upon later. You know, it isn't like having a total, uninhibited freedom in today's society.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Uh-huh.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: And so, being in that position, you know, that you are in --

'INMATE VAN HOUTEN: (Inmate nods head.)

yourself today, you know, in understanding your position, as being able or as having to come out of that anti-social atmosphere environment, identification with peers of that type, to a person who is able to adjust?

thet question until we get to that part of the hearing, or we'll get hopelessly confused if we start that. He will, too INMATE VAN HOUTEN: All right:

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Any other questions?

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: No.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Mrs. Sides?

viewing your social history, you graduated from high school in June of '67, right?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

10

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

23

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: A year in business college,

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Then, a few weeks of wandering around; was it a few weeks? What I'm getting at is when did you arrive at the Spahn Ranch?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Okay. I believe I linked up with Bobbie Beausoleil who eventually -- you know, he was an offshoot of the Spahn's Ranch people, he and Catherine Share -- in August.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: August what?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: '68.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: 168.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: And I got to Spahn's, I believe

in September or October of 168.

10

0 8 8

12

13

14

15

16

17

10

19

20

21

22

24

So, it was after you were at the Spahn's Ranch that you had your contact with law enforcement --

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: -- because the first was April of '69.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: And then it was about a year later that the LaBianca murder was committed?

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Okay. Thank you.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. Is there anything else, counselor, you feel that you want to say about that phase of the hearing?

MR. FITZGERALD: No.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. The time is now 11:05. We will take a 10-minute break.

(Thereupon a brief recess was taken.)

in the case of Ms. Van Houten. All person previously identified are back in the room, with the exception of Mr. Jimenez. The time is approximately 11:30, and we will enter the phase of post-conviction factors. And Mrs. Sides will be presiding over this part of the hearing.

for the purpose of poet-conviction, your original reception date of April 28th, 1971, will be considered.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: All right.

MARD HEMBER SIDES: So, we are going to go back to that in order to review your entire incarceration.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Right.

é

10

11

12

18

15

16

17

ĺÆ

19

20

21

22

23

24

record. I find you had very little opportunity to really become involved in programming, because of your housing situation. In spite of that, you were anxious to do something, and the staff indicated that you did work at their convenience. There are strong and supportive laudatory chronos in the file regarding your work efforts. You also spent some time doing needlepoint work. You tried to keep yourself busy while you were in tight security.

Fairly recently, back in 1975, you began taking courses at Chaffey College.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Right. And you did pick up two disciplinary problems about that time.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: One, you had possession of marijuans in July of 1976. And the other, June of '76, possession of 50 cents.

INVATE VAN HOUTEN. Yes.

BUARD MEMBER SIDES: Now, these are the only two disciplinary metters I found in your file.

INVATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

in elerical work, helping staff in a clerical way.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN; This time, yes.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: And you were editor or you worked on the newspaper, the prison newspaper.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Now, for the period December 23rd, 1976, to December 27th of 1977, you were at Sybil

Brand

‰.

10

4 P

.13

.14

3.8

16

事業

18

19

20

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Excuse me?

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: December 23rd, 1976, to

December 27, 1977, about a year at Sybil Brand.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Oh; yes: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Then, you were out on bail

in December of '77 to July of 1978?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

been back, you've stated you have helped with medical records, and you do some work in the PTU kitchen, once in awhile?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Well, I volunteer when necessary.

~

MAND MEMBER SIDES: All tight.

* 18

10

9 9

12

18

15

16

17

18

10

20

24

I started when I came back. I was in the kitchen for awhile, I think maybe a month or so. And then, from there I went to clerk for the secretary of PTU. I haven't done the medical records. That's a proposed thing for if I move to campus.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: So, in the PTU -- you're doing clerical work in PTU?

Then, I'll have the lob as a medical -- records.

chronos and account sheets, that kind of stuff.

I wanted to read into the record. Let's see which file.

We have three files here. It's a current, very strong laudatory chrono from your work supervisor stating that you're doing an excellent job and you get along well with the staff and with the other inmates. It appears as though your period of incarcaration has had relatively few problems in terms of management and disciplinary matters. And you have worked to the extent that the institution has permitted you to work.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes

else you wish to tell this panel about any activity since

broad.

MOARD MENDER SIDES: Well, there is work.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

BOARD NEMBER SIDES: School.

IMMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Newspaper.

in -- okay. Should I just start from the beginning?

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Fine.

10

92

12

13

14

13

16

17

18

19

20

24

温常

24

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Okay. When I was in SSU, I was with Fat and Susan. And after the death penalty, they allowed the first workshops to come into the unit. And that was our first -- up until that point, it had moetly been family visiting. And it was, you know, cut off, like, under the death-row kinds of circumstances.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Uh-huh.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: And from that workshop on, we started to work on programs that I personally feel that a lot of the programing and the fact that it worked was my initiative and wanting to do it. The teachers, at first, would come to the unit and teach the class, you know, just to fat and I, after they would teach it over there, so that at least we could get the education, because we couldn't go ever. Then, they began letting one of us go over and tape

the class, and the other sould lister to it and take the courses.

for the paper. And I had been writing a man who was in prison that my family and an old friend of my family's though it would be good for me to start communicating with him to get different kinds of influences. At that time, I was thinking that, unless someone had done time in prison, they weren't where it was at, which, you know, now that seems really far out to me. But then, that was true. The man I was writing had a lot of similarities in his history to Charlie's, as far as being just a loser goes. And he got me started into playing around with writing. And that's what got me into the paper. And I wrote a short story on the county jails.

10

11

1.2

20

21

22

23

24

25

Then, I went to the Psychiatric Treatment Unit to get used to being around large amounts of people. If I was around more than six people, I was uncomfortable, because in that unit, for four years or so, there was never more than, maybe, you know, three or four people at a time. And the schooling was stopped at that point, I believe, because they couldn't afford the escorts and all of that.

think I learned an awful lot in that time period. I was around the prison population. I was exposed to the prison.

Found some, partly, when - well, would you like me to explain the disciplinaties, the two quarters?

are pretty self-explanatory. But, for the record, go abead and explain it.

had borrowed a girl's jacket for a reception. And when it came time to be searched, I handed the woman the jacket, and they were in there, you know. And there is not much you could do with two quarters. I think it's pretty clear I wasn't into money and dealing and that kind of thing.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Do you want to say anything about the marijuana?

10

12

14

15

16

12

14.

19

20

22

and seeds on me. at that time. And at that point, I - I was feeling like I really didn't have too much to look.

forward to. I was making, I think, bad judgments in a self-destructive way. I wasn't -- I wasn't making judgments that would have hurt anyone else. And it's taken me a long time to understand certain parts of me. And for quite swhile -- actually, it'didn't really come clear until I was able to talk with the amount of psychiatrists I was in preparation for the second trial, because not only did I speak to them about the case and the upcoming trials, but I also spoke to them a lot about myself, because it became important

to me to understand the different things in me that had led to this situation and my behavior. And I think I get a lot of that influence from my mother, because, like I said earlier, she's into therapy. And she's always encouraged it with me.

For a long time, I thank rather than being able to directly cope with the guilt of what I had done, I would do things to set myself up for self-hurt. You know, like, I would have friends, and then maybe I would do something to where the friendship would become heated and ended. And to me, the marijuana thing was part in that area. After that, I didn't -- I hadn't -- I hadn't been heavy into drugs before the bust. The girl had given them to me, I believe it was, near a holiday. I don't remember when it was. I think the 4th of July. As a matter of fact, I'm not really sure.

10

12

13 -

14

13

16:

17

18

19

20

2.2

2.5

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: It was. It was six months later that you went but?

and, you know, the officer searched me. They were caught, and after that I just didn't put myself around that any a longer.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: All right. Before I get into the clinical information, I'm going to ask the staff if they have anything to add in terms of programing.

MR. VASTUEZ: Yes. I con't think beslie has spoken to the fact that at this point, although it hasn't been finalized, we are working on a college program for her through Antioch --

IMMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

MR. VASQUEZ: -- College. And this has gone alk the way up to the superintendent for review and the whole bit And it's in the balance at this point, to finalize.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Did you receive your A.A. from Chaffey College?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: No, I haven't yet.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: So, you have that to finish.

Antioch -- okay. See, when I came back, I was put into Psychiatric Treatment Unit again. And I assumed that I would be kept there and that I would not be allowed to attend the college programs on campus. So, I worked along with an old friend of our family's, Mr. Glenn Peters, to get an extended university program so that I could keep my education going within the limits of, you know, what I was given at the institution.

At this time, there is also a decision that's waiting to be made where I might be moved to campus soon, which means I would go ahead and attend the courses over here But, in decking it all up. I have one year of school, college

24 :

10

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

22

level, in, with a high-B average. So, that's as far as I've gotten.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Now, is there anything else from the CDG staff, you wish to report on her in-prison activity or programing?

job, that we appreciate how she's handled it, is the confidentiality of the office as our clerk, because she overhears many statements that taff make. The people on PTU proper are aware that she is aware of some things she shouldn't be. And they have initially tried to put some pressure on her to try and get information out of her. And to my knowledge, she has never abused the confidentiality that is demanded with that position.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: (Inmate nods head.)

BOARD MEMBER SIDES; Okay.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: I have a question.

BOARD MEMBER-SIDES: All right, Go ahead.
PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: What is the Antioch

program?

MR. VASQUEZ: It's college courses through correspondence. Because of her restricted movements, she cannot attend educational programs on campus and we do not have an educational program in PTU.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Okey

College, but they do have a branch on the west coast?

MM. VASQUEZ: Right. It would also be a

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: It's a very well respected university in the country.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes. That's what I understand.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: All right. Let's go into the clinical matters now. I'm looking at a psychological evaluation dated 5 --

MR. FITZGERALD: 5/20/71?

10

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: No, way back before that.

MR. FITZGERALD: That was the first evaluation.

. BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Let's see.

MR. FITZGERALD: By Dr. V-i-t-o-a-v (sic).

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: 5/14/71; is that what you said?

MR: FITZGERAŁD: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Okay. 5/14/71. The psychologist is Dr. V-i-t-e-z-s-l-a-v, S., last name, Pi-s-e-s-a-n-n, Ph.D., Psychologist. In his resume

girl Smalley will be a 'right from wrong',

underetunds her present objective eliustion; is adequatally aware of the circulatances which brought this situation about. But she disagrees, radically. The driving force behind her thinking and feeling is a radical, passive-aggressive opposition, camouflaged as non-conformity. her character disorder is not that of a bland and insensitive paychopath. On the contrary, she feels strongly, does not lack empathy, needs group approval to be reassured in her radical opposition. She found all this in the bizarre little subculture she identified with. It is likely that the rationalizing mysticism of the little group of confused LSD abusers somehow matched with her own schizoid trend. It certainly reinforced this trend with ties of collective solidarity.

10

11

12

18

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Leslie still is happy and self-confident.

In spite of the occasional 'voices calling her name', she has no doubt about her sanity and the insanity of the world she rejects. She cannot afford to believe differently. In this sense, the does not know or understand her present subjective, intrapsychic situation. She may be latently psychotia. Since, at this point, the

bizarre and confused rationalizations were weakened or shattered, the paradoxical conclusion appears true: Leslie's continuing identification with the pathological culture of 'Manson's tribe' protects her from a full-blown personal pathology -- psychotic disintegration."

Then, we have a report by Dr. Michael B. Coburn, C-o-b-u-r-n. Staff Psychiatrist. This is October 2nd of 1978. That isn't the right date for that one.

15.

MR. FIT ERALD: No. In fact, it's in '71.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: June 8th of '71, right. And median to read from the mental status part:

with her previously shaved head having grown out into a long crewcut, was fully alert, oriented and acoperative. There was no indication of hallucinations, systematized allusions, or indications of ovent psychosis. There were obvious memory defects concerning the multiple years of drug use, such memory defects mostly due to the fact that it was not part of the group ethics to keep track of time or memory and that, in fact, it was part of the ethic to avoid such 'inconsequential' involvements as with ordered time. She admitted to 'losing a

day to day memory was excellent, and there appeared to be no evidence of organic brain disease. Her affect was inappropriate in that she was superficially smiling, laughing, happy, and cooperative, et cetera, even when talking about the instant offenses and her incarceration. She did have periods where this would drop, and she would appear outwardly as if uncomfortable or depressed, however, she denied being uncomfortable.

(13

"She did admit that she would prefer not to be incarcerated, something the other previously-examined co-defendant in this case (Ms. Krenwinkel) would not admit to or was not aware of. She readily admitted that, although she had no desire at the present to kill anyone, that she would have no difficulty again doing so if she wanted to.

Repeatedly the word 'attention' came into her conversation, once when discussing herself, and discussing a co-defendant and her need to gain attention and maintain her personal identity, and another time when discussing possible motivation in another murder which was brought up by this evaluator. She appeared to have above-awarage intelligence, good day-to-day judgment, as long

, as her belief system was not involved or not necessary to come to a decision."

This is just from the mental atatus section. And, counselor, you might want to, after I finish, make some comments about the rest of that seport.

continuing on, I'm trying to put this in some kinds of chronological order. Moving along, we have a staff psychiatrist, Dr. R. V. Hensley, who interviewed her on 6/14/71. In his psychiatric opinion he states, and I'm quoting:

.24

"This young woman's personality seems more neurotic and not as pathological as her two codefendants. She is having some difficulty in adjusting to her present incarceration and appears to have less energy tied up in the previous group belief system, as time goes on, she may have more overt anxiety and difficulty sleeping and might require some tranquilizing medication. I would rate her violence potential and her suicidal potential as low and, even if she begins to have more trouble, I think this will be more neurotic in nature than it will be bizarre or umpredictable. At the present time, there is no need for psychiatric intervention, and by current standards, she is not psychotic nor brein damaged,"

Then, what is the bace of Dr. Rok sliceoph I dob's report?

WR. FULGONI: May Leth, 1971?

MR. KAY: It should have the date at the bottom.

ECARD MEMBER SIDES: They aren't always correct.

L'11 use that date, \I'm poing to use that date for purposes
of this hearing. I'll use the date at the bottom, May 14th
of '71. Or. Joseph F. Koh, Chief Psychiatrist, made a
diagnosis of drug dependency because of her history of
involvement with drugs.

"She felt comfortable and had no complaints."

She asked, however, for her own clothes. There
was no indication for chemotherapy or psychotherapy
at this time. It is recommended that she be allowed
to wear her own clothes."

I am mainly interested in pointing out the psychiatric diagnosis, which is drug dependency due to her history of

Then, we have a staff psychologist, Lynne Boylan, B-o-y-1-a-n, who submitted this report on 3/20/72. The last paragraph states:

"All in all, Leslie is an intelligent,
emotionally-intact person who is coping satisfactorily with the current situation. It is just
as clear, however, that this degree of adjustment
is made with considerable effort and that

25

10

11

12

14

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

place intense strain on het. She is capable of personality growth and greater maturity, if given a chance. At the same time, the question of security is certainly a major issue. Lealie does not appear to be a danger to herself or others, nor is she likely to provoke danger to herself from other inmates. The degree of risk associated with escape possibility, though, cannot be regarded lightly."

Then, we have a report by Senior Psychiatrist R. L. Flanagan, and this report is for the August 30th -- it's dated August 30th, 1973, and that was submitted for the September, 1973, Board hearing at that time. And in the last paragraph, helpstates:

"At this time, there is no evidence of psychopathology that would warrant inclusion in any
particular diagnostic category. Her intelligence,
perceptiveness, self-discipline and capability of
being truthful and establishing loyal and trusting
relationships are positive prognostic findings."

Another report by Dr. Joseph F. Roh, R-o-h, M.D., Esychiatrist, dated July 12th, 1974, for the September, 1974, Soard hearing, in a discussion, Dr. Roh states:

"This 24-year-old, single, Caucasian female

exprensad on homerous occasions has interest in obtaining an A.A. degree and, finally, B.A. degree, which she wants to start by participating in an English course given on tempus through coopers-'tion of Chaffey College. She further expressed friendly relationship with Mr. Krenwinkel, inmate. She has little complaint about the food service and about her exercises. She verbalized she becomes lonesome at times. This interviewer observed that she was friendizer and more open during this interview, and this interviewer would strongly recommend, if possible, that she be allowed to participate in her English class this fall with aim to obtain an A.A. degree."

Then, we come to another psychiatric evaluation for the 1975 Board, and the diagnosis is drug abuse because of history of use and drug abuse, marijuans and hashish. Both of these are because of history of abuse. Again, the tlinical indicates there is no specific psychopathology during examinations:

I will move on, now, to the 19 -- July 20th, 1976. psychiatric report prepared for the 1976 Board, And at that time, reading the last two paragraphs, Dr. R. L. Flanagat, Psychiatric Consultant, states:

"At the time this woman involved herself in

21

to.

11

12

13

14

15

16

4 17

.18

19

20

22

4

24

afternath which followed the time was the late 1960's. Abuse of psychedelic drugs was widespread and openly advocated by certain factions of the academic community as well as by the community and entertainment media. Value systems were under open assault with rebellion and revolution being openly advocated. These conditions have abbed and paled with the passage of time.

"Ms. Van Houten has disassociated herself from that situation. She has ability and potential and is considered motivated to develop her positive assets. The overall prognosis, in terms of her becoming a productive and contributing member of the community, is considered to be favorable. From a psychiatric point of view, there are no contraindications for parele consideration."

Moving along to the psychiatric report, and Pybelieve, this is the current psychiatric report, dated August 22nd, 1978, the diagnosis:

"At this time no mental disorder."

The prognosis for satisfactory readjustment is considered satisfactory. The recommendations: psychiatric referral is

indicated, because of the nature of the offenses.

In summary, we look at your total incarceration

*

period, No. Van Houten. It would appear that you've handled your incarceration very well. You have had limited progress involvement, because of the nature of your confinement.

INMATE WAN HOUTEN: (Inmate nods head.)

upgrade yourself academically and to get along with staff and the immates. You have had minimum disciplinary problems.

The clinical information available would indicate that you were in a more precarious state as described by clinicians when you came into the prison setting. And it would appear, from the clinical reports, that there has been some progress.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

.24

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Does anybody on the panel wish to make any comments regarding institutional adjustment?

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Mr. DeLeon?

know -- 'going back to your work, if you don't mind, I'll ask this question of Mr. Vasquez. In regard to selecting someone for that position, what criteria do you take into consideration for selecting a person? You say it's a job involving confidentiality of records, I would understand, and verbalization that might occur in the person's presence and so forth. Now do you select that person?

MR. VASQUEZ: There's various factors that are taken into consideration. Naturally, typing skills would be

one. The evaluation of the FIU staff as for as their impression of how she conducts herself with all staff and I peers; does she get along; can she, in fact, convey a message from staff to a fellow peer without entegonizing them this type of thing. And then, does she go around spreading rumors, trying to incite others to do these things and that thing? If all these are favorable, then we call them in. interview them, and lay out the job specifications, expectations, and give her a trial run:

BOARD MRMER DeLEON: Now, does she have access confidential reports?

MR. VASQUEZ: Not per se. There are some things that go through the secretary's desk that I'm sure our tlerks get to see. However, the Central Files, no. They do not have access to that type of confidential information.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: I see. Is she rawarded for · 17 | this assignment?

MR. VASQUEZ: These are expectations, and the supervisor's work evaluation is the only reward she gets. We do not give awards for meeting-expectations. And these # fare our expectations that she has met.

BOARD MEMBER DelEOM: All of her work reports have | been above average?

> NASOURA: She is an above-average worker, yes. MUAND MEMORA DelZON: Now, you also mentioned

22

12

14

3.8

when an instance is placed in maximum security at CIW, say a person having suffered a conviction for a capital offense, now, can that person initiate efforts to take extension courses?

opportunity. Leslie is the first one; and only one since
I have been in PTU, that has taken the initiative and
followed it through with whatever assistance she needed from
our staff, because of her restricted housing.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: She's the only one?

MR. VASQUEZ: To my knowledge, that is housed in PTU, that has pursued this. And this has been in the fire for, what, three, four months, Leslie?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

MR. VASQUEZ: And she continues to pursue it without letting it get her down and saying, "Hey, you know what, the heck with it." She has continued to work on it. And it's a slow process. And she's the only one that I am aware of that has pursued a college course that is housed in PTU.

Treatment Unit is a very unusual housing unit. We house psychiatric cases. We house management-control cases. We house protective custody cases. And we house security cases.

A.C

10.

100

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

I all within the compound of FCU. And it is quite sectic at times, trying in all and do any acudying with some paychistric patient acting up and then staff having to so and defuse whatever the situation is; or some management control case acting up. It's a difficult situation.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: You know, if an immate comes in, you know, say, having suffered a murder first conviction, they would not automatically go in there; would they?

MR. VASQUEZ: No, not automatically. They would be evaluated according to the circumstances. Reception Center does the initial screening. They make a recommendation to the Institutional Classification Committee, who is the superintendent's committee that, again, reviews all the circumstances, interviews the person concerned, and they make the final decision of where that person will housed.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: All right. If a person has, you know, committed such an offense, and they are not going to be housed in PTU, where would they be housed?

MR. VASQUEZ: In all probability, Barn Number B.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: And there would they have a greater opportunity to engage in --

MR. VASQUEZ: Oh, definitely. They are not as controlled. Their sovement is not as controlled, and programing is not as controlled as PTU.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEDE: What is the criteria for

25

15

16

20

keeping a person in PTU? I mean, why is Ms. Van Houten in PTU, and why has she been there?

opinion on my part. I do not know the exact reason. One of the reasons that was given to her, evidently, is security reasons, the notoriety of the crime. If she, or any of her co-defendants were to escape without the institution taking the proper security measures, we would not be doing our job as far as protection of society.

10

11

12

13

17

19

20

22

激素

have had a number of conversations with the various superintendents of this institution over the period of her entire incarceration. And she is in PTU because this is, quote, "a special interest case", unquote, with the Department of Corrections. And because of the attendant publicity, they feel they have to house her in a more restricted area. Originally, she was kept in PTU because they feared for her own safety in the main campus. But, much more recently, they've clearly indicated that they are holding her in PTU -- although there is a transfer now pending to transfer her from PTU to the main campus -- they are keeping her there because of the special interest nature of the case. And they indicate that in the footnotes of some of the reports.

ROARD MEMBER DelEON: I see. Well -

a Psychiatric Treatment Unit, but as the counselor has indicated, there are whole numbers of people that are there simply because the security in that unit is very good. This is -- this is a very easy institution to escape from, generally, this sort of main campus, particularly when inmates are allowed to wear their own clothes. So, it's very easy to escape from. This is sort of a prison within a prison, the PTU section.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: I see. Now, I read in the documentation that you admitted taking LSD when you were in a so-called CIW death row --.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Uh-huh.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: -- type of confinement?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: (Inmate nods head.)

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: What year was that?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: The year I got here. So, '71.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Was that in PTU?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: No, 'no. It was in a different

unit.

. .

19

10

10 ST

12

13

.14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

MR. FITZGERALD: It was in what was the SSU, Special Security Unit. That was really a seath row It was a female death row. It housed the three Manson girls, as well as two other girls under sentences of death. That part of the institution was phased out when the death penalty

was held unconstitutional in 172 and 173.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: I see. Now, you know, I'm bearing in mind that I've seen inmates here who have been here on capital offenses and who did outstanding academic work, you know, ever the years that they were here and obtained a Bacheler of Arts degree and are now looking forward to a Master's.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: I see. All right. Now, you know, at least one psychological report that I read -- and I put them all in the same category, psychologists, psychiatrists --

· INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Uh-huh.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: -- that I read, indicated, you know, opposite another psychiatrist who said -- who was just, you know, full of a great deal of praise -- this one was more reserved, and he said -- I believe it was the second one that you had in your documentation -- he said that absent any return to drugs, you know, and he was referring to the unpredictability of human behavior and of --

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: (Inmate nods head.)

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: -- setting a prognosis of how any person is going to behave in the future, and he said, absence the use of drugs, you know And I look at your history, you know. From the time you were 14 years old, you

21

20

10

11

12

13

14

15.

16

17

22

23

Spalm Ranch, involved in the use of drugs, and then, you know, in to the institution and involved in the use of acid. And then, years later, you know, stopped in possession of marijuana, which is an extremely serious offense. I mean, that's -- if you had a date, you know, sometimes they'll take it away from you. It's a felony, possession of narcotics in prison grounds and so on.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: (Inmate nods head.)

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: And then, the diagnosis of drug dependence that indicates, you know, the history, really. How do you see that?

12

12

16

17

18

19

20

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Well, like I said before, I think the idea of me going ahead and doing that, and, like you say, it was a very serious thing. I think a lot of the idea that I would get involved in that here and everything else was that I wasn't -- I wasn't able to find the ways to cope with what had happened in the past with me. I hadn't -- I hadn't been able to really work out a lot of the things, that were going inside of me subconsciously with in depth discussions with psychiatrists. Like, up until I went out for the trial, the most I would see one would be for maybe an hour once a year. And I think I was just taking out the things that I had done and was not able to face up to -- I would put myself in a self-destructive environment.

and I've come to learn the ways of coping with different things. And I know the -- I know the patterns. before they come on to me, you know. I, uh --

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Don't you feel, or do you

MR. FITZGERALD: I think that's a very good question that you asked. And I think that there is sort of another answer, too, and it's the back part of it. The diagnoses are drug dependence, and I think that what we see in these reports is a progression from being dependent to being independent.

As we go through the reports, some of the earlier ones talk about her being very heavily influenced by her peer group, wherever the peer group is, in prison and so on. But, as the counselor said, too, not only do the psychiatrists see a progression but he is indicating how independent she's become; that, in spite of how difficult it is to study in PTU and to -- she's done it alone. She's become more independent.

So, I think there is always a danger of drugs, and I think we no longer have the drug use coupled with a dependent personality. I think she's developed real initiative, individuality, and independence.

> BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: I see.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: I can honestly say that when

24

23

. 7

10

1000

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

I'm in contact with people that are into it, I find myself very bored with them in general, you know. Like, I don't put myself in the environment where there are people that think, live, breathe, you know, drugs; or, you know, want to pretend they are not here for that reason or be in the whole little subculture within this subculture.

I never even looked for people that I had known or would be able to put me around that, you know, that kind of environment. And, you know, I personally don't feel that I did that because it would have looked bad later. I just don't want it.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: I see.

you know. I don't want to do that.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: I see: I am going back to Mr. Vasquez for just one final question. What influence does an inmate have in initiating transfers, you know, within the institution?

MR. VASQUEZ: An immate concerned in a transfer of another inmate?

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Say an inmate wants to transfer and puts forth a major effort to transfer to the campus.

MR. VASQUEZ: I can honestly say that in PTU, they

73 74

.7

10

2 2

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

```
Nave no influence what specie
                               . (Laurinar.)
                            I MOAND WESTER Delline That's what I wented to know.
                                             MARD WHERE SIDES: Pay I ask a question, Yadas
             TARATOTAG MORKE ANGRES - Surv.
                          TWAT WORKS MEMBER SIDES: Are there any projected plans
             for change of curtody status?
                                              M. VAN EZ: At this point?
                                              MOAND MEMBER (SIDE) Yes.
                                             MR. VARQUEZ: Not to my knowledge. There is a
  13 change or a discussion of a change of housing from PTU to
            MARD MINBER SIDES: So, that would be a change of
            aria de la constanta de la con
                                            Ma. WASQUEL: Bot necessarily. . .
                                            BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Not necessarily?
 *
                                            Ma. Walling floore are people living on campus
 W with along dustody.e
                                    WAND MARKE SUME: On, I see. But the programing
At [will be a little richer, the rehabilitative aspect of the
All the same and
                                          Ma. VASUEL: They have freedom of movement during !
```

2 the daylight hours to involve themselves in any program

🕶 [avallable: da pagesa.

PRESIDENC MEMBER RUSHEN: I have one question.

How long have you been with the institution, Mr. Vasquez?

MR. VASQUEZ: Seven months.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. Is there anything that you want to add to the institutional adjustment, post-conviction factors concerning her activities in the institution that you cannot cover in your closing statement?

something to Mrs. Sides' rendition of the chinical picture.

And I'd just like to point out that as early as August of

'73, the institution psychiatrist, Flanagan, began to see
a definite and positive change in Leslie. And he notes her
intelligence, perceptiveness, self-discipline and capability
of being truthful and establishing loyal and trusting
relations are positive prognostic findings:

And then, more importantly, in the report she mentioned of July of 1976, Flanagan, the psychiatrist I mentioned earlier, saw her as suitable for parole from a psychiatric point of view. He says:

"She has the ability and potential and is considered motivated to develop her positive assets. The overall prognosis, in terms of her becoming a productive and contributing member in the community, is considered to be favorable. From a

34

10

14

15

16

179

18

19

20

- 21

22

2.3

10

14.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

. 20

21

22

23

24

paychistric point of view, there are no contraindications for parole consideration."

I just wanted to make the point that as early as '76, from a psychiatric point of view, the psychiatrist, being fully aware of her commitment for a violent offense, feels that she can be released and be nonviolent and be a productive and contributing member of society.

And in his latest report of August of '78, he reiterates the conclusion of '76 and goes on to actually use that language that she can be a productive member of society. And he does not feel that she poses an unreasonable risk of danger to the community.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. Thank you.

Beore we leave the institutional part, I'll ask the second

person from the institution, from the Records Office, if

she has anything she wants to add.

MS. JEFFERIS: No, nothing at this time.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay.

MR. FULGONI: May I say something?

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Sure.

MR. FULGONI: At this point, rather than get into a statement, I just want to direct the Board's attention to certain statements that seem to pervade the psychiatric and psychological reports, those statements that indicate.

Ms. Van Houten is extremely desirous of group approval. And

don't want, you know, to state what my conclusions are At this time; but at a later time, I'd like to relate these things, the certain behaviors that occurred during the trial, this last trial, the one I participated in, in 1978, for the hourd's consideration.

PARSIDING MEMBÉR RUSHEN: All right. Mr. DeLeon, will you take up parole-plans?

BOARD MEMBER Dellow: Now, you know, your background as a legal secretary and that training which might be, in your mind, not what you want to go into, . necessarily, and your 125 IQ, or what has been reported here as a very high intelligence level and potential, you know, certainly speaks well for job opportunities. You've obviously been involved in counseling -- in reading through the letters that were: submitted -- with young people, sick people. That has, obviously, produced favorable results.

And the difficulty in projecting for yourself, you know; what you might do on the outside or formulating any '& serious plans without @ date in mind as to when you had the freedom or the opportunity to put those plans into effect, 21 you know, considering all on that and the skills that you have, what would be -- or do you have a plan as to what you will do when you go out of the institution into a community setting?

I would live

25

24

12

12

13

14

16

17

with the woman that I lived with while I was out on bond.

Judy. And I would work as a legal secretary for Mr. Doug

Draper. I did part-time work for him before the trial

started.

to the working and the day-to-day routine, which I was starting to get into pretty easily by the end of the six months out there, like running to get the groceries for dinner that night, you know, and getting my time in line to do my laundry and all that kind of thing, I'll go back and continue chool at night until I can get my B.A. But I -- I enjoy secretarial work. I like the part-time work that I did. Typing wills and a few writs and adoptions and all that I enjoyed a lot.

And then, I don't want to sound like I'm on, like, a good-will mission. I would space out in the right kind of way with counseling, you said before. I did a little of it with -- one of my girl riends is a P.E. high school teacher. And a few of her students that were having problems, we'd get together and talk about, and the results were pretty good. And that made me feel, really, like I was doing something constructive. But I would do it on a small scale and on a personal scale, and very quiet scale so that I, in that way, I think I would feel like I'm putting back a little positive for a lot of negatives.

about living at my mother's just because if anyone wanted to find me or something. I just feel like I may be subjecting her to too much pressure. But where I live would be close enough that I can see her; I think, at least a couple times a week talk to her regularly, like I did when I was on bail. Mostly, I would just continue the way I was when I was out on bond, only not going to court every day but working:

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: Do you -- do you feel that the notoriety that you've received, you know, in regard to the commitment offense and the circumstances following the trials, and so forth, do you feel that this would interject itself into your personal life?

11

14

警覧

.. 21

22

24

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: The only -- the only way I could see that is if I ended up, say, you know, in a few years from now as some sort of a credit card thing, you know, where I would go to the market or to the store. I think only when confronted with the name and the face is it a problem, because the whole time I was out, it never came into -- into play in any way. People were very kind to me. I was kind to them. They had -- they had no idea who I was.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: I understand. Society's reaction to you, as you're referring to it -- and that's not what I had in mind -- I would agree with you. But that would not be a significant problem. What I was alluding to is

opportunities, writing opportunities, and things of that nature that would present themselves, because of your background and your position and your experiences. That might have an influence on plans and might have an influence on the stability of, you know, what you are relating to now, living with a friend and working, you know, a 40-hour-a-week job and counseling. Do you feel that that would be something that would create a problem?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Well, I don't -- I mean, you know, I have been presented with a lot of different -- I know what you're saying -- becoming, like, kind of a sideshow.

And, no, I wouldn't. Like I say, the only thing I will ever do would be talking to -- well, where I feel I'm the most benefit, like is talking to girls that have the similar makeup that are at the turning point of 16 or 17 years old that are starting to experiment. And, like, I would rather do that on a very personal basis. I wouldn't -- I den't -- I don't feel myself looking forward to large lectures or --

BOARD NEMBER DeLEON: I see. I have no further questions.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN; I think that's -- yeah.
PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN; All right.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: What kind of family support

do you have?

ENMATE VAN HOUTEN: Complete and total:

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Are you getting visits from
family?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes, I do.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: And who -- what is family to

youl

12

12

15

16

17

100

19

10

21

22

23

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Uh, my mother, she visits every week, has, and we are very, very close. My father lives in Washington. I don't see him as much, but we are also very close. It's -- it's a different kind of relationship.

MR. FITZGERALD: Brothers and sisters.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes. I have two brothers and a sister. And my two brothers are married.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Any contact with them?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes, yes. Uh-huh. They don't

visit as much, but --

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: When you say, "Yes," what do you mean?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes, they visit. We write.

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Visit. I see.

IMMATE VAN HOUTEN: I don't see them as much as my mother. I never have through the whole thing, seen my

family, the other members, as much as my mother, but that's because they are living their own lives. We are in contact.

Their love and their support is constant and is with me and has, you know, never -- when the case first broke, it was hard on my younger brother and sister, because it completely destroyed their high school lives. But they don't hold that against me. Our family works together. It's a very tight unit, and --

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: So, you have family wisits and some correspondence with your family.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: Okay.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. We are going to break for lunch at around 12:30 and come back for the closing statements. I would like to spell out some things that we will be concerned about and counsel may want to address that in his closing remarks. The D.A. may want to address it.

Of course, the thing that makes this crime, sort of, is a lot of people have said the crime is the presence of a person by the name of Manson who somehow, some way, gathered around him those people who were capable of going out and randomly killing people. Now, what we will be addressing in deliberation is what factors do we have to consider that will support a finding that Ms. Van Houten will not, upon release, by some unfortunate circumstances, find herself in the company of someone who wants to do something

else. That really will be the crux of what we will be discussing.

Stay away from drugs. We really know that that's not as easy as it sounds in this work. We have been around a long time, and that's one of the things that really will cause us some problems in trying to deliberate.

your relationship with the other people in the family. That's the Manson family so-called. Now, so you might want to address that when you return.

And we would like to hear some expression from you as to, number one, why you think you did it.

12

13

14

15

17

.18

19

20

21

22

23

24

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: (Inmate nods head.)

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: And number two, how you would avoid it in the future. These things will be discussed when we come back from lunch.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Okay. There was one other thing that I didn't mention on plans for when I got out.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: But I assume that, should I ever get far enough beyond parole, there would be a stipulation automatically, but I would definitely see a psychiatrist regularly. And when he would think that I no longer needed to see him, I would see a psychologist.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN. Okay.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Like I said, I'm almost positive that would be part of it.

MR. FITZGERALD: We would agree to that as a condition, a special condition.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: But I would want that, and I talked with one of the psychiatrists during the trial about that.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. We will break at 11:30, and we will reconvene at --

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: 12:30.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: I mean, 12:30, and we will reconvene at 1:30.

(Thereupon the noon recess was taken at 12:30 p.m.)

-000-

16 17

10

11

12,

13

14

15

18

19

20

46

22

23

AFTERNOON SERSION

case of Ms. Van Houten. All person previously identified are now in the room, with the exception of Mr. Jimenez. The time is 1:40 p.m., and we are at the phase of the hearing for the closing statements. And we will ask the D.A.'s office from Los Angeles County if it will make its closing statement.

MR. KAY: Okay, Thank you. As most of you know, I have been involved with Ms. Van Houten and this case for quite some time. And in weighing all the factors -- and I must say there are a lot of factors to weigh in this case, more than with the other defendants -- but on balance, it is my recommendation that Ms. Van Houten at this time be found unsuitable for parole for the following number of reasons:

brutal murders where innocent victims were killed in the privacy of their homes. These victims were complete strangers. I think that's important. And I think that's probably the main reason that this case has shocked the public conscience so much, because people tend to think that they are safe in the warmth and security of their homes. And they don't expect to have people come in and for no good reason -- and there was no good reason in this case. -- just brutally

ė

carve them up like pieces of meat.

Another factor was there was excessive sufflation.

Mrs. Labianca was stabbed 42 times. Ms. Van Houten, by her

own admission today, she's mentioned two numbers, 10 to 14

stab wounds - she said 10 once and 14 another time - that

she inflicted herself on Mrs. Labianca.

The motive, as I stated in the opening remarks, is very bizarrs. The motive in and of itself almost makes it an unreasonable risk to society to parole someone that has believed and accepted this Helter-Skelter motive, because it's so bizarre. And if they've done it and accepted this type of motive at one time, what is there to indicate that they can't accept something similar or bizarre at another time?

Mr. Fitzgerald, I thought, made a very good point. He said, well, Mrs. -- or Ms. Van Houten is very much a follower. And the Board expressed interest in Ms. Van Houten and how she falls in with a bad group and would she do that again. Well, I think her whole history has been that -- and she had a good childhood, a good upbringing. She is very intelligent, but she always tends to fall in with the bad group.

In high school, here she is a class officer and homecoming princess, really has it made so to speak. And yet, she falls in with a fellow that's taking drugs and a

18.

admission on cross-examination, the other kids in her high school were not taking drugs. This wasn't a situation that you might think, well, gea, everybody's smoking marijuana or taking LSD. No, she sought these people out and fell in with a group and even, as she said today, she had gone with a group that was different from her high school group, not even the location of her high school.

free she goes to Sawyer's Business College, graduates in the top of her class as a Certified Legal Secretary. Again, you would say, gee, she really has it made an intelligent girl. She'll go out and get a good job. And yet, she drops out of society and takes up with Bobby Beausoleil, who -- I know the Board is aware who Bobby Beausoleil is and the fact he has been convicted of Gary Hinman's murder. Although he wasn't a murderer at the time she took up with him, but this, again, is the type of person she fell in with. And Beausoleil became her boyfriend.

And then, from Beausoleil, she goes and falls in with the Manson family. Even when Manson is preaching his antisocial philosophy and Hitler and killing people, she falls in with him. And at the time of the murders, who is her boyfriend? None other than Tex Watson, who is the actual murderer of most -- I mean the actual physical murderer of most of the victims in the Tate-LaBiance homicide.

much a follower. And her choices that she makes are not the best choices. Even with her background; with her education, the choices always seem to be bad. And the people that she falls in with, even though she's exposed to good people, she tends to take up with the me'er-do-wells, so to speak.

Mer drug abuse is well documented in her file:
She, again, as I stated, she took -- went into drugs when,
really, it wasn't a big thing in her high school. She kind
of thought it out, and has always -- in this period with
SRF now, after she took drugs in high school, the marijuana
and LSD, then she joined the Self Realization Fellowship, and
she was off drugs for a period of about a year. But she
left the organization and went back to taking LSD within a
period of two months. And on cross-examination, I asked her;
"Well, why did you do this after this drug-free period of
a year?"

And she stated, "Well, I felt more comfortable with hippies that take acid, LSD, than I did with straight people. I didn't relate to straight people."

That's another consideration that the Board should have, and, of course, the marijuana in prison and the LSD in prison. Again, it always seems to come back to the drugs.

Ms. Van Houten may be very sincere in wanting to stay away from drugs and saying, at this point, that she's going to stay

that, that that's really going to -- going to eppen. I would hope that it would happen, and I would hope that she's sincere and that when things get tough that she won't turn back to the drugs. But that, the marijuana in prison, which is a serious offense, is somewhat troublesome.

I think another factor that the Board should consider was the kind of callous and extremely willing participation by Ms. Van Houten in the murders: expression when she found out about the Tate murders that she was unhappy that she didn't get selected to go in the first group of murders, and that she hoped that if they went out again that she would get selected to go if they were going to kill anyone else; and the fact that she stated on crossexamination that she weighed, for two days, the question of whether or not she could kill anyone, and decided that she could and that she wanted to join this conspiracy to commit murder before Charles Manson ever asked her to join the conspiracy; also taking food from the refrigerator, from the victim's, after the crimes and eating it or at least drinking the chocolate milk, which she has stated today and which she admitted to Dianne Lake, testimony that was entered into ... one of the trials about taking the chocolate milk: also. that she was very much in control of herself at the time of the murders, contraty to some of the things that - or at

10

11

12

13

14

• 16

17

18

19

21

least the impression that she's given today. She wiped the fingurprints. She burned evidence after she got back. She was not under the influence of drugs

Another point which I think we have to consider

is the views of society. Society, of course, views this

case as at the top of the spectrum of crime. There is no

question about this. In the eyes of the public, this is the

crime of the century, so to speak.

Now, Ms. Van Houten has some friends that she's met while she has been in prison and out on bail. And they've written some nice letters for her, which is nice. But that was not society in general. That's a small group of people that are friends of the family or friends of her girl friend or people that have met her and liked her work in prison.

15

17

18

-20

21

23

has significantly, I think, spent just over the minimum amount of time for first degree murder, because they are eligible for parole after seven years. I think time is a very important factor in Ms. Van Houten's case. I think she is in a different category than Krenwinkel, Atkins, Watson and Manson. I see her in a different category, and I hold out some hope for Ms. Van Houten that at some time she will be suitable for parole. But my own opinion is, at this particular time, in view of the nature of the crime, all of the factors that I have some — that I have gone through. I.

in my opinion, I just feel it's an unreasonable risk for society at this time to grant Ms. Ven Houten parole.

MR. FULCONI: Thank you. I came to this case much later than Mr. Key, as a matter of fact, in late 1977. And with respect - I don't want to add enything more to the facts of the case other than adopt what Mr. Kay has said myself.

What I'm concerned about this case, about Ms.

Van Houten, is whether or not, as I stated in the letter I sent to the Board, she's the kind of person that really has fundamental morals that are part of herself rather than the kind of person that goes out into groups of people, whether they be formal groups or informal, and then adopts her values from whatever source that benefits her interests. And I stated in my letter that I we evidence that she is manipulative, that she does not have the kind of internalized moral sense that I would like to see before I would recommend for the Board -- from the D.A.'s office, that she has a parole date or be found suitable for parole.

Shared Shared

I mentioned that a couple of the jurors thought she was trying to manipulate them by looking over and smiling at them excessively. Not that a defendant on trial for murder shouldn't put on a good face for the jury. That's not what I'm talking about. I'm talking about excessiveness in this regard.

She was being overly friendly. That sating. That may not mean anything in and of itself, but the moment I started cross-examining the psychiatrists and they were being put in an uncomfortable situation, all this friendliness ceased immediately.

The same way -- statements have been made in her letters that she does not show emotion in front of the jury, because that's private. She doesn't show remorse. Yet, there was one time in the 1978 trial when she did show a form of remorse. She commenced crying. When was it? Not when the murders were described; not when any of the horrible circumstances of this crime were gone into, but rather when Mr. Kay was embarrassing her main lay witness on crossexamination, Paul Watkins. Those things that seemed to bring out the emotion are those things that are unfavorable to her.

1 1

17

Now, I agree with Mr. Kay. There are a lot of favorable things to be said about her. And I want to concentrate on some of the negatives, because I think that she is not what she appears. She may be, and I don't purport to be a psychiatrist and psychologist. I am a layman, and what I've got to say is a result of watching her and applying that to 45 years of living. That's all it is. But even the psychiatric testimony in court in her last trial, one of the

paychiatriata mentioned the rather internal-external value

scale, that she appeared on that scale as someone who looks

to other people for her values. Now, this may fit in very

well with a defense when defense is diminished capacity.

But, when you apply that same standard to whether or not she

has the kind of internal morality that would function well

on the putside when all these supporting people, that are

supportive now because she is in an uncomfortable situation,

start falling away, as they will, then what do we have? Do

we have someone who may return to drugs? If she returns to

drugs, according to, I believe it was, Dr. Coburn, then we

don't know what we are dealing with.

Again, I don't want to seem unduly harsh, because
I do think that she should be evaluated. But I don't think
she should be evaluated by someone who works inside the
prison. I think she should be evaluated by a competent
professional selected by joint agreement, by ourselves and
the defense, and evaluated over a long period of time and
give her whatever tests need to be given, whatever observation
need to be made, focusing on that one issue, not whether she
exhibits the external manifestations of rehabilitation, but
going down to the core to see whether or not Leslie Van Houten
is somebody who can function outside the spetlight, function
without drugs, and without the supportive groups.

15

16

19

20

22

7.4

Even today, I think we've seen some evidence of her

that the reason she called Tex Watson was for the purpose of getting a man with a bigger knife; because it wasn't working, Patricia Krenwinkel was not able to stab Mrs.

LaBianca effectively. So, she went out to get him for that purpose. Today, she states she went out to get him and doesn't recall why. Now, that's my recollection of what she said here today.

- 5

control of Charles Manson, and that's why she did all these things. Yet, very clearly in her testimony, which Mr. Kay sent to you, before she even met Manson, she decided not only to join the family, but to call her mother and tell her mother that she was dropping out, that she was to consider her as a dead person. That's not something that Manson could possibly have produced. And by the way, this was only a couple of days after she had met Bobby Beausoleil. So, he could not have had that kind of influence, unless there is something fundamentally unstable there. And yet, we get all those glowing reports.

I submit that she is capable of functioning very well within an institution. And the reason she is is because she knows that within the institution she can be benefited. I may be wrong. I don't know what your procedures are and what is possible. I would ask that semehow the case be

continued until such a determination can be made: And if that cannot be done, I would suggest that the Board find her unsuitable for parole at this time so that the matter can be taken up with, really, the kind of penetrating information that we need in this case and I'm afraid we do not have.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Thank you. Counselor?

MR. FITZGERALD: I'd like to answer a couple things brought up by the D.A., and then I'll address myself to the areas in which you wanted some comment.

happened 10 years ago. We are here at a lifer hearing.

There is no question at all that Ms. Van Houten was convicted of murder. She is now almost a 30-year-old woman. This happened when she was 19 years of age. This happened in August of 1969.

one of the criteria the Board uses in determining suitability -- and it's an important criteria*-- is whether or not the individual has some previous history of violence. Is this a pattern of violence? We know that before 1969 there was no pattern of violence. And after this act, these acts in 1969, there has been no institutional violence. There is not one thing in the record that would indicate that she has been violent with another inmate, that she has displayed anger or hostility toward snybody, none whatever.

PATERS MARTHAUN REPORTING CORPORATION

These acts, as Dr. Coburn said -- the men they referred to -- he said that he considered these incidents in her life to be isolated. And a lot has changed in 10 years.

Mr. Key referred to this as the crime of the century. Well, that's ludicrous. The only person that ever referred to this crime as the crime of the century was Mr. Bugliosi, who Mr. Fulgoni referred to in his letter as the author of the very self-serving book, Helter Skelter.

6

Ţ

10

15

12

13

14

16

19

20

21

22

29.

74

25

This case received such prominence, such national prominence, because of America's peculiar sort of love affair with violence. And it just turned out that this case had all the tintillating, interesting things that sell newspapers and sell television programs. It had sex, and it had violence, and the people killed were movie stars and so on.

I've essentially been practicing criminal law for 15 years and have represented a number -- literally almost a hundred people charged with murder. And I know you people on the Board have experience, and you have seen people come before you who have committed enormously more important crimes than this. We have all seen more hideous, more sadistic, more senseless crimes. This crime was senseless, but I venture to say that 75 percent of the people that come before you have committed, essentially, senseless crimes.

Ray or Mr. Fulgoni, asid that some time in the future, she may be suitable, or at some time in the future she may be cligible. And they refer to glowing reports. Somehow, all the good that Leslie's done to change her life and to become independent and to become a nonfollower, somehow all these glowing reports are suspect, because they are glowing reports. Somehow, they want you to believe that it would be better, or you would be better off, if you had in front of you the picture of a girl who had numerous institutional problems, who didn't demonstrate remorse, who the psychiatrist didn't say was suitable to be released and not a danger.

Interestingly, the material in your very file, the file of the institution, is the strongest statement in Leslie's behalf in terms of suitability. And these are not people that are easily manipulated. The staff here at CIV is in the business of convicts, and they know all the convicts' games. They know all the manipulations. They know all the tricks. They are very, very wary. It is ludicrous to suggest that Dr. Flanagan, an institutional psychiatrist who saw her ever the years, had available to him, not only her over the years, but had available to him the staff recommendations, the people who watched her on a daily basis, sometimes an hourly basis.

It's ludicrous to assume that some psychiatrist will

manipulated. There have been not one psychiatrist, not two, not three, not four, but your very records indicate that there have been about eight different psychiatric evaluations of this young woman. And they all say essentially the same thing, that she is not a threat, that she is not a danger.

Mow, this is about being a follower, and addressing myself to one of the problems you want to hear something about, is this problem: How can we be assured that this won't happen again? Now, Mr. Kay suggested that because this happened to begin with, it's likely to happen again, that because she did this, we can never be sure that she won't do something like this in the future. Well, first of all, we can never absolutely predict human future behavior. We can't predict, and the standard set by the Community Release Board, or by the Legislature, is whether she poses an unreasonable risk. And they also suggest to you that because of her brightness, became she is so bright, because she is so smart, that her will was really not overborne by Charles Manson.

I'd suggest that unfortunately, what happened to Leslie Van Houten had more to do with the personality of Charles Manson than it did with her personality as a follower. And as an illustration, consider for a moment the horrible

killed their own behavior their arms. And I don't think
that anybody would suggest that any of the survivors of
that herrible thing would be likely to go through that thing
again. Tragically and unfortunately, there are some people
in this world who can exert horrible evil influences over
somebody. And I think that's the situation in Leslie Van
Houten's case. But it's happened to her, and she knows now
what the Charles Mansons are like. And I think that she's
better equipped to resist that kind of influence in the
future than somebody who actually hadn't had that experience.

But, in terms of her suitability, the very people -- and unfortunately, we can't be all things to all people. We can't be lawyers, Board members, psychiatrists, staff members, all at the same time. We're got to trust in the judgment of many of these people who we set out for these things. Now, the staff here has had hundreds of years of accumulated experience in dealing with convicts. And psychiatrists here see a very skewed and sort of odd portion of life. They only see people in here who are antisocial. And they see recidivism constantly. They see people coming back in here who have committed crimes in the past. As a result, they are very hardnessed, callous people who are very resultant to the future. They are people who are years are people who are years people who are years are are ye

to come back. They take a very pessimistic, conservative view of humanity.

that have been made on her behalf. Not only does Flansgan, as early as 1976, say that she is eligible, or that there are no psychiatric indications of future contact -- or future conduct. Others as well, Dr. Pollack -- you don't know much about Dr. Pollack, but he's a very experienced and very well respected, conservative member of the faculty of the medical school of the University of Southern California, who wrote a letter urging the judge to give her probation saying that he didn't have much faith in her when he first met her in 1971, and neither did Dr. Coburn, but they saw a dramatic change. And he's not a fool, either. He says, I think, in the back end of his report, at the very end, he says he has finally seen somebody who has been thoroughly rehabilitated, somebody that's made a dramatic change in her life.

Although it's only been touched on very briefly, it's a terrible stigma to have gone through the last leyears as a Manson girl. They were housed separately. They were deprived of many of the privileges and benefits that other inmates had. And it was extremely difficult to outlive that and outgrow that with everybody constantly reminding these girls of their horrible crime and so on:

But, despite the hardships, despite the limited

APPEND PURINCIPAL DEPONDENCE COMMUNICATION

privileges, she's really done - has undergone a tremendous transformation. She has rehabilitated herself. And she's done so in a very realistic fashion.

one of the things you can consider in determining suitability is the concrete, realistic plan for the future that an immate might have. And I know from reading portions of newspaper accounts of the Community Release Board remarks about Patricia Krenwinkel, that they felt her plans for the future were not realistic. I remember reading an article that said something about she told this Board that she wanted to go to work in the earth sciences or something, and one of the Board members commented or was quoted as commenting that they thought that her plans for the future were not realistic.

V

Į4

Well, in terms of Leslie Van Houten, I mean is a sort of rhetorical fashion. I might ask you: How many people do you see that come before you that have her intelligence? How many people do you see that come before you that have such concrete, fundamental employment skills? How many people come in front of you that go right out into the job market? How many people come before you for parole consideration who really have no place to go; they don't have a family; they come from horrible environments, just virtually running to their home suvironment is unbealthy? How many people have a family that cares about them? How many people have a family that cares about them? How many people have a constellation of friends that would raise

\$200,000 in half. Now many people come before you who have actually been dut in the community for six months, as she has on half, with no recurring crime problem or anything like that? How many people do you have that deal with you as honestly and whatever?

And I beg to differ with Mr. Fulgoni. She hasn't been manipulative with you. You received a letter, I believe from Mr. Max Keith, an attorney, who suggested to you that she was the reverse of manipulative, that she was really, in fact, honest to a fault. And you saw that here this morning. You didn't go in in depth in your questioning concerning the two offenses here, the possession of 50 cents and the two marijuana cigarettes. She asked you if you wanted an explanation, and she explained it. And she told you, not only did she have two marijuana cigarettes in her pocket, but she told you she had some seeds in addition. I think she's been very candid and very open.

15

17

18

发布

Now, in terms of her drug use and whether or not she is going to go back to the use of drugs, one of the things that I think you wanted answered, all I can say is that we are dealing with a different person. Not only are we dealing with a changed person, we are dealing with an adult rather than a child. We are dealing with a 30-year-old rather than a 19-year-old. And as she's pointed out, we are almost in the 1980's, and the 1980's differ dramatically from the 1960's.

Sha's an older, more mature, much more aquared-away worsh whose horizons, believe it or not, have been dramatically expanded.

How would we know that anybody is going to go back to drugs? I guess I gave the best enswer I could think of to Mr. Deleon this morning when I suggested that she's not the dependent kind of person that this drug dependence developed out of. She's not the kind of person anymore: She's now independent. She's seen other sides. She has been, I think one can say, relatively drug-free for the last 10 vears.

I can remember when she was admitted to the Sybil 13 Brand Institute, the county jail in Los Angeles, When the jury verdict came in and they took her to Sybil Brand, she knew she was coming back to the California Institution for Women. She knew that she was going to be placed back in prison, and she didn't think she was going to be convicted. Remember, her second trial, the jury was almost equally divided, seven to five. Seven people on that jury, two of. whom wrote letters to the judge, seven people felt that in 1969 that she was -- .

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Five.

2 9

15

17

19

20

22

23

MR. FITZGERALD: Five in 1969 was -- really severe problems that made this less than a first degree murder. Despite the fact that it was a Manson girl in a Nauson case, seven of these jurges said manulaughter. She didn't think she was coming --

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: "Five.

MR. RAY: No. five.

10

11

12

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

to five. Seven for first degree murder, five for manslaughter.
When she was an her way back and she was admitted to the county jail, and everybody there, as everybody here, liked her, they told her that they would take her back to the hospital and tranquilize her, if she wanted. They knew what a shock it was. And she turned down the tranquilizer.

I don't think that she's interested in drugs. I don't shink that's the kind of future that she wants. She realizes the pain and sorrow, particularly that it caused her family and second, her. Also, in terms of the drug use, we have the same problem with almost any inmate. How do we know that somebody with a drug history won't go back to the use of drugs? Well, all I can suggest is that there be a special condition of parole that she undergo frequent and periodic and non-noticed testing for the use of alcohol or for the use of narcotics or dangerous drugs, that there be a special condition of parole that she be intensely supervised, and that there be a special condition of parole that she cooperates in an approved program of outpatient psychological or psychiatric care, structured so that the

therapist responds directly to the parole supervioling agent
if there should be any indication of drug use or any
indication of any decompensating mental process.

persons in the Manson family, she's going to talk about that with you herself. But from my point of view, she has absolutely and totally severed any contact with any members of the Manson family. She is not any longer enamored of Charles Manson or what remnants of his family still exist. For your own sort of curiosity and information, it's my point of view, and I've been involved with the Manson family since 1969, there really is no Manson family anymore. And that is another aspect that is interesting.

There have been many Manson people that have passed through this institution and have been paroled. We tend to think only of Leslie Van Houten, Patricia Krenwinkel, and Susan Atkins, but the oldest member, the member that was in the Manson family the longest, was a girl by the name of Mary Brunner, who was Manson's wife and bore him a child and was the first member of his family to pass through this institution and was paroled. And she has a background strikingly similar to Leslie's. She had a graduate degree in library science and was working at the University of California Library at Berkeley when she first met Charles Manson.

.20

the proceedings this morning, another Manson family member, passed through this institution some time ago and was paroled. Brenda McGann, also a Manson family member, passed through this institution and has been paroled. And these people have not returned to this institution. So, I don't think that we can say once a Manson member, always a Manson member.

I don't think that +- well, strike that.

Do you, at this time -- I mean, assuming that -- do you want me to address, to assume for a moment that you were going to find her suitable, and then address the problem of where she falls in the matrix, or do you want me to address that --

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: You don't have to make that assumption, but I would suggest that you make a statement as & where you think she should fall.

MR. FITZGERALD: -- because my understanding is that

I'm not going to get an opportunity to talk again, that's all

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: That's right. This is

20 | 1t.

10

12

-13

4.

15

16

17

19

23

24

WR. FITZGERALD: So, I might as well. Okay. As I we set out in my papers here, beginning on page 13, I take the position that under 2282 Subdivision (a), that she falls -- and where she falls in the matrix of base terms is in Section (b). And I take that position because, although I agree

that the's got to fall under Roman number lill, because there was no prior relationship with the victim and her. I agree with that. But I contend that she falls under the column indirect act with mitigation, thus a base term of 11 years.

Circumstances were indirect and that the victim died of causes related to the act of the prisoner, but was not directly assaulted by the prisoner with deadly force in that a crime partner actually did the killing. And I think we've got to resolve that doubt in her favor. Mr. Kay says he can't prove it one way or the other, and the standard I think we ought to really use is is it clear -- no question that she assisted, that she aided in the commission of this offense and that she was involved with the killing of Rosemary LaBianca -- but I think we have to take the position that she was not a prime mover in the death!

12

14

15

16

17.

1.8

19

22

23

247

The autopsy surgeon's testimony, the pathologist's testimony, was that the fatal wounds were caused by a five-and-a-half inch blade. That indicates the death was really due to the bayonet wounds that were inflicted by Mr. Watson, which parenthetically he thoroughly agrees to in the publication of his recent book.

Secondly, the autopsy pathologist testified that there were numerous superficial wounds that amounted only to that, and that they were post-mortem, that they were inflicted after docth, and they were in the area of the body indicated by Ms. Van Houten. So, I think that in absence of a clear demonstrable showing that she actually assisted materially in the cause of death, she has to fall into that category.

Next, under Section (2), I suggest that the prisoner perticipated in the crime under partially excusable circumstances, which do not amount to a legal defense. What I have in mind here is that there was a considerable — the whole issue in the second and third trials of Leslie Van Houten was her mental state. And unfortunately, we are stuck with the verdict in the final case, but that's not to say that there wasn't considerable controversy on both sides as to' the mental state of Ms. Leslie Van Houten. Also, even the foreman of the jury who convicted her stated publically to the press that he thought there was some diminished capacity, not enough to relieve her from responsibility, but they believed that she wasn't, in 1969, the woman she was today.

W. W.

So, I think that this Board can take that into consideration in setting her time, that, I think, that if it wasn't for the strong male domination influenced by the -- the influences of Charles Manson and Tex Watson and her drug use at the time, that these acts would have occurred. I don't think that you can say that even if it wasn't for Charles

Manaon: these pumple would be dead today. I think the clear answer is that if it wasn't for Charles Manaon, they would be here today:

It's not Lealie Van Houten who developed the theory of Helter Skelter. And so, I suggest that that's mental illness tantamounting to insanity at the time of the oftense.

Also, under Section (3), I think Leslie had no apparent disposition to commit the crime, but was induced by others to commit it. And under number (5), the prisoner has the minimal history of criminal behavior, as well as number (6), that the prisoner was a passive participant and played a minor role in the commission of the offense.

14

15

14

12

19

20

22

22

I don't mean to minimize the offense. We've got some people that are dead here that are never going to be able to be brought back to life. I recognize that, and I don't mean it in any sense of justification. But I think when you compare her role -- and that's the term the CRB uses, "role" -- when you consider her role in these two killings, her role is minor compared to the major role played by Tax Watson and the slightly less major role played by Patricia Krenwinkel.

That concludes my remarks. Leslie, would you address yourself to three things: Number one, the relationship with other people in the Nanson family that you currently

have, and then, two, would you give some expression of, if you can, why you committed this offense, and number three, how, if released on parole, you can avoid committing similar offenses in the future?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Should -- I don't know where
I should start. Should I start from --

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Start with the relationship with the other family members.

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

27

23

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Right. Now, the only communication I have with any people that I knew then are Pat and Susan. And that's -- I'm housed in the same unit they are, and it's got a population of about 45. So, we see each other often throughout the day.

The relationship is friendly but distant. I relate to them like I do most of the other women on the unit -- courteous enough to make it through, but, you know, not personal.

other than that, I'm not in touch with anyone, and I left a notice in the mailroom that I would not receive. notes or messages that a young girl sometimes sends around. She used to send them to the courthouse, too, from Charlie. So, I haven't had any contact in that area at all.

That's where I'm at with the Manson family and where I'll stay. Of course, it will be more distant if they move me to campus, because there I won't have to be in a

close bousing situation with Pat and Sugan.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN, Okay.

Invall VAN HOUTEN: In looking -+ in finding why
I ended at Spain's and went to the house, it's something I'm
-- the more time goes by, the more I find hard to believe
I did it, myself. But I can't help but feel that a lot of
it was the times, early 60's. I don't agree with the person
that testified that when I got to the ranch, Charlie was
talking about killing people. He was talking about killing
our own egos, but that's -- you know, I don't know if I
should discuss the things that I differ with that I differed
with in the trial or not, but I don't remember going to the
ranch and falling in love or admiring a person, that sat
around and did nothing but talk about Hitler and killing
people. I remember a man who talked a mixture of Eastern
philosophy and loving our fellow people in the acid reality
that was very different from everyday life functioning.

And the longer I was there, the more removed we became from other people to the point where, when it seemed that the war was going to come to a great bolocaust, that It was believable to me. And I believed in Charlie very, very much. I believed --

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: I couldn't bear that. What did you say?

INMATE VAN . MOUTEN: I believed in Charlie and what

25

-

10

v 11

13

增爆

15

16

18

20

L

22

23

he said. And when he asked to could we mill for our brothers, meaning to free the world of its had kares, I thought about it, and I thought that I could. I, uh, I don't think until I was actually stabbing Mrs. Labianca in the back did I feel the animal beastliness that came out.

f (Innate crying.)

16

10

22

that, I covered it up really quickly in my mind. After that, I believed it was the right thing and to help, you know. I'm not saying that now, because the case is over. It's the way I felt and what I believed in. And in my dealing with it and talking — and talking with the psychiatriars, it's been those kinds of things that I've tried to learn about myself and understand why I would become so vulnerable to another person and what they believed in.

I don't ever imagine myself even bedonging to the healthiest of organizations again. You know, you learn and I certainly have made efforts to understand myself, what pure me there, because I'm deeply ashamed of it. And the longer I go on, sometimes people would say to my mother when she would come to visit me, how much I had changed or, you know, as the years went on. And she always said that she didn't so much as see it as a change, but she saw it more of what I went to when I was in my younger years in high school. And that's how I think I see it too.

The just relocated byself in relating to people and in the prefronment that I am comfortable with. It's not convicte and you know, heavy drug dealings, or -- I don't know how to explain the environment. But I has, it's -- you know, I a not comfortable with that.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: One final question. When be said, "Could you kill to save the brothers," what brothers were you talking about?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Well, the whole world, kill to save your brothers and your sisters, meaning the whole world that no one knew but ourselves and that they didn'to know what they were doing.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay. Now, go back a little bit slower, because I'm missing something. He's saying that he wants to know if you can kill to save the world.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yeah,

10

12

13

15

16

19

ZŽ.

24

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: From what?

I had ve, I probably -- the idea was that the world was killing itself. It needed to be cleansed through this holocaust that would happen:

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Uh-huh.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Andowhat we were going to do was start it. So, we were saving the world by destroying it

but, I mean, how, that makes sense, but in those days, I never fallowed chrough any of the ---

PRESIDING MÉMBER RUSHEN: To its conclusions.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yeah. I never followed through on what it was about.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHER: Okay, What about the drugs? Why do you think you --

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: I think that if there would ever be a question, it would be marijuana. I have no doubt in my mind whatsoever I would never deal with a chemicaltype drug or LSD, any -- actually, anything like that. My only concern would be the marijuana. And I can honestly say, to me, that that particular high isn't -- when you get down to the level of marijuana smoking, it seems to be a thing that I never spoke badly against, one that I always thought, 16 Mell. I've taken a liberal position on it! But I -- if I were shows the opportunity, I would never blow it on, you know, daze guanat : I wouldn't: I'm not -- I wouldn't have the slightest concern in my mind about LSD.

You know, that one person. And when they knew who I was, you know. "Oh, do you want some acid?"

[No." And it wasn't even a battle And I told be in my mind of yes or nothing anything. I never sew the person again. I've gone through too much to get my head back.

20

19

13

22

Estain, I never was around. Nowners, I wasn't around. The other -- the uppers were experimental at the time period.

I'm not - I think knowing that I could have a therapist that I could see, and having the support that I do have, that, I don't think, will diminish. You know, I think my family will be by me now or in the future as much as they have been. I - more than losing people through my incarceration, I have gained new friends that are healthy and they are good, functioning citizens. And I treasure too much being around people that aren't of the nature where I always have to wonder what their motives are or what their - in other words, when I was on bail, I was able to be around an anwironment that was not drug-oriented, and I was very comfortable there. And I found that the people enjoyed me as much as I enjoyed them. And that's the environment I would put myself in.

I have no intentions of seeking out any person that I would have the slightest doubt in my mind wasn't living according to the standards that I hot only know would be asked of me, but that I want to live in.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay. Mr. Deleon?

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: I only have one question. Do
you feel of you step out into society tomorrow, into that
setting, with your ability, your personality and skills, that

if you were created to totally abstain, despite society a feelings of butlook on, say, a drug like -- or on a sind-altering substance like marijuana --

INPATE VAN HOUTEN: Uh-huh.

BOARD MEDISER DeLEON: -- that it would be no problem to abstain in today's society where it is everywhere

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

差量

24

25

BOARD MEMBER DelEON: -- if, in your position, the orders were that you were to abstain?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: If I was told not to be around it, I wouldn't be around it. I know that's easy to say, but, believe me, if I ever -- If I ever was told that I could get a parole, I wouldn't -- I wouldn't do anything to violate it. And I know that that's true.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: There are many people who feel that mind-altering substances are all the same, whether it's alcohol or mark juana or drugs.

INMATE VAN MOUTEN: (Inmate nods head.)

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: And that they -- the danger of, you know, using one greatly strengthens the possibility of using another, you know, and so forth.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Uh-hoh.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: You feel that you could control that?

INVATE VAN HOUTEN: Yes. . My father has been a

DECOMINATE TOWN DRIVE SHIPE THE

years. And he and I have talked about that a lot and the addictive nature and staying away from it. And if that was the stipulation, I wouldn't -- I wouldn't be anywhere around it. And whoever had asked me, I would tell them that I wouldn't be around them, either.

I would feel that strongly, and I feel my friends would be sensitive to that and wouldn't give me those alternatives.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: I'd like to ask one more.

Do you feel at this point that you have availed yourself of your time within the institution to the maximum insofar as preparing you for a life outside the institution, or outside a structured setting?

of locked-up situation that I have been in, I think that I ve used every opportunity I could to prepare.

BOARD MEMBER DeLEON: All right. Nothing further.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Mrs. Sides?

BOARD MEMBER SIDES: I don't have anymore questions.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: We will recess at 2:40.

We will clear the room.

10

14

15

19

19

20

.21

24

(Thereupon the room was cleared; and the Hearing of the Community Release Board was recessed for deliberations by the Board.)

ERSINFTICAL OF PROCERDINGS

....

TEXTIDING NEMBER RUSHER: The time is 3:55. All the persons previously essembled in the case of Leelie Van Houten are present in the room with the exception of Mr. Jimenez.

have tried to the best of our ability to weigh all of the factors. And we have come to the conclusion that we are finding you unsuitable for parole at this time on the basis of the following reasons:

Number one, the gravity and the nature of the offenses have not been outweighed by the prisoner's minimal criminal history; her positive institutional accomplishments; her psychiatric diagnosis of quote, "no mental illness", unquote; and her excellent support plans for parole.

12

16

17

18

10

21

23

24

The panel notes that the prisoner had above-average social experiences in gaining recognition at a most crucial time in her life -- the impressionable high school years.

She was homecoming queen, class secretary, and belonged to the choir, and enjoyed all of the advantages. This was not enough. She sought out and encountered negative associates and influences.

The panel is concerned that a person possessing the intelligence, education and background of the prisoner

brutal killing at random of insocent victims. Society has no defense and is helpless in utilizing any form of profession in this type of crime, except to isolate the responsibles from society.

This is not to say that you will not earn a parole date in the future. Historically, society has taken, under various -- has taken risks under various rules and released prisoners. Such risks may be taken at an earlier date when the motivating factors are understood or originate with the prisoner, for example, murder for revenge, for profit, for heat/of passion. These murders did not fit into any of these categories.

out and the bizarre means used for the most illogical reasons, coupled with the uncertainty of your ability to sustain your rehabilitated gains over a period of time, the panel feels that it must observe you longer. And we must have more time before we can project a parole date.

Do you have any questions about what we mean?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: No, I understand what you're saying. But you will observe me? I mean, there is hope at some time?

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Yes.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Okay. That's all I needed to

13

15

16

17

18

19.

20

21:

22

landw.

are that you remain disciplinary-free; that you continue your academic upgrading; and that you participate in available self-help programs. We realize what your situation is here. We don't know whether your housing will be reduced or not, but whatever is available to you, participate in it, and don't give up hope.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: I won't. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Any comments or

questions?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. I've got a question. You're denying the parole date on the basis of the gravity and nature of the acts and the motivelessness of it. That, essentially --

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: And -- \$

MR. FITZGERALD: -- I take it is your position?

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: And the history of the prisoner's behavior. Would you like for me to go a little further with that?

MR. FITZGERALD: Right. I mean, because it seems quite illogical to take into consideration - 1 mean, she came from a --

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN. All right! Let me explain everything. We have a young lady who, in high

24

10

11.

12

14

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21.

chaol, achteved what most high school people went. And that's recognition, you know, homecoming queen.

Mr. FITTHERALD: Princess .

PRESIDENG NEMBER RUSHEN: Princess, popular, that's a big thing in high school. It give we status. It feeds the ego. She was in the church choir. She was doing all the things that, usually, young people find rewarding.

She heeded something else. She sought out associates and went into drugs. At another point in her life, she decided that that was not the way to go. She goes into -- what was it, Self Realization?

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Fellowship.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: She straightened up her act: She gets herself together. She goes without drugs. And she goes into school. She graduates with honors. She goes back into drugs. Ultimately, this pattern leads her to the murders.

She has now had eight years of good behavior up and down, but in a rather restricted setting. What we are saying is that, because she has gone in and out of these phases, we want a longer period of time of successes before we project a parole date.

as to what you mean by "longer time"?

PRESIDING NEWBER RUSHEN: No. She will be reviewed

AO

9 1

12

12

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

again next year

49

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

. 22

23

24

25

very many positive things you're doing and positive progress and considered, you know, many factors that really are really encouraging to you and to your progress. And I think that you are -- you have a lot of things going for you. If you can utilize them in the right way and put them all together, I think that there is a great deal of hope.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: I feel that. I truly feel that. And I appreciate it.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Good luck to you.

INMATE VAN HOUTEN: Thank you very much.

MR. FITZGERALD: But I can't help but feel that she's really getting a rougher shake than she would if it didn't have the name Manson attached to it. I've represented people who are in this institution who have committed more heinous crimes than this. I have represented many people who received earlier parole dates.

I just can't help but feel that because of the public indignation that surrounds this crime and its notoriety that she is going to have a very difficult time ever getting out, because when I look at the record, I just can't see anything more that an individual could do to achieve a parole date, you know.

PRESIDING MEMBER RUSHEN: Well, she has -- if you're

```
eatlafled with the findings, adminave appeal
                    ware concluding this hearing at 4:05%
                 sey good luck to you, for have a chance.
              LINEATE VAN ENTEN.
              Maria Trucker
                                Trank von
               (Thereupon the Hearing of the Community
              Release Board in the Matter of the life
              term parole consideration for Lealie
              Van Houten was adjourned at A:05 p.m.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
```

24

18

19

20

2)

23

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

CERTIFICATE OF SECRETAIND REPORTER ...

I, DIANN M. HOLMBACK, a Gertified Sworthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a distinterested person herein; that the Moregoing Community Release Board Hearing was reported in shorthand by me, Disne N. Holnback, and theresizer transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorned for any of the parties to said hearing, nor in any way interested in the outcome of said hearing.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 27 day of February, 1979.

Quan He Holakack

DIANG M. HOLMBACK

Certified Shorthand Reporter License No. 4022

19 20

12

14

15

. 16

17

18

21

22

23

24