

1 INITIAL PAROLE CONSIDERATION HEARING

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

3 COMMUNITY RELEASE BOARD

4
5 In the Matter of the Initial)
6 Parole Consideration Hearing of:)

7 PATRICIA KRENWINKEL)

CDC Number W-8314

8 ORIGINAL

9
10
11
12
13 CALIFORNIA INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN

14 BOARD ROOM

15 FRONTIER, CALIFORNIA

16
17
18
19
20 MONDAY, JULY 17, 1978

21 2:37 P.M.

22
23
24
25 CATHY A. SINGER
C.S.R. License No. 3252

I N D E X

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

Page

Proceedings	1
Recess	47
Resumption of Proceedings for Findings of Board	87
Adjournment	90
Certificate of Reporter	91

PROCEEDINGS

--OO--

1
2
3 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: This is a life parole
4 consideration hearing for Patricia Krenwinkel, CDC Number
5 CIW-8314, and we are at the California Institution for Women
6 on July the 17th, 1978. The time is 2:37 p.m.

7 It will be necessary for us, Miss Krenwinkel, to go
8 around the room and identify ourselves, everybody here, for
9 the purposes of the record. I will start, we'll go to my
10 right. When we get to you, if you will spell your last name
11 and give your inmate number.

12 My initials are R.V., last name De Leon, capital
13 D-e capital L-e-o-n and I'm a member of the Community Release
14 Board.

15 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Ruth Rushen, R-u-s-h-e-n,
16 Board Member.

17 MR. DEL PESCO: Robert Del Pesco, D-e-l P-e-s-c-o,
18 Hearing Representative for the Board.

19 MR. KAY: Stephen Kay, S-t-e-p-h-e-n, K-a-y, and
20 I'm a Deputy District Attorney for Los Angeles.

21 MR. GILBERT: Dana Gilbert, G-i-l-b-e-r-t,
22 attorney for the Defendant.

23 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Pat Krenwinkel, Krenwinkel
24 K-r-e-n-w-i-n-k-e-l. My number is 8314.

25 MR. DUENAS: My name is Ralph C. Duenas, D-u-e-n-a-s.

1 I'm a staff representative, CC-1.

2 MR. GILBERT: Before you start, may I ask a
3 question of the Board?

4 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Yes.

5 MR. GILBERT: Okay. In the confidential case
6 record that you examined, at least the one that we looked at,
7 certain confidential items were deleted from the record
8 for our examination. Did the Board read and consider these
9 confidential matters? I'm referring specifically to a
10 document which I signed, Central File Examination Requested
11 by Attorney of Record which is a list of approximately five
12 deleted items which indicated they were deleted from the
13 C file. It had to do with medical reports, psychological
14 examinations and the like.

15 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Yes, that same
16 inclusion is found within the reports that the Panel has
17 reviewed and none of the confidential records are included
18 in our reports. Where it states that they are in a separate
19 file, we did not review those.

20 MR. GILBERT: Okay, fine. The reason I was asking
21 was, because --

22 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. You
23 were referring only to this. I think we would need to check
24 these other four. I'm not sure about the psychiatric reports.
25 This one is one I think we were discussing.

1 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Now, if a report or a
 2 comment is included in our record, it is not confidential,
 3 if it is included as a part of our record. There are
 4 statements, documents in our folder that state, that allude
 5 to confidential information which is not included within
 6 this folder. Now, as to the interim medical report dated
 7 4/3/72, I have to go back over the record again to see if
 8 that is included. And I'd ask my fellow Panel members to do
 9 the same thing.

10 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Give us just a minute.

11 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: 4/3/72 and the
 12 psychological report of 5/24/71.

13 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Counselor, did you get a copy
 14 of the cumulative summary? That would be the inclusive
 15 dates of 6/29/71 through '78?

16 ~~MR. GILBERT:~~ I have one dated 6/29/71 and I've
 17 got one running through 5/1978.

18 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. I think the
 19 quickest way to do this is just, let's start. You have
 20 page two that starts with "circumstances of the offense"?

21 MR. GILBERT: Yes.

22 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. Then, you have
 23 the CII report?

24 MR. GILBERT: Yes.

25 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: And you have the face sheet

1 dated 7/20/71?

2 MR. GILBERT: Yes. Oh, right.

3 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. Then, you have
4 "Social Evaluation," dated 7/20/71?

5 MR. GILBERT: Which consists of five pages.

6 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay. One, two, three, four,
7 five, all right. And then, you have a page nine called,
8 "Custodial Evaluation"?

9 MR. GILBERT: Right.

10 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: And then you have Exhibit D,
11 "Notice," page ten and eleven?

12 MR. GILBERT: Oh yes, I have that.

13 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. And then you have
14 Exhibit D, "Notice," page twelve, thirteen, and fourteen?

15 MR. GILBERT: Yes.

16 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: And then you have a
17 "Psychiatric Evaluation" and the date on the bottom of the
18 page is 5/14/71 and the number is fifteen? The number of
19 the page is fifteen and in parenthesis one?

20 MR. GILBERT: Yes, that consists of two pages.

21 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: All right.

22 MR. GILBERT: By Joseph Roth. I have a "Psyche
23 Evaluation," dated 6/7/71 consisting of --

24 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: That's pages what, Counselor?

25 MR. GILBERT: Seventeen through twenty.

BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: All right.

MR. GILBERT: Four pages dated by Michael B. Coburn, M.D., and I have a "Psychiatric Evaluation" one page in length, dated November 21 by R.V. Hensley. I have a "Report of Superintendent," page twenty-two and "Report of the Associate Superintendent," page twenty-three, and "Report of the Chaplain," page twenty-four.

I have a "RGC Staff Recommendation," page twenty-five. And then, I've got "Social Evaluation," again on page twenty-six through thirty. And then, I've got a "Psychological Evaluation," pages thirty-one and thirty-two, an "Interim Summery," dated 3/31/72. And I've got another "RGC Staff Recommendation," pages thirty-three, thirty-four, and thirty-five.

BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Okay.

MR. GILBERT: "Total Evaluation," page thirty-six and "Annual Report," page thirty-seven, "Report to the Board on Terms of Parole," page thirty-eight, and another "Psychiatric Evaluation for the Full Board," pages thirty-nine and forty. Another "Report to the Board on Terms of Parole," is September of '74, page forty-one and forty-two. And another "Psychiatric Evaluation," July of '74, pages forty-three and forty-four, and another, September '75, "Report to the Board on Terms of Parole," page forty-five and forty-six. And then I've got another "Psychiatric

1 Evaluation," dated August 28, '75, pages forty-seven and
 2 eight. Another "Psyche Evaluation," July 21st of '76,
 3 forty-nine, fifty, and fifty-one. And another "Report to the
 4 Board of Parole," September '76, pages fifty-two and
 5 fifty-three, "Psychiatric Evaluation," September, '77
 6 calendar, and that's two pages in length. Another
 7 "Psychiatric Evaluation," dated May 18th of this year. No
 8 page date, but it appears to be two pages in length. And
 9 then, the last thing I have is a "CIW Release Board Apply
 10 for Hearing," page twenty, no page.

11 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Then, on the other side, you
 12 have the letters --

13 MR. GILBERT: I have a letter from Chief Davis,
 14 a letter from Charles Older, a notice to P. Fitzgerald, two
 15 notices to him. One to Chief Davis, one to another P.
 16 Fitzgerald, another to J.P. Busch. I've got what looks like
 17 sentence information, showing a need to set a parole date of
 18 2/16/77, minimum date, I guess.

19 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Parole date MEFD?

20 MR. GILBERT: That's two pages. I've got a "Parole
 21 Decision" which consists of two pages, three pages, excuse
 22 me. And then, I've got another what looks like --

23 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: What went on at the hearing?

24 MR. GILBERT: Yes, then two pages, I've got some
 25 typed "Evaluation, Appearing Staff Representative," which is

1 three pages, a notice that something's been removed from the
 2 file dated 1/27/75. One of those, and I've got an
 3 "Evaluation of Hearing by Staff Representative," dated
 4 9/7/73, two pages. I've got an "Evaluation," three pages.
 5 And another "Evaluation," and then I've got a document,
 6 "Parole Board," dated June of '76.

7 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: What was that, Counsel?

8 MR. GILBERT: I've got a document to the Parole
 9 Board, dated --

10 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Is this by way of statements
 11 and/or recommendations, Section 120301?

12 MR. GILBERT: Right. That's one page. And I've
 13 got another letter, two pages, from Stephen S. Trott, Deputy
 14 District Attorney. A letter from Tom Bradley, consists of
 15 two pages signed by Daryl F. Gates. A letter from Sheriff
 16 Peter J. Pitchess with an attached news release. It consists
 17 of a total of four pages. And I've got what looks like a
 18 Sheriff Buckingham --

19 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Do you have the Probation
 20 Officer's report?

21 MR. GILBERT: Yes, I have the Probation Officer's
 22 report, eleven pages.

23 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, he has
 24 everything that we have with the exception of this one
 25 portion here and he may want to speak to that. That's it.

1 MR. GILBERT: The reason I ask this is because,
 2 when I signed that, it was with the knowledge of the fact
 3 that there were five things pulled out of the C file and
 4 were looked at. By counting the number of pages that showed,
 5 indicating that things had been pulled, it came out to about
 6 twelve. And I was just wondering where the other seven or
 7 eight, what were they that were pulled out? I looked through
 8 the C file that she had and there were these documents that
 9 said note, something has been pulled out of your file
 10 because it was deemed to be confidential. And it's not even
 11 listed on that document. And I was just trying to determine
 12 whether or not you actually received it or not.

13 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Well, it appears that
 14 everything that we have, you have.

15 MR. GILBERT: Okay, fine.

16 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: And we've reviewed the
 17 file and there do not appear to be any problems or contra-
 18 dictions with the exceptions of the one, this portion of the
 19 incident report which we will show you that we have. You
 20 state here, portions of incident report dated 1/28/77 deemed
 21 confidential due to the security of the institution. You
 22 have that report, Mrs. Rushen?

23 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Yes, this is this report,
 24 but the report is favorable to your client in that, there was
 25 no evidence connecting her with the incident. But the nature

1 of the report is such that it would not be safe for other
2 inmates nor your client to see it. But it is not prejudicial
3 towards your client.

4 MR. GILBERT: Thank you very much.

5 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Now, Miss Krenwinkel,
6 this hearing is being conducted pursuant to Penal Code
7 Section 3041 and 3042 and the regulations of the Community
8 Release Board governing parole consideration hearings for
9 life prisoners will prevail at this hearing. Now, the
10 purpose of today's hearing is to consider your suitability
11 for parole. Now, it's necessary for us to conduct this
12 hearing under revised procedures established by the Legisla-
13 ture effective July 1st, 1977 which are applicable to all
14 prisoners under a life sentence.

15 We will be considering the nature of the crime
16 which committed you to State Prison, your criminal history
17 or lack of it prior to your commitment to State Prison or
18 to the incident that led to your commitment to State Prison,
19 and then we will reach a decision as to whether or not you're
20 suitable for parole, and if not, why. Also if you are found
21 suitable, why you are found suitable, the length of your
22 confinement, and we're going to cover that, and the specific
23 factors leading to the determination of the Panel, why we
24 made the decision.

25 Now, the hearing is going to proceed in the

1 following manner. I am going to review the preconviction
 2 factors, the incident that led to your conviction, the crime
 3 that led to your conviction. And Ms. Rusher will cover
 4 postconviction factors, everything that you have done within
 5 the institution. And you know, that is important to us in
 6 making our decision, every facet of your postconviction
 7 activities. And Mr. Del Pesco will cover your parole plans
 8 that you might have and how you have prepared yourself for
 9 that and all factors surrounding any parole consideration.

10 Now, there's no need to consider the incidents
 11 or discuss the incidents that did not involve a conviction
 12 or that were dismissed for whatever reason prior to the case
 13 that brought you here. There were no convictions for these
 14 other incidents as you know. Now, we have a Deputy District
 15 Attorney present from Los Angeles County, and what we're
 16 going to do, this is not an adversary hearing. And we will
 17 not permit this hearing to develop into an adversary hearing.
 18 And so, we will permit the Deputy District Attorney to make
 19 a statement, whatever you would like, at the beginning and
 20 then at the close, before counsel for Miss Krenwinkel makes
 21 his final statement. But you will have the duty to make the
 22 final statement. Now is that satisfactory, Counsel?

23 MR. GILBERT: Yes, sir. May I ask a question
 24 before we proceed?

25 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Yes.

1 MR. GILBERT: Okay. I'm not that familiar with
2 some of the rules and regulations, but I was under the
3 impression that there had to be a two-weeks written notice
4 before a District Attorney can appear and be heard.

5 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: It is a policy of the Board
6 that we give two weeks notice if possible, but we also have
7 the right to reserve whether to let the D.A. in if that notice
8 has not been given. When were you notified?

9 MR. GILBERT: I was notified over a month ago.

10 MR. KAY: Who was notified a month ago?

11 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: No, when were you notified
12 that the D.A. would be here?

13 MR. GILBERT: When he walked up and said, 'Hi, I'm
14 the D.A., this afternoon.

15 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: We're sorry about that.
16 That can happen in these cases. We're all just getting
17 started, Counsel, and we'll do our best.

18 MR. KAY: I might say for the record that I was
19 notified last week about the hearing on Susan Atkins which
20 is to take place after this hearing today. I called out to
21 Frontera to ask them what time the hearing would start and
22 they said it would start as soon as Patricia Krenwinkel's
23 hearing was finished. And I said, we didn't even receive
24 notice that Patricia Krenwinkel was going to have her
25 hearing; and at that time, I said I would like to attend that

1 hearing. And he told me where it would be and here I am
2 today. So, I found out last Wednesday, I believe it was,
3 about both hearings.

4 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: We apologize to you, too,
5 Counsel, and we hope that this matter will get straightened
6 out.

7 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Now, Miss Krenwinkel,
8 did you receive notice of this hearing thirty days ago?

9 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, I did.

10 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: And did you receive
11 notice within the last twenty-four hours, or twenty-four-hour
12 notice that the hearing would be today?

13 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, I did.

14 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: You've had adequate
15 time to prepare yourself?

16 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, I knew this hearing would
17 be held. I was just given notice only about five days ago,
18 though, of my attorney, and I had no idea that Mr. Kay
19 would be here at all. So, I had no -- you know, I was not
20 I'm not prepared for that. I spoke with my attorney
21 yesterday and today. I mean, yeah, Saturday and today. But
22 I was only really given notice from my attorney who said
23 that he was going to represent me five days ago.

24 MR. GILBERT: Some of the statements we're making
25 are obviously for the record. We're prepared to proceed at

1 this time.

2 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: We have one to make for the
3 record. The law was not changed until, I believe it was
4 effective July 1 to allow your counsel to represent you
5 today. So that's another reason we're all in the process
6 of just getting the forms and everything rolling. It's a
7 new law.

8 MR. GILBERT: Well, I understand that. I have an
9 objection that the rules say that the people will be
10 notified at least a month in advance, obviously to give them
11 time to submit documentation for your consideration; and some
12 people have. I'm wondering whether that gives an unfair
13 advantage to one side, the prosecution, because they are the
14 same people that were involved in the original trial, given
15 a shot at least a month in advance to put in their two
16 cents worth. I realize there's no rules governing such.
17 And then, counsel for the defendant comes in at the last
18 minute and is faced with basically this problem. And I
19 wonder if it's true and fair to the defendant to allow this
20 stuff to come in. You know, all these considerations were
21 supposedly made at the time of the original sentencing. And
22 in this case, it's been over eight years ago. There's no
23 indication in any of this thing that they have any recent
24 knowledge of what's going on. And all this sounds like, you
25 know, it's pretty much standardized responses. So we feel

1 that it would be unfair to our client.

2 Also I might make a point that, in this
3 particular case and this is just to make a point that,
4 apparently somehow the word's gotten out that there is an
5 infamous or famous person being heard today, because the news
6 media now, like bloodhounds, are hot on the trail. And when
7 I first got into this thing, there was no mention of trial
8 by media or anything like that. But apparently now, the
9 news media is, in fact, picking up on this hearing. And I
10 don't know whether or not they've contacted you or not. I'm
11 just concerned. I feel the Board should deliberate uninflu-
12 enced by what may or may not have happened in recent or far
13 distant past or because of the fact that my client happens
14 to be somebody who the newspapers happen to make good press
15 over. At least one person has made a small fortune on it.

16 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: All right. Let me try
17 to address those issues one at a time. The responses from
18 the District Attorney and the Judge are very familiar
19 documents to all the Panel members. We receive documents
20 and sometimes, as you say, the content of the document would
21 appear something that might be applicable say, twenty years
22 before. Say the incident had occurred twenty years before
23 as in some cases that we have or twenty-five or even thirty
24 years before, and we have those type of responses from
25 Judges and District Attorneys. And you also receive a copy

1 of the same document that we receive. And the Panel gives
2 these documents and statements therein, I believe, the
3 weight that they deserve. You know, with consideration,
4 as you say, of the fact that they are long removed and they
5 do not have access to all of the materials, and, you know,
6 the postconvictions factors and so on, and staff records,
7 custody records, institutional documents and so forth, and
8 the facts that the Panel has available to it. But we take
9 it in its weight and we give it the weight that we feel
10 that it deserves in the prospective of the entire totality
11 of all circumstances that prevail in that particular case.

12 We've had no reports and no concern with the news
13 media. I have heard of -- I personally have heard no
14 interest, and I will ask my fellow Panel members if they
15 have been approached or heard any discussion. I have heard
16 nothing by any media whatsoever in regard to this case, I
17 was not aware that we were going to hear this particular
18 case today, and gave it no consideration. And it will be
19 evaluated in the same manner as any other case considering
20 the circumstances involved and all other factors.

21 MR. GILBERT: I understand.

22 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Does the Panel have
23 anything to say?

24 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: I don't have any comments.

25 MR. DEL PESCO: Counsel is looking at me for a

1 reply. I also heard nothing. Yours was the first time that
2 I heard about the news interest. And in fact, I was told
3 before lunch, trying to get our cases ready, that our case
4 after lunch was Krenwinkel. And frankly, I didn't even
5 associate it. It was just another name. And I started
6 reading the file and I realized who it was.

7 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: That's true. I also
8 heard the name and it didn't mean a thing to me until I
9 started reading the file and then I thought it was related
10 to a particular case.

11 MR. GILBERT: Thank you, sir.

12 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Now, we will go into
13 the preconviction factors. All the preconviction factors
14 deal with the murders involved. And so ordinarily, I would
15 have you make your statement prior to going into this. But
16 I do not see the necessity for repetition, if there is some
17 repetition. So we will go into this first, and then you may
18 make your opening statement. And then, you know, your
19 closing statement later, after we've gone into the precon-
20 viction, postconviction and parole considerations.

21 Now, Miss Krenwinkel, in the case that brought you
22 here, you were convicted for the killing of Abigail Folger
23 which occurred on August the 9th, 1969 at 10050 Cielo Drive
24 in Los Angeles, and involved the deaths of Abigail Folger
25 with multiple stab wounds, Wojciech Frykowski, gunshot in

1 the left back, multiple blood forced trauma to the head.

2 MR. GILBERT: Could you spell that for the
3 reporter?

4 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: He was also stabbed.
5 First name spelled W-o-j-i-c-i-e-c-h; last name
6 F-r-y-k-o-w-s-k-i.

7 Count Three, the killing of Steven Parent,
8 P-a-r-e-n-t with multiple gunshot wounds.

9 Count Four, killing of Sharon Polanski,
10 P-o-l-a-n-s-k-i, multiple stab wounds.

11 Count Five, the killing of Jay Sebring,
12 S-e-b-r-i-n-g, multiple stab wounds.

13 Count Six, Leon LaBianca who was killed on August
14 the 10th, 1969 at 3301 Waverly Drive in Los Angeles, and
15 died of multiple stab wounds to the neck and abdomen.

16 You were convicted of Count Seven, the killing of
17 Rosemary LaBianca who died of multiple stab wounds to the
18 neck and trunk.

19 And Count Eight, you were convicted of conspiracy
20 to commit all of the above offenses.

21 Now, in the case involving Abigail Folger, you
22 chased her out onto the front lawn where you caught her and
23 stabbed her twenty-eight times. You and your crime partner
24 Van Houten, in the case of Rosemary LaBianca, took her into
25 a bedroom, and you stabbed her while your crime partner held

1 her. In this case, you stabbed her forty-one times while
2 your crime partner held her to the floor. You went into
3 the other room where Leno LaBianca was dying where you
4 plunged a fork into his stomach. You then carved the letters
5 "War" on his stomach. Now, using the victim's blood, you
6 wrote "Death to all pigs," the words "Helter Skelter," the
7 word "Arise" on the walls. Then, you and your crime
8 partners which included a man named Watson and a man named
9 Manson and Van Houten all showered, ate a meal in the
10 kitchen before leaving the residence.

11 Now, would you like to comment on that incident?

12 INMATE KRENWINKEL: On any of the inaccuracies that
13 I --

14 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Yes, any inaccuracies
15 or corrections or whatever.

16 INMATE KRENWINKEL: All right. With Abigail Folger
17 I chased her out onto the lawn and I stabbed Abigail Folger.
18 How many times, I couldn't tell you. But at the time I
19 left her body then, I went and I called Tex who went back
20 over to the body and stabbed it then, too.

21 And as far as the LaBianca house, when I was in the
22 bedroom with Miss LaBianca, I stabbed Miss LaBianca a couple
23 times at which time she fell to the floor and again, I went
24 out and Tex came back in. Because at that time, the weapon
25 that I had would not work. I mean, it was not established.

1 So I went and I called Tex and he went into the bedroom then.
2 And I'm trying to remember, there was something else. I did
3 not write "War" on the man's stomach. Tex did. I did take
4 the blood off his stomach and I did put the fork into his
5 stomach and I wrote the words on the wall.

6 MR. GILBERT: When you left LaBianca, was she still
7 alive?

8 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes. When I left the room and
9 went for Tex, Miss LaBianca was still alive. And when I left
10 Abigail Folger, she was down on the ground, and I would not
11 know at that time if she was dead or not by my, you know,
12 by my actions. I don't really know. I do know that Tex
13 also entered that.

14 I'm trying to remember if there was anything else
15 in particular. Yes, the only -- when I was in the Tate house,
16 the only person that I came in contact with with my weapon
17 was Abigail Folger. And any other time, I did not give any
18 kind of injury to any person there.

19 PRESIDING MEMBER E LEON: Were you under the
20 influence of drugs when this occurred? In the first incident,
21 were you under the influence of drugs?

22 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, I had taken acid. I had
23 taken acid probably the day or so before and it's hard to
24 explain what, you know -- I know it goes into the same thing.
25 It's kind of difficult to explain that the prolonged use of

1 the drug, and it's not -- when you are continuously taking
2 it at certain times and continuing with it and you never
3 have a time to really come down, and it's not so much that
4 it's just the constant influence of the drug but that you
5 never really -- as long as you keep a certain feeling and
6 you never relate to something different, then you kind of
7 maintain that same pattern or that same feeling. And there
8 was definitely use of LSD.

9 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Counsel, we can't hear you.

10 MR. GILBERT: Were you under the influence of a
11 drug at the time of this incident?

12 INMATE KRENWINKEL: No.

13 MR. GILBERT: Okay. Did you have any flashbacks?

14 INMATE KRENWINKEL: I don't think it was a matter
15 of a flashback because there was no -- at that time, there
16 was no back to. It's hard to explain.

17 MR. GILBERT: Were you hallucinating at the time?

18 INMATE KRENWINKEL: I can say this. I would give
19 the whole incident if, in looking at it at that time, is
20 very much under the same kind of visual perception and
21 hearing that you have under complete -- like, what they would
22 say at, like almost a climax or a high point of acid where
23 it's a distortion of many things. It either brings things
24 out or the movement or the motion or a certain kind of
25 feeling. That was definitely at that time. But that was

1 happening.

2 MR. GILBERT: Was there a second incident? Were
3 you involved in it?

4 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, I was not under the
5 influence of any drug the second time.

6 MR. GILBERT: Did you actually take part in the
7 second incident?

8 INMATE KRENWINKEL: My participation in that was,
9 as I was explaining is that, I was in the room and I stabbed
10 that woman while Leslie held her. I left from that room and
11 I went and I called Tex.

12 MR. GILBERT: Okay. But, was this two separate
13 incidents, two separate physical locations?

14 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes.

15 MR. GILBERT: I'm talking about the second
16 physical location now.

17 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes.

18 MR. GILBERT: Were you involved in that?

19 INMATE KRENWINKEL: That's the one I was in the
20 bedroom.

21 MR. GILBERT: Oh, okay, fine.

22 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Now, what was there
23 about your participation in these incidents that would make
24 any similar occurrence, or would make these incidents not
25 repetitive occurrences? You were not under the influence of

1 drugs when you committed these acts. What are the factors
2 that did prevail then that, in your opinion, could prevail
3 again or could never be repeated? You know, the causes, in
4 other words, of the incidents.

5 INMATE KRENWINKEL: All right. My personal feeling
6 and I believe that it, of course, could never be repeated.
7 I don't think anything like that could ever happen again.
8 But the situation that developed into that situation was
9 something of a kind of -- well it was like two years of
10 completely alienating myself from any -- it's hard to find
11 words -- thought patterns or a certain way of living, certain
12 mores, certain feelings that are instilled in someone
13 probably from the day they are born. Those certain things,
14 through the process of drugs, through the process of having
15 someone who -- like -- all right, to bring up Charlie, he
16 was someone whose opinion or, I guess, would be opinion or
17 his direction, that I would accept as being totally correct.
18 I would follow that. Now, what happens is, when you get
19 more than -- when you don't have anyone to say that's not
20 happening and you have more people doing the same thing,
21 more people saying okay, that's correct, then you pick it
22 up and you emulate it. It was like taking one -- I don't
23 know.. It was like making popcorn balls or something. You
24 start and you build. And each time, and there's nothing
25 that ever comes to break it apart. There was never any

1 wedge that stopped it. And each thing reflected upon the
2 other, keeping that whole together.

3 It was at least two years of myself of being
4 involved in a total change of, I guess, philosophy, whole
5 way of thinking that just started gelling and continued to
6 grow.

7 MR. GILBERT: If you were walking out of this
8 institution and let's say, a week later, somebody had the
9 same magnetic personality and you went back into a commune,
10 and two years later coming back and killing another twenty
11 years. What's to prevent that from happening again?

12 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Well, I know they could
13 certainly never involve me.

14 MR. GILBERT: Why?

15 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Because I know. I see how
16 that happened. I do not look to someone to give me my
17 thoughts.

18 MR. GILBERT: Are you saying that you can step
19 aside now and divorce yourself mentally from the emotional
20 acceptance that you're talking about here and say hey, wait
21 a minute, this is wrong?

22 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Certainly. I mean, it's a
23 whole amount of growth that, at that time, when I was
24 nineteen years old, I had not really at any time ever been
25 forced to make a decision in my life for myself, and I found

1 it very easy to let someone make my decisions for me
2 continuously. I had never really had any faith in anything,
3 any of my own abilities to learn those lessons that tell you
4 your own yeses and your own noes, the things that give you a
5 whole, that give you the real strength to make your
6 decisions just even -- just in your everyday life, to know
7 this is what you want and this is what you do. I had not
8 tried anything.

9 I lived in maybe -- when I look back, when I go
10 back through myself and I see just the opening and the
11 wish and the want just to have someone that all of a sudden
12 can take you and tell you, all right, this is the way things
13 are going to be and this is going to be all right. The idea
14 to want to believe in a fantasy or believe in a whole lot of
15 things because the looks of the things around you, you don't
16 seem to be able to cope with them then. It was a way of
17 trying to find a different way to cope, but it was a slow
18 process of doing that. It seemed well and good in the
19 beginning when you go around and you travel and you just kind
20 of meet people on the road. And I could not find ways in
21 myself of dealing with a whole lot of incidents where I
22 would say, just to watch someone like Charlie be able to
23 deal with that situation, just going in somewhere and being
24 able to talk with somebody and be able to convince them of
25 something or a need or getting this fixed or how to get a

1 tire changed and watching this process happen. And pretty
2 soon, you develop faith in someone by watching them do the
3 things which you think are right. And little by little,
4 you don't doubt if they say well, the light's red. And you
5 automatically stop the car. But it's a process. It's a
6 continual, it's a slow process. And it's also been the
7 same slow process that I have gone through since the day I've
8 been incarcerated to go back through it all and look at it
9 bit by bit and see how I would follow each small thing. To
10 me, it's a very intricate, it's a very intricate thing.
11 But eventually, you stop and you realize, as you go through
12 the pain of opening up each thing and seeing why you were
13 so weak to be able to do this or believe this, then it seems
14 that that little bit of pain or understanding that you build
15 with yourself, you build, you say yes or no and you understand,
16 and you start to feel confident in your own ability to do
17 what you need to do and to live your life and make your own
18 decisions. It would be impossible for anyone -- I don't look
19 to anyone to give me an answer, nor do I believe in the
20 immediacy of a world war or a whole lot of different parts
21 of facets of a philosophy that's quite -- it's quite large.
22 But I had it at one point. It would be impossible for it to
23 happen now because I have gone through that. I don't believe
24 you can ever -- there is not a back really that something
25 from that back could catch me again because I'm very well

1 aware of it now. Because I learned it as a painful lesson.

2 MR. GILBERT: Doesn't this institution make the
3 major decisions for you now?

4 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, they do make decisions
5 as far as where you reside, if you're in this room, if
6 you're in that room, or they make the decision on what
7 you're going to do.

8 MR. GILBERT: How about your behavior?

9 INMATE KRENWINKEL: On your behavior? Not so much
10 because there isn't -- you can break the rules if you want
11 to. If you feel like you wish to get loaded, there is a way
12 to find that, to bring it to yourself if you want to. If
13 you want to make institutional hooch, you can find a way to
14 do it and still go ahead and do it if you want to, for
15 yourself, if you feel that that's worth the problem which
16 you're going to get at the end. It's a way of evaluating
17 yourself if you want to go through the problems of getting
18 a one-fifteen or a write-up or going to lock-up or those
19 kinds of things. On the whole, you have a certain amount
20 of -- I think the thing which I was given where mainly the
21 inmates here may not have been is that I was -- they
22 constructed a small unit wherein there was only three --
23 actually three of us there except for two other women for a
24 short period of time which they called SSU. And it was a
25 completely locked down unit. And when it began, at its

1 inception when I was under the death penalty, I only came out
 2 of my room an hour a day. Now, you've got twenty-three hours
 3 a day that you sit in a confined area. You either start
 4 dealing with your mind or you go mad. I don't think you
 5 have a choice. Because when you're completely isolated for
 6 periods of time, when you constantly sit from day to day,
 7 you eventually have to deal with your own head. You can
 8 keep telling yourself certain things, but other things come
 9 and eventually you go back and remember a past or you
 10 remember this. One of the things to keep you from not
 11 thinking and which I found like was one of the things when
 12 I was on the road is that, we were continuously busy. As
 13 long as you're continuously busy, you're not thinking. As
 14 long as you're working hard, you don't have time to sit down
 15 and think well, why did I do this or this. Because you're
 16 constantly busy. But when you're sitting in a penitentiary
 17 for four and a half years in SSU, it wasn't until the very
 18 last we actually had, at that point, been given more than
 19 maybe hours where it had gotten to, and then eventually four
 20 hours, and then eventually, I think, they let us out of our
 21 cells six hours a day.

22 Well most -- like the women here a lot of times
 23 can stay busy into a lot of things in order to keep them-
 24 selves active. I was not. I was not granted that. So the
 25 activity I involved myself in mostly was sitting and thinking

1 I'm sure I've thought a whole lot of wrong things. That
2 doesn't mean I've figured out everything. But I've sat and
3 I've looked at myself a great deal, and not only looking at
4 myself, but I've looked at the whole situation as I can see
5 it. It's just self-evaluation, self-discovery, and it's
6 quite a process.

7 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Does the Panel have
8 any questions? Miss Rushen?

9 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: I don't have any.

10 MR. DEL PESCO: I have nothing further.

11 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Does a member of the
12 Staff have anything to say?

13 MR. DUENAS: No, I don't.

14 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Now, Mr. Kay, would you
15 like to make your statement at this time?

16 MR. KAY: All right. Mr. De Leon, I have written
17 a letter last week when I found out about the hearing dated
18 July 13th, 1978. If that can be made a part of the record,
19 then I won't have to read it as my opening remarks. I'd
20 like to have those as my opening remarks, and I'd like to
21 have a few comments on some things that Miss Krenwinkel has
22 said if that's all right with the Board?

23 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Well, you know, since
24 Counsel did not have a copy of your letter prior to this hearing,
25 it would be preferable that you would read that or state the

1 contents verbally.

2 MR. KAY: All right. The envelope was addressed
3 to the Community Release Board and the letter states, To
4 Whom It May Concern. In 1970 and 1971, I was a prosecutor
5 of Patricia Krenwinkel for the murders of Sharon Tate, as you
6 called her, Sharon Polanski, that was her married name, her
7 stage name was Sharon Tate, Jay Sebring, Voytek Frykowski
8 (That's how he pronounced it in the United States), Abigail
9 Folger, Steven Parent, Leno LaBianca, and Rosemary LaBianca.
10 Since I'm intimately familiar with the role that Miss
11 Krenwinkel played in those murders, I feel it incumbent to
12 speak up and be present at her hearing on July 17th, 1978
13 where she is to be considered for parole.

14 I shall attend this hearing not only as a
15 representative of the Los Angeles County District Attorney's
16 Office, but also as a representative of the People of the
17 State of California, the same people I represented when I
18 prosecuted Patricia Krenwinkel eight years ago.

19 I have spent the past two years prosecuting one of
20 Miss Krenwinkel's co-defendants, Leslie Van Houten for the
21 LaBianca murders. And as such, I have had numerous occasions
22 recently to review Miss Krenwinkel's role in both the
23 LaBianca and so-called Tate murders. In my opinion, Miss
24 Krenwinkel was well aware of the gravity of her acts of
25 murder on August 9th and August 10th, 1969. She knew that

1 participating in murder was wrong, but she decided that her
2 loyalty to the Manson family was more important. Miss
3 Krenwinkel had made her decision to participate in the murder
4 even before she and the other members of the family left
5 Spahn Ranch in the late evening hours of August 8th, 1969.

6 Miss Krenwinkel was a very willing participant in the killings
7 at the home of Sharon Tate, and by her own admission at the
8 penalty phase of her trial, stabbed Abigail Folger to death.

9 Miss Krenwinkel had such a deep remorse for
10 participating in the five murders at Sharon Tate's home that,
11 when she returned to the getaway car, the only thing she had
12 to say was her complaint that her hand hurt because, when
13 she stabbed the victim, she kept hitting her bones.

14 The next day after the Tate murders, Patricia
15 Krenwinkel spent part of the day watching TV news accounts
16 of the murders so she could see what a good job she had
17 done. That night, even knowing of the brutality and
18 destruction of human life that she participated in the
19 night before, she went out on the second night of the
20 murders and participated in the LaBianca murders, actually
21 stabbing both Leno and Rosemary LaBianca. Before she left
22 the LaBianca residence, she carved the word "War" w-a-r
23 on the abdomen of Leno LaBianca and also stuck a carving
24 fork in his abdomen. She then, in Mr. LaBianca's blood,
25 wrote the words, "Death to pigs," "Arise," and "Helter

1 Skelter, inside the LaBlanca home.

2 Leslie Van Houten testified at her trial in 1977
3 that Charles Manson told her that Patricia Krenwinkel was a
4 complete reflection of him, that she was more like him than
5 anyone else in the family.

6 In my opinion, the main purpose of our prison
7 system is to benefit and protect society. I think we owe it
8 to society not to turn loose a member of the Manson family
9 such as Patricia Krenwinkel who has participated in seven
10 of the most vicious, brutal murders in the history of
11 American crime. The public is very concerned about Patricia
12 Krenwinkel and her co-defendants getting out on parole. I
13 think it would be a great deterrent value to show the public
14 that not everybody who commits murder can automatically get
15 out on parole. The public will certainly feel that if
16 Patricia Krenwinkel gets out on parole, that anybody who
17 commits murder will certainly be paroled. For it is almost
18 impossible to conceive of more vicious murders than those
19 knowingly participated in by Patricia Krenwinkel.

20 Her seven victims cannot expect parole and neither
21 should she.

22 That concludes my letter. However, I would like
23 to make a couple of responses to some things that Miss
24 Krenwinkel has said. I agree with her on the stabbing of
25 Abigail Folger that she did not inflict all of the wounds.

1 Watson did inflict some. The evidence showed that she
2 stabbed Abigail Folger until she was dead and then Watson
3 who was about -- oh, ten yards away stabbing Frykowski on
4 the front lawn came over and also stabbed Abigail Folger.
5 But by his testimony, she was already dead. But he just
6 wanted to give some added stab wounds. Frykowski, I might
7 add, was stabbed fifty-one times, to give you any indication
8 of Mr. Watson's state of mind about the number of stab
9 wounds to inflict.

10 I think it's very important, and I'm glad that
11 Mr. De Leon picked up on it, about the fact that Miss
12 Krenwinkel was not under the influence of narcotics or
13 dangerous drugs at the time of the murder. There had been
14 four trials on the Tate-LaBianca murders. The first trial
15 involved Miss Krenwinkel, Leslie Van Houten, Susan Atkins
16 and Charles Manson. The second trial involved Tex Watson.
17 He fought extradition at the first trial until, he had to
18 be charged separately later. And then of the last few years
19 involving Leslie Van Houten, her trial last year ended in a
20 hung jury. Her trial this year resulted in a first degree
21 murder conviction for the murder of Len and Rosemary
22 LaBianca and conspiracy to commit first degree murder.

23 The evidence has been that, the only one under the
24 influence of narcotics at all, that Watson took some speed
25 the second night, the night of the LaBianca murder, to pep

1 him up, to wake him up, because he was tired from his
2 participation in the Tate murders. But there was no drug-
3 taking here, and I think that's important that she knew
4 exactly what was going on. She wasn't under the influence
5 of any drugs. And I think it's important, and I think
6 you've seen here that she is an intelligent girl. She's no
7 dummy. She's had a year of college, before she joined the
8 Manson family in Alabama. She knew what she was getting into.
9 This group was not some hippy flower child group that she
10 found. The evidence has been developed that Manson, from
11 the outset, viewed Adolph Hitler as his hero and talked to
12 the members of the family about Adolph Hitler and that he
13 wanted to construct a master race, Manson did, among members
14 of the family. The family was only open to whites and only
15 the whites that he selected. And of course, the motive for
16 these murders was that they were to be blamed on blacks.
17 They wanted to blame the murders on blacks and start a race
18 war. Have the whites take revenge on the blacks and
19 start going down to places like Watts and just shooting the
20 blacks at random. Manson, even at the second night of the
21 murders where Manson went along, he didn't go the first
22 night. He just sent them out from the Spahn Ranch the first
23 night. But the second night, he went in and took Rosemary
24 LaBianca's wallet and then tried to plant it in Pacoima which
25 is a section of the San Fernando Valley that has a large black

1 population. His hope was that a black person would find the
2 wallet and use the credit cards in there and get blamed for
3 the murders. He misjudged where Pacoima was and planted the
4 wallet in a gas station in Sylmar which is on the border.
5 Pacoima is the next town from Sylmar and the gas station
6 attendant found it three months later when he was cleaning
7 the rest room. That doesn't say much for how often they
8 clean the rest rooms. But it was not used by anyone.

9 Miss Krenwinkel, in knowing again what she was
10 doing on the second night of the murder, she instructed
11 Leslie Van Houten to wipe off the fingerprints. And I
12 think that's important to know that, even though they had
13 their separate philosophy in the Manson family about what
14 rules they thought society should follow, they still were
15 very well aware of society's laws and society's rules, and
16 they knew that what they were doing was wrong. They knew
17 that, if they got caught, that they would be punished. And
18 I think it's very instructive, the fact of her instruction
19 to wipe off the fingerprints. I mean, that's something that
20 we think of in the experience a criminal would think of to
21 get rid of the evidence, so to speak. Her statement about
22 stabbing Rosemary LaBianca, about not inflicting all the
23 wounds to Rosemary LaBianca, from what I know, I think is
24 correct. Leslie Van Houten held Mrs. LaBianca down and
25 Miss Krenwinkel stabbed her on a number of occasions. But

1 according to Van Houten anyway, her knife blade bent, and
2 at that point, Miss Van Houten stated that she called for
3 Watson and Watson came in and had a bayonet, a very large
4 knife, and finished off Mrs. LaBianca, although she was
5 already motionless and down on the floor.

6 So, it could very well be that she was dead after
7 Miss Krenwinkel got finished with her. But Miss Krenwinkel
8 did not inflict all of the wounds. Leslie Van Houten admitted
9 that she herself inflicted a number of the wounds, although
10 Miss Van Houten said the wounds she inflicted were after
11 Mrs. LaBianca had already died.

12 Miss Krenwinkel denies now carving "War" in Leno
13 LaBianca's stomach. To my recollection at the penalty phase
14 of the trial, she admitted that that's what she did. And
15 Watson at his trial said that that's what she did. That she
16 actually carved with a carving fork the letters "War" across
17 the abdomen, and then plunged the carving fork into Mr.
18 LaBianca's abdomen. And there was also a knife embedded into
19 Mr. LaBianca's throat. The handle stuck out one end and the
20 blade went all the way through, severed the carotid artery
21 and went out the other end. The writing was done by Miss
22 Krenwinkel. "Arise" was the inside part, above the front
23 door. "Death to pigs" was on the living room wall, and
24 "Helter Skelter" was on the refrigerator door.

25 After the murders, a period of time after the

1 murders when the police started focusing on the family, Miss
2 Krenwinkel fled to Alabama and she had to be extradited from
3 Alabama. When the police tried to arrest her there, she was
4 spotted in a car, saw the police officers and ducked down,
5 trying to, again, avoid detection. But she was apprehended
6 and extradited from Alabama.

7 Even before the murders which, I think, is
8 important to consider, Manson used to give demonstrations
9 at night at the ranch about how to kill people, where to stab
10 them with the knife and how to put the knife in and jerk up
11 on it and the vital points of the body. So the fact that
12 there were murders was no surprise to nobody at the ranch.
13 They were all well aware that there was going to be murders.
14 Miss Krenwinkel knew before she even went out what she was
15 going to participate in, knew it was wrong, but went out and
16 participated in it anyway, not only the first night, but
17 even knowing what happened the first night, went out again
18 second night and participated and had the wits about
19 her to direct people to do various things in the house.

20 I might add, the evidence came out in the first
21 trial that, after the Tate murders when they got back to the
22 ranch, again Miss Krenwinkel's remorse was such that she
23 and Tex Watson made love together when they got back to
24 Spahn Ranch. That was the testimony that came out at the
25 first trial. So with that, I don't believe -- Miss Krenwinkel

1 said she took acid a day or so before. An acid trip lasts
2 between eight and twelve hours. So even if she had done
3 that, there would have been no residual effects in her at
4 the time. She admits she wasn't under the influence at the
5 time of either the Tate or LaBianca murders.

6 I don't have anything more to add at this time.

7 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Fine. Counsel?

8 MR. GILBERT: Okay. Well, it's difficult to
9 retry the case. Obviously it took place over a two or three-
10 year period, and we have a number of different trials, a
11 lot of transcripts. I was just briefly discussing some of
12 the facts with my client. Apparently there are substantial
13 differences in what we understand the facts to be as to what
14 the District Attorney pointed out. And without on an
15 individual basis and simply trying the case over again, it
16 would be difficult to go through them. I would like to make
17 a couple of major points.

18 First, what I heard from Miss Krenwinkel is a little
19 bit different than what both of you have said. My under-
20 standing was that there was a whole series of acid trips
21 that took place over a period of time. And that, as a result
22 of that, there was no need to trip out on an individual
23 basis. I mean, they were in a constant state of high almost
24 all the time. And when this thing went down, that's what
25 happened. They were in this type of acid euphoria, almost

1 like a realistic-type of behavior where they're living in
2 another world constant. So I question seriously the state-
3 ment -- she made the statement that she was, the way I
4 understand it, under the influence. We seemed to pick up
5 differently.

6 Okay. Secondly, over a period of time, there was
7 a constant eroding of what we would call the independent
8 will of the people involved. You know, a constant, and if
9 Manson was a follower of Hitler, then he would be well aware
10 of how to do this. Because that's exactly what Hitler did
11 over a period of time by constant repetition, constant
12 assaults on the senses, he overrode the will of people around
13 him. And in Hitler's case, it was a massive erosion of the
14 state. But constantly repeating of the big lie and big
15 statements over and over and over again, the independent
16 people, independent judgment of people like judges and
17 lawyers and doctors, people who have had supposedly education,
18 university degrees are all overcome. And if Manson was
19 familiar with Hitler's tactics, then it wouldn't be that
20 difficult to apply them to people who obviously did not have
21 training and sophistication that these people did. Yet
22 these people were overcome, yet we're asked to assume that
23 my client did not have the training and the will and the
24 background to withstand that and therefore act independently.
25 And I submit that whole thing is patently ridiculous.

1 Over a two-year period, Manson concentrating on a
2 select number of people knowing where he was going, and
3 the people were basically a group of followers and no
4 definite philosophies, it's conceivable that he would not be
5 able to basically, you know, feel as well over there. And
6 therefore, I think the whole concept of the D.A.'s argument
7 of independent judgment is a sham in this case.

8 He didn't have to. He programmed them and he sent
9 them out. And what this institution is trying to do is
10 deprogram and reprogram them ourselves. So we ourselves,
11 as this institution are engaged in the same type of practice
12 as we're now condemning Manson for. Or supposedly our
13 purposes are better than his are. The point I'm trying to
14 get at is that, you can't say that he had independent will.
15 I think it was clearly demonstrated, there was no independent
16 will here.

17 Okay. I'd also like to point out the fact that
18 our own society has said, if you kill somebody, that in and
19 of itself is not inherently, morally wrong. If you do it
20 with the State's blessing, you get a medal for it. If you do
21 it without the State's blessing, you get punished for it.
22 And people who have the training and education, when they
23 come back from doing the State's will have had trouble trying to
24 differentiate between the two. So this is not an uncommon
25 problem. In fact, the veteran's hospitals are full of people

1 who have had that problem. So our own society has set up a
2 situation with that problem. I'm not trying to say it's
3 all society's fault. I don't necessarily believe that. All
4 I'm saying is, if you consider the facts and circumstances
5 of a case and you throw in all the tangential and other
6 factors that the District Attorney has included, you've got
7 to consider that also.

8 The next point I'd like to make is, each trial was
9 different. I'm sure different facts came out at the
10 different trials. To say conclusively what happened, only
11 one or two people can say that. That was the people who were
12 actually there. The trial itself does not mean that every-
13 thing is going to come out. Now, I've seen trials myself
14 where certain facts don't come out because the parties do not
15 wish them to come out for one reason or another. So
16 therefore, I would tend to be inclined to think that the
17 statements made by Miss Krenwinkel about what actually
18 happened are more truthful than what the District Attorney
19 said. I'd also like to point out that the District Attorney
20 has a vested interest in making sure that this person does
21 not get out, and therefore, their objectivity is somewhat
22 less than absolute. Also we should not be concerned what
23 the public says. I mean, if it's a trial by public, let's
24 throw them out to the local mob like they did in the Roman
25 times and actually tear them limb from limb and we can say

1 oh, that's too bad. So what the public is concerned about
2 is not our function. We should consider first, what are the
3 facts of the case, and then, has she rehabilitated. And if
4 so, is it safe to let her out again? I think she's tried to
5 explain to you in her own way that, you know, she was
6 rootless, drifting, she had no sense of purpose, she grew up
7 with none. She was offered a sense of purpose. She was
8 directed by a man who was probably good or an expert in the
9 field. She was programmed as such. In the course of
10 conduct that apparently,-- from what the District Attorney says,
11 there's no indication in her past that there's any type of
12 relation to what we're talking about. There's no evidence.
13 She came from a middle class background, no indication at all
14 of ideas, where they come from. Did they come from a
15 spontaneous generation, somebody planted them in her mind.
16 And basically at that time, she was an extension of somebody
17 else.

18 The question now becomes, is that extension still
19 there as far as the facts of the case are concerned. Again,
20 without trying the case, and I imagine the transcripts of
21 those trials would cover this entire desk and with room to
22 spare. I'm not sure that the Board is inclined to go through
23 them all. I think that we should basically, you know, what
24 Miss Krenwinkel says is probably more accurate. So I'll stop
25 at that.

1 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Well, you know, I don't
 2 want you, Miss Krenwinkel, to lose sight of the fact that
 3 this is your hearing and there are statements made here by
 4 the parties to the hearing that you may agree or disagree
 5 with. And you may give testimony freely, you know, as I say,
 6 to the Panel and as candidly as you wish. And if you wish,
 7 in order for us to proceed in that manner, I'm going to
 8 formally swear you in and then you can testify under oath.
 9 You want to stand?

10 (Thereupon Inmate Patricia Krenwinkel
 11 was, by the Presiding Member, sworn
 12 to tell the truth, the whole truth,
 13 and nothing but the truth.)

14 INMATE KRENWINKEL: I do.

15 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Now, is there anything
 16 that you wish to address, any comments that have been made
 17 by your counsel or Mr. Kay that you wish to allude to?

18 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Well, it's very hard -- it's
 19 like, there was at least fifteen or sixteen things, state-
 20 ments that you made that I know is not true.

21 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Address the Panel,
 22 Miss Krenwinkel.

23 INMATE KRENWINKEL: I mean, that's what's very --
 24 that's what I'm finding difficult now. I mean, I feel like,
 25 am I to create a debate with this man on the evidence that

1 he says that might have come out but evidence that he never
 2 asked me? It's like, he made statements by Leslie. I'd
 3 like Leslie here because I didn't tell Leslie to wipe the
 4 fingerprints off. Now, it would have to be a debate between
 5 me and Leslie on who's telling the truth or what. See, I
 6 don't understand that.

7 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: You tell us what
 8 happened.

9 INMATE KRENWINKEL: All right.

10 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Tell us what you did or
 11 did not do.

12 INMATE KRENWINKEL: All I can say, I did not
 13 inform Leslie to -- I mean, it's difficult because there's a
 14 whole lot of things, discrepancies in there. They're all
 15 little and very minor. I just know that -- I know that
 16 things-like, telling her to take the fingerprints, I didn't
 17 tell Leslie that. So, Leslie will have to deal with that
 18 for herself. And why she said that, I don't know. I know
 19 that like, when you say -- I did not know that night where
 20 I was going. We had never discussed in that family killing
 21 anyone really, as far as like anyone going out to kill
 22 someone. I had known there had been a murder of a Gary
 23 Hinman, but it was kept very quiet and I had no idea that
 24 what -- Mr. Kay makes sounds like there was these big times
 25 when people sat around and talked about killing. I was never

1 there. So if they happened, I wasn't there. And when you
 2 start, you know, a whole lot of -- I did not know that night
 3 until I was in the car. I was in taking care of the
 4 children at the time at -- when I was awakened in the night
 5 and I was told to go with Tex by Charlie. I got into the
 6 car with Tex and it wasn't but way late down the road
 7 somewhere that I asked Tex what we were going to do. And it
 8 was when we were -- and for a long time he said nothing.
 9 And then eventually, and so we just gabbed and whatever and
 10 we drove. Eventually, when we went up Cielo Drive, Tex said
 11 that we were going to go in the house and kill everyone
 12 there. I had no idea where I was going. Yes, I followed
 13 directions from Tex from then on. But I did not know where
 14 I was going.

15 And then he made statements like, when we got back
 16 that evening, I didn't make love with Tex. I don't know
 17 where you got that from. You know, things like that that
 18 I've never known because, throughout the entire trial, so
 19 much was said that, by different people, that you've got
 20 contradictions from a whole lot of different people that said
 21 things. But I think you've got me confused with someone
 22 else. Yeah, you do. And I mean, it's hard to explain.

23 The whole -- there is, I think, a hundred twenty-one
 24 volumes to the transcript of the case. So when someone goes
 25 to talk about it, there's a million little things that come

1 out, but a million little things, too, that were, in some
2 way or another, rebuttaled or whatever. It's really hard,
3 I mean, I could probably sit and talk with Mr. Kay, but I
4 didn't think this was a trial. I mean, because there is a
5 whole lot that was said.

6 At the time that I got on the witness stand, too,
7 and the statements that I made, I don't have a copy right
8 now of my transcript. I sent them out because they are so
9 massive that I cannot keep them in my room. It's impossible
10 or I wouldn't be living there. They take up an entire
11 corner. So I don't have them and I didn't think that this
12 was a trial, so I did not go through word for word. I would
13 not mind going through whatever I said on the witness stand
14 because I think it would be quite obvious that a whole lot
15 of things that I said then were even deliberate lies that
16 were set up to make certain things that, at that time I felt
17 we wanted to say. And I think Mr. Kay was even obvious then
18 that we did do many things in a courtroom that we all did
19 just at that time -- I can even say now, it was all just
20 maybe Charlie decided that day we'd go in with an X on our
21 head. Now, I don't, you know -- so that at the time that
22 even that I was on the witness stand and gave all my
23 testimony, at that time of my testimony, I was not looking
24 at -- I was expecting any day really for the world to come
25 to an end at that point on the witness stand. I don't think

1 that, saying that I was then as I am today, I don't think
 2 even you can say that, Mr. Kay. I don't think I talk now
 3 like I did then. So I think you would have to even say
 4 there's a little bit of a difference, and that my reasoning
 5 was at the same point that it is right now.

6 So a whole lot that's said, I think, is just, I
 7 know I probably should have taken a pen because there was a
 8 whole lot of little things that I felt that the man said that
 9 are all just little incorrect things, but I don't, you know,
 10 I don't want to go into it.

11 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Don't lose sight of the
 12 purpose of this hearing. This is not a trial. It's a
 13 hearing to determine whether you are suitable for parole.
 14 And you know, that is the purpose of this Panel and that is
 15 the purpose of this hearing, to make a determination as to
 16 whether you are suitable or unsuitable, and the factors that
 17 will help us to make that decision.

18 Now, on the preconviction factors, do you have
 19 anything else that you wish to add?

20 MR. GILBERT: No, sir.

21 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Now, at this time, we
 22 will go into postconviction factors, Miss Krenwinkel, and
 23 Miss Rushen will chair that portion of the hearing dealing
 24 with postconviction factors.

25 Why don't we take a five-minute recess.

1 (Thereupon a short recess was
2 taken.)

3 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: The Panel has recon-
4 vened and all the original parties are back in the room.
5 The time is 4:20 p.m. Counsel, do you have anything else you
6 wish to add on preconviction factors?

7 MR. GILBERT: No.

8 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: We will not go into,
9 as we mentioned prior to the recess, postconviction factors
10 with Miss Rushen being in charge of that portion of the
11 hearing.

12 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: All right. You came in, I
13 believe, 4/28/1971; is that correct?

14 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes.

15 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: And in summary, it seems as
16 if you have not been a disciplinary problem. You have -- I
17 am looking at the general chronos in the file, looking at
18 7/3/78. I will read into the record that quote,

19 "Patricia has shown an interest in the
20 CDCI clerk position and from all indi-
21 cations, appears suitable for the job.
22 She has presented no problem in the
23 cottage and is disciplinary-free.
24 Her willingness to help her peers is
25 also noted. Subject also has necessary

1 clerical skills and a good rapport with
2 her peers."

3 That speaks to your most recent, I believe, work
4 chrono.

5 We also note a letter dated October 5, 1977 in which
6 you were given an outstanding evaluation for work. And
7 your Board report dated 5/19/78, and I will quote in full,
8 starting with evaluation.

9 "Subject has been known to this writer
10 as her counselor since February of
11 1977. Patricia has always displayed
12 a mature attitude in dealing with her
13 problems. She is considered an
14 excellent worker in her assignment in
15 the cafeteria. Her work reports
16 indicate dependable and she gets
17 along well with staff and her peers.
18 Subject has continued to express an
19 interest in her education and plans
20 to continue next school semester.
21 She has completed several courses
22 with a high grade average. Recently,
23 subject has expressed some interest
24 in involving herself in the now
25 defunct institution paper and has

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

hopes of reviving it. Subject has remained discipline-free since last seen by the Board and has received commendations for volunteer work in the cafeteria. Subject's plans for future parole are to parole out of State with her supporting father who visits on a weekly basis and is near retirement and expresses desire to help Pat make a new life for herself."

That will be more properly entered under Mr. Del'Pesco's discussion. But I just read the whole thing. And that is signed, submitted by J. Dowell, D as in David, o-w-e-l-l, CC-I, Cottage Latham B.

That is your work record and your institutional adjustment in terms of attitude. We do have several psychiatric reports that are in your file. Looking at the May, 1978, looking at the conclusions, and these are by Dr. J.F. Roh, R-o-h. He states, quote,

"Subject showed no manifestation nor symptomatology of mental health disorder. She showed symptomatology of drug abuse and drug experimentation. There was no history clarifying the means of her drug abuse influence

1 was related to her criminal behavior
2 in the past. She showed moderate im-
3 provement in this institution since
4 the undersigned saw her for the first
5 time in 1971. She was polite and
6 cooperative. She answered all the
7 questions without hesitation. Her
8 continuation of her psychiatric im-
9 provement cannot be answered. It
10 would probably be influenced by her
11 activities, vocation involvement,
12 education, and the nature of her
13 interpersonal relationship. This
14 subject should not be considered for
15 transfer to the Department of Health
16 under Section 2684 of the Penal Code.
17 Her violence potential outside a
18 controlled environment in the past
19 was increased by history. Her vio-
20 lence potential in this institution
21 since 1971 appeared to be below
22 average. She was thirty years old,
23 five feet five inches tall, she
24 weighed one hundred eighteen pounds.
25 Her weight appeared to be stable.

1 She was alert. She was in good contact
2 with reality. She was oriented as to
3 the date, time and person. She appeared
4 to have accurate information about the
5 major events in this country. She
6 showed no evidence of thought disorder
7 or disorder or affect. Her abstractions,
8 her concept formation, her recent and
9 remote memory were appropriate and
10 accurate."

11 End of quote. What I would like for you to address yourself
12 to are the following issues:

13 Number one, what do you feel you have done here
14 that has prepared you -- and I'm not talking about
15 vocationally now, mentally, to enter into society and
16 participate? That's number one. And number two, what are
17 some of your feelings about what you have done, the effect
18 on others, and how would you go about trying to make any
19 kind of restitution?

20 MR. GILBERT: Before we answer that, can I add
21 one or two comments for the record?

22 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Sure.

23 MR. GILBERT: Okay. Your father comes to see you
24 regularly; is that correct?

25 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, he does.

1 MR. GILBERT: You have to speak up.

2 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, he does.

3 MR. GILBERT: Okay. Are you close to him now?

4 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes.

5 MR. GILBERT: Okay. When this incident started,
6 had you basically alienated from him?

7 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes.

8 MR. GILBERT: I take it, since you've been in here,
9 you've reached some type of understanding with your father?

10 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, I have.

11 MR. GILBERT: And you think you've changed, or you
12 think he's changed?

13 INMATE KRENWINKEL: I think we've both grown.

14 MR. GILBERT: Okay. Now, wasn't there, at one time,
15 some type of a lock-down or a work slowage by most of the
16 people in the institution?

17 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, there was.

18 MR. GILBERT: And when was that?

19 INMATE KRENWINKEL: It was probably a month and a
20 half ago, I guess.

21 MR. GILBERT: What happened?

22 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Well, there were some major
23 issues that the inmates felt could only be -- that the only
24 way that attention could be brought to those problems was by
25 a sit-down at which quite a few, about four hundred, I think,

1 showed up initially for this. And the ADM responded and they
 2 gave us some feedback on some issues. And eventually, ADM
 3 made their last statement to how they would react to these
 4 issues at which time they asked us to leave. And two hundred
 5 women, actually one hundred ninety-nine, remained after
 6 that time, because they felt that the ADM had not answered
 7 them the way that they had wished. They had not gotten the
 8 response they wanted. So they went ahead and they pushed
 9 the issue. And after they pushed it, there ended up being a
 10 lock-down. But I left the sit-down before the lock-down
 11 occurred. So it was during that time, I worked at the
 12 institution.

13 MR. GILBERT: All right. Basically, they excepted
 14 you from the lock-down?

15 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yeah, I was not in the lock-
 16 down.

17 MR. GILBERT: Did you come and actually work at
 18 one of the places around here?

19 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, I was working in the
 20 cafeteria.

21 MR. GILBERT: So during this lock-down, they
 22 basically relied on you to continue on your normal functions?

23 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Right.

24 MR. GILBERT: Did you, in fact, continue on what
 25 you had actually done?

Harold Cunningham

1 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes.

2 MR. GILBERT: Were you cooperating with them in
3 all ways?

4 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, trying to feed all the
5 people that were locked in.

6 MR. GILBERT: Did you get any type of assistance
7 or commendation for that?

8 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, I did.

9 MR. DEL PESCO: That's documented in the file.

10 MR. GILBERT: Okay. Now, the two questions that
11 were asked, the first one is, why do you feel, how are you
12 prepared mentally to enter into society now? Is that a
13 correct phrasing of it?

14 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Yes.

15 MR. GILBERT: I wonder if you could address your
16 answer to the Board in answer to that question?

17 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Well, I feel that a lot of
18 self-evaluation which has been done primarily by myself and
19 also at the different -- at the different people that I have
20 met here, different staff. Some have been staff. Some have
21 been inmates. I think participation with just the people
22 in general in different areas, in different situations, and
23 working conditions or in playing ball or in doing different --
24 depending on each situation, I think, each thing has been
25 in some way, some way that I have used it to maybe for self-

1 growth or come to understand a whole lot of different people
2 and the way that they -- different beliefs and the values
3 they have. A great majority of it, I don't agree with or
4 do not believe, but it gives me a chance to kind of have --
5 it's just interreaction with an incredible variety that you
6 find, I think, connected with the penitentiary. It seems
7 to me that, at first, being isolated, there was only -- the
8 only contact I was given was just that which was allowed to
9 come in which would be either family or certain staff that,
10 at that time, they had picked to even come back and work in
11 that unit. And for about four and a half years, everything
12 was fairly well constructed on different certain people, and
13 the certain -- certain people, certain values that were
14 allowed in. Because even to different correspondence
15 and things that were not allowed or whatever at first, it was
16 extremely tight. And the contact was extremely limited.

17 It was certain people. One of the people who I
18 spent quite a few hours talking with at that time from SSU,
19 one of the people that I enjoyed conversation with, I
20 actually found extremely stimulating and was very helpful
21 was Dr. Flanigan that was a psychiatrist. At the time, he
22 was working as a medical doctor. And Dr. Vines at that time
23 was the chief psychiatrist who I was seeing also. But I
24 found Dr. Flanigan to be -- we used to spend hours when he
25 would have the available time just commenting and talking.

1 It was through a participation which, at that time, it was
2 very structured and there was not so many that I'd find --
3 these people that would give me something to start -- to
4 start looking at. A whole new -- many new ideas. When I
5 came out on campus and started living, well, first I went to
6 PTU. And PTU was dealing with a lot of the women who are
7 in some way designated as having some mental problems and
8 emotional problems.

9 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Why did you go there? Why
10 were you assigned there?

11 INMATE KRENWINKEL: I was assigned there for
12 security housing. At that time they decided that PTU was the
13 next secure unit. And I was not put over there for
14 psychiatric reasons which made it kind of a strange situation
15 too, because I had just come out of isolation from SSU into
16 PTU. And the first women that I had, I wasn't exactly sure
17 on, I mean -- for myself you can't -- it's strange because,
18 these women, I did not really know entirely had as many
19 emotional problems until I left PTU. Many of the women that
20 I dealt with in PTU for a long while, I did not really come
21 to realize I had maybe some of the problems that they had.
22 Because in that surrounding again, it was extremely encased
23 in a more -- there was not that much input from other areas.
24 Again, you're kind of confined. So you deal with a certain
25 group of people and a certain group of staff that again are

1 usually trained particularly to deal with PTU. And I've
2 noticed, there is differences like being from SSU in an
3 isolation setting to PTU which is a psychiatric setting to
4 being on a regular compound where there's much more freedom
5 and there's much more of a variety of people, and you have
6 a much more, a large change of staffs. So you're always
7 dealing with a different kind of person.

8 I go to a visiting room where, again, I was just
9 in touch with people and there are visitors and that kind of
10 thing. It was like an entire change from the time like,
11 SSU where everyone was confined, even visiting into that
12 unit. So I think it would be mostly in the participation
13 with other people that, you go through a tremendous amount
14 of growth and understanding about many, many people and
15 their problems and their lives, and where they come from,
16 where they're going, and where they've -- you know, I don't
17 know.

18 It's hard to say because, each person that I have
19 met somewhere, you know, that I've come close to has left
20 some kind of impression or something that I've found. I've
21 learned to deal with a whole lot of situations that I don't
22 think normally anyone would ever have to deal with outside
23 of an institutional setting that I think are extremely
24 stressful. And that at times, you know, I feel my own
25 aggravation with this, but somehow you learn to handle it.

1 It becomes mostly, I think as time goes by, it becomes a
2 factor of dealing with a certain amount of stress on the
3 fact that you are lacking certain freedoms. Even to the
4 point of, at night if you want to read a book, if the
5 women are loud in the halls, you're not going to read that
6 book. There's nothing you can do about it unless you have
7 ear plugs. And even that sometimes may not stop the noise.
8 So you deal with a situation where you go through your
9 internal changes and external changes and just relieving the
10 situation with an extreme variety of people.

11 And I think in that, you learn to, I think,
12 coping. I think you learn patience. You learn tolerance.
13 You learn how to show, I think, all the variety of emotions
14 that any human being could have. You get hot. You get
15 tired. You get nasty with somebody at times and you respond
16 back and forth. And you use your senses, say, well now, this
17 is crazy. Why should you and I argue over this. And you go
18 through those points.

19 You have, I think, every emotion possible is at
20 one time felt sometime. You make friends and you lose them.
21 And I think that just makes you equipped to handle any kind
22 I mean, I don't believe that the situation in dealing with
23 people here is that much different than it could be beyond
24 here. I think it's just --

25 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Let's move then to any

1 thoughts you've given about restitution?

2 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Well, there is no way that I
3 can bring life to those people that are now dead. I don't
4 think that -- I know that I have like, losses, but I may
5 never have money that I could pay back. I don't ever
6 imagine that I will have millions of dollars for anything.
7 I have never -- my skills, it's possible to be a secretary.
8 I don't think that kind of employment or even as maybe
9 going further into some kind of even field-like money,
10 monetary restitution could ever be made, because I don't ever
11 foresee having millions of dollars. Because I know that I
12 have those lawsuits so there's nothing I can do about that.

13 You know, the only thing that I can feel is by --
14 the only thing that I could possibly do is try to live my
15 life daily as best that I can and try never to bring harm
16 to anyone again. I don't know exactly what you're asking.

17 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: My point is, the purpose of
18 the question was to just see if you had done any thinking
19 about what I owe and what can I do. And of course, we're
20 aware that all the money in the world wouldn't. But some-
21 times, people do think about that, think about, as you say,
22 you will live your life in a certain kind of way. And the
23 point of the question was just to see if you had done any
24 thinking in that line as to it.

25 Okay. I have one last one. And that is, when you

1 first came in, looking at the cumulative summary, one would
2 get the impression, looking at the cumulative summary and to
3 some of your remarks, and looking at the probation officer's
4 report that, you felt yourself pretty alienated. And you
5 made remarks about the general society and so forth. What
6 comments would you have on society today?

7 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Well, I think there's a whole
8 lot of areas that a whole lot of people are doing specific
9 work in to change that which they feel is right or wrong.
10 But I think there's -- I mean, I definitely don't feel that
11 everything is perfect. I don't think society has come to,
12 you know, to absolutely all of its perfection. I think
13 there's a lot that needs to be done. And I feel there's a
14 lot of people that are doing extremely constructive ways of
15 working and changing. I feel I have been kind of -- I was
16 lucky. I was introduced to some people in this institution
17 that came in here with a college program from Santa Cruz
18 University. And it was a Ph.D program. And each of the
19 people that were a part of that program had each picked
20 different points that each one in that program was not a
21 specific one that everyone had to do their dissertations or
22 their thesis or anything on a certain point. Each one was
23 into different things. Each person had a different field.
24 And they were people that were very interested in, some poli-
25 tics, some economy, some more the education and new ways and

1 means of developing finer and better education, people
2 involved in ecology. It was kind of interesting.

3 In this Ph.D program, I met a lot of people who I
4 found to be extremely exciting because they are very aware
5 people, things that are very involved in a lot of things.
6 And to me, I think that's exciting when communities are
7 starting to show or working towards concern, and I don't know
8 I mean, it's a hard question because I'm trying to just
9 even try to find points. Because I mean it's a massive
10 society and there's a lot of areas.

11 MR. GILBERT: Can I ask her a couple of questions?

12 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Yes.

13 MR. GILBERT: Okay. Have you been to school
14 since you've been in this place?

15 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, I have, college classes.

16 MR. GILBERT: Okay. Now, did you have a high
17 school diploma before you came in here?

18 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes.

19 MR. GILBERT: Now, have you taken as much schooling
20 as they have to offer here?

21 INMATE KRENWINKEL: No, I can go on and take some
22 more classes.

23 MR. GILBERT: But you have been involved in a
24 college program here?

25 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Right. I have about thirty-six

1 credits, somewhere around that, from the classes that I've
2 been taking.

3 MR. GILBERT: Okay. What type of classes have you
4 been taking?

5 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Well, I've taken what -- at
6 times, I didn't have much choice because they don't have
7 a huge variety. But I've taken Science and quite a few
8 classes in English, Psychology, mostly the basics. First
9 usually the junior college, I'm in the first year of college
10 classes that they offer. And they're mostly your basics
11 that cover all -- Sociology --

12 MR. GILBERT: Okay. Now, do you have a particular
13 degree in mind that you'd like to try for?

14 INMATE KRENWINKEL: I've already talked to some
15 counselors here and they've already told me I would have a
16 certain problem in that I could gather up sixty credits here
17 which is enough for your first two years of a college if you
18 were going towards a Bachelor of Science degree which is
19 what I would like to go towards in Earth Sciences which is a
20 fairly new field and it falls under different titles of
21 different universities right now. But the majority of the
22 universities in California now do have these classes. But I
23 could take up my first sixty credits here, but it wouldn't
24 get me specialized to go any further with that kind of
25 training. All it could do is give me my A.A. or just use of

1 sixty credits for a Bachelor of Science. That's as far as
2 this educational department goes to. I can go on further
3 with some correspondence.

4 MR. GILBERT: Basically, you're shooting for a
5 B.A.?

6 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Bachelor of Science degree.

7 MR. GILBERT: B.S. Do you have any skills at the
8 present time?

9 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Secretarial skills.

10 MR. GILBERT: Okay. Now, if you were to get out,
11 would your intentions be to find a job?

12 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Uh-huh.

13 MR. GILBERT: I can't hear you.

14 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Certainly.

15 MR. GILBERT: And what type of job would you be
16 looking at?

17 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: That's into the next phase.

18 MR. GILBERT: Okay, fine.

19 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: We're going to end this
20 phase in just one moment here. I'll ask the Panel members
21 if they have any questions.

22 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Yes. Now, you've become
23 an artist since you went into the institution?

24 INMATE KRENWINKEL: I've become what?

25 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Have you done any art

1 work?

2 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, I have. I paint. For a
3 while, Mr. Casey that used to be the head of the art
4 department came over to SSU. And at that time, I learned
5 screen printing and oil painting and worked with acrylics
6 which is just a different form of paint from Mr. Casey. And
7 I do a lot of handwork and different macrame. There was a
8 woman that came over from the occupational therapy department
9 that got me into different crewel work and that kind of
10 thing. I've done pottery. That was when I was in PTU. I
11 was taught how to do pottery. I've learned quite a few
12 different artistic things to do. I mean, macrame, and so I
13 mean a lot of that. But I guess there's a lot of that done
14 in the institution.

15 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: What are your hobbies?

16 INMATE KRENWINKEL: My favorite hobby now is, I've
17 been teaching myself how to play the guitar. So I do that
18 mostly now. Oil painting is hard because we don't have an
19 art department out here on campus. So I've given up the oil
20 painting and I've been teaching myself how to play the
21 guitar. And I try to get out and play tennis. It's been
22 kind of hot.

23 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: You know, in the
24 documentation, there's an item that you had one painting, you
25 and someone else --

1 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Leslie.

2 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Yes, Van Houten, that
3 you sold or were going to sell or was valued at \$1500?
4 That's the figure that's stated.

5 INMATE KRENWINKEL: No, I think they were talking
6 about a piece of sewing that -- Leslie and I combined our
7 efforts in an embroidery piece. It's a six foot dragon.
8 And when it was completed, my father took it and got it
9 insured. And they insured it for a \$1,000. It's quite
10 massive and it took us about a year and a half to complete
11 when we were in SSU. It's quite a beautiful piece. But
12 it's all embroidery and it was insured. Most likely, I think
13 that was mentioned at one time and a couple of paintings
14 Leslie and I did were in an art show here. And I have sold
15 art work through the hobby craft department.

16 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Now, what is your major
17 goal in college?

18 INMATE KRENWINKEL: I would like --

19 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: What would be your
20 major field?

21 INMATE KRENWINKEL: I would like to find some way
22 to work with parks, possible parks, recreation and forestry
23 department.

24 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: I have nothing further.

25 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Mr. Del Pesco?

1 MR. DEL PESCO: Yes, I think several points have
 2 been already covered by your replies and also by counsel's
 3 comments. But briefly, as I see it, there's already mention
 4 in the Board report of 5/19/78 that you intend to settle
 5 out of State on release with your father, Joseph Krenwinkel
 6 who's in Playa Del Rey. I don't know what the purpose of
 7 this is. I was wondering if it might be to start with an
 8 anonymity rather than California where your name may be
 9 quite familiar?

10 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Right. I spoke with my
 11 counselor at one time and I told him, as of today, I have
 12 never given an interview. I have not ever at any time
 13 really tried to make myself public in any way. I have not
 14 spoken with any one of the press at any time. All right,
 15 so what I'm saying is that, I myself had asked him if I was
 16 able to leave, I would personally like to change my name
 17 and leave, you know. I don't see any reason to try to draw
 18 attention to something such as this case with myself. I
 19 don't see how that would be of any value.

20 MR. DEL PESCO: Didn't I read that you wrote a
 21 book?

22 INMATE KRENWINKEL: No, the most that I have is
 23 that I contributed some poetry that had nothing to do with
 24 this case to an anthology of certain requirements --

25 MR. DEL PESCO: It had nothing to do with the

1 offenses or offense?

2 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Nothing. No, it was just
3 poetry.

4 MR. DEL PESCO: Well, with that reply, I needn't
5 pursue it, then. It also notes that you have had some
6 FLU visits I imagine that is family, right?

7 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Right, family.

8 MR. DEL PESCO: With your father? And you're
9 in close contact with him? And there was mention of an aunt
10 and a cousin that are supportive in the community.

11 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Right. Sandy Reeves. She
12 lives in San Francisco, so it's hard for her to get down
13 very often.

14 MR. DEL PESCO: I see. And then, of course, you've
15 in part already answered or possibly have answered what I was
16 wondering about when I read the various places in the file
17 that you were interested, I think, at the last Board
18 appearance, something about entering the cooking field.

19 Then it mentions, you've had secretarial skills. And now,
20 we hear that you're interested in doing park work or getting
21 out in recreation. So you perhaps have already answered it.
22 I also note that somewhere, you mention that you were hoping
23 to proceed with an MA degree, again -- is that the same field?

24 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, I've just been basically,
25 and it's pretty continuous there, because the first program

1 that I ever got out of SSU from was education. And that's
2 all the way through. And it wasn't until after an incident,
3 after that incident when they arrested me on supposed
4 knowledge and possession that they stopped my education at
5 that point through ICC which is the Inmate Classification
6 Committee that I go to. And they told me at that time I
7 could not go back to school. And that has been a program
8 I've been involved in for about four years. So I just, you
9 know, at that point, that was rather depressing. And so it
10 has been until recently that they have lifted again and
11 decided that I could continue on and go back to classes.
12 That's what basically I have been involved in since I've
13 been in.

14 MR. DEL PESCO: Have I covered it all now? Is
15 there anything else that isn't in here? I can appreciate
16 you not firming up absolute plans, you know, as someone
17 with a parole date might have. But as of now, is this
18 sum and substance of what has occurred?

19 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes.

20 MR. DEL PESCO: Panel, is there any further
21 questions on the release program?

22 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Nothing further.

23 MR. DEL PESCO: Counselor?

24 MR. GILBERT: You now have plans to live with your
25 parents?

1 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Well, not, you know, not really.
2 My father said he would be helpful in getting me started at
3 any time as far as, you know, monetarily. And we might live
4 together for a while. But I know that I would never-- I
5 don't believe it would be fair to him or myself to say I
6 would be living with my father.

7 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: I'd like to ask you one
8 thing. You know, it sounds to me like, you know, I don't
9 mean to be critical. But it sounds to me like you're very
10 idealistic in what you have learned academically, you know,
11 and what you have learned about your philosophy and in
12 discussing items and so forth almost as if there is a lack of
13 candor there or a lack of practical knowledge as to faults
14 with this order, which maybe is not existent. Maybe you'll
15 find that, as you get out on the outside, you cannot get a
16 position that you had planned in recreation or forestry or
17 whatever. And you may have to do something very menial and
18 very difficult that is not in keeping with your obvious
19 talents.

20 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Well, for the last year and a
21 half, I've been working pots and pans in VC. That's been my
22 job. And I can do that on the outside. I could wash pots
23 and pans. As a matter of fact, I was told by someone that
24 they have good pay for people that wash pots and pans. I
25 mean, I don't feel that there is little that I could not do.

1 I mean I think there is, as far as jobs, I don't have any,
2 you know, specific field that I'm really good in. But I
3 don't think, if it was necessary to get a job in order to
4 eat, I would take what I could do. And I could do -- I
5 could dig a ditch, you know.

6 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: I see. Well, that's
7 what I wanted.

8 INMATE KRENWINKEL: I enjoy pots and pans.

9 MR. GILBERT: You work in the kitchen now?

10 INMATE KRENWINKEL: No, I just got changed.

11 MR. GILBERT: What are you doing now?

12 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Now, I'm working for Mr.
13 Duenas as his clerk.

14 MR. GILBERT: How long did you work in the pots and
15 pans?

16 INMATE KRENWINKEL: One year and two months.

17 MR. GILBERT: What have they got you doing now?

18 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Well, now, I'm typing.

19 MR. GILBERT: Okay. So if you were to go out, you
20 could either work in a kitchen or you could work as a
21 secretary or clerical staff of some sort?

22 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes.

23 MR. GILBERT: Would you plan on going back to
24 school if you got out?

25 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, that's what I would like

1 to do.

2 MR. GILBERT: What's your field? What subject
3 would you be interested in?

4 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Well, I'd still have to work
5 right now on some of my basics. But, I am pretty in concrete
6 on going into some of the sciences.

7 MR. GILBERT: So what you're saying is, right now,
8 the only marketable skill you've got is either a secretary-
9 clerk or a dishwasher of some sort. Would you be willing
10 to work at those occupations while you went to school?

11 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Yes, I would.

12 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: I have one other question
13 before summation.

14 You know, when you look back at the crimes, I
15 think I would characterize them as extraordinary. There are
16 several things in there, of course, that plays a lot of
17 responsibility on this Panel. And I think maybe we need to
18 hit on some of those.

19 One, we have a dual purpose here. We have to
20 protect society. And SB42 speaks to punishment. And we have
21 to look at mitigation, aggravation. And then, in some ways,
22 when we talk about suitability, we have to really address
23 ourselves to, for lack of a better word, the odds of
24 something happening again. In trying to do that, one of the
25 things that weighs very heavily with us is, do we dare risk?

1 Okay? And when we say, "do we dare risk," we have to go back
2 to what has been done. Now, I'm saying all of that because
3 I want you to -- you don't have to answer in, you know, a
4 long response. But what I'm trying to say is that, when we
5 start thinking about a parole date for you, we are going to
6 have to start thinking about what has happened that we can
7 risk turning a person loose in a society who can kill
8 without passion. By that I mean, you don't know the person.
9 They haven't done anything to you; that you can kill at the --
10 on the order of another person, if you know, if we can
11 accept that. You know, can we really risk that? And I
12 think, I don't think we've talked enough about that. And I
13 feel we need to. Any comments about any of that?

14 INMATE KRENWINKEL: Well, I'm trying to -- I don't
15 know any way to, you know, on exactly like -- I understand
16 that, for you to consider a parole for me, it would be very
17 difficult. But I don't know what I can say to say that I
18 know it would never happen again, that I would not take
19 somebody's life. I don't know. You know, I know that inside
20 myself, but there's no way that I can impart that to you
21 through any words that I may use. I don't --

22 MR. GILBERT: Can I add something? I think a
23 possible answer to your question is, what has not happened
24 other than what has happened. She's been in here now for
25 over seven years. It's been a number of, just about everybody

1 in this institution has had an opportunity to get involved
2 in some type of disciplinary action. Just recently, there
3 was some type of disturbance over a grievance of some sort.
4 A person who supposedly walked into this institution was
5 a radical of sorts. I mean, it's clear from what the facts
6 were, you're dealing with a radical or a reactionary, and
7 somebody who is off the deep end and who is expressing it
8 in the form of violence. You know, up against the wall,
9 pig, that type of thing. That type of personality would
10 express itself in hostility toward the institution which is
11 a classic example of society, and I suppose all its faults
12 or some type of disciplinary problem. And I think that the
13 fact that there hasn't been any of that is an indication of
14 some of the changes.

15 Okay. A person who is the type of person who
16 seems to be the kind of person who would commit this type
17 of act would be a rebel, would be flaunting authority,
18 would be antagonistic toward the people in this institution,
19 would be noncooperative, would probably do anything they
20 could to make this place miserable because they believe
21 what it was. What do you have over a seven-year period?
22 That's how you can judge whether or not you have a radical
23 here or you have somebody who maybe you can trust.

24 Okay. There's no disciplinary action. There was
25 one incident that turned out she was not involved in. In

1 fact, as short a time as a month and a half ago, there was
 2 apparently a sit-down demonstration in this institution.
 3 And yet the people who run this place that know her on a
 4 day-to-day basis who have enough trust in her, they continued
 5 to exempt her from the limitations they placed the other
 6 people in and allowed her to continue on with the work and
 7 help feed people.

8 So I think you have first, in the absence of
 9 conflict and the absence of bad behavior, you have an
 10 indication of how she's actually going to behave in a
 11 situation and how she's changed. Secondly, I think there's
 12 a certain type of trust that's been shown by the people of
 13 this institution in that respect.

14 And I have one last point. That is, I've talked
 15 to one or two of the people who had involvement with Miss
 16 Krenwinkel over the last couple of years. And their basic
 17 feeling is that, she's been straight. She's not playing the
 18 games. She's not doing this so she can get out. What she
 19 says and the way she puts herself forward is the real her.
 20 And so I think, by the absence of some of the signs that
 21 seem to be prevalent and the type of personality we think
 22 we're dealing with, I think that's a good indication.

23 I've had a number of clients who have been the
 24 type of person you've been talking about. They've been
 25 sullen, rebellious. They've constantly been in trouble.

1 Their files are thick with problems they've had in the
 2 lock-downs, locked up, isolation. You know, where is that
 3 here? If we were dealing with the type of person that
 4 supposedly you're talking about, then there would be some
 5 indication of it. And there is no indication at all that
 6 she's been other than a model prisoner except the one
 7 incident and she was found not to be involved in that.
 8 So perhaps that's at least a partial answer to your question.

9 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Thank you, Counsel. I don't
 10 have anything else.

11 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Mr. Del Pesco?

12 MR. DEL PESCO: Well, it's kind of along the same
 13 lines as the question that was asked by Mrs. Rushen. Counsel
 14 from what you said, you gave me another thought. So I'll
 15 try to combine it. The act in itself or acts obviously,
 16 I think we're all in agreement, certainly shocked the public
 17 conscience. The behavior is inconceivable to the general
 18 member of the public as to how these things can happen. You
 19 conjure up this person that's a rebel and not getting in
 20 trouble in the institution. But I note that the history
 21 prior to this incident, criminal history is nil. I don't
 22 believe there's another conviction. I think there was an
 23 arrest for furnishing a seventeen-year old with LSD or
 24 something like that. But I don't believe there was a
 25 disposition shown or no conviction. We're dealing with a

1 person who was twenty-two years old when this happened.
2 So let's see if I can say this simply so I can put it in the
3 form of a question. How, then, can we be assured that such
4 an irrational act, as I mentioned that shocked the public
5 conscience and is taken out of context so to speak, how can
6 we be assured that a set of circumstances wouldn't again
7 arise that might bring similar behavior about?

8 MR. GILBERT: By the very nature of the question,
9 there's only one answer to it. That is, there's no way.

10 MR. DEL PESCO: Would you care to answer? I was
11 directing it to Miss Krenwinkel. Would you care to answer
12 that?

13 INMATE KRENWINKEL: That's, again, a question
14 that --

15 MR. DEL PESCO: I'm not looking for an academic
16 or an intellectual answer. I just want a gut level answer.
17 How would you feel through your thinking, how could you --

18 INMATE KRENWINKEL: There's no way I could ever
19 be put in that kind of position again, because I know that
20 I can't. That's the only answer I can give you. I know
21 myself. I know all that I want out of life which is very
22 simple, and that's just to be able to live, you know. I'm
23 not looking for any great answers to any major problems in
24 this world or anything else. I'm trying to learn to deal
25 with me and to get by every day on the simple things that I

1 need to get done, to live in comfort or whatever interests,
 2 learning to read the books I want or watch the TV program
 3 that I want to. There is no way, and I know that after all
 4 this time and going through the different changes within
 5 myself and realizing it and seeing all of this, after looking
 6 back at myself and all those things, that I could ever go
 7 back and repeat it. And it could not happen again. I can
 8 see what you're asking, interests, you know. You could read
 9 through the reports like in '71. You said you didn't want
 10 an academic answer. Well, that's a question where there is
 11 no -- I don't see that there is an absolute, concrete answer
 12 I can give you that, outside of just what I learned from
 13 myself and asking you to give it back.

14 MR. DEL PESCO: One more question. I heard you
 15 talking about your relationship with Dr. Flanigan as being
 16 productive. Were you ever involved in formal psychotherapy
 17 in the institutions?

18 INMATE KRENWINKEL: You mean counseling? I had,
 19 Dr. Vines used to come over to SSU weekly, and then that
 20 ceased. And then, after leaving SSU, not really again. You
 21 know, you see a psyche once a year. And Dr. Flanigan was just
 22 someone that worked in the medical department that we used
 23 to just talk.

24 MR. DEL PESCO: I have no further questions, Mr.
 25 Chairman.

1 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Now, do we have any,
2 comments? I know we pretty well entered into the area of
3 parole and preparation. Is there anything else along that
4 line that you wish to talk to?

5 MR. DEL PESCO: I don't have anything.

6 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: All right. I just
7 wanted to make sure that we had all of that. Counsel, do you
8 have anything that you wish to cover, anything else you wish
9 to cover on parole plans?

10 MR. GILBERT: Well, of course, I would have some-
11 thing I could say concerning this. It's very difficult to
12 draw specialized programs and say, I will do this, I will
13 do that without a date. She's obviously without one. The
14 only date that I've seen is the one last year with her
15 minimum release date. So it's difficult to say for sure,
16 I want to do this with the ultimate goal of becoming -- or
17 whatever. Because you know, one word from you and the whole
18 thing is struck down the tubes. The only thing I can say is
19 that, I think she's done what she has to or what's available
20 to get her started. I look at it this way. You've got a
21 limited education program and many people don't take
22 advantage of it. She has. You've got a limited amount of
23 skills and training which are available at this institution,
24 menial, not intellectual skills or professional skills, but
25 basically clerical and that type of thing. She has taken

1 advantage of that. I grant you, being potscrubber may not
2 be the most glamorous thing in the world, but at least it
3 puts bread on the table. And having clerical skills, there's
4 a need for that. So what are we talking about? We're talking
5 about a person who has had the educational opportunity and
6 availed herself of it, who had the opportunity to pick up
7 some type of productive skill and who did take advantage of
8 that, who, when she goes out, will not automatically get on
9 some welfare role and wind back up in the situation where
10 she was, but get a job. She's got a father who's supportive
11 and willing to help her as well as a parole officer. She's
12 got a situation where she has some type of outside support
13 she can go to. She can continue her education. She can find
14 a job while she's finding a decent goal to go to. So she's
15 got that.

16 On the positive-negative side, we've got the fact
17 that she could have availed herself of all the vices that
18 seem to habit these types of institutions. She could have
19 gotten herself into trouble whereby the file would be
20 replete with disciplinary problems. She has not. So by
21 doing and not doing, I think this lady has set herself into
22 a position now where she could say, okay, I had seven years
23 to think about what's going on. My head had to get
24 straightened out. I talked to psychologists and psychiatrists
25 and I think I know where I'm going now. I didn't before. I

1 know what I did was wrong, and I'm doing my damnest to make
2 sure it's not going to happen again. I have the opportunity
3 to continue with my old pattern of life and I have not done
4 that, both with the staff, as far as interactions with the
5 staff, as far as interactions with the inmates here. There
6 is a positive way to go. She has educational abilities.
7 She has gone ahead and she's developed some art work, the
8 limited ability that's available here; some poetry with the
9 limited ability that's available; some practical skills,
10 typing, secretarial work, clerical work, manual labor,
11 whatever. She has done that. And then, she has contacted
12 and made peace with her father. They both have changed.
13 But I know the father has, but I tend to think that she's
14 probably changed more than he would have changed. But
15 basically, she was alienated from him because of her attitudes.
16 And her attitudes have changed and her and her father have
17 gotten back together again. So we have a person that has
18 at least made an effort with the limited facilities that are
19 available here and the limited material available. There's
20 always a possibility that one word and whamo, she's going to
21 be here forever, to try to put the past behind her and to
22 at least start down the road for a productive life. And I
23 think part of that could necessarily be the psychological
24 impact of her name change to put the past behind her so it
25 won't be constantly coming up and haunting her, either through

1 the media or through associations. People will say oh, I
2 remember that took place back when. You can't wipe out the
3 past. I realize that. And you're right. It was an unusual
4 offense to say the least. And it generated a lot of publicity
5 and a lot of feelings on all sides. She received threats
6 on her life while she was here. There are people like Chief
7 Davis who are absent her conduct. So it was not all one-
8 sided. There were reactions on both sides.

9 Okay. Now, what can you do? You can't resurrect
10 the dead. The best you can do is to try to make of your
11 lives the type of behavior that won't happen again, and
12 perhaps, by your conduct, you can, in some way, atone for
13 what you've done in the past. And I think she has done that.
14 And I think now, after all this time, the time is now to
15 stop rehashing the dead and let them have their peace. Let
16 them lie and let us see what we can do to build a future so
17 that this doesn't happen again.

18 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Now, Mr. Kay, are you
19 prepared to make what would be your closing statement?

20 MR. KAY: Yes. I don't have too many additions
21 to what I've already said. I think that what's been brought
22 up, especially in the last two categories kind of points out
23 the problem that you have to deal with. If Miss Krenwinkel
24 was someone who had, was mentally ill or had a bad background
25 or something like that, I think you could understand a little

1 bit better what went on. Why did she do this? But she's
2 not that type of person. She didn't have mental problems.
3 She wasn't raised in a life of crime, so to speak. She made
4 her decision. She didn't have to join the Manson family.
5 She didn't have to sit there and listen to what Manson was
6 saying and go along with it. Nobody forced her to
7 participate in these murders and she's been held fully
8 responsible for all of the murders. As I said before, this
9 is the first hearing that I've attended. I don't know if
10 you've had other hearings where D.A.'s have attended. I
11 tried to find somebody from my office who has attended a
12 hearing and I couldn't find anybody. I think, we don't
13 appear on every hearing. It's unusual. And I hope this
14 conveys our concern about this case, not just Miss Krenwinkel
15 but, of course, Miss Atkins and, if Mr. Manson has a parole
16 hearing, I intend to appear on that, too. I mean, we have
17 a great deal of interest in this case, in the participants.
18 And in Miss Krenwinkel especially today, she knew better.
19 She knew better than to do what she did.

20 I find it interesting about her interest in earth
21 sciences. Now, just as a side, I'm sure you're well aware
22 that the members of the Manson family, that's kind of the
23 current thing. Sandy Good, a member of the family was
24 sentenced to fifteen years in Federal prison for sending
25 death threats to corporate executives because they were

1 polluting the environment. Charles Manson, whenever he
2 talks to the press now, all he'll talk about is the
3 environment and people polluting the earth and how terrible
4 they are. I find it interesting that that's Miss Krenwinkel's
5 interest. I don't know if there's any connection between
6 them or if she arrived at this interest on her own or if
7 she's aware that this is kind of the family program now.
8 But it is at least Manson's program and Sandy Good's program.

9 I think the letters from Chief Davis and Chief
10 Gates -- he wasn't chief when he wrote the letter, but there
11 is a letter from him -- and from Sheriff Pitchess and from
12 Steve Trott who is the Chief Deputy District Attorney of Los
13 Angeles County, I think, points out the interests that we
14 have in this case and in not seeing Miss Krenwinkel released
15 into the community.

16 I have nothing else to add.

17 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Counsel, closing?

18 MR. GILBERT: Just two points. Okay. First about
19 the common interest. Sandra Good and Manson are interested
20 in earth sciences. So is President Carter. I mean, does
21 that mean that he's part of the Manson family also? Because
22 he is also interested in pollution. A lot of people are
23 interested in pollution. I mean, it's a hot topic, that in
24 and of itself. This, again, goes to my second point. And
25 that is, the State in the form of the prosecution will not

1 let the people forget that they were part of the Manson
2 family. And it doesn't matter if you try to break away.
3 You will not be allowed, not by Manson, but by the State,
4 by Chief Davis, by the District Attorney's office, you will
5 not be allowed to forget that you were part of the Manson
6 family. And everything you do is because you're a part of
7 the Manson family. Because you're interested in ecology,
8 that's a part of the Manson family. Because you're interested
9 in earth sciences, you're part of the Manson family. It
10 doesn't matter. It's guilt by association. It's as simple
11 as that. You were part of the Manson family once. You will
12 never be allowed to forget that. If you have an independent
13 interest, that doesn't matter. It's because of somebody
14 else in some part of the Manson family at one time thought
15 about it, that means that you're still interested in the
16 Manson family. Don't you think we've had enough of this?
17 It's been almost eight years now.

18 Okay. The incident took place eight years ago,
19 and they won't allow anybody to forget it. Now, if she has
20 made an honest effort to get away from the Manson family,
21 will she be allowed to? Or will she now be inseparably
22 linked to him forever and ever simply because something
23 happened a long time ago.

24 I guess what the Board should decide is, is there
25 an honest effort to break away? Is there an attempt to

1 create a life of your own, independent, put that in the past.

2 I guess that's the question. That's all I have.

3 INMATE KRENWINKEL: I would like to say, there's
4 only one thing I just want to make clear. I think mostly
5 with Mr. Kay, because he comes out with the attitude that
6 I have said that I'm not responsible for those deaths. I am.
7 I'm not saying I'm not. You know, I'm not saying that I
8 didn't, when Charlie and I started on the road in September,
9 yes, I chose to go with him just like I chose to get up and
10 fix myself eggs in the morning when I'd eat breakfast. Those
11 choices I did make. I mean, I'm not saying that I am
12 innocent by being completely, you know, this way or that.
13 Yes, I take responsibility for those actions. I'm not trying
14 to say I'm all innocent and please blame everybody, because
15 I am guilty of that which I did. I know. I did it. I am
16 guilty. I'm not saying I didn't do it.

17 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Anybody here have
18 anything else to offer?

19 MR. DEL PESCO: Nothing further.

20 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: I don't have anything.

21 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Staff, do you have
22 anything to add?

23 MR. DUENAS: No, I don't.

24 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Then at this time, we
25 will recess and make a decision.

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

(Thereupon the room was cleared and
the hearing of the Community Release
Board was recessed for deliberation
by the Board.)

--000--

RESUMPTION OF PROCEEDINGS

--000--

1
2
3 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Let the record show
4 that all parties are returned to the room. The panel is
5 again in session. The time is approximately 6:04 p.m. and
6 we've made a unanimous decision. The Panel finds you
7 unsuitable, Miss Krenwinkel, for parole due to the gravity of
8 the offense and all of the total circumstances involved in
9 the offenses.

10 The subsequent actions of yourself and your
11 crime partners in the act shocked the conscience of the
12 community and of the public and all concerned persons.

13 The Panel notes the excessive mutilation of the
14 victims. The victims were unknown to you and your crime
15 partners. It does appear that you killed on orders or
16 directions of another person, that the victims were selected
17 at random. The Panel noted a high degree of callousness
18 evidenced by many factors, including the fact that you and
19 your crime partners were able to consume a meal at the
20 residence after the murder of the LaBiancas while, of course,
21 the two victims had been stabbed to death and were still at
22 the scene.

23 Now, the Panel commends your efforts at rehabilita-
24 tion and all of the things that you have done and the progress
25 that you have made within the institution for preparing

1 yourself, and the favorable reports that you have received.
2 But the bizarre nature of the offenses including the
3 motivation for the acts which defies understanding creates
4 too great a risk to the safety and the health and the
5 welfare of the public to such an extent that, at this time,
6 we cannot project a date for you.

7 Does the Panel have any additional comments?

8 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: I don't have any.

9 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Mr. Del Pesco?

10 MR. DEL PESCO: I have nothing further.

11 PRESIDING MEMBER DE LEON: Counselor, Miss
12 Krenwinkel, do you have anything to say or ask?

13 MR. GILBERT: - No.

14 MISS KRENWINKEL: No.

15 MR. KAY: I just have a question. What's the
16 next step? When will be the next time that she will be
17 eligible for a hearing?

18 MR. GILBERT: Sixty days.

19 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: No.

20 MR. GILBERT: Pursuant to Section 3041.7 of the
21 Penal Code, request is now made for a rehearing.

22 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: I believe that the new law
23 are you quoting from the new law? The July 1st law?

24 MR. GILBERT: Well, unless there's been a change,
25 according to the notes that I have, this is effective 1978.

1 I don't know if it's a new law.

2 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: What's the number of the
3 bill? No, the bill? What's the number of the bill?

4 MR. GILBERT: Effective July 29, 1977 operative
5 July 1st, 1977.

6 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: It's my understanding, and
7 of course you'll have to research it, Counselor. It's my
8 understanding that the bill that permitted counsel at the
9 first hearing took out the rehearing part. Now, I may be
10 wrong. See, prior to today and prior to the first, she would
11 have had a lifer hearing without counsel. And within sixty
12 days, she could have appeared with counsel.

13 MR. GILBERT: According to this thing, unless
14 legal counsel is required by formal revision of the law,
15 a person designated by the Department of Corrections shall
16 be present to ensure that all facts relevant to the decision
17 be presented including necessary --

18 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: I think you're quoting from
19 the old law.

20 MR. GILBERT: I'm quoting from 3041.5 which is the
21 prisoner's rights.

22 MR. KAY: The law might have been changed.

23 MR. GILBERT: That's very possible. Okay. To
24 answer his question, then, either the law says that she has
25 a right to a rehearing or, if there's no rehearing, or if

1 that's been taken out by the new rules which this is the
2 latest that I've got, then I guess the next step would be
3 some type of administrative hearing, annual administrative
4 hearing.

5 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Every year, she's entitled
6 to a hearing.

7 MR. GILBERT: Or there will be some sort of a
8 legal action through the courts.

9 BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Right.

10 MR. GILBERT: So, I guess the next step for us to
11 do is to decide whether or not this is operational. Now,
12 the way I read this thing, you're right. There was no
13 attorney present at the first hearing. And then, that was
14 being changed to add provisions for attorneys. But we'll
15 have to find that out. This is effective. This is the
16 latest one I've got.

17 PRESIDING DE LEON: Any additional comments?
18 This hearing is now terminated. It is noted the time is
19 now 6:10 p.m.

20 (Thereupon the hearing before the
21 Community Release Board was
22 adjourned at 6:10 p.m.)
23
24
25

that's been taken out by the... which this is the
lastest that... then I guess the next step would be
some type of administrative hearing, annual administrative
hearing.

BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Every year, she's entitled

to a hearing.

MR. GILBERT: Or there will be some sort of a

legal action through the courts.

BOARD MEMBER RUSHEN: Right.

MR. GILBERT: So I guess the next step for us to

do is to decide whether or not this is operational. Now,

the way I read this thing, you're right. There was no

attorney present at the first hearing. And then, that was

being changed to add provisions for attorneys. But we'll

have to find that out. This is effective. This is the

lastest one I've got.

PRESIDING DE LOON: Any additional comments?

This hearing is now terminated. It is noted the time is

now 6:10 p.m.

(Throughout the hearing before the

Community Release Board was

adjourned at 6:10 p.m.)