

## WHO WAS JACK THE RIPPER?

In 1888, the most infamous murders of all time took place in London's East End. Five prostitutes, destitute women who knew of no other way to survive, were killed and slaughtered by a supposedly unknown killer who bears the nickname Jack the Ripper.

The victims are listed below:

Mary Ann Nichols, Friday 31st August mutilated at Buck's Row  
 Annie Chapman, Saturday 8th September mutilated at Hanbury Street  
 Elizabeth Stride, Sunday 30 September throat cut at Berner Street  
 Catherine Eddowes, Sunday 30 September mutilated at Mitre Square  
 Mary Jane Kelly, Friday 9th November murdered indoors at Miller's Court

## TABRAM?

It is believed that Martha Tabram who bears nearly all of the signs of a Ripper killing who died 7 August 1888 should be included. Tabram had some odd wounds that because of a prostitutes' lies were assumed to be a bayonet! Our suspect was adept with scissors and tried to kill his sister with them. Our suspect would have struck close to home the first time. He had to get more confident and more experienced. Killers do strike close to home in the first stages. Sion Square his abode was a short distance away. When the killer killed Eddowes you can imagine he had to get out of and stay out of a large radius on which the police were going to be concentrated in. If the killer went back to Sion Square and then out again to plant the apron piece belonging to Eddowes at Goulston St that makes perfect sense. It was only a short distance from his home and it was easy to sneak back there again. It had to be for it was best to keep off the streets unless there was an extreme reason to be out.

It seems certain that the Ripper would have suffered from mental illness and paranoia. This shows he was not wandering too far from home to kill.

## THE EMBARRASSMENT FRAMEWORK

The candidate for the Ripper needs to explain one thing: the huge devastating embarrassment caused to the police for not catching him and failing to have him convicted. Failure to capture was the biggest issue for the witness who picked out the killer would not testify and so that was not the police's fault. It would help if the Ripper were a smart and/or well-off man but he was anything but. The police records show how hard it was for those involved to admit who the killer was. We must remember how the police were terrorised by the media and laughed at by the public. That embarrassment is the key to understanding how we can read the documents and read between the lines.

The Ripper should have been stopped.

He should have been convicted.

The police had to settle for leaking that they knew who he was and that errors and problems with getting witnesses to testify were the reason there was no conviction. The man's insanity caused other problems for you cannot identify a man who is insane at the present time or execute him for murder.

## IT IS PROVEN WHO SHOULD KNOW BEST

The identity of the killer is controversial and many believe the right man will never be named.

The best judges are those who may have had knowledge that has been lost to us.

Once you start pretending you know better it can lead anywhere.

Assistant Chief Constable Macnaghten, Sir Robert Anderson and Chief Inspector Donald Swanson certainly claimed to be in the position to know. Macnaghten and Swanson named Kosminski as the Ripper. Sir Robert Anderson didn't name the killer but merely said he was a specific Polish Jew.

We will deal with them in order.

## MACNAGHTEN

Assistant Chief Constable Macnaghten who though he did not investigate the Ripper murders when they were happening did look into the matter retrospectively. That he wrote so soon after the murders overrides any of today's speculations by authors. He wrote in 1894,

“No one ever saw the Whitechapel murderer; many homicidal maniacs were suspected, but no shadow of proof could be thrown on any one. I may mention the cases of 3 men, any one of whom would have been more likely than Cutbush to have committed this series of murders:

(1) A Mr M. J. Drutt, said to be a doctor & of good family -- who disappeared at the time of the Miller's Court murder, & whose body (which was said to have been upwards of a month in the water) was found in the Thames on 31st December -- or about 7 weeks after that murder. He was sexually insane and from private information I have little doubt but that his own family believed him to have been the murderer.

(2) Kosminski -- a Polish Jew -- & resident in Whitechapel. This man became insane owing to many years indulgence in solitary vices. He had a great hatred of women, specially of the prostitute class, & had strong homicidal tendencies: he was removed to a lunatic asylum about March 1889. There were many circumstances connected with this man which made him a strong 'suspect'.

(3) Michael Ostrog, a Russian doctor, and a convict, who was subsequently detained in a lunatic asylum as a homicidal maniac. This man's antecedents were of the worst possible type, and his whereabouts at the time of the murders could never be ascertained.”

Notice that Kosminski gets the strongest reckoning as a suspect. He is careful to say with Drutt that his family blamed him but gives nothing but foggy indications of Ostrog's possible guilt. Why is suspect in quotation marks? It is a hint that this suspect was more than a suspect. He was the killer.

Hatred of women especially prostitutes and mentioning that trait only with Kosminski says it all.

Drutt stands out as first, the "favorite". That speaks of the political correctness of the time. He just didn't want to direct the finger at a Jew. Police policy was to be very careful about starting a media and anti-Semitic wildfire. It cannot be stressed too much that this first best suspect is written about in such a way to make it clear that there is nothing more to go on than hearsay.

The error is that the date of the admission to the asylum for Kosminski is wrong and he uses "about" possibly indicating that it may be misremembered so it may not be a real error.

He indicates that there was actual evidence. So really he should have only the one real suspect - Kosminski. He writes of him different from the others. He is clear that it was hearsay was what was accusing Drutt. Drutt and Ostrog the other one are decoys. It looks bad if you say such things about a person and don't catch him so what you do is throw a couple of other suspects into the mix so make the failure to convict him more understandable.

The next suspect Ostrog has no case against him except that he had a dangerous past and his whereabouts at the times of the murders were unknown. Macnaghten knows that he should not be mentioned and yet he is! He is a decoy.

I would suggest the importance of the mention of Thomas Cutbush. He carried weapons to stab women. For the others to be more likely than him they must have carried knives too. Ostrog did. We don't know about Drutt but a man suffering paranoia like him would probably have done. Kosminski as we will learn liked sharp accessories too.

## MISSING FILES?

Macnaghten was responsible for the destruction of some of the most important files on Jack the Ripper. He stated that he burned them to protect the murderer's family (page 88, The Complete Jack the Ripper). His daughter however claimed that he lied about burning the papers to avoid being pestered by questions about them.

It is totally ridiculous to imagine that Macnaghten needed to burn papers that he read and studied to stop questions! It was what he remembered about the Ripper and the papers that the questioners wanted to know about. Why didn't he just have the papers locked away somewhere where nobody could get to them? It was easy enough to have papers locked away for

years so that nobody could get them until it was safe.

But it seems that Macnaghten did burn the papers as he said. When Macnaghten felt he should destroy the papers it shows he KNEW who the Ripper was.

## ABERCONWAY VERSION OF the MACNAGHTEN MEMORANDUM

This differs from the official version in certain ways. It lists Druitt, Kosminksi and Ostrog as the suspects.

Written in 1894, it says he believes that Kosminksi is still detained in a lunatic asylum from March 1889. This is a break from the evidence of others that the possible killer was committed and died soon after! He says he only believes it so nobody was checking. But James Monro had a report dated 15 March 1889 that the patrols in Whitechapel that existed just to track the Ripper and prevent murders had been ended. So we have a reason why the mistake is really an inaccuracy. The police but not necessarily Monro thought the women of Whitechapel had no longer to fear the Ripper.

Of Kosminksi he adds, "This man in appearance strongly resembled the individual seen by the City P.C. near Mitre Square."

He rules out Kosminksi, "A much more rational and workable theory, to my way of thinking, is that the 'rippers' brain gave way altogether after his awful glut in Millers Court and that he then committed suicide, or, as a less likely alternative, was found to be so helplessly insane by his relatives, that they, suspecting the worst, had him confined in some Lunatic Asylum."

The text however shows the committed man he is thinking of is specifically Kosminksi.

But he exonerates him and Ostrog and blames Druitt, "Personally, & after much careful & deliberate consideration, I am inclined to exonerate the last 2. but I have always held strong opinions regarding no 1... The truth, however, will never be known, and did indeed, at one time lie at the bottom of the Thames, if my conjectures be correct."

He says he is certain that Sadler killed Frances Coles. Alice McKenzie is sometimes thought to be a Ripper victim. The evidence is how they had the same stabbing in the throat. So he writes that, "I have no doubt whatever in my own mind as to his having murdered Frances Coles".

The version is clearly a first draft and the official one is the one that should stand. He removed the material where he pressed his view that Druitt was the killer. It is helpful but not the last word.

## NAMES

The issue with names was rather messy in those days. A suspect who was divorced from reality may have used that name.

We decide then that Kosminksi was not necessarily the killer's legal name.

Macnaghten gave only a surname. It is through looking at other non-police sources that the name Aaron Kosminksi. The lack of a first name is to prevent anybody knowing exactly who was meant. The safety and privacy of the family of the killer had to be considered. As the family of the killer were blamed for protecting him that was the only safe course.

## AN ERROR?

Macnaghten wrote that Kosminksi was put in an asylum in March 1889. In fact Aaron Kosminksi went to the workhouse on July 12 1890 for three days. Then he was back there February 4 1891. On February 7 he went from there to Colney Hatch Lunatic Asylum until he was moved to Leavesden Asylum for Imbeciles in 1894.

Why the error? Did he get the wrong information from deluded Kosminksi? Is the record lost meaning he was right after all? Or was the man he was thinking of was not Aaron Kosminksi?

The date fits no possible suspect exactly so we should not read too much into it.

There is no obvious error so far.

## SWANSON AND THE RIPPER

Chief Inspector Donald Swanson, head of the Ripper investigation, wrote in a private record of his own in 1910 that the

Ripper was identified at the Seaside Home and was returned to Whitechapel and later he went to Stepney Workhouse and then to Colney Hatch, Lunatic Asylum. He wrote that Kosminski was this man and he died soon after.

"After the suspect had been identified at the Seaside Home where he had been sent by us with difficulty in order to subject him to identification, and he knew he was identified. On suspect's return to his brother's house in Whitechapel he was watched by police (City CID) by day & night. In a very short time the suspect with his hands tied behind his back, he was sent to Stepney Workhouse and then to Colney Hatch and died shortly afterwards – Kosminski was the suspect – DSS"

Neither Aaron Kosminski or any Ripper suspect can be confirmed to have gone to Stepney Workhouse - there is no record of it.

He wrote that the suspect had been identified by a witness at the Seaside Home. And that the killer had been identified by a witness who wouldn't testify against him because both suspect and witness were Jewish. He said the witness did this "because the suspect was also a Jew and also because his evidence would convict the suspect and witness would be the means of murderer being hanged which he did not wish to be left on his mind. And after this identification which suspect knew no other murder of this kind took place in London."

The witness identified the killer but refused to testify.

The witness made it clear that he didn't want the man hanged so he must have been certain that the suspect was indeed the killer. Swanson wrote that the witness would have been the cause of the murderer being hanged had he testified that this man was indeed the murderer. Swanson then is hinting that the police did know who the killer was but just needed a sworn identification to prove it enough. How else could a sworn identification be sure to lead to the gallows? Identifying somebody as the killer doesn't mean that your word will be taken for it. There must be evidence to support what you say.

Swanson writes "Kosminski was the suspect".

We have to take this as literal. He was not going to use a fake name in a record for himself. He means Aaron for Aaron did have a brother who looked after him at times.

After the identification, the killer didn't kill any more. Swanson speaks as if the identification put the killer off committing any more murders which fits his saying the killer was sent back to Whitechapel.

It is felt that the identification must have taken place after the killing of other women who were thought to be victims of the Ripper such as Frances Coles and Alice McKenzie. But this is not necessarily true. An identification is based only on finding somebody who may have seen the killer.

Kosminski was in Colney Hatch Lunatic Asylum when Frances Coles was murdered 13 November 1891. The date of his admission was 7 February 1891. No reliable identification of the Ripper would have been possible from then on unless a lucid phase had taken place.

The identification took place before the asylum incarceration according to Swanson. This was most likely 1889 or 1890.

## ANDERSON'S SUSPECT

Sir Robert Anderson who was head of the Criminal Investigation Division of the London Metropolitan Police in 1888 declared in 1910 in Blackwood's Magazine, Part 6, that the case of Jack the Ripper had been solved back then in 1888.

We must remember that Anderson was noted for his honesty.

"One did not need to be a Sherlock Holmes to discover that the criminal was a sexual maniac of a virulent type; that he was living in the immediate vicinity of the scenes of the murders; and that, if he was not living absolutely alone, his people knew of his guilt, and refused to give him up to justice. During my absence abroad the Police had made a house-to-house search for him, investigating the case of every man in the district whose circumstances were such that he could go and come and get rid of his blood-stains in secret. And the conclusion we came to was that he and his people were low-class Jews, for it is a remarkable fact that people of that class in the East End will not give up one of their number to Gentile justice. And the result proved that our diagnosis was right on every point. For I may say at once that 'undiscovered murders' are rare in London, and the 'Jack-the-Ripper' crimes are not within that category. And if the Police here had powers such as the French Police possess, the murderer would have been brought to justice. Scotland Yard can boast that not even the subordinate officers of the department will tell tales out of school, and it would ill become me to violate the unwritten rule of the service..."

A footnote added: -

"Having regard to the interest attaching to this case, I should almost be tempted to disclose the identity of the murderer and of the pressman who wrote the letter ['Dear Boss/Jack the Ripper' letter] above referred to, provided that the publishers would accept all responsibility in view of a possible libel action. But no public benefit would result from such a course, and the traditions of my old department would suffer. I will only add that when the individual whom we suspected was caged in an asylum, the only person who had ever had a good view of the murderer at once identified him, but when he learned that the suspect was a fellow-Jew he declined to swear to him."

His reasons for not saying much more was that "no public benefit would result from such a course, and the traditions of my old department would suffer". The Ripper then was either dead or had no chance of being released back to the public when he wrote in 1910.

He added that the killer was "a sexual maniac of a virulent type", that he lived "in the immediate vicinity of the scenes of the murders". He said that the man's "utterly unmentionable vices reduced him to a lower level than that of the brute".

Anderson wrote, "For I may say at once that 'undiscovered murders' are rare in London, and the Jack the Ripper crimes are not within that category". Also, "In saying he was a Polish Jew I am merely stating a definitely ascertained fact".

It is proven the way you can prove something but the law cannot prove it.

Incidentally, when Anderson says that no benefit would come from naming the forger of the letter we have to be sceptical. If the forger was caught he should have been convicted. If he was not, then Anderson and the police had no proof that he was the forger. Thus we cannot listen to those who say Anderson refuted the authenticity of the Dear Boss Ripper letters.

Why go out of your way to mention the Dear Boss letters when there were others especially the notorious Lusk letter which purported to be from the killer and with which a kidney allegedly taken from Catherine Eddowes was sent? The Dear Boss letters stung for they gave a Jewish religious motive for the killings. This was too near the real truth.

He does not say he cannot name the killer for fear of libel but only that he cannot name the letter writer. The implication is the family of the killer would not sue for the truth would come out or they didn't have enough money to take a court action.

THE SAME MAN?

Did Sir Robert Anderson have the same person in mind as Macnaghten? Or did they mistakenly think they had the same person in mind?

Anderson writes in 1910 that he will not name the killer. Does that show he did not regard Kosminski by Macnaghten in 1894 as the legal and correct name of the killer? Or that he just did not want to confirm?

People would only assume it was Kosminski Anderson meant so he didn't need to give a name! He knew what he was doing.

Insane people couldn't be hanged. Anderson by saying that the killer was an inmate of the asylum when identified and that the witness didn't want to swear to it for the killer was a fellow-Jew was indicating that the killer wasn't insane all the time so the killer might still have ended up at the end of a noose. The other fear could have been that in those anti-Semitic times the killer could have been declared sane by corrupt medics so that a hanging could proceed.

Anderson says that the witness who identified the suspect without hesitation refused to testify against him in the murder trial they hoped to have when he learned that the suspect was a Jew. The words, "but when he learned that the suspect was a fellow-Jew he declined to swear to him" tell us that the witness didn't know who he was asked to identify or that he didn't know the killer personally. The latter is doubtful because the witness must have known the killer to be able to identify him months and years after seeing him at the scene of a crime. The witness must have known the suspect when he was so sure it was him after getting only a quick look at him. There had to have been rumours about who this suspect was among the Jewish community. The witness would have known a Jew by his appearance. It seems then that he didn't know who the suspect was until he met him. Chances are the Jews from their respective countries Poland etc in such a small area as Whitechapel all knew each other. And we can't believe that the police knowing that Jews didn't tell on each other would tell the witness that the suspect was a Jew as well!

The witness did not know who he was going to see for otherwise he would not have went.

A house to house search of the Whitechapel area in October 1888 led Anderson to declare: "The conclusion we came to was

that he and his people were low-class Jews... and the result proved that our diagnosis was right on every point". The result can only refer to the positive identification of the killer by a fellow Jew. He speaks of proof here. This identification must have taken place after the Kelly murder. It may have been the reason the killer stopped killing.

## TWO IDENTIFICATIONS?

Anderson says the suspect was caged in an asylum when identified. Swanson says he was staying with his brother and wasn't put in the asylum yet. This is not necessarily an error. There might have been two identifications. Perhaps the police wanted to make sure the witness was able to pick the suspect out of an identity parade. After all it had been a long time since the witness saw the suspect at a crime scene.

One possible answer to how a man caged in an asylum when identified making no sense is that the man was in the process of being released with a clear bill of mental health!

## GRIFFITHS ON ANDERSON

In 1895, Arthur Griffiths stated how his friend Anderson was convinced that the Ripper was a maniac who was put out of bloodthirsty action by ending up in an asylum. This narrows things down a lot so we can be sure that one of the names accused of being the Ripper was the Ripper. Going through the records throws up Kosminski and others.

Anderson stated in late 1889 that they had failed to "find Jack the Ripper."

Griffiths explained that the problem was how the police were certain who the killer was but had no way of putting him away. "One was a Polish Jew, a known lunatic, who was at large in the district of Whitechapel at the time of the murder, and who afterward having developed homicidal tendencies, was confined in an asylum. This man was said to resemble the murderer by the one person who got a glimpse of him - the police-constable in Mitre Court." We can point out that glimpse is clearly bad wording. Policemen and the system depend on more than that!

Interestingly an earlier draft of what Macnagten wrote about the Ripper reads, "This man in appearance strongly resembled the individual seen by the City PC near Mitre Square".

The Ripper was identified instantly by a witness at the Seaside Home. The witness said he would not take the matter any further for he learned the man was Jewish and he did not want to betray a fellow Jew.

The witness has not been named.

The witness was not the Jew Schwartz who saw Stride being attacked for he did not anybody take her into the yard where she was murdered. You would wonder if Schwartz who turned out to be a Polish Jew though he claimed to be Hungarian told lies to cover up that he saw Kosminski with Stride?

The witness was not Joseph Lawende who said he was clear that the man was in his late 20s but could not identify him. It was Joseph Levy a Jew who was probably told by the police not to say much.

It is clear that the Polish Jew Kosminski was identified as the killer.

## WAS THE NAME REAL?

Everybody had confusing names in those days.

The Ripper may have used the name Kosminski to persuade women that they didn't know him at all or to mislead them.

There is no evidence for the view that Kosminski was Nathan Kaminsky who was put away for syphilis treatment in March 1888. Martin Fido thinks his name was also David Cohen who was totally violent. The Ripper of course was not. He was only violent when he wasn't being watched.

The Ripper victims had different names. Mary Ann Nichols was often known as Polly Nichols. Annie Chapman as Annie Sivvey. Catherine Eddowes was also known as Catherine Conway. Worse, her other name was Mary Ann Kelly! Mary Jane Kelly was Mary Jeanette Davies by marriage.

We should assume that as Kosminski was known to the police and the medical profession under that name that it was his name. Swanson wrote privately that this was the name and why would he not use the real name in a record for himself?

## AARON KOSMINSKI

The Polish immigrant Jew Aaron Kosminski is the only person in the records who makes a reasonable fit for the police reports. He fits all the facts given about the Ripper from different sources.

The facts and near-facts include these.

The killer was a Jew. Mrs Long saw a Jew with Chapman before her body was found.

The killer was Polish.

The killer was relatively young and seems to have been in his late 20s. Lawende said that much.

The killer hated women.

He took trophies from the victims – Chapmans' rings and Eddowes kidney and Kosminski must have been in the habit of taking things when he was prowling the streets.

The killer was an ordinary man who had some anatomical knowledge but who was not an expert at cutting people up. Differences of opinion exist on this. Overall we can be sure it was not a medical student or somebody like that. It was Joe Soap.

It is now known the mutilations could have been done quite quickly.

He knew the streets extremely well and worked virtually under the noses of the police and the groups who were out to help the police keep a lookout.

He could speak English.

He could present as normal in public.

He was definitely mentally ill.

He was good with a knife and had some anatomical knowledge.

He did not strike on weekdays which makes some think he was a working man.

He was poor for the victims were found with no money on them and so he must have taken what they had.

He went to an asylum after the killings. Sagat and Swanson both said that there were no Ripper like murders after the suspect was committed.

It is said that, "There is no evidence that Aaron Kosminski who fits some of the information was the suspect they meant. He could not have been for he died in 1919 while Swanson indicates he died soon after the murders. Detective Inspector Edmund Reid agreed." But nobody else fits as well.

A reasonable fit is what we need. A perfect one asks too much.

## OBJECTIONS TO KOSMINSKI AS THE RIPPER

The prime Ripper suspect can only be Aaron Kosminski. Against that it is said,

#He was not the Ripper for he was totally incoherent to talk to.

#We know he only spoke Yiddish so how did he get the prostitutes alone?

# Was dirty and ate scraps off the street. Not the kind of man who could get a prostitute to go with him!

# He ended up a complete imbecile so how could he be so good at dodging the police?

#He didn't masturbate at the crime scenes though he had a addiction to masturbation

#There was no deviant sexuality in the asylum

So they conclude that none of what they said points the finger at Aaron Kosminski. The hatred of women, hatred of prostitutes, the insanity, the Jewishness, and the other facts about Aaron prove nothing.

Aaron's lunatic behaviour has been exaggerated by writers seeking to case the joint.

Aaron spoke German in the asylum and was okay with English. There is no reason to think he was totally insane all the time. He spoke reasonable English.

The women did go with dirty men for whoever killed them went through their pockets before mutilating them which shows grave poverty and fits somebody like him who went about homeless a lot. Kosminski may not have been overly dirty all the time. The Ripper could hardly have been a model of hygiene having had his hands inside bodies! He did not even clean up at the Annie Chapman scene. In Colney Hatch pauper lunatic asylum Aaron was described as being 'cleanly' on Jan 18 1893.

The accounts tell us that an unnamed suspect who stayed with his brother was taken from Whitechapel to the Seaside Home, Brighton, for identification with his hands tied behind his back as if he could be uncontrollable. Some question if Aaron Kosminski would have needed to be restrained. But why not? The killer could handle Polly Nichols and Annie Chapman who were known to be able to hold their own against stronger women. Nichols had a bad reputation and once tried to stab a man in the workhouse. She was a strong woman able to make any male attacker think twice. So the needing to tie the suspect is a hint that he could be the right man. A letter came up showing he did need restraining and our Aaron did have a brother to stay with.

A Ripper with mental illness and or who had huge stress levels got away. This could be Kosminski as well as anybody else.

Aaron Kosminski who showed no sexual deviance in the asylum but then his mind was gone and his illness had taken hold so that would have meant changes. But who knows? Self abuse was on his admission record so was there much need to record something as private as that? No.

There is no barrier at all against his candidacy as being the Ripper. Now we need to look at the evidence of his guilt.

## POLISH JEW

The Star said Israel Schwartz who it merely calls the Hungarian said he saw an attack on Stride. She was found dead shortly after. The attacker tried to push Stride into the yard. He said the other man, pipe man, made as if to attack that man. He said this man had a knife. He said he had a red moustache. It said the police were questioning that man. It ends with saying Schwartz was not wholly trusted. It is generally believed that this report was planted by the police. That is the best interpretation. Schwartz was kept out of the affair for it probably was best for police operations.

Schwartz was in fact a Polish Jew not a Hungarian. Why was that lied about? Maybe because the Ripper was known to be a Polish Jew and to protect Schwarz from repercussions.

A man shouted the anti-Semitist abuse Lipski at the scene. Abberline said that Lipski was shouted at Schwartz as he had a strong Jewish look about him. "I questioned Israel Schwartz very closely at the time he made the statement as to whom the man addressed when he called Lipski but he was unable to say. There was only one other person to be seen in the street and that was a man on the opposite side of the road in the act of lighting a pipe." This is best seen as being shouted at the man who killed Stride.

## KOSMINKSI AND HIS DOG

Aaron could still present reasonably well in public in 1889 over a year after the last murder.

Police-constable Borer said that he saw the defendant with an unmuzzled dog, and that when asked his name he gave that of Aaron Kosminski, which his brother said was wrong, as his name was Abrahams. Defendant said that the dog was not his, and his brother said it was found more convenient here to go by the name of Abrahams, but his name was Kosminski. Sir Polydore de Keyser imposed a fine of ten shillings and costs, which the defendant would not pay as it was the Jewish Sunday, and it was not right to pay money on Sunday. He was given till Monday to pay."

Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper, Sunday, 15th December, 1889.

This shows Kosminski was religiously conscious. We have indications that we should look for a religious man as the murderer.

AARON KOSMUNSKI also appeared to a summons for having a dog unmuzzled in Cheapside. When spoken to by the police he gave a wrong name and address. Defendant: I goes by the name of Abrahams sometimes, because Kosmunski is hard to spell. (Laughter.) The defendant called his brother, who corroborated that part of the evidence which related to his name. The Alderman said he would have to pay a fine of 10s., and costs. Defendant: I cannot pay; the dog belongs to Jacobs; it is not mine. The Alderman: It was in your charge, and you must pay the fine, and if you have no goods on which to distrain you will have to go to prison for seven days.

This shows he had reasonable English to talk to the Whitechapel victims and had his wits before the law.

## REVEREND DOTT LETTER

Dated July 12 1889 this letter turned up in Australia. Tilly is Aaron's sister Matilda. The letter says that the police were not the only ones who blamed him for the Ripper murders. The Reverend could have been privy to information like clergy usually are.

My Dearest Sister

I surly received your kind letter dated a few days since, and was made glad to hear that you were still content in your works. Praise be to almighty God. Before this reaches you the sad intelligence of the death of our dear sister Rachel Bell will have reached you. She departed this life on Monday last around nine o'clock after much suffering. This most stirring news is delivered as such a sad dispensation. But we will continue to fight the good fight. Walter sends his blessings. Mary's health remains well. She shares no exceptional news of late other than an attack [hard to read}. From the Jew Kosminski Wednesday week past. On walking alongside the fruit barrow poor Mary took such fright when the lunatic ran at her with those ghastly scissors yelling his devil tongue. Mary ran all the way back. It's a wonder he hasn't hung for what he did to those poor girls and the terrors he has delivered upon poor Tilly. Please give my warmest tidings to brother Michael and Sister Jenny. We pray nightly of their works. I remain yours in Christ. Dott.

Again he is just called Kosminski.

Anderson described prostitute Alice McKenzie's killing of July 1889 as an ordinary murder. It was not really ordinary and he talks as if he were sure it were not the Ripper. But this could be a police decoy. The doctor did say it was the Ripper's work. The letter shows Kosminski was out and about at the time.

Dr Brown said of the Eddowes murder, "The wounds on the face and abdomen prove that they were inflicted by a sharp, pointed knife, and that in the abdomen by one six inches or longer." So the killer may have used more than one instrument.

The killer put marks on her face so accurately despite the terrible lighting. There was one on each cheek. Each mark exactly mirrored the other. Each mark was an accurate upside down v. Did he use scissors? It is nearly impossible to explain it otherwise...

## AARON KOSMINSKI'S ILLNESS

Kosminski was admitted on February 7 1891 to Colney Hatch.

It was recorded that he could read and write and was insane – characterised as incoherent and maniacal for six years. They were reasonably happy with his bodily condition. Showing he is the Kosminski mentioned in the Machanityhen material he is described as having a self-abuse problem – masturbation.

The illness first came on him when he was 25 the record says and that he had been in Mile End Old Town for treatment the previous July. Then the record says the current state has lasted for six months.

Why does the record say Kosminski was sick for 6 months and then need correcting to 6 years? Somebody didn't want to say he was mad at the time of the murders...

The illness is, "He declares that he is guided and his movements altogether controlled by an instinct that informs his mind, he says that he knows the movements of all mankind, he refuses food from others because he is told to do so, and he eats out of the gutters for the same reason."

Kosminski plainly believes that God or something is guiding him and giving him all knowledge. This force is telling him not to eat from others but to use the gutters instead.

This religious content fits the religious style markings of Catherine Eddowes and the bodies being laid out like Jewish animal sacrifices.

Jacob Cohen who was with him said that he “about the streets and picks up bits of bread out of the gutter and eats them, he drinks water from the tap, he refuses food at the hands of others. He took up a knife and threatened the life of his sister. He says that he is ill. He is melancholic, practises self-abuse. He is very dirty and will not be washed. He has not attempted any kind of work for years.” The Certifying Medical Officer is E Kouchin of Stepney.

When admitted he was described as not being dangerous to others. But that was then! What about before?

Stepney is an interesting reference and may explain why it was said by Swanson that he had been in Stepney Workhouse if he hadn't. It is possible though.

RECORD FEB 15 1891

Is rather ---- to deal with on account of the --- character of his ---. Reported to the father the other day as his “instinct”.

Could this line with the illegible words be,

Is rather DIFFICULT to deal with on account of the VIOLENT character of his ACTIONS. Reported to the father the other day as his “instinct”.

It is hard to imagine it said anything different. He thinks some power is telling him to hurt people. Remember what happened as bad enough to be reported to the father. Or was it highly unusual?

Or could it be, Is rather IMPOSSIBLE to deal with on account of the VIOLENT character of his CLAIMS. Reported to the father the other day as his “instinct”.

Was he raving about being the Ripper?

HE IS VIOLENT IN THE ASYLUM

January 9 1892 says he, was “incoherent, at times excited and violent – a few days ago he took up a chair and attempted to strike the charge attendant, apathetic as a rule, and refuses to occupy himself in any way: habits cleanly, health fair.”

Sept 18 – Indolent but quiet and clean in habits, never employed. Answers questions concerning himself.

He was removed to Leavensden on April 19 that year.

He had a violent streak and could be coherent at times and answer questions and keep himself clean. The wording implies that he engaged in more violence than just lifting a chair.

A SERIAL KILLER IS OFTEN MADE BY SEXUAL ABUSE

The Chairperson of Leavesden Hospital History Association found that Kosminski had been sexually abused by his mother and even in the records from the hospital endured a burning irremediable hate for women and prostitutes in particular. He alone is the candidate for being Ripper who was damaged as a child. The attacks on a woman's power to give life tells it all. The abuser was attacking his own mother for giving birth to him to abuse him.

DEATH OF THE RIPPER

Aaron Kosminski went to Leavesden on April 19 1894. He died there at 5.05 am on 24 March 1919 in the presence of Bennett the night attendant. He was not buried with his family. He was buried under the name Kosminski the only one of his family to be buried under that name.

THE SEARCH ENDS

Sagat and Swanson both said that there were no Ripper like murders after the suspect went to the asylum. The police had proof of the Ripper's identity. Yet there were killings still being attributed to the Ripper by the public and the media.

The only explanation that makes sense is that the police knew that the Ripper was dead or incapacitated.

On 29th July 1891 the Jack the Ripper case was rapidly closed. This was very odd for many detectives and policemen at the time thought the Ripper liked to take longer gaps between murders and was still killing. The Ripper either died or had

turned into somebody brain damaged. The latter is what happened to Aaron Kosminski who turned into what they called an imbecile.

The police had proof of the Ripper's identity. Yet there were killings still being attributed to the Ripper. The only explanation that makes sense is that the police knew that the Ripper was dead or incapacitated.

## CONCLUSION

Macnaghten, Anderson and Swanson worked on the case and must know things that nobody else knew. What they wrote and said carries more weight than all the modern speculations about the Ripper put together. Kosminski was the name that is pointed out. However, the detectives did not want to give too much away.

If the Ripper murders were not solved by the police, that doesn't prove that they didn't know who the Ripper was. It is possible for even the police to know that somebody is guilty of a crime and be unable to prove it. And even more so when you are talking about the nineteenth century! The Ripper murders officially speaking are unsolved. Unsolved crimes are more than possibilities: they are facts of life. But for a criminal like Jack the Ripper to leave no trace of who he was is near-impossible. One of the known 150 plus Ripper suspects was the Ripper. We can be confident that he was most likely one of the obscure and most ordinary suspects. Aaron Kosminski was an ordinary man.