

JACK THE RIPPER

AND THE JEWS



BY
KARL RADL

First Published by Purity Publications in 2024

Copyright © 2024 Karl Radl

Address for Correspondence: karlradl14@protonmail.com

This publication may be reprinted, distributed and donated freely but may not be sold without the explicit permission of the author.

Quotation and discussion of this publication are encouraged.

Introduction

The case of Jack of Ripper has long maintained a personal fascination for me. Long before I began researching the Jews and Judaism. I cut my historical teeth as a teenager studying the case of the Whitechapel Murders as the killing spree of Jack the Ripper is better known.

The murders in the East End of London in the summer of 1888 have long exercised the fascination of many historians and crime writers. Part of that fascination for many of these researchers is the simple fact that we have never solved (nor are ever likely to solve) who '*Jack the Ripper*' was or why seems to have suddenly stopped killing as quickly as he began.

This booklet represents my contribution to that discussion by bringing to bear my extensive knowledge of both Judaism and the '*Jack the Ripper*' literature on the subject to suggest a new direction for future research.

Hitherto links between '*Jack the Ripper*' and the Jewish community in the East End of London in 1888 have largely been ignored or dismissed out of hand as 'anti-Semitism' by popular literature, film makers and the Jewish community in Britain, but yet are well-known and widely studied – although often tacitly – by the community of researchers on the case who have come to call themselves by the sobriquet: '*Ripperologists*'.

I make no claims to have solved the question of just who exactly '*Jack the Ripper*' was, but rather to make the case that '*Jack the Ripper*' was very likely both Jewish and took his inspiration and methodology from the practice of ritual slaughter in Judaism: Shechita.

Jack the Ripper and Shechita

When I read about the laws of Kashruth in Judaism; I began to notice certain parallels between the method of ritual slaughter and preparation (Shechita) and the modus operandi of Jack the Ripper.

I am not the first to do so either as at the time; the local inhabitants of the East End of London, (1) prominent newspapers such as *'The Times'* and the *'Pall Mall Gazette'*, (2) and Geoffrey Lushington, an Under-Secretary to the Home Secretary, (3) among others all believed that Jack the Ripper was a Jew.

Indeed, to this day the two most plausible suspects identified as Jack the Ripper are Aaron Kosminksi and David Cohen: who were both Jewish. (4)

Further it was a widespread belief – of doubtful validity in and of itself – that Jack the Ripper was, or had worked as, a butcher. (5) A great many butchers in the East End of London at the time were schochetim or rabbinically-licensed Jewish butchers who killed animals according to the laws of Kashruth (i.e., shechita). (6)

Ordinary people in the East End would then naturally have a good working knowledge of what the practice of shechita would look like even if they would be unlikely to have much understanding of the halakhah (Jewish religious law) and reasoning behind the practice.

That a similarity was noticed between the practice of shechita and the modus operandi of Jack the Ripper – which was made much of in the newspapers of the day - is thus noteworthy. (7)

Some authors have tried to dismiss the general connection between Jews and the Jack the Ripper killings. On the basis that the Jews were then flooding into the East End of London from the Russian Empire (making up thirty percent of the population of the area at the time of killings), (8) which naturally antagonised the British and Irish inhabitants of the area. (9)

The idea that Jack the Ripper couldn't have been Jewish, because well... that would be anti-Semitic... was used at the time by both the Chief Rabbi Dr. Hermann Adler (10) and Ashley Myers (the editor of the Jewish Chronicle) (11) as well as more recently by Israeli media outlets. (12)

That, as Stephen Molyneux has become famous for saying, is not an argument.

We must always remember that we were all born many years after this event occurred and should pay attention – although not slavishly – to what the people who lived with and/or tried to track down Jack the Ripper at the time thought.

In the case of the link between the practice of shechita and Jack the Ripper's modus operandi; I think there is something to the proverbial jungle drums of the East End.

In the first instance we have the undeniable facts that the two likeliest suspects that have been advanced were both Jewish, that the area of London where the murders occurred was heavily populated by recent Jewish immigrants from the Russian Empire and that none of the Ripper's victims were themselves Jewish.

These facts alone should make us closely scrutinise any purported link between the Jewish community and the Jack the Ripper killings, because it is quite possible and even, I dare say probable that some kind link or association did exist.

When we examine the autopsy reports of the canonical victims of Jack the Ripper then we note the following details.

In the case of Mary Ann Nichols (Victim #1) her neck was sliced open with a knife.

The first incision was relatively superficial and four inches in length, while the second of eight inches had severed all the tissue back to the vertebrae. (13)

In addition, there were several incisions across and down as well as and one jagged deep cut on the left side of the abdomen. All the injuries were caused by the same knife. (14)

In the case of Mary Ann Chapman (Victim #2); the incision in the neck was made by two distinct cuts on the left side of the spine that were parallel to each other and about half an inch apart. (15)

The abdomen had been entirely laid open and the intestines severed from their attachments then placed on her shoulder plus the bladder had been entirely removed as had the uterus and the upper part of the vagina. (16)

In the case of Elizabeth Stride (Victim #3); there was a clean-cut incision on the neck. This was six inches in length and commenced two and a half inches in a straight line below the angle of the jaw. The main artery was cut through. (17)

In the case of Catherine Eddowes (Victim #4); her throat was cut across to the extent of seven to eight inches. A superficial cut of about two and half inches was below. The right carotid artery had been opened and the left cut. (18)

The intestines were drawn out to a large extent and placed over the right shoulder. They were smeared with some faecal matter. The right ear was sliced through sideways. A piece of the ear dropped from her clothing during the examination in the mortuary. (19)

Eddowes' face was heavily mutilated. There was a cut about a quarter of an inch through the lower left eyelid near to the nose. There was also a scratch on the upper left-hand side of this eyelid, while the right eyelid was cut through about half an inch. In addition, there was a deep cut over the bridge of the nose on the right side. (20)

The tip of the nose had been detached by a sideways cut from the bottom of the nasal bone to the wings of the nose. This joined on to a cut on the face, which went through the gum of her upper jaw. There was also a cut on the right angle of the mouth made *'as with the cut of a point of the knife'*. (21)

There were triangular cuts on both cheeks which allowed a flap of skin to be pulled back. There were in addition two abrasions under the left ear. (22)

Her torso was open upwards from the pubes to the sternum. The liver had been stabbed as if by the point of a sharp instrument, plus had a cut of two and half inches and the left lobe of the liver had been split through by a vertical cut. (23)

There was a stab of about an inch on the left groin. Her thigh was cut. The intestines had been largely detached. Two feet of colon had also been cut away. Her pancreas was cut slightly. Meanwhile the left kidney had been carefully removed and so had the womb. (24)

In the case of Mary Kelly (Victim #5); the neck had been severed to the bone. (25)

The whole surface of her thighs and abdomen had been removed. The abdominal cavity had been emptied of viscera. Her breasts had been cut off. Both her arms mutilated, and face hacked beyond all recognition. (26)

The lower part of lower right lung was broken and torn away but still somewhat adherent, while the left lung was adherent and intact. (27)

Her kidneys, uterus and one breast were under her head. The other breast was by the right foot. Her liver was between the feet with the intestines to the right side and the spleen to the left. Her ears were partly removed, and the heart was absent. (28)

Now granted this is quite a lot of data, but we can easily simplify it by pointing out, as McDermid has, that the signature of Jack the Ripper killings is the throat of the victim being cut and the guts removed. (29)

We can see that in all cases, except that of Elizabeth Stride, the throat of the woman was cut, and the viscera removed (or an attempt made). The reason that this pattern is broken by Stride is because the Ripper was disturbed, and we must always remember that these killings were occurring on public streets in the early hours of the morning. Thus, the murderer was liable to discovery at any time and therefore had to be quick about their work.

When we turn our attention to the details of the killings; we should note that in the cases of Nichols, Chapman and Stride (i.e., Victims #1-3). There was also significant bruising around the neck and/or shoulders (30) suggesting that the killer used to force to hold the women in place, while he cut their necks.

The lack of bruising reports by the autopsies on the bodies of Eddowes and Kelly is quite possibly caused by the large amount of mutilation on their bodies, which would render such marks difficult to isolate in the context of the mess of mutilated organs, limbs and skin. This could also have been caused by Eddowes and Kelly being taken by surprise by the Ripper or the natural improvement of the latter's killing technique.

This is a common practice in Kashruth, because of the requirement of severing the trachea, jugular, carotid arteries and the oesophagus of the animal in one continuous perfectly smooth stroke. (31)

Hence it is necessary to hold the animal in place so that the precise area of the neck to be cut (*'Zevichah'*) (32) and this Jack the Ripper did.

Edwards' assertion that the murderer asphyxiated their victims before he slit their throats (33) just isn't realistic (it forgets the time constraints, prolongs the killing process and renders the slitting of the throat relatively pointless as anything other than ritual behaviour) and would by its very nature place the Ripper at an increased risk of being discovered (since it takes longer to asphyxiate a victim rather than slit her throat).

When we look at the slitting of the throats of the victims, we also note an interesting habit exhibited by the Ripper. That is in the cases of Nichols, Chapman, Stride and Eddowes (Victims #1-4) all had a failed and often superficial incision in their neck that was separate from the deeper incision that likely killed them.

This caught my eye, because one of the more or less unique aspects of shechita - outside of Halal that is - is that, as previously stated, it is important to sever the trachea, jugular, carotid arteries and the oesophagus of the animal in one continuous perfectly smooth stroke.

In other words: in order for the kill to be judged kosher (*'fit'*) not treif (*'unfit'*) then the cut has to be made as described.

Why did Jack the Ripper make two cuts (the first one usually too shallow)?

It is difficult to put it down to ritual as there is nothing to indicate that it is such (hence the fact that Kelly only had one knife cut across her throat and didn't have this second shallow cut) and had the killer not had a reason for doing so; then they surely would have just sliced the victim's neck as hard as they could in order to make the kill as quick and noiseless as possible.

Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the murderer was more likely than not using shechita as his guide in how he needed to kill the victims.

This is also indicated in the other element of the '*signature*' of Jack the Ripper, as McDermid styles it, the viscera being removed.

Traditionally this is just put down to the ritual fascination of the killer with disembowelling women, a hatred of women and/or the desire to cut out the uterus as quickly as possible (a-la the theory placing Francis Tumblety as the Ripper).

However, this to me has always seemed like a lazy explanation. Precisely because it would be rather odd if there wasn't some kind of distinct purpose behind the mutilations rather than some nebulous hatred of women or sexual fascination with disembowelling people.

These could be true of course, but I think we have to look a bit deeper here because the Ripper must have had something that he was using as his model even he significantly modified it to suit his needs.

When we note that in the cases of Chapman and Eddowes (Victims #2 and 4) – the cases of Nichols and Stride (Victims #1 and #3) being incomplete attacks where the Ripper is widely believed to have been surprised before he could carry out much of his ritual - the intestines were peculiarly arranged over the shoulders along with other organs. While in the case of Kelly (Victim #5) the intestines among other organs were arranged around the room, while the heart was missing. (34)

There are very few potential explanations for this, but one can easily be found in shechita: in the practice of inspecting the organs and innards of the slaughtered animal for defects. These inspections are called b'dikas p'nim ('*internal inspection*') and b'dikas chutz ('*external inspection*'). (35)

The purpose of the inspection process is to ensure that the slaughtered animal is free from blemishes and broken bones. (36) This ensures that the animal died from the process of shechita alone and not from any other cause. (37)

The areas checked by the inspector (bodek) also correspond nicely to the organs and apparent interests of Jack the Ripper.

These are the brain, heart, spinal column, jaw, oesophagus, lungs, trachea, liver, gall bladder, spleen, kidney, womb, intestines, omasum, abomasum, rumen, reticulum, legs, ribs, and hide/skin. (38)

In the most complete Ripper murder (i.e., that of Mary Kelly [Victim #5]) all these are either removed or exposed with the exception of the brain, which was likely just hard to get to and was not, as far as I am aware, often checked by pre-twentieth century kashruth inspectors.

Interesting: isn't it?

We have a clear and close similarity between the killing method (cutting the victim's throat with a very peculiar timidity in making said cut) as well as the post-death ritual of opening up the victim to take out the viscera and the practice of shechita, which was in widespread use at the time in the specific area of London where the killings occurred.

Is that just a coincidence?

I don't think it can reasonably be argued to be.

Indeed, one can also suggest that the famous claim in the *'From Hell'* letter – in which the writer claims to have fried and eaten a piece of Catherine Eddowes' (Victim #4) liver – if real (and this author doubts it) is consistent with this link to shechita. After all liver if kashered is kosher (39) as is a heart (which was missing from Mary Kelly's corpse and may have also been similarly eaten). (40)

To suggest that Jack the Ripper was a cannibal is certainly difficult to prove or even speculate based upon the evidence, but what is reasonably certain is that he was practising his own personal form of shechita on his victims.

That hasn't stopped people like Sandor Gilman writing about how accusations that shechita was linked to the Jack the Ripper killings were a *'fantasy'* linked to an alleged obsession of Western Europeans with *'diseased and mutilated Jewish genitalia'* however. (41)

References

- (1) Russell Edwards, 2014, '*Naming Jack the Ripper*', 1st Edition, Sidgwick & Jackson: Basingstoke, pp. 55-56
- (2) Judith Flanders, 2011, '*The Invention of Murder*', 1st Edition, Harper Collins: London, pp. 441-442
- (3) Ibid., p. 441
- (4) For example, see Bruce Paley, 1996, '*Jack the Ripper: The Simple Truth*', 1st Edition, Headline: London, pp. 218-219; Martin Fido, 1999, '*David Cohen and the Polish Jew Theory*' in Nathan Braund, Maxim Jakubowski (Eds.), 1999, '*The Mammoth Book of Jack the Ripper*', 1st Edition, Robinson: London
- (5) Paul Harrison, 1991, '*Jack the Ripper: The Mystery Solved*', 1st Edition, Robert Hale: London, p. 142
- (6) Ibid., p. 143
- (7) Ibid., p. 144
- (8) Ibid., p. 16
- (9) Edwards, Op. Cit., p. 28
- (10) John Eddleston, 2010, '*Jack the Ripper: An Encyclopaedia*', 2nd Edition, Metro: London, pp. 170-171
- (11) Edwards, Op. Cit., pp. 226-227
- (12) For example: <http://www.haaretz.com/blogs/routine-emergencies/.premium-1.614952>; <http://www.haaretz.com/jewish/news/1.614536>; <http://forward.com/articles/209121/jack-the-ripper-one-of-us-no-thanks/>
- (13) Nathan Braund, Maxim Jakubowski, 1999, '*The Autopsies*', p. 70 in Braund, Jakubowski, Op. Cit.
- (14) Ibid., p. 71
- (15) Ibid., p. 73
- (16) Ibid.
- (17) Ibid., p. 75
- (18) Ibid., pp. 78-79
- (19) Ibid., pp. 77-78
- (20) Ibid., p. 78
- (21) Ibid.
- (22) Ibid.
- (23) Ibid., p. 79
- (24) Ibid., pp. 80-81
- (25) Ibid., p. 84

- (26) Ibid.
- (27) Ibid., p. 85
- (28) Ibid., pp. 84-85; Val McDermid, 2014, *'Forensics: The Anatomy of Crime'*, 1st Edition, Profile: London, p. 240
- (29) McDermid, Op. Cit., p. 240
- (30) Braund, Jakubowski, Op. Cit., pp. 70-72, 75 in Braund, Jakubowski, Op. Cit.
- (31) Nathan Gross, Alexander Rosenberg, Berel Wein, 1972, *'Kashruth: Handbook for Home and School'*, Rabbinical Council of America: New York, p. 2; Yacov Lipschutz, 1988, *'Kashruth: A Comprehensive Background and Reference Guide to The Principles of Kashruth'*, 1st Edition, Mesorah: New York, p. 20; Solomon David Sassoon, 1956, *'A Critical Study of Electrical Stunning and the Jewish Method of Slaughter (Schechita)'*, 3rd Edition, Self-Published: Letchworth, pp. 4; 23
- (32) Lipschutz, Op. Cit., p. 20
- (33) Edwards, Op. Cit., pp. 54-55
- (34) McDermid, Op. Cit., p. 240
- (35) Lipschutz, Op. Cit., pp. 23-24
- (36) Sassoon, Op. Cit., p. 23
- (37) Lipschutz, Op. Cit., p. 22
- (38) Ibid., p. 21
- (39) Victor Geller, Irwin Gordon, n.d., *'Kashruth'*, Rabbinical Council of America: New York, p. 15; Gross, Rosenberg and Wein, Op. Cit., p. 4; Lipschutz, Op. Cit., p. 37
- (40) Gross, Rosenberg and Wein, Op. Cit., p. 5; Lipschutz, Op. Cit., pp. 31-32
- (41) Sandor Gilman, 1991, *'The Jew's Body'*, 1st Edition, Routledge: New York, p. 191



FINDING THE MUTILATED BODY IN MITRE SQUARE

Cartoon of the Murder of Catherine Eddowes from the 'Illustrated Police News', 1888.



Cartoon of the Police Searching for 'Jack the Ripper' from the 'Illustrated Police News', 1888.

The Case for a Jewish Jack the Ripper

In the last chapter we discussed how the infamous murders committed in London's East End by Jack the Ripper during the summer of 1888 were likely inspired by the process for ritually slaughtering animals in Judaism that is called Shechita.

Since it is a common practice – and dare I say it routine - for Jewish authors, (1) authorities (2) and their apologists (3) then as now to declare that Jack the Ripper cannot possibly have been Jewish without ever actually making a case that actually goes beyond the axiom of the modern study of anti-Semitism: *'Jews dindu nuffin'*.

The fact that we do not actually know who Jack the Ripper was doesn't matter to such people and institutions. The point is that a Jew cannot possibly be a serial killer and even if you can prove otherwise – as in the case of David Berkowitz – then Jews will still ardently all but deny that he was. (4)

That we don't know for sure who Jack the Ripper was would normally logically render such claims that he *'couldn't possibly'* be a Jew into logical absurdity, but yet Jews still continue to cling to this nonsensical position.

The fact is however that there are twelve very good reasons to believe that Jack the Ripper was indeed of Jewish origin.

These are:

1) The killings show distinct similarities of the Jewish ritual practice of shechita and are likely to have been performed by someone very familiar with it. (5) As shechita is a ritual practice unique to Judaism that must be carried out by a religiously devout Jew in order to be a valid then this indicates that the Ripper was almost certainly of Jewish origin. This was also recognised at the time. (6)

2) In 1888 at least thirty percent of the population of Whitechapel was Jewish. (7) This therefore means that assuming –as many Ripperologists do – that the Ripper was a local man. (8) It follows that there is at least a 3/10 chance that the Ripper was of Jewish origin as was noted by newspapers at the time. (9)

3) There was significant friction between the Jewish and non-Jewish population of Whitechapel (10) and, considering that all the victims were not Jewish, then there was a belief among the local population that a Jew was responsible for the murders. (11)

4) Buck's Row – where Mary Ann Nichols, the Ripper's first victim, was killed on 8th September 1888 – was next to a Jewish cemetery. (12)

5) Dutfield's yard – where the Swedish-born Elizabeth Stride, the Ripper's third victim, was killed on 30th September 1888 – was next to 40 Berner Street, which housed *'International Working Men's Educational Club'*. (13) This, to quote Judith Flanders, was a *'radical Jewish organisation'*. (14)

6) Israel Schwartz – the only man believed to have actually seen Jack the Ripper and a Jew – identified an arrested suspect as Jack the Ripper at the London Police's *'Seaside Home'* station but refused to testify against him in court. (15) The reason traditionally ascribed for this is because the

Ripper was a fellow member of the Jewish community (16) and this is supported by halakha – Jewish religious law – which prescribes that religious Jews not *'inform'* on their fellow Jews to non-Jewish authorities on pain of death. (17)

7) Sir Robert Anderson, Assistant Commissioner of the London Metropolitan Police in 1888, stated in an article in 1910 in *'Blackwood's Magazine'* that the identity of Jack the Ripper was known and that he was a Polish Jew. (18)

8) Sir Melville Macnaughton, who was actively involved in the police investigation into the Whitechapel murders as Assistant Chief Constable (CID) of the Metropolitan Police from 1889-1891 fingered a Polish Jew named Kosminski as one of his three chief suspects in the case. (19)

9) Chief Inspector Donald Swanson, head of the Whitechapel Murders investigation, specifically wrote in his marginal note in his personal copy of Sir Robert Anderson's 1910 *memoirs 'The Lighter Side of My Official Life'* that the Ripper was a Jew named Kosminski. (20)

10) Harry Cox, a former City of London Police Detective, revealed after his retirement in 1906 that the main suspect for the Ripper murders was Jewish and that the Jews realized who he was and then closed ranks to prevent him being prosecuted. (21)

11) Robert Sagar, a former inspector in the City of London Police and who as a police sergeant had been closely involved in the 1888 Ripper investigation, revealed that the prime suspect had been Jewish, discovered by his family/community and removed as quickly as convenient to a lunatic asylum, which prevented more ripper killings and caused them to stop. (22)

12) Geoffrey Lushington, the Home Office Under-Secretary in 1888, is also on record as stating that the evidence suggested that Jack the Ripper was a Jew. (23)

So, contrary to what Jewish authors, authorities and apologists will have you believe, there is not only good reason to believe that Jack the Ripper was a Jew, but it is extremely likely that this was the case.

References

- (1) Cf. Edwards, Op. Cit.
- (2) John Eddleston, 2010, *'Jack the Ripper: An Encyclopaedia'*, 2nd Edition, Metro: London, pp. 170-171
- (3) <http://www.haaretz.com/blogs/routine-emergencies/.premium-1.614952>;
<http://www.haaretz.com/jewish/news/1.614536>; <http://forward.com/articles/209121/jack-the-ripper-one-of-us-no-thanks/>; <https://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/was-jack-the-ripper-really-a-hate-spreading-antisemite-1.435905>
- (4) For example: <http://www.jewornotjew.com/profile.jsp?ID=40>
- (5) See the previous chapter *'Jack the Ripper and Shechita'*.
- (6) Harrison, Op. Cit., p. 144
- (7) Ibid., p. 16
- (8) For example, see: <http://www.casebook.org/dissertations/rip-charles-cross-was-jtr.html>
- (9) Flanders, Op. Cit., pp. 441-442
- (10) Edwards, Op. Cit., p. 28
- (11) Ibid., pp. 55-56
- (12) Ibid., p. 48
- (13) Ibid., p. 73; Harrison, Op. Cit., p. 53
- (14) Flanders, Op. Cit., p. 439; support by Edwards, Op. Cit., p. 73
- (15) <http://www.casebook.org/dissertations/dst-koz.html>
- (16) Edwards, Op. Cit., pp. 82, 255-256, 261
- (17) Myer Lew, 1944, *'The Jews of Poland: Their Political, Economic, Social and Communal Life in the Sixteenth Century as reflected in the Works of Rabbi Moses Isserls'*, 1st Edition, Edward Goldston: London, pp. 128-129
- (18) Paul Begg, James Carnac, 2012, *'The Autobiography of Jack the Ripper'*, 1st Edition, Bantam: London, p. 270
- (20) Edwards, Op. Cit., pp. 221-222; Harrison, Op. Cit., p. 136
- (21) Edwards, Op. Cit., p. 227; Harrison, Op. Cit., p. 137
- (22) Edwards, Op. Cit., pp. 254-255
- (23) Ibid., pp. 252-253
- (24) Flanders, Op. Cit., p. 441

Jewish Ritual Murder and Jack the Ripper

The subject of Jewish Ritual Murder - or the Blood Libel as it is often pejoratively called by its critics – is one that is close to my heart. Since it was the study of it and my scepticism towards the hand-waving and weird claims of the *'Jews would never have done that'* camp was the original impetus for beginning my study of Jews and Judaism.

I would thus be remiss if I didn't mention the occasional references that have suggested that tales of Jewish Ritual Murder may have influenced or been the motive for Jack the Ripper's killing spree. (1)

This was certainly believed to be a possibility at the time of original Ripper killings since no less than *'The Times'* newspaper suggested that this was indeed a plausible motivation (and in a sense solution) that lay behind them. (2) However, it also true to say that anti-Semites themselves have not historically put much credence in the claim that the Jack the Ripper murders were a revival of Jewish Ritual Murder in England. (3)

Possibly the best attempt to argue this case has been made by Robert House in *'Ripperologist'* in 2005.

In *'Aaron Kosminski Reconsidered'* he writes as follows:

'By the time Aaron was an adolescent, there was widespread anti-Semitism in Russia. Influential newspapers forgot their Jewish sympathies, and anti-Semitic literature appeared, containing both intellectual and obscene content. Anti-Semitism also began to gain a semblance of intellectual respectability as a result of the new 'scientific' anti-Semitism of western, mostly German, origin.

In 1878, when Aaron was 13 or 14 years old, the myth of the 'Blood Libel,' outlawed by Alexander I, was revived in Kutais in anti-Semitic newspapers like Novoye Vremya. Based in part on the ritual murder of the child Simon of Trent and others, this myth held that the Jews participated in the ritual murder of Christian children, using their blood to appease the wrath of God. Specifically, the blood libel myth held that that 'Jews had kidnapped a Christian child, tied him to a cross, stabbed his head to simulate Jesus' crown of thorns, killed him, drained his body of blood and mixed the blood into Passover matzohs.' If a Christian child was found murdered near Easter or Passover, there was a good chance that local Jews would be blamed. Into the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, at least two dozen ritual murder trials took place in Central and Eastern Europe.' (4)

This is fine as far as it goes, but I note with pointed interest that the *'blood libel'* – which is incidentally a pejorative propaganda term used to delegitimise free and open discussion of allegations of Jewish Ritual Murder – that what he is citing here is the fully fledged ritual murder accusation as a point of comparison. (5)

House cites as his primary examples the ritual murders of Saint Simon of Trent and Saint Andreas of Rinn. He claims that in the case of Saint Simon of Trent; the Jews sliced pieces of Simon's flesh off and ate them in addition to mixing his blood with their Pesach matzo so they could consume it. (6)

However, I cannot find any reference to anything of the kind in the literature of the subject. (7) The perpetrators eating the flesh of the victim in a case of Jewish Ritual Murder is almost unheard of.

The charge of host desecration is similar and would have been viewed as such at the time of the trials at Rinn and Trent. Unfortunately for House of course, as with Jewish Ritual Murder, the charge that it was and is a *'libel'* is absurd as Horowitz has demonstrated. (8)

House's argument that Kosminski '*carried this the blood libel over*' from Eastern Europe and acted it out in London (9) is thus unfounded, because Jewish ritual murder involves the torture of the victim in imitation of the suffering of Christ (the crown of thorns, whipping/flaying, the wounds in his hands and feet and the wound in his side) and the collection of blood to be eaten with matzo on Pesach.

None of the Ripper killings bear any likeness whatsoever to this description, but House's suggestion that Kosminski could have been working to kill Christian women of the '*underclass*' could certainly be true.

After all non-Jewish women seeking to have sexual intercourse with Jews – and it is worth remembering that all Jack the Ripper's victims were non-Jewish prostitutes in a heavily Jewish part of London – would be viewed pejoratively as traditional dangerous foes of the Jewish community (i.e., as shiksas) and would thus Kosminski could have killed them for that reason, but that is something best discussed elsewhere.

It is sufficient to say here that the Jack the Ripper murders were without doubt not cases of Jewish ritual murder, because the evidence does not support this claim.

References

- (1) For example: <https://antizionistleague.com/2014/10/27/jewish-ripper-ritual-murder-proven/>
- (2) Flanders, Op. Cit., p. 442
- (3) Arnold Leese, 1938, *'My Irrelevant Defence'*, 1st Edition, The IFL Printing Company: London, p. 55
- (4) Robert House, 2005, *'Aaron Kosminski Reconsidered'*, Ripperologist, No. 58
(<http://www.casebook.org/dissertations/rip-koshouse.html>)
- (5) Darren O'Brien, 2011, *'The Pinnacle of Hatred: The Blood Libel and the Jews'*, 1st Edition, The Hebrew University Magnes Press: Jerusalem, pp. 63-65
- (6) House, Op. Cit.
- (7) Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia, 1992, *'Trent 1475: Stories of a Ritual Murder Trial'*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, pp. 46-47; 62-68
- (8) Cf. Elliot Horowitz, 2007, *'Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence'*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton
- (9) House, Op. Cit.



Jack the Ripper's First Victim: Mary Ann Nichols.



Jack the Ripper's Second Victim: Annie Chapman.



Jack the Ripper's Third Victim: Elizabeth Stride.



Jack the Ripper's Fourth Victim: Catherine Eddowes.



Police Drawing of Jack the Ripper's Fourth Victim: Catherine Eddowes.



Jack the Ripper's Fifth Victim: Mary Jane Kelly.

Was Jack the Ripper an anti-Semite?

Was Jack the Ripper really an '*anti-Semite*' seeking to trigger a pogrom?

Well, the leading Jewish newspaper in Britain – the '*Jewish Chronicle*' - clearly wants you to believe as much. (1)

As someone who has read most of the fairly considerable body of Jack the Ripper literature – from allegations of a satanic and freemasonic conspiracy to the more mundane crazed serial killer reconstructions – and written work on the subject of the Ripper murders. The frankly idiotic ravings of Ben Welch and, if characterised correctly, Stephen Senise should be enough to confine them to a lunatic asylum.

Let me go through Welch's article in the '*Jewish Chronicle*' paragraph by paragraph and demonstrate the lunacy contained there-in and presented to the reader of said publication as if it were an informed opinion.

'Jack the Ripper, rather than simply being a maniac, was actually an antisemite who committed his murders to stir up tensions between Jewish immigrants in the East End and working class Londoners, before fleeing to Australia.'

Except that flies in the face of most of the Jack the Ripper literature – past and present – as well as the opinions of the police officers and local people on the ground at the time.

I would be very surprised if Senise's research contained anything particularly substantial to link George Hutchinson to the Ripper crimes any more than Mei Trow's theory about the Whitechapel workhouse morgue attendant Robert Mann or Patricia Cornwall's theory about Walter Sickert have successfully managed to convince seasoned Ripperologists of their validity.

In fact, without looking at Senise's research – and let's face it his thesis is not only improbable it is borderline impossible even when you cursorily think about it – I'd say it is not a legitimate attempt to identify the Ripper, but rather to sell books to the eternally histrionic Jewish community.

'That is the contention of Australian journalist Stephen Senise, whose self-published book Jewbaiter: Jack the Ripper is out this week after almost two years of painstaking research into the infamous Whitechapel murderer.'

If Senise's book is as '*painstaking*' as Welch claims: then why is it being self-published by a tiny independent publisher like so many of the weird and wonderful non-mainstream theories regarding the Ripper?

Surely, he should have forwarded it to a renowned Ripper authority like Paul Begg, Martin Fido or Donald Rumbelow and then bowled them over with the '*power and force*' of his '*painstaking theory*' or maybe his theory is just a selective and tentative one that was written up to sell books not to convince Ripperologists.

'Mr Senise, who is not Jewish, argues the killer was George Hutchinson, a local labourer, and that his motive was to mislead the public by framing the murders as "Jewish ritual killings".'

Except as I have explained in detail in a previous chapter in this book: (2) the killings were not *'ritual murders'* – which is what Senise is getting at – because they don't have any of the characteristics of the classic Jewish Ritual Murder (or, if you prefer, blood libel). They helpfully also occur in the middle of a wave of *'blood libels'* in Europe that share no characteristics with them what-so-ever and even confirmed anti-Semites like Arnold Leese of the *'Imperial Fascist League'* doubted they were anything to do with a Jewish ritual killing.

The autopsy reports do however show a distinct similarity to the practice of shechita – Jewish ritual slaughter – as I have demonstrated in a previous chapter in this book, but not Jewish Ritual Murder. (3)

'Hutchinson was initially questioned by police as a witness to one of the murders, but many historians have concluded he misled officers, with some believing he could have been the killer.'

What Welch (and apparently Senise) fails to mention here is that George Hutchinson was only connected to the last of the canonical five Ripper victims: Mary Kelly. (4)

'Mr Senise, 49, said: "This book takes a look at the socio-historical context of what was going on at the time. There were a high number of recent Jewish immigrants and poor East End Londoners were competing with them for scarce food and work. Whichever way you look at it this is a tragic story. Both sets of people were exploited.'

"What I propose is that somebody was trying to use the architecture of a racist lie, in other words, the mirage of Jewish ritual murder, to frame the Jewish community at a most sensitive political juncture.'

But as I have already explained in detail in the previous chapter: the murders quite clearly show absolutely none of the characteristics of classic Jewish Ritual Murder or share any similarities with the ritual murder cases going on around the time of the Ripper killings.

The *'link'* was made early on by the London press (5) and it is simply incorrect, because the *'link'* is simply *'women are murdered in a strange way in the East End which is full of recent Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe'* and *'Jews in Eastern Europe have been recently tried for strange ritual killings of women'*.

QED.

"The location of many of the murder sites, the antisemitic graffiti left in Goulston Street, and the re-invigoration of the Jewish-suspect angle with the emergence of George Hutchinson as a witness, helped steer me to the conclusion that someone was trying to intentionally point blame at Whitechapel's Jews."

Any discussion of anti-Semitism and the Ripper case invariably brings up the Goulston Street graffiti, but Senise ignores the fact that the only reason that people place any credence in this piece of graffiti having a connection to the Ripper killings is because a piece of Catherine Eddowes' bloodied apron was found underneath it.

Graffiti was common in the East End of London and anti-Semitic graffiti would have been both common and prominent amongst that street art. There is absolutely no reason to suppose that the Ripper wrote said graffiti as there is no actual evidence that he did (although a lot of wishful thinking) and it defies logic that he would stop to write on a random wall in order to implicate Jews when he is running away after committing a particularly gruesome dual murder.

The Goulston Street graffito is clearly written by an opponent of the Jews in a street that was densely populated by them not by the Ripper. (6)

'Mr Senise, who is a freelance horseracing journalist by trade, describes how the demographic shift in the East End in the 1880s resulted in a "turf war" which was liable to descend into conflict. While he is not claiming there was a conspiracy to cover up Hutchinson's guilt, he says: "There is perhaps a historical forgetfulness around what areas of Whitechapel and the East End were like more than 100 years ago. There were real tensions between different groups.'"

This is the statement of a man who has read very little of the literature on Jack the Ripper. Since most authors on the subject are at pains to stress the conflict between the Jewish and non-Jewish residents in Whitechapel.

In fact, they cannot not but mention it given how important it is in the well-known vigilante actions against Jewish suspects like John Pizer aka *'Leather Apron'*. So, Senise here is guilty not only of misrepresenting the literature on the Ripper killings but telling outright lies in support of his theory of an *'anti-Semitic'* Ripper.

'The mystery of Jack the Ripper's identity has never been officially solved but interest persists, and the case has spawned countless books, documentaries and TV programmes.'

But yet that doesn't mean every theory is equal.

George Hutchinson is not a popular suspect, because nobody has ever provided any suggestive evidence that he was in any way involved in the Ripper killings other than as a witness in the last one.

In fact, Senise's theory sounds awfully like a word-for-word repeat of Trevor Marriot's theory about a sailor named Carl Feigenbaum being the Ripper, but without Marriot's rather more formidable research (despite his incorrect conclusion in my view) and a different suspect.

'The killer targeted prostitutes in London's East End and in 2015 the controversial Jack the Ripper museum opened to a series of protests against the glorification of violence towards women.'

"This book does not feature the gratuitous photos of murdered women you see in other books," says Mr Senise. "There is a temptation to dive right into the gory elements.'"

Again, this rather demonstrates that Senise hasn't read much of the Ripper literature since most of it spends at least 30-40 pages setting the scene before moving onto the 'gory details' of the murders themselves.

'Mary Ann Nichols, Annie Chapman, Elizabeth Stride, Catherine Eddowes and Mary Jane Kelly, all murdered between August and November 1888, are considered Jack the Ripper's only five victims.'

The commonly-held belief is that the spree ended with the killer's death, imprisonment, institutionalisation or emigration. Mr Senise, who lives on Australia's Gold Coast, claims Hutchinson's departure for the Antipodes on a ship of union-busting sailors coincided with the end of the killings, which points to his guilt.'

As stated, before this is almost the exact same case as Marriot made for Carl Feigenbaum and Marriot's point about when Feigenbaum was in and out of port in London is considerably more convincing than saying *'Hutchinson left soon after the attacks'* especially as Mary Kelly's murder is the most controversial of the canonical ripper killings. (7)

'He gathered much of his evidence from New South Wales state archives and documentation of Hutchinson's movements.

His book also boasts two never-before-seen photographs of Hutchinson.'

None of which is likely to be related to the actual Ripper crimes, but rather speculative huff and puff from the Antipodes.

'The JC is cited a number of times in Jewbaiter to highlight the concern at the time of violent acts of retaliation towards the Jewish community.'

Except that the editor of the *'Jewish Chronicle'* absolutely denied the possibility that Jack the Ripper could even be a Jew (8) even though the area was teeming with Jews? (9)

'Mr Senise said: "Elements of London's Jewish leadership at the time, Rabbi Hermann Adler, Samuel Montagu, the MP for Whitechapel, and the JC newspaper, thought that somebody may have been trying to incriminate the community.'

What Senise leaves out here is that this was – and still is - the standard Jewish communal response to any type of real or imagined criticism. In effect: *'it was/is an anti-Semitic conspiracy'* against the Jews regardless of the evidence.

"I believe such suspicions were correct, and that Adler, Montagu and the JC stand vindicated."

On pretty much no evidence apparently...

References

- (1) <https://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/was-jack-the-ripper-really-a-hate-spreading-antisemite-1.435905>
- (2) See the previous chapter '*Jewish Ritual Murder and Jack the Ripper*'.
- (3) See the previous chapter '*Jack the Ripper and Shechita*'.
- (4) http://www.casebook.org/ripper_media/book_reviews/non-fiction/cjmorley/88.html
- (5) Flanders, Op. Cit., p. 442
- (6) Paley, Op. Cit., p. 61
- (7) Pieter Spierenburg, 2008, '*A History of Murder: Personal Violence in Europe from the Middle Ages to the Present*', 1st Edition, Polity Press: Maldon, p. 194
- (8) Eddleston, Op. Cit., pp. 170-171; Edwards, Op. Cit., pp. 226-227
- (9) Harrison, Op. Cit., p. 16

Jack the Ripper and the Graffiti in Goulston Street

The graffiti in Goulston Street is one of the most debated facts among historians of the Jack the Ripper killing. The graffiti was discovered by PC Alfred Long on 30th September 1888 in the doorway leading to the Wentworth Model Dwellings above a piece of bloody cloth that was allegedly cut from the apron of Catherine Eddowes by Jack the Ripper. (1)

The text has been recorded as saying slightly different things by different sources, but the official police version - as reported by PC Alfred Long and accepted by Sir Charles Warren (the then Metropolitan Police Commissioner) - stated as follows:

'The Juwes are the men that will not be blamed for nothing.'

The second version, as recorded by the detective Daniel Halse, stated:

'The Juwes are not the men who will be blamed for nothing.'

The third version, as recorded by the surveyor Frederick William Foster, stated:

'The Juwes are not the men to be blamed for nothing.'

'Juwes' is simply a vernacular spelling of Jews in English and all three versions the meaning has stayed the same with only superficial differences in expression of that meaning. The meaning should be simply understood as a two-fold message: *'the Jews are never blamed for things that they do'* and/or *'the Jews have really done what they are blamed for'*.

Both meanings are fundamentally the same message (i.e., the Jews should be blamed for what they have done but they aren't always blamed for what they have done) and therefore we cannot quibble over meaning or the message, but to say that it is simply a common anti-Semitic argument.

As to the graffiti's relevance, it would be best to take a sceptical angle here by pointing out that the East End of London - particularly Whitechapel - at this time was home to a very large community of émigré Jews from Eastern Europe and anti-Semitic feelings were understandably running high. (2)

This would make the existence of anti-Semitic graffiti on a street with a heavy Jewish population nothing unusual. (3)

After all there has never been any proof for the assertion – which is occasionally made- that Jack the Ripper wrote those words. It seems rather unlikely that the Ripper stopped and decided to write a bit of anti-Semitic graffiti implicating Jews in the murders with his still blood-soaked hands.

After all, if the Ripper was Jewish - as some have argued using the Goulston Street graffiti - then why on earth would he or she implicate themselves by pointing directly to it as there were many non-Jews as well as Jews living in the East End of London - and Whitechapel in particular - at this time.

The more likely explanation of this graffiti - as attested to by the fact that it has not been argued to be of any significance among authors on, and researchers into, the Whitechapel murders for quite some time - is that it was simply there when Jack the Ripper passed by and accidentally dropped the piece of apron in the tiny alley/cut through he was using. (4)

As stated, anti-Semitic graffiti would have not been unusual, and it is unlikely there is any reason that a bloodied part of Eddowes' apron was dropped under that graffiti intentionally and there is every reason to believe that it was simply a piece of cockney anti-Jewish graffiti. (5)

The reason for its removal on orders of Sir Charles Warren – the prevention of it potentially causing a major anti-Semitic riot in the capital – (6) makes perfect sense, because Warren was deathly afraid of the resulting scandal if another major riot occurred during his watch as the head of the Metropolitan police. (7)

The fact that Superintendent Thomas Arnold – who believed Jack the Ripper was a Jew – agreed with Warren's reasoning (8) suggests that it was not any attempt to cover up the Ripper's probable Jewishness as some have claimed.

In essence this piece of evidence is a red herring in the argument for a Jewish Jack the Ripper in so far as it seems to proffer a useful piece of evidence for that thesis, but it actually forces the person using that evidence for said thesis to journey into the realms of wild conjecture as to why on earth Jack the Ripper would do something as stupid as tell the world that he or she was - in fact - a Jew.

References

- (1) Stewart Evans, Keith Skinner, 2001, *'Jack the Ripper: Letters from Hell'*, 1st Edition, Sutton: Stroud, p. 23; Harrison, Op. Cit., pp. 62-63
- (2) Alex Lerner, 2008, *'Jack the Ripper and the East End'*, 1st Edition, Chatto & Windus: London, pp. 65-66
- (3) Evans, Skinner, Op. Cit., p. 23; Paley, Op. Cit., p. 61
- (4) Lerner, Op. Cit., p. 151
- (5) Ibid, p. 26; Harrison, Op. Cit., p. 65
- (6) Edwards, Op. Cit., p. 97; Flanders; Op. Cit., p. 441; Harrison, Op. Cit., p. 63; Paley, Op. Cit., pp. 118-119
- (7) Flanders, Op. Cit., p. 450
- (8) Evans, Skinner, Op. Cit., pp. 24-25

Jack the Ripper and the 'From Hell' Letter

The 'From Hell' Letter – postmarked 15th October 1888 – is another source of contention in the Jack the Ripper case. Generally speaking, the letter is dismissed as not being from the killer by most modern Ripperologists and by the FBI profilers of the Ripper.

The relevance to the Jews of the letter; is that it is sometimes used to argue for a non-Jewish identity of Jack the Ripper. Thus, it has a somewhat tangential relevance to the subject of this book.

The actual text of letter is as follows:

'From hell.

Mr Lusk,

Sor

I send you half the Kidne I took from one woman prasarved it for you tother piece I fried and ate it was very nise. I may send you the bloody knif that took it out if you only wate a whil longer

signed

Catch me when you can Mishter Lusk'

Looking at the text of the letter; it is obvious that – despite many well-meaning attempts – we cannot really learn very much about its author from it.

Were they a highly educated journalist seeking to stir up controversy or a barely literate person trying to gain notoriety?

Both have been argued with cogency by different Ripperologists.

The reason for the letter not being disregarded into the archives of the thousands of fake letters from Jack the Ripper at the time; (1) is the inclusion – per the text – of half a human kidney. This is often believed to come from the fourth Ripper victim Catherine Eddowes, who had a kidney excised by her murderer.

In support of this assertion is the fact that we know the kidney is human in origin and that the person that it came from was suffering from Bright's disease. This is then linked to the fact that Eddowes was known to suffer from Bright's disease to claim that the kidney was indeed from her and therefore the letter is genuine.

The problem with that argument is that Bright's disease was not an unusual condition among London prostitutes at the time and can be induced by the severe alcoholism that prostitutes at the time frequently engaged in.

When we acknowledge this; it rather puts the damper on claims that it was Eddowes' kidney.

I mean it could be, but it could also have been excised from almost any other dead prostitute in London.

This means that – as Phillip Sugden has observed – all we can really learn about the kidney is that it is human and from the left side of the body. (2)

Therefore, we cannot link the '*From Hell*' letter to Catherine Eddowes and thus we cannot therefore produce any evidence to suggest an actual link to Jack the Ripper.

As it stands; we cannot link the '*From Hell*' letter to Jack the Ripper.

References

(1) On these see Evans, Skinner, Op. Cit.

(2) Cf. Phillip Sugden, 2012, *'The Complete History of Jack the Ripper'*, 1st Edition, Little Brown: Boston

Arthur Conan Doyle and the Jack the Ripper Murders

As an appendix to this short work, I thought I would briefly comment on Conan Doyle's thoughts about the five canonical Jack the Ripper murders in London in the summer of 1888.

It is hardly a surprise that Doyle, as a burgeoning celebrity writer and novelist, would pass some comment on the subject given that the murders were one of the biggest media events of the time. (1) *'The Times'*, for example, gave a particularly large amount of column inches over to the issue during the period of the killings. (2)

Therefore, it is hardly surprising, as Charles Higham notes, that Conan Doyle based two of his Sherlock Holmes stories on the Ripper killings; the most notable of which is *'The Cardboard Box'*. (3)

Further at the time Conan Doyle wrote about the killings and, with typical chutzpah, took the authorities to task about the *'Dear Boss'* letter, which was received by the Central News Agency on 27th September 1888.

Conan Doyle believed that the *'Dear Boss'* letter was absolutely genuine and unleashed a vitriolic attack on the London police and detective force for *'failing to investigate it properly'*. (4) This is despite the fact that the letter, from where we get the name *'Jack the Ripper'*, is now (as then) usually regarded as a sensationalist hoax written by a journalist. (5)

What I find surprising about Conan Doyle on this is that he doesn't comment on the rather obvious fact that the area in which Jack the Ripper operated was that an estimated thirty percent of the Whitechapel population at the time were Jewish. (6) While the local indigenous British population (7) as well as both radical and conservative journalists (8) all believed that the killer was probably a Jew.

While the Jewish press, most notably the *'Jewish Chronicle'*, were screaming about *'defamation'* and demanding the proverbial heads of those who asserted the Ripper might be Jews (including senior police detectives such as Sir Robert Anderson). (9)

As it happens the leaders of modern research into the Ripper killings, for example Martin Fido and Paul Begg, believe that the likelihood is that the killer was a Jew. More specifically a mentally disturbed individual with probable schizophrenia named Aaron Kosminski. This is further supported by the explicit statements of several of the leading detectives who worked in and around the Ripper case. (10)

The fact that Conan Doyle appears to have wilfully ignored the significant possibility that Jack the Ripper was Jewish and fixated instead on the *'Dear Boss'* letter and alleged official incompetence is suggestive of his own rather strange attitude to popular currents as well as his habit of taking unpopular stances whenever he felt there was a underdog to support. (11)

References

(1) Flanders, Op. Cit., p. 426

(2) Ibid., p. 339

(3) Charles Higham, 1976, *The Adventures of Conan Doyle: The Life of the Creator of Sherlock Holmes*, 1st Edition, Hamish Hamilton: London, pp. 77; 100; 104

(4) Harold Orel (Ed.), 1991, *Sir Arthur Conan Doyle: Interviews and Recollections*, 1st Edition, MacMillan: Basingstoke, pp. 72-73

(5) For example, Trevor Marriot, 2007, *Jack the Ripper: The 21st Century Investigation*, 1st Edition, John Blade: London, pp. 219-223

(6) Harrison, Op. Cit. p. 16

(7) Edwards, Op. Cit., pp. 55-56; Gerry Black, 2003, *Jewish London: An Illustrated History*, 1st Edition, Breedon: Derby, pp. 100-104

(8) Flanders, Op. Cit., pp. 441-442

(9) Edwards, Op. Cit., pp. 226-227

(10) Ibid., pp. 221-222; 226-227; 254-255; Harrison, Op. Cit., p. 136

(11) Julian Symons, 1979, *Portrait of an Artist: Conan Doyle*, 1st Edition, Andre Deutsch: London, p. 79