

THE TRIAL OF PETER SUTCLIFFE

The following has been compiled from various newspaper sources at the time of the trial, and from books released afterwards. It is by no means a complete record of events at the trial of Peter Sutcliffe, but is, hopefully, a substantial account of those events. It should also be noted that in the attempt to merge the various accounts together, I have had to decide where to place some sections of text and quotes in the order of testimony. There is the possibility that some of these sections may not be in the correct position. In the case of extracts from Peter Sutcliffe's confession, I am also unsure whether all that I have included were actually read into the record of the court.

CHARGES AND PROCEDURES

JANUARY 5 1981: MURDER AND THEFT CHARGES

FEBRUARY 20 1981: MURDER AND ATTEMPTED MURDER CHARGES

APRIL 14 1981: TRANSFER TO OLD BAILEY FOR TRIAL

APRIL 29 1981: PRELIMINARIES

THE TRIAL: WEEK ONE

MAY 5 1981: TRIAL BEGINNINGS, THE VICTIMS

MAY 6 1981: LAST VICTIM, MILNE REPORT

MAY 7 1981: ARREST, FRIENDS

MAY 8 1981: OTHER PROSECUTION WITNESSES

THE TRIAL: WEEK TWO

MAY 11 1981: PETER SUTCLIFFE

MAY 12 1981: PETER SUTCLIFFE, DR MILNE

MAY 13 1981: DR MILNE

MAY 14 1981: DR MILNE

MAY 15 1981: DR MILNE, DR MacCULLOCH

THE TRIAL: WEEK THREE

MAY 18 1981: DR MacCULLOCH, DR KAY

MAY 19 1981: CLOSING SPEECHES

MAY 20 1981: CLOSING SPEECHES, THE JUDGE'S SUMMARY

MAY 21 1981: THE JUDGE'S SUMMARY

MAY 22 1981: THE VERDICT

THE TRIAL

CHARGES AND PROCEDURES

MONDAY, JANUARY 5 1981: MURDER AND THEFT CHARGES

At Dewsbury Magistrates' Court, Court Clerk Dean Gardener asked: "Are you Peter William Sutcliffe, of 6 Garden Lane, Heaton, Bradford?" After an affirmative response, he continued: "You are accused that between 16 November and 19 November 1980 you did murder Jacqueline Hill against the peace of our Sovereign Lady the Queen. Further, you are charged that at Mirfield, between 13 November and 2 January, you stole two motor vehicle registration-plates to the total value of 50p, the property of Cyril Bamforth."

The County prosecuting solicitor, Maurice Shaffner, stated that Sutcliffe was not legally represented. Sutcliffe replied in the negative when asked whether he wanted reporting restrictions lifted. The hearing lasted about five minutes.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 20 1981: MURDER AND ATTEMPTED MURDER CHARGES

At Dewsbury Magistrates' Court, Peter William Sutcliffe was committed for trial accused of 13 murders and seven attempted murders, and transferred to Leeds Crown Court. During a 14 minute hearing, David Kyle, for the Director of Public Prosecutions, made the application for Sutcliffe's committal for trial under a procedure where an accused person can be committed for trial without oral evidence being given. The prosecution also requested, and the magistrates agreed, to the withdrawal of one charge of the theft of number plates worth 50p.

Kerry Macgill, defending, accepted committal without oral evidence. He did not make any applications for bail or for the lifting of reporting restrictions. He did apply for two counsel to represent Sutcliffe at his trial.

The murder charges were of: Wilma McCann, 24, of Scott Hall Avenue, Chapeltown, at Leeds, on October 30 1975; Emily Monica Jackson, 42, of Back Green, Churwell, Morley, at Leeds, on or about January 20 1976; Irene Richardson, 28, of Cowper Steet, Leeds, at Leeds, on or about February 6 1977; Patricia Atkinson, 33, of Oak Avenue, Manningham, in Bradford, on or about April 23 1977; Jayne Michelle McDonald, 16, of Scott Hall Avenue, Chapeltown, at Leeds, on June 26 1977; Jean Bernadette Jordan (Royle), 20, of Lingbeck Crescent, Hulme, Manchester, at Manchester, between September 30 1977 and October 11 1977; Yvonne Ann Pearson, 22, of Woodbury Street, Bradford, at Bradford, between January 20 and March 26 1978; Helen Maria Rytka, 18, of Elmwood Avenue, Birkby, Huddersfield, between January 30 and February 4 1978; Vera Evelyn Millward, 40, of Grenham Avenue, Hulme, Manchester, at Manchester, on or about May 16 1978; Josephine Anne Whitaker, 19, of Ivy Street, Halifax, at Halifax, on or about April 4 1979; Barbara Janine Leach, 20, of Grove Terrace, Bradford, at Bradford, between September 1 and September 4 1979; Marguerite Walls, 47, of New Park Croft, Farsley, Leeds, at Farsley, on or about

August 20 1980; Jacqueline Hill, 20, of Lupton Flats, Headingley, at Headingley, Leeds, between November 16 and November 19 1980.

The attempted murders charges were of: Anna Patricia Rogulskyj, 39, at Keighley, on July 5 1975; Olive Smelt, 51, at Halifax, on or about August 15 1975; Marcella Claxton, 23, at Leeds, on May 9 1976; Maureen Long, 46, at Bradford, on July 10 1977, Marilyn Moore, 28, at Leeds, on December 14 1977; Upadhya Nadavathy Bandara, 34, at Leeds, on September 24 1980; Teresa Simone Sykes, 16, at Huddersfield, on November 5 1980.

TUESDAY, APRIL 14 1981: TRANSFER TO OLD BAILEY FOR TRIAL

At Leeds Crown Court, the judge ruled that Peter Sutcliffe would go on trial in London's Old Bailey criminal court April 29 1981. During a four minute hearing, both defence and prosecution lawyers agreed to the transfer, fearing Sutcliffe might not get a fair hearing before a Yorkshire jury.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29 1981: PRELIMINARIES

Case: Regina v Peter William Sutcliffe

Place: Number One Court, Central Criminal Court, "Old Bailey", London

Judge: Mr Justice Boreham

Prosecution: Sir Michael Havers, QC, the Attorney General

Prosecution: Harry Ognall, QC

Defence: James Chadwin, QC

Defence: Sidney Levine

(No jury is present.)

When asked his plea on each of the thirteen murder charges, Peter William Sutcliffe pleaded: "Not guilty to murder but guilty to manslaughter on the grounds of diminished responsibility." He also pleaded guilty to each of the seven charges of attempt murder.

Sir Michael Havers told Mr Justice Boreham that the Crown accepts the pleas by Mr Sutcliffe. He also stated that he has the reports of four psychiatrists who had interviewed Mr Sutcliffe. Sir Michael: "I have met with them to discuss their reports with the greatest care and anxiety and at great length. The general consensus of the doctors is that this is a case of diminished responsibility, the illness being paranoid schizophrenia."

Mr Justice Boreham: "I have very grave anxieties about Sutcliffe and his pleas. I would like you to explain in far greater detail than usual any decision that you are going to make about the acceptance of these pleas."

For the next two hours, Sir Michael Havers outlined the reasons why the Crown was prepared to accept the pleas of diminished responsibility, including details of Mr Sutcliffe's history, confessions, conversations with the psychiatrists, the reports by the psychiatrists, and other evidence. (NOTE: Since these elements of the case are detailed later during the trial itself, I have not included them

here.)

After Sir Micheal Havers finished putting his case: "that this is a case of diminished responsibility", Mr Justice Boreham rendered his decision: "The matter that troubles me is not the medical opinions because there is a consensus. It seems to me that all of these opinions – and I say this without criticism – all these opinions are based simply on what this defendant has told the doctors, nothing more. Moreover what he has told the doctors conflicts substantially with what he told the police on the morning of arrest. I use the word 'conflict' advisedly. In statements to the police he expressed a desire to kill all women. If that is right – and here I really need your help – is that not a matter which ought to be tested? Where lies the evidence which gives these doctors the factual basis for these pleas? It is a matter for the defendant to establish. It is a matter for a jury. We have in a sense conducted a trial which has satisfied us. It seems to me it would be more appropriate if this case were dealt with by a jury."

After the 90–minute luncheon adjournment, there was further legal discussion which lasted for about 40 minutes. Sir Michael Havers informed the judge that he could proceed with the case before a jury on Friday, May 1st. James Chadwin, for the defence, sought an adjournment until Tuesday, May 5th, because he needed time to prepare his case. After some discussion, Mr Justice Boreham agreed to the defence request, and the hearing was adjourned until May 5th.

(NOTE: Trial source material: Burn, Cross, Jones, Yallop, Daily Telegraph, London (Canada) Free Press, The Times, The Guardian.)

THE TRIAL

WEEK ONE

TUESDAY, MAY 5 1981: TRIAL BEGINNINGS, THE VICTIMS

Case: Regina v Peter William Sutcliffe

Place: Number One Court, Central Criminal Court, "Old Bailey", London

Judge: Mr Justice Boreham

Prosecution: Sir Michael Havers, QC, the Attorney General

Prosecution: Harry Ognall, QC

Defence: James Chadwin, QC

Defence: Sidney Levine

Opening for the prosecution, Sir Michael Havers, QC, the Attorney General, told the jury that by evidence alone, it demonstrated that Peter Sutcliffe carried out a series of calculated, premeditated, and sadistic murders. However, there was also medical evidence that showed that Mr Sutcliffe suffered from paranoid schizophrenia, as all the doctors who had examined him since his arrest were agreed on the diagnosis. Sir Michael: "This is an abnormality of the mind which, in the view of the doctors, substantially impairs his mental responsibility for his acts, namely murder."

The doctors opinions were not binding on the jury. They were based entirely on the version of events as told to them by Mr Sutcliffe. Sir Michael: "The reason for this trial is simple. There is a marked significant difference between the version which Sutcliffe gave to the police and the version he gave to the doctors. You will have to consider whether the doctors might, in fact, have been deceived by this man; whether he sought to pull the wool over their eyes, or whether the doctors are just plain wrong. You will have to decide whether as a clever, callous murderer he has deliberately set out to provide a cock and bull story to avoid conviction of murder."

Mr Sutcliffe told a psychiatrist about his alleged reasons for the killings. Sir Michael: "He said, in short, that he had messages from God to kill prostitutes and that what he was doing was a divine mission."

Consultant forensic psychiatrist Dr Hugo Milne had a series of 11 interviews with Peter Sutcliffe. It was on March 5th, during the eighth interview and two months after his arrest, that Mr Sutcliffe first made reference to his "mission". Mr Sutcliffe had been describing how he had murdered his third victim, Irene Richardson, and concluded with: "It was important to my cause that I had to carry on with the mission."

When encouraged to talk more by Dr Milne, Mr Sutcliffe said: "I know if I was allowed out I would know it was all right. I'm here now but it might only be temporary. If I was out the feeling would come back. It would be wrong to say I wouldn't to it again. It would be different to say that I couldn't. I know it's wrong to kill but if you have got a reason it's justified and it's all right. I have no doubts whatsoever. I wasn't as rational then as now. If there were women around now it wouldn't take long to get these thoughts again. The prostitutes are still there, even more on the streets now,

they say. My mission is only partially fulfilled. God gave me the mission to kill. He got me out of trouble. I'm in God's hands. He misled the police. Perhaps God was involved with the tapes."

Dr Milne said in his report: "He was confident that he was called to do it. It was his calling. He had no qualms about it."

Mr Sutcliffe said that he thought that God might have decided that he should be arrested, so that he could rest from the mental torment that went along with the killing. It could be that God had called someone else to continue with the mission. Mr Sutcliffe had also told Dr Milne: "I have never seen God. I have heard him often."

Sir Michael: "But none of that detail was told to the police at all. He told the police that he had urges and hallucinations but of a different kind to what he later described to the doctors." As well, he hadn't told the police straight away about those urges and hallucinations.

It had taken the best part of two days to take down Mr Sutcliffe's statement. Sir Michael: "But that confession is curious, you may think. It is by no means wholly frank. There were twenty murders and attempted murders. He only spoke in his confession of fourteen." He had not included the murder of Marguerite Walls who had been strangled with a rope in Leeds last summer. Mr Sutcliffe claimed to have heard voices in his head say: "Kill, kill, kill," during the attack.

When first arrested, Mr Sutcliffe did not in any sense tell the police: "I have a divine right to do this. I am responding to God's orders." Sir Michael: "What he did say, he told a whole series of lies as to how he had been caught and why he was in the car with a prostitute and why he had weapons in the car and why he had a rope in his pocket and gave a cock-and-bull story about how he came to be there."

Sir Michael said that the discrepancies between what Mr Sutcliffe told the police and what he told the doctors would, to the jury, "cause the greatest anxieties in this case and that they will be the most relevant facts to the issue of whether the medical evidence should be accepted by you or not." Sir Michael said that the doctors would say they were aware and had taken into account these discrepancies in Sutcliffe's story.

However, there were two separate occasions which cast grave doubts about Mr Sutcliffe's story given to the doctors. The first was while he was in Armley Prison Hospital, Leeds. Six days after his arrest, on January 8th, his wife was visiting him. A prison officer, Mr Leach, had been present during the visit. Mr Sutcliffe told his wife he was guilty of all the charges and had given the police the details.

Sir Michael: "He also said that he expected to get 30 years in prison, but – and listen to this – he said that if he could make people believe that he was mad, he would only do ten years in a loony bin."

The second occasion was on April 14th, the same day it was announced that Mr Sutcliffe's trial was transferred to London from Leeds. A hospital prison officer was sitting with him. Sir Michael: "Sutcliffe was insisting that he was normal, and he was highly amused at the doctors considering him disturbed. Was this part of a pattern of what happened on the previous occasion?"

Sir Michael said that the Crown intended to demonstrate that Mr Sutcliffe had 'duped' the doctors and was a 'sadistic killer'. The defence had the burden of proving that Mr Sutcliffe suffered from diminished responsibility. If the defence could not satisfy the jury that Mr Sutcliffe genuinely believed that he had heard the voice of God when he was working at Bingley cemetery, then they must find him guilty of murder on all thirteen counts.

After he had listed all the charges against Mr Sutcliffe, Sir Michael said: "All this finally ended on the night of January 2 this year." On that night South Yorkshire police officers, PC Robert Hydes and Sgt Robert Ring, were on routine motor patrol and were checking office premises in a large deserted area. "This area was regularly used by prostitutes. The police vehicle drove up. They saw a Rover parked without its lights on."

Noticing a man and a woman in the vehicle they went over to check it. The woman was: "a well-known prostitute and the man Sutcliffe. Sutcliffe first said she was a girlfriend, but could not give her name, so that did not go on for very long."

When the officers radioed to check the plates on the Rover, they found they were false and belonged to another vehicle. It was after this discovery that both the man and woman were then taken to the police station in Sheffield.

Sir Michael: "Because of this the largest and most expensive and most protracted manhunt ever mounted by a police force in this country was brought to an end." The investigation had cost more than £4 million and had involved more than one million hours of police work.

Sir Michael then told of the activities of: "the man now seated in the dock, who became known, because of the killings, as the Yorkshire Ripper." Peter Sutcliffe had, over a period of five years, made 20 homicidal attacks on women. Thirteen had died and seven lived. They were between the ages of 16 and 47. Some of the women were prostitutes, some were women of easy virtue, but the attacks from 1979 to 1980 involved six women whose reputations were totally unblemished.

With the exception of two attacks in Manchester, all the attacks had taken place in five West Yorkshire towns or cities: Bradford, Leeds, Halifax, Huddersfield, and Keighley. No woman was free from these homicidal attacks. Sir Michael: "His modus operandi was marked by deliberation and brutality."

Mr Sutcliffe modus operandi in the cases involving prostitutes was to get them in his car and drive to a secluded place, sometimes of his choosing, sometimes of theirs. Sir Michael: "On a pretext of having sexual intercourse with them he invited them into the back seat and as they stooped to get in he would attack them from behind with a hammer."

In other cases, Mr Sutcliffe would park his car and lie in wait for a victim, or he would follow his victim on foot. The method of attack soon assumed a "clear badge of identity" to the police trying to catch the killer. The victim suffered multiple depressed fractures of the skull, in most cases they were rendered senseless, if not dead. The victims were also repeatedly stabbed about the trunk. Mr Sutcliffe also displaced or removed their clothing before he stabbed them with a knife or screwdriver, saying that when they were found they would: "look as cheap as they are."

Mr Sutcliffe had often been disturbed during his attacks, but always escaped. Sir Michael: "One

might almost say, in happier circumstances, that he led a charmed life."

During the November 1980 attack on Theresa Sykes, age 16, in Huddersfield, he was actually seen attacking her and was chased by a young man. Mr Sutcliffe escaped by hiding in a front garden of a house.

Peter Sutcliffe said that one of his victims, Maureen Long, attacked in Bradford in 1977, passed by him in Bradford city centre approximately two weeks before he was arrested. He recognised her immediately, but she did not recognise him.

In his confession, while most of his victims were prostitutes, Mr Sutcliffe acknowledged that there did come a stage when it no longer mattered to him. He had attacked women of excellent reputation, four of whom died. Sir Michael: "He has given no explanation of importance as to the motive for these killings."

Sir Michael said that Mr Sutcliffe had told of the time, during his late teens, in 1965, when he had been in a motorcycle accident, and had suffered a severe blow to the head on a lamp post, implying that this might in some way account for his later actions. Mr Sutcliffe told the doctors he was: "knocked unconscious for hours." To others, he had said he had been knocked unconscious for half an hour. Sir Michael suggested that: "you may think he was embroidering this story."

Sexual intercourse did not appear to have played any part in Mr Sutcliffe's conduct in regards to his victims. He had asserted that, other than the one exception involving victim Helen Rytka, he had not sought or had sexual relations with any of his victims.

The use of false number plates had led to Mr Sutcliffe's arrest. He had been due to appear in Bradford court charged with a breathalyser offence. In such cases it was usually inevitable that disqualification would take place. He said he had stolen the number plates from a scrapyards in Mirfield, West Yorkshire because his car insurance had expired and in order to tide him over until he lost his license.

Sir Michael: "Of course there may be another motive for this, there was careful checking going on in all the prostitute areas by the police and Sutcliffe had been interviewed a number of occasions. Whatever the cause for the deception it in fact led to his arrest and helped, perhaps, to save the life of Olivia Reivers (the prostitute he was with at the time), and perhaps many more."

Sir Michael said that the police investigation of the murders was bedevilled by letters that were received by the man in charge of the investigation, Mr George Oldfield, Assistant Chief Constable of West Yorkshire Police. The letters had been posted in Sunderland. They were written in taunting tones, and it appeared that the author had detailed knowledge of attacks. In June 1979, the police received a tape cassette, also posted from Sunderland, that contained a sarcastic mocking message, and had been made by someone with a northeast accent originating from an area of Sunderland.

Sir Michael: "Most regrettably it became widely accepted by a number of senior officers that this man was in fact the Ripper and that he spoke with a Wearside accent. One of the things which affected the investigating officers, seeing hundreds, if not thousands, of people, was that if people interviewed did not speak with a Sunderland accent or if their writing did not compare with that on the letters they tended to be eliminated. The harsh truth is that the author of the letters and tape has

nothing to do with this case. That person's wicked behaviour may be responsible for casting a shadow over many innocent people. For my part I cannot condemn too strongly this cruel hoax."

Sir Michael then detailed Peter Sutcliffe's personal background. From a family of six, he left school at age 15 and had a variety of jobs, including labouring, factory work, and gravedigging, before he qualified as a heavy goods vehicle driver. He was married at age 28 to his wife Sonia, age 24 at the time, in August 1974 after having courted her for seven or eight years. She had been his only regular girlfriend. They lived with her parents in Bradford after their marriage until they bought their own house. They didn't have any children.

Sonia Sutcliffe worked as a supply teacher, and also worked as a nursing auxiliary one night a week. Mr Sutcliffe had stated that for many of his attacks it was on a night when his wife was working.

The people who knew Mr Sutcliffe the best, his family and friends, knew him as an unremarkable man who lead an unremarkable life. When Mr Sutcliffe lived with his wife at her parents' house, next door lived two brothers named Barker. One of the Barkers, Ronnie, kept a diary and was able to pinpoint events on certain dates.

On May 28 1977, the Barker brothers were driven to York by Mr Sutcliffe. While there, he disappeared for approximately three quarters of an hour, telling the brothers he had been with a girl. Later, on their way back to Bradford, Sutcliffe drove the car through the Chapeltown area of Leeds, telling the brothers they were: "in Ripper country."

That incident took place exactly a month before the killing in Chapeltown, Leeds, of 16-year-old Jayne MacDonald. Sir Michael: "It is for your consideration that this might well have been a reconnaissance trip. If so this shows a measure of premeditation."

Peter Sutcliffe would sometimes drop the Barkers off at the end of the road where they lived and then would drive off by himself. Most of those evening were when his wife, Sonia, was at work at the hospital.

Mr Sutcliffe was with the Barkers out drinking on the night of Jayne MacDonald's murder, and dropped them off at the end of the road before driving off alone. Within three hours, Jayne MacDonald had been brutally killed in Chapeltown, Leeds.

Once while out with the Barkers, Mr Sutcliffe suddenly stopped the car and left the vehicle after seeing a girl he liked and telling them he was going after her.

Before detailing the attacks and murders, Sir Michael told the jury that they would have to "steel themselves" to look at photographs of the victims.

Peter Sutcliffe's first victim was 39-year-old Anna Rogulskyj. She was attacked as she tried to get into her boyfriend's house. The attack took place in July 1975. She had argued with her boyfriend and spent the evening drinking in pubs and clubs. Mr Sutcliffe had spotted her about 1:30 am.

Sir Michael: "Sutcliffe said that he had seen her twice in the area before and asked her if she was in business and was rebuffed. While trying to get into the house, Sutcliffe hit her from behind with a

hammer and admitted that he tried to kill her but was prevented from doing so because he was disturbed by something." Anna Rogulskyj suffered two depressed fractures of the skull and had abrasions on her stomach. She has since made a good recovery from her injuries, suffering no brain damage.

When asked about the killings during an interview on January 5th of this year, Mr Sutcliffe said: "All this really started when I was done out of £10 by a prostitute in Bradford. She went off to get it changed and never came back. This poisoned my mind about prostitutes."

When asked about the Anna Rogulskyj attack, Mr Sutcliffe stated: "Yes, that was me. She had a funny name and I asked her if she fancied it. She said 'Not on your life,' and went on trying to get into the house. When she came back, I tapped her again and she elbowed me. I followed her and hit her with the hammer and she fell down. I intended to kill her but I was disturbed. I can't remember anything else."

During the January 22nd interview, Mr Sutcliffe was asked if the Anna Rogulskyj attack was his first. He replied: "Yes, I'm sure of that. I hit her on the head and I think I intended to kill her. I had this inner complex which I think started back in 1965 when I had a motorbike accident. I ran into a telegraph pole and went into it with my head. Since then I have had severe bouts of morbid depression and hallucinations. My mind goes into a haze and I don't know what was right or wrong, or if I was acting rationally or not."

Sir Michael: "You will notice that he makes no mention of any voice from God, simply hallucinations and depressions."

Mr Sutcliffe later told police that he got two bouts of depression a month: "I used to think I was hearing things. These are the sort of things that have been going on, but other times there would be no pattern to them." He also said he thought his attacks on women were probably linked to these bouts.

Mr Sutcliffe went with his first prostitute in order to "level the score" with Sonia before they were married: "I was working at the water board and I heard that Sonia was seeing an Italian ice-cream man who would pick her up from college and take her out at nights. It depressed and upset me and I didn't want to lose her. By going with a prostitute I thought it would level the score. I thought I would have intercourse with the prostitute, but changed my mind when it got to the stage where we had got to do it."

Sutcliffe had later seen the prostitute, who had cheated him out of £10, and: "She refused to give me it back and I felt humiliated, outraged and embarrassed. I was full of hatred."

Describing the attempted murder in August 1975 of Olive Smelt, a 46-year-old office cleaner living in Boothtown, Halifax, Sir Michael said: "She often went out on Friday night drinking with another woman friend. Sutcliffe probably went to the same public houses that Mrs Smelt visited."

Olive Smelt had been out drinking with friends on August 15th and had been in five different public houses in the town centre of Halifax. She left the Royal Oak in a car with two men who dropped her off 400 yards from her home. She walked down Woodville Road and then turned down a narrow lane. She then realised there was someone walking on her right-hand side. Having exchanged a few

words with her, he walked off. Sir Michael: "She walked on down the alleyway and the next thing she remembers is waking up in the hospital."

Mrs Smelt's life was saved when a man drove up to the spot with his headlights on, disturbing Mr Sutcliffe during his attack on her. While the driver did not see the assailant, he did see Mrs Smelt lying on her front on the pavement with her clothes pulled apart to expose her backside. She was then taken to the hospital. She had suffered two fractures of the skull and had two curious abrasions on the small of her back, one being 12 inches long, and the other four inches long.

Sir Michael then spoke about Trevor Birdsall, aged 32, who had known Peter Sutcliffe since 1966. Sir Michael: "At the back end of last year, in late November, he went to the police and gave them certain information which he had been in possession of for a long time and had done nothing about."

Mr Birdsall told police that in 1971 he was driving his car along Manningham Lane, Bradford, when Mr Sutcliffe told him to stop. Sir Michael: "He got out and walked up St. Paul's Road, a prostitutes area. Five or ten minutes later he came running back, said 'Drive off quickly.'"

Mr Birdsall saw that Mr Sutcliffe had a sock with a stone in it. Mr Sutcliffe said he had "hit a woman" and then proceeded to throw the stone out the window.

Sir Michael: "That was about in 1971. The first count on this indictment is 1975."

(NOTE: The attack took place in 1969, not in 1971 as stated above. This was corrected later on during the trial. All further references have been corrected to 1969).

Sir Michael: "Mrs Smelt was attacked in August 1975. On that very night when the attack on her took place, Sutcliffe went with Mr Birdsall to Halifax and in one of the pubs they visited, the Royal Oak, he pointed out some women and said: 'I bet they are on the game.'"

Mr Birdsall and Mr Sutcliffe were driving out of Halifax towards Bradford later that evening. As they passed through Boothtown, Mr Sutcliffe stopped the car, picked something up from the car, got out and walked off down a street, which was parallel to one where a moment before they had seen a woman.

Sir Michael: "That woman was Olive Smelt. About twenty minutes later, Sutcliffe came back and Mr Birdsall says he was rather quiet and tried to chat a bird up but didn't get anywhere. The next day, Mr Birdsall saw in the paper of the murderous attack on Olive Smelt and where it happened. He didn't do anything." It must have been in Mr Sutcliffe's mind that his friend might have been suspicious about him.

Mr Birdsall again wondered about Mr Sutcliffe when he found out he had been interviewed by the police in 1977 in regards to a £5 note found on one of the murder victims. The police had traced the note to a wages batch which could have been given to Mr Sutcliffe by his employer. Sir Michael: "Mr Birdsall thought again and wondered – but did not do anything. It was not until November (of 1980) that he sent an anonymous letter to the police and then went himself to see them."

When interviewed by the police after his arrest, Mr Sutcliffe confirmed that the information from Mr Birdsall that he had attacked a prostitute in 1969 while out with Mr Birdsall was correct.

Mr Sutcliffe had told police: "I got out of the car and asked her the time and hit her with a sock with a stone in it. I had got depressed. I had trouble with violent headaches. I blame prostitutes."

Mr Sutcliffe claimed that when first interviewed by the police (in 1969) about the attack, he told them he had hit her with his hand: "I was given a lecture and told the woman would not press charges."

Peter Sutcliffe had been arrested in 1969 in Manningham, Bradford, found carrying a hammer, and was subsequently convicted of going equipped for theft. He was asked this year by the police if he had carried the hammer in order to kill prostitutes. Mr Sutcliffe told them: "I had it in my mind to kill prostitutes. "But I did not tell them what was in my mind when I was arrested because to tell them would have been a far worse charge than to tell them what I told them at the time."

When interviewed about the Olive Smelt attack, Sutcliffe stated: "I saw this woman in a pub and she annoyed me, probably in some minor way. I took her to be a prostitute. I hit her on the head and scratched her buttocks with a piece of hacksaw blade or maybe a knife. My intention was to kill her but I was disturbed by a car coming down the road."

Peter Sutcliffe's first murder victim was Wilma McCann, who was separated from her husband and lived with her four children. Sir Michael: "She drank too much, was noisy and sexually promiscuous – she distributed her favours widely."

On the night of her death, Wilma McCann had gone to a public house and then to a club. She left the club in the early hours of the morning. She had 183 milligrammes of alcohol in her blood. She had been seen by two policemen at around 1:30am while they were on routine patrol. She was picked up by Mr Sutcliffe in his car and her body was found the next morning by a milkman, who at first thought the body was a bundle of rags.

Sir Michael: "Medical evidence says she was first hit on the head then fell to the ground and then repeatedly stabbed." She had been stabbed in the abdomen, chest, and neck. She also had laceration to her scalp which was probably caused by a hammer. Mr Sutcliffe had carried with him in his car a hacksaw blade, a hammer and a knife.

Mr Sutcliffe told police: "I wanted to pick up a prostitute with the intention of killing her. I realised this one was a prostitute because she asked me if I wanted business. I may have given her the impression that I wanted to have sex, but this was not so. This kind of talk was a preamble which would lead to the true purpose of my killing. I had to put up with all kinds of language and abuse in case she didn't see the point."

(Mr Sutcliffe:) "I was driving through Leeds at night. I had been having a couple of pints and I saw this woman thumbing a lift. She was wearing white trousers and a jacket. I stopped and asked her how far she was going and she said, 'Not far, thanks for stopping' and jumped in. I was in quite a good mood and just before we set off she asked if I wanted to do business. I didn't know what she meant and asked her to explain and, it seemed to me, a scornful tone came into her voice. She said: 'Bloody hell, do I have to spell it out!' as though it were a challenge. My reaction was to go with her."

(Mr Sutcliffe:) "I parked near a field and we sat there for a minute. All of a sudden, her tone changed and she said, 'Well, what are we waiting for! Let's get on with it.' Before we started, she

said, 'It costs a fiver.' I was a bit surprised. I was expecting to be a bit romantic. I couldn't have intercourse at a moment's notice, I had to be aroused. She said, 'I am going. It's going to take you all fucking day. You are fucking useless.' I felt myself seething with rage. I wanted to hit her. I told her to hang on a minute and not to go off like that. She said, 'Oh you can manage it now, can you!' It sounded as though she was taunting me. I said, 'Can we do it on the grass!' This was my idea to start hitting her."

(Mr Sutcliffe:) "She stormed off up the field. I had a hammer in the tool box and I followed her up the field. I had the hammer in my right hand and put my coat on the grass. She sat down on the coat and unfastened her trousers and said, 'Come on, get it over with.' I said, 'Don't worry, I will.' I then hit her with the hammer on the top of the head. She made a lot of noise and kept on making noise so I hit her again. I hit her once or twice and she started making a moaning noise. I felt, 'God what have I done!' I knew I had gone too far."

(Mr Sutcliffe:) "I sat in the car and could see her arm moving. I was in a numb panic. I half expected her to get up and realised I would be in serious trouble. I felt the best way to get out of the mess was to make sure she couldn't tell anyone. I thought to make sure she was dead I would stab her in places like her lungs and throat. I was in a blind panic when I was stabbing her, just to make sure she would not tell anybody. I was very frightened and I can't remember driving back. I thought I was bound to get caught. I looked over my clothing before I went into the house, then I went straight upstairs to the bathroom, washed my hands and went to bed. I carried on as normal, living with my wife. After that first time I developed and played up a hatred for prostitutes in order to justify within myself a reason why I had attacked and killed Wilma McCann."

When asked by the police why he disarranged her clothes, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "When they find them (the prostitutes) they will look as cheap as they are."

Peter Sutcliffe's next victim was Emily Jackson, a 42-year-old prostitute. She was a married woman whose husband would drive in to Leeds with her, and leave her to carry out her business. Her body was found by a motorist who spotted a pair of legs among some rubble. He first thought it was a tailor's dummy.

There were boot impression found near the body, and these matched a pair of wellingtons found in Mr Sutcliffe's Bradford home.

Mrs Jackson's clothes had been pulled up above her waist. The body had 52 stab wounds in five groups. She had been stabbed in the chest, abdomen, and back. The pathologist who examined the body, Professor David Gee, stated that it was: "impossible to see the individual track of each wound. They had been inflicted with a Phillips-type screwdriver."

Mr Sutcliffe told police: "I felt an inner compulsion to kill a prostitute. I saw this woman and she said it would cost me £5. I remember there was an overpowering smell of cheap perfume and this served all the more for me to hate the woman, even though I did not know her. I could see how the first murder had unhinged me completely. I knew from the outset that I didn't want intercourse with her, I just wanted to get rid of her. I couldn't bear even to go through the motions of having sex with her. I wanted to do what I had got in mind as soon as possible."

(Mr Sutcliffe:) "I pretended the car wouldn't start and told her I would have to look under the bonnet

and asked her to help me. She held her light over the bonnet, I took a couple of steps back and hit her over the head with my hammer, I think a couple of times, and she fell down in the road. I made sure she was dead by taking my screwdriver and stabbing her repeatedly. I pulled her bra up and pulled down her pants. It gave me some sort of sexual revenge on her as, on reflection, it had done with Wilma McCann. I stabbed her frenziedly, without thought, all over the body. I was seething with hate for her. I pushed a piece of wood against her vagina to show how disgusting she was."

While leaving the scene, a car stopped nearby, startling Mr Sutcliffe: "It scared me so I put my hammer and screwdriver on the car floor and went straight home to my mother-in-law's house and had a feeling of satisfaction and justification. I didn't have any blood on my clothes so I didn't have to dispose of them."

Sir Michael had commented part-way through reading Mr Sutcliffe's statement: "Can you imagine an account which sets out more carefully the deliberate way in which he manoeuvred her into a position where he could hit her? Everything was so well planned."

Sir Michael said that Mr Sutcliffe's next attack was on Marcella Claxton, an educationally subnormal West Indian prostitute with an IQ of 50, who was aged 20 at the time of the attack. On Saturday, May 8 1976, she had been drinking in the Chapeltown area of Leeds. She survived despite being hit on the head eight times with a hammer. Evidence showed that Mr Sutcliffe had not left the scene straight away, but had returned to where he had left her. Sir Michael: "Mercifully, she had managed to move away and get help."

Mr Sutcliffe told police: "She went behind some trees to urinate and suggested that we 'start the ball rolling on the grass.' I hit her once on the head with the hammer, but just couldn't bring myself to hit her again. For some reason or another, I just let her walk away and I went back to the car."

It was nine months later that Irene Richardson, 28, was killed. Sir Michael said that she was an active prostitute. She was last seen alive at 11:30 pm on Saturday, February 5th, by her landlady.

That night, the evidence showed, Mr Sutcliffe had been trying to pick up a number of women in the area from about 11:35 pm. Having picked up Mrs Richardson in Chapeltown, he took her to almost the same place he had attacked Marcella Claxton, Roundhay Park in Leeds. Irene Richardson died within a hundred yards of where Marcella Claxton had been attacked.

Irene Richardson's body was discovered the next morning by Mr John Bolton who was out jogging in Roundhay Park at around 7:45 am and spotted a body lying on the ground.

The head injuries, three lacerations on the back of the head, had been caused by a flat surface, such as a hammer head. One of the blows to the back of Irene Richardson's head had driven the skull three quarters of an inch into the brain. Other injuries had been caused by a knife. One injury was a 6 3/4 inch long incision in the trunk. Mr Sutcliffe said that the weapon used was a Stanley knife, a knife with a blade that could be changed.

Mr Sutcliffe told police: "I drove to Leeds to find a prostitute to make it one less. I saw this girl and she got in without a word. I told her that I may not have wanted her but she told me she would give me a good time. I drove her to a park and she wanted to go to the toilet. They were locked so she decided to urinate on the grass. I used the hammer and a Stanley knife on her. As she was crouching

down urinating on the grass I hit her on the head at least two or three times. I lifted up her clothes and slashed her abdomen and throat."

Mr Sutcliffe also told police he left the murder scene after he heard voices, but couldn't tell where they came from. He also heard a car being driven away from the entrance to a house. Later he found out that the house was where disc jockey Jimmy Savile lived.

Mr Sutcliffe also told police: "By this time, killing prostitutes had been an obsession with me. I couldn't stop myself. It was some sort of drug."

While being interviewed by the police, Mr Sutcliffe had been asked why it had been so long between murders. Irene Richardson's murder was over a year after his last murder, of Emily Jackson. Mr Sutcliffe replied it was because of his state of mind: "I was having a battle in my mind. My mind was in turmoil whether I should kill people."

Mr Sutcliffe's next victim was 35-year-old prostitute Patricia Atkinson, whose killing was unusual in that it took place in the victim's home in Bradford. She was last seen alive on April 23 1977, and was found the next day, completely covered by bedding. She had four lacerations to the head. As well as being hit with a claw hammer, she had oblong bruises and grazes on the lower part of her abdomen, and puncture marks on the vagina. The pathologist had described these marks as "curious". Mr Sutcliffe had used the claw end of the hammer to scratch her body. The jury was shown the hammer that Mr Sutcliffe had used on Patricia Atkinson.

Mr Sutcliffe told police: "I heard her using foul language. It was obvious why I picked her up. No decent woman would have been using language like that at the top of her voice. I hung my coat up when I went into the flat because the hammer was in the pocket and I didn't want her to see it. I went up and hit her on the back of the head. She fell off the bed onto the floor. I saw lots of blood on the bedroom floor. I hit her again. I put her back on the bed by picking her up under the arms and hoisting her up. I pulled her clothes up and hit her several times more on her body with the hammer. I saw it marking her body. She made horrible gurgling noises when I hit her. She was still making gurgling noises when I left, but I knew she would not be in any state to tell anyone."

The 1977 murder of Jayne MacDonald was, Sir Michael said: "typically tragic." Aged 16, she was living with her parents and younger sister in Scott Hall Road, Leeds, and was completely respectable.

On June 25, at a public house in Leeds city centre, she met, by chance, a young man named Mark Jones. They stayed together until approximately 1:30 am when they parted in Beckett Street, near St James' Hospital. He had said his sister would drive her home, but: "she was quite prepared to walk home on her own." Her body was found by two small children at 9:45 am the next morning in an adventure playground.

Sir Michael: "Doctors formed the view she had been hit on the head once and fallen, hit once more where she lay, dragged to where she was found and there stabbed on the front of the body and then turned over and stabbed repeatedly in the back. Unfortunately she did not die until after some of the stab wounds had been inflicted."

She had been stabbed under the right shoulder blade and in the chest. In the front trunk area of Jayne

MacDonald was a large gaping wound. In it was an embedded broken bottle with the screw lid still attached. It was not known whether it had been a deliberate act by the killer, or whether the broken bottle had become embedded in the body while it was being dragged along. Mr Sutcliffe had denied responsibility for the broken bottle.

The pathologist had the view that Miss MacDonald had been stabbed as many as 20 times. As well, the killer had wiped his knife clean on the back of her body.

Mr Sutcliffe said: "This next one I still feel terrible about. I read recently about her father dying of a broken heart and it brought it all back to me. I realised what a monster I was. I thought she was a prostitute. I felt like something inhuman and I realised it was the Devil turning me."

Mr Sutcliffe continued: "I were quite certain she were a prostitute, absolutely positive. She were walking along in the red-light area, for one thing, and then I saw her stop and chat to a couple of girls on a street corner. I felt sure she were one of them. I walked behind her, following her a short distance. She never looked round. I hit her on the back of the head and she fell down. I pulled her, face down, into the corner of a yard. Her shoes made a horrible scraping noise."

Maureen Long, 42, separated and living with another man in Bradford, was attacked two weeks later. While she had convictions, none were in relation to prostitution. Apparently she still had maintained some relation with her husband, as she met him in Bradford on Saturday, July 9 1977, and had a few drinks with him.

A factory guard in Bowling Hall Lane, Bradford, saw a car being driven at speed out of Mount Street at approximately 3:15 am. The vehicle was a white Ford Corsair and as a result the police checked out over 5,000 cars of similar description that were registered in West Yorkshire. Maureen Long was found when some people heard shouts for help.

Sir Michael: "She had three fractured ribs and stab wounds all over her body." Taken to the hospital, she was: "successfully treated and discharged." However, she has still not recovered and continues to receive out-patient treatment and has fits.

Mr Sutcliffe told police: "She asked me if I fancied her. I told her I did. I had my hammer ready as she got out of the car. I also had a knife. I struck her on the head with the hammer while she was crouching, urinating. I saw a light on in a caravan, but it didn't stop me. The next day I heard my victim was still alive. I got a nasty shock. I thought it was the end of the line there and then. I thought she would be able to identify me."

Sir Michael: "There he is, from the moment of picking her up until all that happened, holding himself back, restraining himself, waiting for the right moment when she put herself in a position where he could use the hammer from behind."

The next murder victim was Manchester prostitute Jean Jordan, which, Sir Michael said, was: "a particularly disturbing story because she was not reported missing, so no search was mounted for her." After Peter Sutcliffe had killed her, he returned to the scene of the murder nine days later and attacked the body again. There were eleven wounds in the top of her head and six fractures to the skull. There were 18 further wounds to the stomach and chest, and 10 wounds between the hip and lower rib cage. There had also been an attempt to sever her head from her body.

Her decomposing body was found the tenth day after her murder by an allotment-holder who had gone to his patch. An allotment holder later found her green handbag which contained a new £5 note.

The £5 note was the 'key'. Sir Michael: "This was the reason Sutcliffe went back to the body several days after he killed her. That £5 note was traced to the Midland Bank at Shipley, West Yorkshire. The police are to be congratulated on their most careful endeavours made to try to trace where this £5 note had gone. In fact Sutcliffe was one of those interviewed, and although he agreed he had been paid, he said this note was not one he had been given. Some 6,000 people were interviewed, and any one of them could have had it, but all 6,000 denied it. That inquiry took something over 27,000 hours of police time. A most important lead if you could have proved to whom it went."

Mr Sutcliffe told police that Jean Jordan had changed her mind about getting into another car, and instead opted for his car: "I supposed this was the biggest mistake she ever made. She told me she was going to go with the other man until she saw me."

After they drove to some allotments, he attacked her: "until the moaning stopped." Since there were a number of cars about, he drove off.

During the October 9th return visit, Mr Sutcliffe tried to cut Jean Jordan's head off and leave it somewhere else: "To make a big mystery of it. I were very frustrated not finding my £5 note and thinking my time was up. I remember I kicked her a few times. I was frustrated, and I thought I had been there long enough so I got back home and went to bed. I was surprised I did not have much blood on my clothes. I put my trousers into the garage to dispose of later. I later burned my trousers along with some garden rubbish."

Mr Sutcliffe also told police: "I read about the note being traced to a Shipley bank, but by some miracle I escaped detection."

Before he was arrested in January, Peter Sutcliffe had been interviewed nine times by the police. Sir Michael: "But every time he was interviewed about his car being spotted in the red light areas he gave explanations. He said that he had been in the Leeds and Bradford areas because he lived and worked in the area and had to pass through."

Marilyn Moore, 25, and a prostitute for six years, was Mr Sutcliffe's next victim. It was on December 14 1977 that she agreed to go with a man in his car. He said to her: "Let's do it in the back." While she was walking round she felt three blows from behind and fell screaming to the ground. Mr Sutcliffe said that he had slipped in the mud as he hit her with the hammer. With her screams, he was worried about some people nearby, so he drove off: "with a lot of wheel spin."

Her screams had been heard by someone nearby and she was then taken to the hospital. She was suffering from seven to eight laceration wounds between one and four inches long on the side of the head and a 4 inch depressed fracture of the skull. After being operated on to release pressure on the brain, she told police her attacker had a trim neat beard with a "Jason King" type moustache. Sir Michael: "Unfortunately, despite tremendous inquiries Sutcliffe was not discovered."

Mr Sutcliffe's next victim, Yvonne Pearson, 22, was last seen alive on January 21 1978, and her body was found on March 26 1978 on waste land, covered by an old settee, and with a comb between her thighs. She had been hit on the head with a walling hammer which Mr Sutcliffe would

later draw on a sheet of paper for the police while in custody. Yvonne Pearson's head had been smashed into seventeen fragments and Mr Sutcliffe had also stuffed the filling from the decaying settee down her throat.

Yvonne Pearson had tapped on his window as he drove past. Mr Sutcliffe told police: "On reflection, it was a very fateful moment for her. This was the one time when I was genuinely going home, but even so I still had my hammer under my seat."

After hitting her over the head with a walling hammer, a car parked beside his, so he grabbed handfuls of horsehair from an old settee lying nearby: "To keep her quiet" (I) "stuffed it into her mouth and down her throat" (and) "kept holding her nose so she couldn't scream out. I let go after a while to see if she was still making a noise but she started again so I took hold of her nose again until the car drove away. It seemed like hours."

Mr Sutcliffe also said: "I talked to her after and apologised for what I had done because she was dead. I was very distraught and I was in tears when I left."

Helen Rytka, aged 18, was killed on Tuesday, January 31 1978, and had lived a short and sad life. Most of her life was spent in the care of the local authority and with foster parents. She had lived with her twin sister, Rita, and one of her brothers in a bedsitter in Bradford. Later, like her sister, she worked as a prostitute, and had only worked for a few days as a prostitute in Huddersfield before she died.

Her sister Rita reported her missing to the police after she had vanished. Sir Michael: "Being a prostitute, this immediately caused a wide search." Her body was found by the police the following Friday, crushed into a small space in an old timber yard. A piece of corrugated asbestos had been thrown on top of her body. She had sustained severe head injuries and stab wounds in the chest.

Mr Sutcliffe told police: "She undid my trousers and seemed prepared to start sexual intercourse right away in the front of the car. It was very awkward for me to find a way to get her out of the car. For about five minutes I was trying to decide which method to use to kill her. She was beginning to arouse me sexually. I got out of the car with the excuse that I needed to urinate and managed to persuade her to get out of the car so that we could have sex in the back. As she was getting in I realised that this was my chance but the hammer caught on the edge of the car door frame and only gave her a light tap. She said, 'There is no need for that, you don't even have to pay.' I expected her to immediately shout for help. She was obviously scared and said, 'What was that?' I said, 'Just a small sample of one of these,' and hit her on the head hard. She just crumbled making a loud moaning noise."

(Mr Sutcliffe:) I realised that what I had done was in full view of two taxi drivers who had appeared and were talking nearby. I dragged her by the hair to the end of the woodyard. She stopped moaning but was not dead. Her eyes were open and she held up her hands to ward off blows. I jumped on top of her and covered her mouth with my hand. It seemed like an eternity and she was still struggling. I told her that if she kept quiet, she would be all right. As she had got me aroused a moment previous, I had no alternative but to go ahead with the act of sex as the only means of keeping her quiet. It didn't take long. She kept staring at me. She just lay there limp and didn't put much into it."

After the taxi drivers left, Mr Sutcliffe retrieved his hammer and, as Helen Rytka staggered to her

feet and towards his car: "This was when I hit her heavy blows to the back of the head. I dragged her to the front of the car and threw her belongings over the wall. She was obviously still alive. I took a knife from the car and stabbed her several times through the heart and lungs. I think it was a kitchen knife which I believe the police later retrieved from my home."

The next murder was of Vera Millward in Manchester. At about 10:00 pm on May 16 1978, she had gone out for cigarettes and had not returned home. She was reported as missing. The next day, some workmen saw her body after they had driven into a compound at the back of Manchester Royal Infirmary. Mrs Millward was found with her coat covering her from her knees to her neck. Blood and brain tissue placement indicated a struggle between the attacker and the victim during the attack. She had been stuck with a hammer three times and then stabbed. Her stomach had been sliced open.

Sir Michael said the last six of the Ripper's victims are significant for several reasons. First, none of them were prostitutes, all were absolutely respectable. Sir Michael: "Second, the modus operandi, the method of operating, is not going to work with respectable women. You can't pick them up and it is rather difficult to drive them to a quiet spot and it is unlikely if you succeeded in that that you could get them into the back of the car. These six have an entirely different pattern. They were all respectable. None were in red light areas."

Josephine Whitaker was a 19-year-old building society clerk living in Halifax, and who was perfectly respectable: "and Sutcliffe knew her to be respectable." On the night of her murder she had gone to visit her grandparents who lived about a mile away from her home in Ivy Street.

Sir Michael: "She left her grandparents at about 11:40 P.M. and a man walking his dog about fifteen minutes later saw a man and a young woman walking side by side towards Saville Park. This was Josephine Whitaker and Sutcliffe. Shortly afterwards another man was walking by the park and he heard an unusual noise, 'the type of noise that makes your hair stand on end.'"

A frenzied stabbing attack was carried out on Josephine Whitaker. Mr Sutcliffe used a specially-adapted Phillips screwdriver, which he later told police he had discarded down a motorway embankment near the M1. Detectives later retrieved the rusty long screwdriver, which had been sharpened before the attack. Sir Michael: "It was done in a way to make it what you may think is one of the most fiendish weapons you have ever seen."

The screwdriver, which was passed around to members of the jury, had also been used in the Barbara Leach murder. Mr Sutcliffe told police: "I used it on Josephine Whitaker and Barbara Leach. It was a giant Phillips screwdriver which was badly worn and had been converted into a bradawl."

Sir Michael: "Josephine's skull was fractured from ear to ear. She had been stabbed twenty-one times in the trunk, six times in the right leg. Her vagina had been stabbed three times in the awful way of using the same entry each time."

Mr Sutcliffe told police: "The mood was in me. No woman was safe while I was in this state of mind. I arrived at Savile Park without having any particular notion. I saw the girl wearing a three-quarter length skirt and jacket. I caught up with her after a couple of minutes. I realised then that she was not a prostitute but I did not bother – I just wanted to kill a woman. I asked her if she

had far to go and she said she was walking home from her grandmother's. We were approaching an open grass area and she said she normally took a short cut across the fields. 'You don't know who you can trust these days,' I said to her. And there was I, walking along with my hammer and screwdriver in my pocket, ready to do the inevitable."

(Mr Sutcliffe:) We started to walk across the fields and about 30 to 40 yards from the main road I asked the time and she told me (by looking at a church clock). I said to her, 'You must have good eyesight,' and I lagged behind, pretending to look at a church clock nearby. I took my hammer out of my pocket and hit her on the back of the head twice. She gave a loud moaning sound and to my horror I saw a figure walking along the road. I dragged her further into the field and at a safe distance I stopped. I heard voices from somewhere behind me and saw at least two figures walking along a path towards the field. She was still moaning loudly. First I pulled some of her clothing off and then I turned her over and stabbed her numerous times in the chest and stomach with the screwdriver. I was in a frenzy."

Sir Michael said that Barbara Leach, a student who was an undergraduate studying at Bradford University, was Sutcliffe's next victim. She was a totally respectable girl. She had been out drinking with friends at a party at a Bradford pub on September 1 1979. When she left the pub at approximately 2:00 am, she decided to go for a walk. The man who she was with did not want to go walking in the rain, he said that he would wait for her at their student accommodation at Bradford University.

Sir Michael: "The next day, when she did not return, it was beginning to assume a sinister pattern and the police came out in force with tracker dogs." Her body was found in a recess used for enclosing dustbins and had been covered by carpets which were held down with bricks.

Sir Michael: "Barbara had a large laceration on the back of her head and seven stab wounds in her trunk, three of them round her umbilicus. The knife was reintroduced again and again into the chest wound. She had numerous bruises and abrasions and had been struck on the head with a hammer and stabbed with a three-sided instrument."

Mr Sutcliffe then hid her body, the action of a man: "determined to delay the discovery of his victim." Her body was found squashed into a rubbish carrier in a walled dustbin recess and had been concealed by the carpets.

Mr Sutcliffe told police: "It (the Whitaker murder) was forty-six weeks after the last one (the Millward murder). I was never urged to do it again until then. I killed Barbara Leach. I took her to the back of the house before I stabbed her."

Sir Michael said that: "another significant departure from the pattern," was the murder of Miss Marguerite Walls, a totally respectable spinster of 47, who was employed as an executive officer at the Department of Education and Science at Pudsey.

Sir Michael: "You find her a complete departure from the way he had done the last few. There was no hammer or anything of that sort. What we do find is that" – and he held up a length of cord, which had been found in Sutcliffe's pocket when he was arrested.

Miss Walls worked late on August 20 1980. Sir Michael: "It looks on the evidence as if she

probably stayed until about 10.45 p.m. doing her work."

Having made up his mind to kill, apparently, a prostitute, Mr Sutcliffe was driving in his car on his way to Leeds when he passed by Miss Walls, who was on her way home to Farsley. Sir Michael: "For what possible reason he could have thought this lady was a prostitute remains a mystery."

The following morning, a couple saw a couple saw a new pair of lady's shoes near a driveway to a house. A skirt, shopping bag and cheque book were found near a rockery. After the police had been sent for, Miss Walls's body was found beneath a pile of grass cuttings near a garage at the house. Her body was was virtually naked.

Bloodstains found by the gateway suggested that Miss Walls had been attacked there as she was walking past it. Sir Michael: "She was then dragged up the driveway, across the rockery, and into the wooded area to the left of the drive. There she was murdered by strangulation. She was stripped completely naked, apart from her tights, and then moved to the position by the garage."

At first, Mr Sutcliffe would not take responsibility for the murder, but eventually he admitted to it in some detail. He told the police he had been on his way to Leeds with the view of killing a prostitute. He had seen Miss Walls walking towards him from a distance of about 60 yards. Mr Sutcliffe told police: "I was already in some kind of rage and it was just unfortunate for her she was there at the time." He then parked the car and caught up to her over a distance of about 400 yards. When he was striking her on the head, he said: "There seemed to be a voice inside my head saying: Kill, kill, kill," Mr Sutcliffe also told police that he had shouted: "You filthy prostitute," while striking her.

Mr Sutcliffe had said that he realised: "I couldn't do anything to stop myself. I were suffering inner torment and just wanted to get rid of all the prostitutes."

When asked why he had not told the police about the killing of Marguerite Walls at an earlier interview, he replied that when initially questioned he knew he was in deep water through his normal method of killing and that this could open new lines of inquiries on other murders that he had not committed.

When asked why he changed his method of killing, Sutcliffe replied: "Because the Press and the media had attached a stigma to me. I had been known for some time as the Yorkshire Ripper. I didn't like it. It wasn't me. It didn't ring true."

Mr Sutcliffe also told police: "I don't like the method of strangulation. It takes them even longer to die."

Mr Sutcliffe next victim was Dr Upadhya Bandara, a doctor of medicine from Singapore who was attending a course at the Nuffield Centre in Leeds. While walking home, she heard footsteps from behind her and moved to the right to let the person pass. The next thing she knew was that, from behind her, a bearded man had put a rope around her neck. She lost consciousness while she tried to prise the rope loose with her fingers. After that, she next remembered seeing a police officer standing over top of her. She had been found lying on the ground.

Mr Sutcliffe told police: "Yes, I used the rope on that girl. She was walking slowly like a prostitute and I hit her on the head with a hammer. I didn't have any tools with me to finish her off so I used

the rope. I dragged her down the road and her shoes were making a scraping noise. I apologised to her and took her shoes off and put them over a wall with her hand bag."

The next victim was 16-year-old Theresa Sykes, who was attacked on bonfire night, November 5th, last year, in Huddersfield. She had gone out to buy cigarettes and was only 30 yards from her home when she was attacked by Peter Sutcliffe, who emerged from the shadows and attacked her from behind. She tried to grab the weapon he was hitting her with, and later said it felt like metal.

Theresa Sykes' boyfriend heard her screams and ran out to help her. He was a physical fitness fanatic and gave chase to the assailant. Sir Michael: "But unfortunately he was not as fast as his quarry. Although he must have run as fast as he could, Sutcliffe was faster. This man with his mission, or the frenzy or the panic which he has described, was quick enough to realise that someone was running after him, so he popped into a nearby garden until the boyfriend went back to Theresa. It was as near as Sutcliffe ever came to being caught red-handed, but unfortunately he escaped and was able to attack and kill again."

During his interview, Mr Sutcliffe said, about the attack on Theresa Sykes, that he hit her a couple of times and knocked her down. He had run off into the garden after she had started shouting: "I attacked her because she was the first person I saw."

Sir Michael: "Remember his words before – 'I hate prostitutes, I cannot stand them.'"

Mr Sutcliffe had stated he intended to kill Theresa Sykes. When asked why, he replied: "At first, it did not take me any time to decide women were prostitutes. I think something clicked because she had on a straight skirt with a slit in it. She crossed the road in front of me."

The trial was adjourned until tomorrow. Sir Michael said he would then deal with the final murder charge.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 6 1981: LAST VICTIM, MILNE REPORT

Sir Michael Havers, QC, the Attorney General, for the prosecution, began the day by detailing the final indictment against Peter Sutcliffe, the murder of 20-year-old Leeds University student Jacqueline Hill.

Miss Hill was living at the Lupton Flats Hall of Residence in Alma Road, Headingley, Leeds. She was a totally respectable girl, like the five preceding victims. She had become involved with social work in about May of last year. Each month she went to a voluntary probation officers meeting in the Leeds city centre. On the evening of November 17 1980 she had attended such a meeting which finished shortly after 9:00 pm. After leaving the building where the meeting was held, she caught a bus back to her residence. She left the bus at the Arndale Centre, near Alma Road, and was not seen alive again.

At around 9:30 pm, witnesses saw a dark-coloured car parked on the left-hand side of Alma Road. It certainly was the defendant's car. Later that night, at around 10:00 pm, a student found a handbag which was Miss Hill's. Sir Michael held up a cream Raffia bag. The student had found it just beyond

the entrance to some waste land. After taking the bag into the hall of residence, he noticed that there appeared to be blood spots on it. The police were called after he had discussed his find with other students. They police went to where the bag was found and searched a large derelict house that was nearby. However, their search did not discover Miss Hill's spectacles or a mitten, those items would be found the next morning. As well, they did not discover her body.

Sir Michael: "It was a filthy night, very windy and raining and probably difficult for these things to be seen. Although they may be open to criticism, nothing turns on it because by the time they got there the girl was clearly dead."

The next morning, the manager of a shop in Arndale Centre, Mr David Court, was walking along a ramp leading to a car park behind the centre when he looked over a wall and saw a body. Sir Michael: "The police arrive and this is what they found..." Sir Michael then showed the jury photographs of Miss Hill's body. Her body was partially covered by her coat, with her bra pulled over her head and her jeans and pants pulled down. There was obviously a head injury and a severe wound in the region of the left breast. The post-mortem examination found five lacerations to the top and back of the head. There was also a stab wound to the right eye, penetrating one inch and a half. Sir Michael: "The pathologist took the view that the girl did not die at once."

Mr Sutcliffe told police: "The last one I did was Jacqueline Hill at Headingley. I sat in the car eating some Kentucky Fried Chicken, then I saw Miss Hill. I decided she was a likely victim. I drove just past her and parked up and waited for her to pass. I got out of the car and followed about three yards behind her. As she drew level with an opening I took the hammer out of my pocket and struck her on the head. By this time I was in a world of my own, out of touch with reality."

(Mr Sutcliffe:) "I dragged her on to some waste ground. A car appeared and I threw myself to the ground, but the car passed by. I can't imagine why I was not seen. She was moving about, so I hit her again. Then I dragged her further into the waste ground as a girl was passing by. I pulled most of her clothes off. I had a screwdriver with a yellow handle and I stabbed her in the lungs. Her eyes were open and she seemed to be looking at me with an accusing stare. This shook me up a bit so I jabbed a screwdriver into her eye."

On January 2nd of this year, Mr Sutcliffe picked up Sheffield prostitute Olivia Reivers in his Rover car, only minutes before his arrest. He had paid her £10 but had not wanted sex. Miss Reivers told police that Mr Sutcliffe wanted to talk to her first. He said he and his wife had had an argument: "something about not being able to go with her." Miss Reivers understood this as meaning that the couple were having sexual problems.

When Mr Sutcliffe was questioned at the scene by the police, he claimed that Miss Reiver was his girlfriend, but could not think of her name.

Sir Michael said that inside the glove compartment of Mr Sutcliffe's car the police found three screwdrivers. Mr Sutcliffe told police he had taken the false number plates and put them on his car because he was due to go to court on a breathalyser charge and had not wanted his car spotted going through the centre of Sheffield. Mr Sutcliffe had said that despite having rows with his wife, he was not having sex problems at home. He told police: "We forget about the rows when we go to bed."

When Mr Sutcliffe was asked where he was on November 17th, the day Jacqueline Hill was

murdered, he replied that he believed he was at home with his wife. The officer then said that his wife would be interviewed the following morning. Mr Sutcliffe appealed to them not to tell his wife about him being with a prostitute.

The officer told him: "You got yourself into this. As far as I'm concerned I think you are a regular punter."

Mr Sutcliffe had replied: "I am not. I've never been with another woman."

The officer told him: "Your car has been seen in the red light districts of Leeds and Manchester and last night you were caught in a car with a prostitute in Sheffield and you paid her £10. I don't believe these are coincidences."

Mr Sutcliffe then said: "It is true. I am not a punter."

Later that same evening, one of the officers who had arrested Mr Sutcliffe in Melbourne Avenue, Sheffield, went back to the arrest site and found a hammer and knife. Sir Michael said that the hammer had been used to kill Jacqueline Hill. Other officers then went to where the discovery had been made. Found at the police station among some of Mr Sutcliffe's belongings was a piece of cord. It had been used in the attempted murder of Dr Upadhya Bandara. Sir Michael: "That was apparently in his pocket."

Then officers went to Mr Sutcliffe's home where they found a yellow-handled screwdriver and a hacksaw in his garage. They went back to Dewsbury and Mr Sutcliffe was interviewed by Detective Inspector John Boyle.

Sir Michael then detailed the events leading up to Mr Sutcliffe's confession. Mr Boyle had said: "I believe you went to Sheffield on Friday night with the sole purpose of picking up a prostitute."

Mr Sutcliffe said: "That is not true."

Mr Boyle said: "I believe you put the false number plates on to conceal the identity of the vehicle in the red-light district."

Mr Sutcliffe said: "That is not true. To be honest with you, I've been so depressed that I put them on because I was thinking of committing a crime with the car."

Mr Boyle then asked: "Why did you leave your car and go to the side of that house?"

Mr Sutcliffe replied: "To urinate."

Mr Boyle said: "I think you went for another purpose."

Sir Michael said there was no response from Sutcliffe. Mr Boyle then said: "Do you understand what I am saying? I think you are in serious trouble."

Mr Sutcliffe said: "I think you have been leading up to it."

Mr Boyle asked: "Leading up to what?"

Mr Sutcliffe replied: "The Yorkshire Ripper."

Mr Boyle then asked: "What about the Yorkshire Ripper?"

Mr Sutcliffe stated: "Well, it's me. I'm glad it is all over. I would have killed that girl in Sheffield if I hadn't been caught. But I want to tell my wife myself. It is her I'm thinking about – and my family. I am not bothered about myself."

Mr Boyle then asked: "Tell me, if you are the so-called Yorkshire Ripper, how many women have you killed?"

Sir Michael said Mr Sutcliffe replied, untruthfully: "Eleven."

When asked whether he was the author of the letters and tape, he replied: "No, I am not." He also stated: "While that was going on, I felt safe. I am not a Geordie. I was born in Shipley."

When asked how the murders started, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "With Wilma McCann." Sir Michael said that this was not, in fact, true. Mr Sutcliffe continued: "I did not mean to kill her. She was bottling me. After that it grew and grew until I became a beast."

Mr Sutcliffe said that Jacqueline Hill in Leeds was his last murder victim, and that he stabbed her in the eye, because her eyes were open and appeared to be staring at him accusingly.

When asked whether he knew the names of his victims, Mr Sutcliffe said: "They are all in my brain reminding me of the beast I am." Mr Sutcliffe then admitted he had killed 12, not 11 women. He continued: "Just thinking about them all reminds me of what a monster I have become. I know I would have gone on. Now I have been caught, I just want to unburden myself."

Sir Michael gave the jury copies of the voluntary statement Mr Sutcliffe had made. It had taken 15 hours and 45 minutes to take down. His statement was "sadly lacking in one way". He had not mentioned five counts of attempted murder or the strangulation of Marguerite Walls. He said that he had not admitted the Walls murder as he thought he might: "get lumbered with other stranglers."

Mr Sutcliffe had taken police to the Mirfield scrapyards where he had stolen the number plates. He also took police to the motor service area where he had thrown one of his weapons. "Very smartly after intensive investigation" police had traced a groundsman who had found another of Sutcliffe's weapons.

On January 8th of this year, police sergeant Robert Ring, who had arrested Mr Sutcliffe and had found the hammer and knife in Sheffield, remembered that Mr Sutcliffe had visited the toilet when at the police station. Sir Michael: "It then clicked in his mind and went to the toilet and found a wooden-handled knife in the cistern."

During a series of interviews with a leading psychiatrist (Dr Hugo Milne), Mr Sutcliffe said that his actions stemmed from a divine mission from God to kill prostitutes. Sir Michael pointed out that it was not until the eighth interview with the doctor, and two months after his arrest, that Mr Sutcliffe

revealed his divine mission.

Sir Michael: "If it was a compelling reason for this man's murderous attacks of five-and-a-half years, that he was acting under the will and control of God, which started with a vision and which became a mission, ask yourselves this: 'Why did it take him so long to tell the doctors?'"

The jury were supplied with a 35-page report by Dr Hugo Milne, a consultant psychiatrist, who had 11 interviews with Mr Sutcliffe while he was in Armley Jail, Leeds. It referred to "his distorted thinking as a result of his long-standing schizophrenic illness." Prior to allowing Harry Ognall, QC, for the prosecution, to read the report, Mr Justice Boreham had halted the proceedings to inquire whether it was correct for the prosecution to present the report, as it really formed part of the defence case. Mr Justice Boreham: "I'm a little troubled about it being done at this stage." He allowed the report to be read after counsel for both sides said that they felt it was the most convenient time to present the report.

Dr Milne's report mentioned that there was no psychiatric history involving any of Mr Sutcliffe's five brothers and sisters. The report said: "The mother became involved with a policeman and as a result the happy marriage was destroyed and the father became unfaithful with the woman with whom he is now living."

The report said the death of his mother, on November 8 1978, had greatly distressed Mr Sutcliffe: "It is also apparent that he was very much fonder of his mother than his father and since his arrest the accused has had difficulty with family relationships on the basis that his wife had objected to the Sutcliffe family visiting him because they have been in contact with the press on frequent occasions." His wife, Sonia, was extremely critical of her in-laws, and he had found it difficult to accede or not to her request not to see his family.

Dr Milne said in his report that he had wanted to find out whether Sutcliffe's killings, because of their nature, had any strong sexual connections. Dr Milne stated: "I found that there was no suggestion that the accused is any way sexually deviant or the his wife is sexually deviant."

Dr Milne had also interviewed Sonia Sutcliffe on a number of occasions. He found that, because of schizophrenic illness, she had to give up teacher training in 1972. She had spent 22 days in a Bradford psychiatric hospital. She was said to have expressed disillusionment and was excited and disturbed for a considerable amount of time.

She had been unable to go back to her job. In May 1976, her doctor said she had made a good recovery from the illness and recommended she be given the chance to resume teacher training. She had said that she was happily married and wished to be in full employment to supplement the family income. Dr Milne said that since that time she had shown no signs of a recurrence of the illness."

Dr Milne's report said: "She readily admits that she had been at times temperamental and difficult, and freely admits that she had teased and provoked her husband, who said himself that the marriage had its ups and downs. He told me that she was over-excited, highly-strung, unstable and obsessed with cleanliness. If he wanted to read a newspaper she would shout at him, swipe him and, as a result, he would hold her but never hit her."

Dr Milne had also been told by Mr Sutcliffe that Sonia had shouted at him to such an extent that he

was embarrassed as he thought that the neighbours must have heard her.

Dr Milne's report said that Mr Sutcliffe had a Catholic upbringing and, after his arrest, said he was a devout Catholic: "Whilst he was in custody he became involved with the Christian faith and was in contact with a Roman Catholic chaplain at Armley jail, Leeds. His involvement with the chaplain was in itself diagnostic with his mental illness."

The report said that in reply to the question about why he and his wife had no children, Sutcliffe had said that they preferred material possessions. Sexual relations with his wife were extremely satisfactory, and Mr Sutcliffe freely admitted to sexual involvement before his marriage, while his wife denied having any sexual experiences prior to the marriage.

Dr Milne said of Mr Sutcliffe: "He completely denies that he was using the assaults to help in the sexual situation. There is no suggestion that he is a sadistic, sexual deviant. I am convinced that the killings were not sexual in any way and the stabbings which were a feature of the assaults had no sexual component."

Dr Milne reported: "I have had the opportunity of spending many hours with the accused and there is little doubt that he is friendly and open in his manner and at no time did he withhold information."

Mr Sutcliffe did freely admit to withholding information from the senior medical officer at Armley Jail. He said he had done so because of a remark she had made to the effect that his wife was stupid if she maintained that she didn't know what he had been doing over the past years.

The Sutcliffes had an intense relationship, while on one hand loving, at the other extreme, sometimes very angry with each other. The report said: "It is interesting to note that he has had episodes at home typical of an anxiety or panic attack. This may obviously relate to his concern at the time he was offending."

Peter Sutcliffe had been employed as a gravedigger in Bingley. On one occasion, while he was working in the Catholic section of the cemetery, he had experienced symptoms of a long-standing paranoid schizophrenic illness. The report said: "He described when he was working he heard a mumbling voice, looked up and saw nobody, got out of the grave and though he was imagining what he was hearing."

Mr Sutcliffe had said: "It appeared to be coming from the top of the cross. It was an echoing voice, vague and distant, and it repeated itself some two or three times, and it was direct from the stone itself and I have never forgotten it."

Mr Sutcliffe said that when he read the inscription on the gravestone he did not understand it as it was written in Polish. However, he said you could read a foreign language as if it sounded like English and remembered a strange word that he thought might mean "Jesus". He also thought the inscription on the gravestone might mean "We be echo." Mr Sutcliffe said: "I decided it was some kind of message from God. I was working in a cemetery, but it did not frighten me. It was just a job."

Mr Sutcliffe said: "It had a really strange effect. I felt I was privileged to hear it. I went back to the stone several times but I never heard it again. I had quite a lot of messages. I have had all kinds of words and messages since." They had helped bring him out of depression. Mr Sutcliffe said that:

"Over the years, I have had hundreds of messages, not always religious." He stated that: "When I have been on this sequence of kills I have heard, 'God giveth and God taketh life' and 'God works in mysterious ways' and odd comments as normal conversation to kill and wipe out all the people called scum who cannot justify themselves in society."

Mr Sutcliffe told Dr Milne: "I have tried to fight it. I have been frightened of it. I have been unsuccessful and I wondered whether it was God when I killed an innocent person."

Mr Sutcliffe said that he suffered dreadful misgivings that it was not God's voice after the killing of Josephine Whitaker. Mr Sutcliffe said: "I hated to think it was the devil." He also said he had been in a terrible state for a year after the killing of Barbara Leach. He told Dr Milne: "Didn't kill. Mental anguish."

Mr Sutcliffe also described being completely under the control of the voice after the Barbara Leach killing: "I had lost the battle, God had won the battle." He had thought the voice might be the devil's after the killings of Josephine Whitaker and Barbara Leach: "But the voice told me Whitaker and Leach were prostitutes. God knew best." Mr Sutcliffe also said: "God wouldn't have punished them. Prostitutes are not innocent. God couldn't make a mistake."

When Peter Sutcliffe was interviewed by Dr Milne on January 14 1981, he said that (in 1969) he had been told by his brother that Sonia had been seen with another man. Mr Sutcliffe then went to find her and confront her and they had a row. Dr Milne's report said: "He could not imagine she had been unfaithful to him." During the argument, Mr Sutcliffe had said to Sonia he would go and buy Durex from a chemist so she could have intercourse with the man. After the row ended, Mr Sutcliffe: "walked off from Sonia in an angry and resentful frame of mind."

Mr Sutcliffe, later that day, was attracted to a girl soliciting from the pavement. He took her in his car to her sister's place and gave her £10. Mr Sutcliffe said that they did not have sexual intercourse, and the girl offered to take him to a garage where he could get change for the £10 he had given her (for the £5 fee).

Dr Milne's report said: "He had threatening remarks made to him by some man and the girl laughed at him. He became extremely angry and left. From this moment on he became consumed with hatred for prostitutes."

Sutcliffe said that he later saw the girl with another prostitute in public place. Dr Milne's report said: "They laughed at him and embarrassed him and he left with a hatred built up for prostitutes." Mr Ognall said that the report also stated it could be a sign of schizophrenia that Mr Sutcliffe felt the prostitutes were laughing at him. The report said: "He was convince from that moment on that prostitutes were hateful people."

When Mr Sutcliffe was working at Anderton Circlips in Bingley, he was told by workmates that there was: "a plague of prostitutes in Keighley." Based on that remark he went to Keighley looking for prostitutes, which eventually resulted in the attack on Anna Rogulskyj.

Mr Sutcliffe was said to have told Dr Milne: "I had a hatred for prostitutes. I don't know what to think. It was a pathological hatred. I was seized in a grip, difficult to explain, occasionally getting depressed at times with splitting headaches. Sometimes I didn't want to go on living. I didn't tell

people because it would pass off."

Mr Sutcliffe told Dr Milne that the thought that Sonia was seeing someone else nearly drove him out of his mind. When questioned about whether he had had sexual intercourse with a prostitute, he had answered no. Mr Ognall said that Sutcliffe had sexual intercourse with prostitute Helen Rytka, but that there was no suggestion that he had intercourse with the victim in any of the other offences.

Dr Milne said that while it was not possible to give a date when Mr Sutcliffe believed he was carrying out the instructions of God or being on a mission for God, it was a possibility that, after the murders of Wilma McCann and Emily Jackson, the murder of Irene Richardson could be the one which put a time factor on the belief that God was controlling his behaviour.

The report said that it would be relevant to comment that Mr Sutcliffe had said in earlier interviews that after the attacks on both Wilma McCann and Emily Jackson he had fled the scene in panic. However, by the time of the Irene Richardson murder he had carefully replaced her clothes and boots, which suggested a man behaving in a controlled way, and not a man in panic.

When Dr Milne asked Mr Sutcliffe if he felt he had the protection of God, Mr Sutcliffe had replied that at the times of the attacks he was confident he was chosen to do it and it was his calling and he didn't have any qualms about it.

Mr Sutcliffe had told Dr Milne: "If I was allowed out from prison I would know it was all right. I am here now but it might be only temporary. If I was out the feeling would be back," adding that he knew it was wrong to kill, but if he had a reason it was: "justified and all right."

Mr Ognall said that in the report was reference to an occasion when a prostitute had come up to Peter and Sonia Sutcliffe while they were walking hand and hand during their honeymoon in Paris in 1974. Mr Sutcliffe had shown no response to this. However, later on, while they were coming out of a station, Sonia had been dragged away by a man who had thought she was a prostitute.

Mr Sutcliffe was said to have told Dr Milne: "I must have thought that the man thought Sonia was a prostitute rather than Sonia saying something to him. From that time we stayed glued together." Dr Milne said that this was an example of: "this man's distorted thinking as a result of his long-standing schizophrenic illness."

Mr Sutcliffe had been questioned about the weapons he had used. He denied trying to mutilate his victims. He told Dr Milne: "Rather than mutilate them, I leave them exposed to show them up because there is no reason to mutilate. It's only a matter of killing them."

In his report, Dr Milne said that he could find absolutely no reason for why Mr Sutcliffe had stabbed his victims through the same hole on repeated occasions. There was no suggestion that Mr Sutcliffe had a specific sexual symbolism.

Mr Sutcliffe had said about the murder of Jean Jordan that he remembered reading in a church magazine an article where a priest warned about prostitutes in Moss Side, Manchester: "This was my message. It was certainly a message. I remember reading it and the priest saying it and that is why I went. It was given to me in print that time and then the voices came."

This illustrated, Dr Milne said, how Sutcliffe believed that messages had been passed to him in various way from God. This was typical of classical schizophrenic illness.

When questioned, Mr Sutcliffe said that he had used a rope for the attacks on Upadhya Bandara and Marguerite Walls because he was: "getting angry with the media because they were calling him the Ripper."

Dr Milne's report said: "He wished to show that he was not the Ripper and used the rope. He didn't like it because it took longer and was unpleasant."

Questioned about the Marguerite Walls murder, Mr Sutcliffe had said: "I was on my way to Leeds primed with weapons for the mission. She lifted her leg up, put it down and then lifted it up again. She looked like a prostitute and was walking at a snail's pace. I killed her with no doubt. The voice shouted 'Filthy prostitute'. It wasn't like my voice it was filthy and angry. Not like me. I don't get angry. I knew it was me who had done what I had done with my own hands, and when I get into the depression this happens."

Dr Milne's report said that Mr Sutcliffe's comments illustrated two aspects of schizophrenic illness. Firstly, his behaviour which allowed him to believe that innocent women were prostitutes. Secondly, his inability to control what he was doing physically, even though he knew what he was doing was wrong.

When asked about the Jacqueline Hill killing, Mr Sutcliffe had said: "She turned round and looked as if she was adjusting her skirt or her stocking, and this suggested that it was the behaviour of a prostitute. God invested me with the means of killing. He has got me out of trouble and I am in God's hands. He misled police and perhaps God was involved in the tapes so the police would be misled."

When Dr Milne asked Mr Sutcliffe about why he was in custody, he had replied: "I may deserve a rest or he has chosen someone else. But I have heard God since I have been here. It seems like God has chosen to put me here."

When asked about the hoax tapes received by the police, Mr Sutcliffe said: "God has another disciple. I'm fairly convinced. No tapes for a while. My mission is halted for a while. I might carry on shortly. The other fellow may send more tapes. God may have stopped."

Donald Sumner, the first witness called by the prosecution, stated that on the night of Peter Sutcliffe's motorcycle accident he had been riding pillion behind Sutcliffe: "We had a puncture while we were going along and came off the bike. Peter went into a lamp-post and I went sliding down the road. Peter hit his head and was bleeding. There was damage to his crash-helmet. He looked a right clown."

When asked how they got home, Mr Sumner replied: "I think we walked, but I'm not right sure."

Before the adjournment, Trevor Birdsall, of Ribblesdale Grove, Pollard's Park, Bradford, West Yorkshire, went into the witness box. He revealed that the bill for the London hotel he was staying in was being paid by the Sunday People newspaper. Questioning by Sir Michael Havers about the financial arrangements he had with the newspaper, Mr Birdsall replied that the newspaper had

helped him pay his bills, had given him £500, and until two weeks ago, was paying him £65 a week expenses. As well, the newspaper had put him up in hotels at their expense, and he had been charging everything, including drinks, to their account.

Mr Justice Boreham: "You are here to give evidence whatever arrangement you may have made with anyone else. Your duty here is to give evidence to the best of your ability. Whatever has gone on in the past, from this moment on, you will not discuss your evidence with anybody else, whether from a newspaper or from any other source. If you break that injunction then my powers are very wide and immediate."

Mr Birdsall had had information about Mr Sutcliffe for a long time, Sir Michael had told the jury. However, it was not until late last year that he told the police of an incident in 1969 when they had been in Bradford's red-light district with Mr Sutcliffe. Mr Sutcliffe had left the car they were in for a short time, and when he returned he had told Mr Birdsall that he had hit a woman with a stone inside a sock.

Mr Birdsall had also been out with Mr Sutcliffe on the night Olive Smelt was attacked in 1975 in Halifax. Even though Mr Birdsall read of the attack the next day in the newspapers, he did not do anything about it.

The hearing continues tomorrow.

THURSDAY, MAY 7 1981: ARREST, FRIENDS

The first witness of the day was Trevor Birdsall, 32, of Pollard Park, Bradford. He was questioned by Sir Michael Havers, prosecuting.

Mr Birdsall said that he and Peter Sutcliffe, an old friend of his, use to drive around the red light districts. The outings took place between 1967 and 1969. During one of the first trips to those areas they had seen a woman staggering around in the road, as if drunk. Mr Sutcliffe had then stopped the car and disappeared with the woman for between ten and twenty minutes.

Mr Birdsall was then questioned by Sir Michael Havers about the night that he was with Peter Sutcliffe when he hit a woman on the head with a stone in a sock. The incident had taken place in Bradford's red light district in about 1969.

While Mr Birdsall was driving a Mini car along Manningham Lane, Bradford, Mr Sutcliffe asked him to stop the car. Mr Sutcliffe then got out of the car and went up St Paul's Road and out of sight. Mr Birdsall said the when he returned to the car, he got in: "Fairly quickly. He looked a bit excited and was not breathing normally. It looked as if he had possibly been running."

Sir Michael asked whether Mr Sutcliffe had said anything. Mr Birdsall replied: "He just told me to drive off. I asked him where he had been, and he said he had followed a woman to a house somewhere. He said that he had hit her, I'm not too sure. He mentioned something about some money, but I can't remember too well."

Sir Michael: "Did you get any impression as to what sort of woman he had followed?"

Mr Birdsall: "I would imagine the lady was a prostitute – but that was just my guess – because of the area."

Sir Michael: "Had he got anything with him?"

Mr Birdsall: "Yes. He pulled a sock from his pocket and there was a small brick or stone in it. I think he threw the stone out the window."

Asked if Mr Sutcliffe had said anything about using the stone, Mr Birdsall replied: "I think he said that he did, but I don't know whether to believe him or not."

Mr Justice Boreham: "Don't worry about that. Did he say whether he had used it?"

Mr Birdsall: "I think he did, yes. I think he hit her on the head. That's what he said."

Following the incident, the car had been traced and Mr Sutcliffe had been interviewed by the police. Mr Sutcliffe had told Mr Birdsall that everything was all right.

Sir Michael asked Mr Birdsall how Mr Sutcliffe reacted to the sight of prostitutes. Mr Birdsall: "He'd comment if he saw a particular young woman with big knockers on." Mr Birdsall also said that Mr Sutcliffe had told him that he had been with prostitutes more than once. Mr Sutcliffe also mentioned that sometimes he did not pay.

Mr Birdsall then described the night of August 15 1975, when he had been out with Peter Sutcliffe. It was also the night that 51-year-old Olive Smelt had been brutally attacked in the Boothtown area of Halifax.

Mr Birdsall: "We went out to Halifax in Peter's car and went to a few pubs. We probably saw about half a dozen unattached women. I remember Peter leaning across to them and talking to them. I think he said he thought this was a prostitutes' pub. On the way home we passed through the Boothtown area of Halifax, which is not a red-light area. Peter stopped the car and got out and said he was going to speak to somebody. I didn't take any notice if he had anything with him but he seemed to put his hand down the side of the seat. There was a couple of people walking past, and I remember seeing a woman. She was walking quickly and Peter went round the back of the car and disappeared. He didn't seem to go in the same direction as the woman but was away ten to twenty minutes. When he came back he said he had been talking to a woman, but he was quiet, unusually quiet. The next evening I read in the Telegraph Argus a report about a brutal attack on a woman in Boothtown. It crossed my mind that Peter might be connected with it."

When asked by Sir Michael whether he remembered a tape-recording, which became known as the "Ripper tape", Mr Birdsall replied: "Yes, I think I heard it."

Sir Michael: "Did you think, after hearing that tape, that there might be a connection with what Mr Sutcliffe did and the attempted murder of Olive Smelt when you heard that tape? What effect did it have on you?"

Mr Birdsall: "I thought there was no chance at all that it could be him. It destroyed the link."

Mr Birdsall stated that last year he had gone out for a drink with Peter Sutcliffe in his dark red Rover. Afterwards, he had read about the murder of Jacqueline Hill in Leeds. Mr Birdsall: "The paper gave a description of the car thought to have been used by the murderer – a red Rover saloon. I thought it was possible it was the same as Sutcliffe's car. I sent an anonymous note to police on the 26th of November last year. I was worried more about it, and very shortly after that I went to see the police myself."

Mr Birdsall was then cross-examined by James Chadwin, QC, defending. Mr Birdsall agreed that in all the time that he had known Mr Sutcliffe he had never indicated a hatred for prostitutes. Mr Chadwin asked him whether he had believed Mr Sutcliffe when he said he had been with prostitutes, Mr Birdsall replied: "I don't know whether it was true or whether he was showing off."

Mr Birdsall also agreed that Mr Sutcliffe had been quiet and calm for someone who had moments before apparently struck a woman on the head. Mr Birdsall said that Mr Sutcliffe tended to be a rather quiet person: "with a shy attitude to women generally."

Mr Birdsall: "I now know Sutcliffe has admitted what happened in the last five years, but I still find it difficult to fit that in with the man I have known for so long, a rather quiet, unaggressive person."

The next witness was Ronald Barker of Tanton Crescent, Clayton, Bradford. He was asked by Harry Ognall, QC, for the prosecution, about any payments made to him by the Press for information about Mr Sutcliffe. Mr Barker replied that his mother had received £700 for a photograph of Peter Sutcliffe's wedding from the Sun newspaper. The People newspaper had taken photographs of him in Chapeltown, Leeds, but while he had not yet received any payment, he expected to get £400 from them.

Mr Barker, a single man, lived next door to the Szurma family, whose daughter Sonia married Peter Sutcliffe in August 1974. Mr Barker told the court that since 1974 he had been in the habit of keeping a diary.

Mr Ognall asked Mr Barker to consult his diary for May 28 1977 and tell the jury about a trip to York. Mr Barker said he remembered making the trip with his brother David and Mr Sutcliffe. Mr Barker: "It was a Saturday night and the three of us went to York. Peter wanted to go to Manchester, but I thought it was too far to go. It was about 8 pm on a Saturday night, and we had just dropped Sonia off at a part-time job."

They called at a number of public houses in York, and Mr Sutcliffe disappeared while he and his brother were playing pool. Mr Barker: "We were a bit annoyed because we didn't know how to get back, and at closing time we walked back to the car and Peter was standing near it. It was three-quarters of an hour since we saw him last, and he told us that he had followed a lass out of the pub. I can't remember him saying anything else."

On the journey back from York, Mr Barker expected to be taken straight back home to Bradford. He fell asleep in the car. Mr Barker: "When I woke up, we were in Chapeltown, Leeds, and I asked what we were doing there."

When asked whether it was necessary to drive through Chapeltown to get home, Mr Barker replied: "No. Peter was driving and I think he said something about this being Ripper country. The car stopped in Chapeltown somewhere and Peter got out. He didn't say where he was going and we didn't ask. He walked off and was away for about a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes."

Mr Barker was asked by Mr Ognall to refer to his diary entry for the night of Saturday, June 25 1977, which, he reminded the jury, was the night of the murder of 16-year-old Jayne MacDonald in Leeds. Mr Barker said that he, his brother, and Peter Sutcliffe had gone out to a pub in Heaton, Bradford, and then visited approximately three more. Mr Sutcliffe was not drunk as he had only had small bottles of brown ale. At the end of the night, at around 1:30 am, Mr Sutcliffe had dropped the brothers off at home and gone off by himself.

Mr Barker said that they had also been out with Mr Sutcliffe on July 9 1977, the same night that Maureen Long had been attacked.

Mr Barker said Mr Sutcliffe sometimes told him about girls he had been with. Mr Barker: "He said he went with a nurse at one time. He also said something about having two girls follow him back to the car the previous night. He said that he had one of them in the back and one over the bonnet. He told me that in 1977. Sometimes he would shout to girls from the car. He was fascinated by the red light areas and always wanted to look at whores. Sometimes he got out of the car and followed them. I don't know why he resorted to them, because he had such a lovely wife sitting at home."

Mr Barker then spoke of the tours through red light districts which Sutcliffe had made after they had been out drinking together: "I always wanted to go home but Peter seemed to want to go round the red light districts. These excursions would last between a quarter and half an hour. Peter never said why he wanted to go. It happened three or four times in 1977."

Cross-examined by James Chadwin, QC, for the defence, Mr Barker said he had learned about Mr Sutcliffe's arrest on Monday, January 5 1981, There had been a great deal of publicity then and Mr Barker agreed with Mr Chadwin that it was obvious to everyone at that time that the suggestion was that Peter Sutcliffe was the Yorkshire Ripper.

Mr Barker had known Mr Sutcliffe throughout the years of the Yorkshire Ripper attacks and had been a friend of his. He had frequently been out in the company of Mr Sutcliffe from 1975 until 1977.

Mr Chadwin: "Did he ever strike you as an aggressive man?"

Mr Barker: "I'm sorry, no. That didn't enter my head." Mr Barker also said that he had never seen anything that suggested that Peter Sutcliffe had an aggressive attitude towards women.

Mr Chadwin: "In fact, he was a rather quiet, even shy man?"

Mr Barker: "I would say so."

When he heard what Peter Sutcliffe had been accused of, Mr Barker admitted that he was "astonished." He said that in all those years, with all the publicity given to the attacks and killings, it had never crossed his mind that Mr Sutcliffe had had anything to do with it, not until the actual

arrest.

Mr Barker said that on the Thursday of the week following Mr Sutcliffe's arrest the Sun newspaper had seen him about the photographs of Peter and Sonia Sutcliffe's wedding. It wasn't until a week later that he learned of the "massive amounts" that were being offered for photographs.

In answer to Mr Chadwin, Mr Barker said that he had assumed there would be some interest from the Press about his account of how Mr Sutcliffe had got out of his car in Chapeltown.

Mr Chadwin: "You see, Mr Barker, although the car may have passed somewhere near Chapeltown on its way through Leeds, that car did not stop and Peter Sutcliffe did not get out of it."

Mr Barker: "You can suggest what you like. I have said what happened."

Mr Chadwin: "You entertain some hope or expectation that there may be some more money available to you if your story is published in the press?"

Mr Barker: "Yes."

Mr Barker was asked by Mr Chadwin whether he thought what Mr Sutcliffe had said about having one girl in the car and another one over the bonnet was true. Mr Barker: "Knowing Peter at the time I suppose you could say that I thought he was spinning a line, but he did say it."

The next witness was David Barker, the brother of Ronald Barker. Under questioning by Harry Ognall, QC, for the prosecution, Mr Barker, who is serving an eighteen-month prison sentence for grievous bodily harm, admitted that he had received £20 from ITN at the beginning of March, and £10 from the BBC on March 23rd. Mr Ognall commented: "The BBC were a bit slower." Mr Barker had been paid just to talk about Peter Sutcliffe.

Mr Barker then spoke about the times he and Mr Sutcliffe had gone out drinking and then went to red light areas during the early morning hours. They would go in Mr Sutcliffe's car to the Chapeltown area of Leeds. Mr Barker: "We have been there three or four times between 1976 and 1977. We went there just for something to do. I have heard that is where prostitutes hung out."

When asked what business the two of them wanted with the prostitutes in the area, Mr Barker replied: "We wanted to go just for a laugh."

The next witness was Olivia Reivers, the prostitute that Peter Sutcliffe was arrested with in his car in Sheffield. Sir Michael Havers, QC, the Attorney General, for the prosecution, questioned her about any money she may have received from a newspaper for her story. Miss Reivers: "Yes. The Daily Star paid me £1,000 but I had to give my solicitor £300 out of that."

When asked if she had signed an exclusive contract with the newspaper and was expecting any more money, Miss Reivers replied: "Yes, there is another £3,000 to come."

Prior to the arrest of Mr Sutcliffe, Sir Michael asked her about the events of January 2nd. Miss Reivers, a prostitute for four years, said that she left her home in Sheffield at 7:30 pm, and had a client prior to Mr Sutcliffe. She carried on with another prostitute, named Christine, after that first

client.

It was while walking along Broomhall Street when she saw a Rover car. Miss Reivers: "I was walking on the pavement when it stopped. The driver asked me if I was doing business and I said I was. I told him it was £10 in the car with a rubber. He said that it was OK."

Miss Reivers had directed him to a quiet road called Melbourne Avenue. When they arrived, Mr Sutcliffe had reversed the car into the driveway, something that no other client had done. Miss Reivers: "He stopped his car and turned out the lights. I said to him: 'Would you like to pay first, please?' He gave me a £10 note and I took a rubber out and had it in my hand putting the money into the packet. He asked: 'Do you mind if I talk to you a bit?' I said: 'No.' He said that he had had an argument with his wife. He did not say what about or what the result of the argument had been. He asked me my name and I said 'Sharron.' He said his name was Dave. He then took off his car-coat and put it on the back seat. He said: 'Would you like to get in the back?' I said 'No, its all right.'"

Mr Sutcliffe had leaned across her with his fly unzipped, and she had touched his penis. Miss Reivers said that she tried for approximately 15 minutes to get Mr Sutcliffe to have sex. Miss Reivers: "He was a bit nervous. I sensed it. I said: 'There's nothing to worry about. Why are you frightened?'"

When asked what happened when she failed, Miss Reivers said: "I said: 'I do not think we will be able to do it', and he said: 'It looks like it.' His trousers were still open. The next thing that happened was the police car came. I peered through the windscreen and saw the police car. I turned round and said: 'It's the police.' He said: 'Leave it to me. Tell them you're are my girlfriend.'" Miss Reivers said that she agreed, and that she thought he was frightened.

Peter Sutcliffe then rolled down the window and told the policeman that the car was his and that his name was Peter Williams. Meanwhile, the second policeman was at the back of the car looking at the number plates.

Miss Reivers heard the sound of the police sergeant using his car radio. The police then told Mr Sutcliffe about the plates being wrong for the car. After the police spoke to her and went back to their police car, Mr Sutcliffe asked her: "Can't you make a run for it?" Miss Reivers said she had replied: "No, I can't. I'm a very well-known prostitute."

Both Mr Sutcliffe and Miss Reivers were taken to the police station. Mr Sutcliffe was asked to empty his pockets, and among the items he took out was a blue and pink length of rope about two feet long. It was the type used for washing lines. It was later said to have been used by Mr Sutcliffe during two of his attacks.

Under cross-examination by James Chadwin, QC, for the defence, Miss Reivers agreed that during the whole encounter with Mr Sutcliffe, he had never achieved any sort of erection.

Mr Harry Ognall, QC, for the prosecution, read the statement made by Sergeant Bob Ring who, along with Probationary Constable Robert Hydes, had arrested Mr Sutcliffe. Sgt Ring's statement had been written on January 4 1981.

Sgt Ring had said that while on routine patrol on January 2nd, he and PC Hydes had checked out the

grounds of a large detached house, used as an office, in Melbourne Avenue, Sheffield. They had seen a Rover parked in the driveway without lights. Sgt Ring's statement said: "I remained in the car whilst PC Hydes went to the Rover, then I joined Constable Hydes at the driver's door." He said he saw a couple inside the Rover.

Sgt Ring began to question the man: "I said: 'Who's she?' He said: 'My girlfriend.' I said: 'What's her name?' He said: 'I don't know, I have not known her that long.' I said: 'Who are you trying to kid? I haven't fallen off the Christmas tree.' He said: 'I'm not suggesting you have.'"

After having made checks by radio on the Rover's registration number, he had found it related to a Skoda and so he confiscated the ignition keys. PC Hydes said that the tax license was also for another vehicle and the officers took that.

Sergeant Ring said that Miss Reivers was taken to the police car. When he returned to the Rover, he heard a scuffle: "Sutcliffe was coming from this direction. I said: 'What are you doing there?' He said: 'I've fallen off that fucking wall.' I said: 'What were you doing there?' He said: 'I wanted to piss.' I told him to go at the side of the building if he wanted to, but he said he wouldn't bother."

Twenty-four hours later, Sgt Ring was back at the scene of the arrest: "At the corner of the building and near an oil storage tank among a pile of leaves, I saw an engineer's ball-pein hammer and on closer examination saw the shiny blade of a wooden-handled knife, partially covered by the hammer shaft." He left them there and contacted his headquarters.

Five days later, Sgt Ring was again on duty and had had time to consider the events of the night of the arrest: "During that recollection, I realised that Peter Sutcliffe had been alone in a toilet at the police station immediately following his arrival and prior to being processed." After telling a Detective Inspector, the toilet was searched and a wooden-handled knife was found in the cistern. Both of the two knives and the hammer were court exhibits.

The next witness was Detective Sergeant Desmond O'Boyle who told the court that he had interviewed Mr Sutcliffe the day of his arrest. He introduced himself as from the Ripper squad. He had said to Mr Sutcliffe: "You have been previously interviewed about you and your car being seen in prostitute areas and you were adamant that you weren't a punter, but having said that, your conduct last night would seem to indicate that you may well be telling lies when you were asked previously."

Mr O'Boyle said that when asked to give a blood test, Mr Sutcliffe seemed concerned and did not want to co-operate.

Mr Sutcliffe at one point asked: "What if it's the same as the one you're wanting?"

Mr O'Boyle then asked: "Are you the Ripper?" Sutcliffe said that he wasn't.

Mr O'Boyle then asked: "Well what have you to fear?"

Mr Sutcliffe had replied: "Oh, all right then. Will you let me know the result of the blood test as soon as you get it?" Mr Sutcliffe then gave a specimen, and also provided a sample of his handwriting.

Mr Sutcliffe told Det Sgt O'Boyle that he had left his home at about 4:00 pm to look for spare parts for his Mini and Rover cars. He found one number plate had fallen off a Skoda, and pulled off the other. Since his insurance had run out the previous night, and he was due on a breathalyser charge, he thought he could use the plates for a few days.

Describing Sutcliffe's manner during the interview, Mr O'Boyle said: "He was very calm and pleasant and cooperative".

James Chadwin, QC, for the defence: "The two things he might be said to have reacted to was the suggestion that he was a punter. He clearly did not like that suggestion?"

Mr O'Boyle: "No, I agree with you."

Mr Chadwin: "Then some reaction though not very much to the suggestion that he should give a blood sample?"

Mr O'Boyle: "He seemed concerned when I mentioned a blood test. He didn't seem as if he wanted to cooperate, though he eventually did."

Mr O'Boyle related that during the interview, Mr Sutcliffe had said that earlier on in the evening of his arrest that he had given a lift to three lads to Rotherham and Sheffield: "To my surprise, they offered me £10 to take them." Just after 10:00 pm, in Sheffield, he fixed the Skoda number plates over those on his Rover.

Mr O'Boyle said that Mr Sutcliffe stated that a woman flagged him down, and thinking she was in trouble, he stopped. She asked him whether he wanted "business." Mr Sutcliffe then told the detective: "I was surprised I did not know she was a prostitute. I thought about things and realised I had £10 burning a hole in my pocket, and thought I might as well use it. The first girl had disappeared, so I drove on and saw another girl and stopped. She asked me if I wanted business. She got into the car and told me where to drive. I paid her £10. I did not want sex – I just wanted to talk about my problems at home. I did not want sex at all." It was then that the police arrived.

Mr O'Boyle said that when he asked whether Mr Sutcliffe was having normal sex with his wife, Mr Sutcliffe had replied he had been: "The last time was about four days ago." Asked about whether they had sex even though they rowed, Mr Sutcliffe said: "We forget about rows when we go to bed."

The trial was adjourned until tomorrow.

FRIDAY, MAY 8 1981: OTHER PROSECUTION WITNESSES

The next prosecution witness was Detective Inspector John Boyle of West Yorkshire police, the officer to whom Peter Sutcliffe confessed to being the Yorkshire Ripper.

Mr Sutcliffe had been unable to tell the police which hammer, knife, or screwdriver he had used for each attack. He had kept all his weapons in a pile in his garage. Mr Sutcliffe told police: "I didn't choose one. I just picked one up."

Mr Boyle stated that Mr Sutcliffe had taken police officers to various locations in West Yorkshire, where weapons which he had thrown away were recovered. Police had recovered a screwdriver from the Woolley Edge motorway service station on the M1, about 11 miles south of Leeds city centre. Mr Sutcliffe said he had thrown it away while in his lorry last summer. He said it belonged to him and he had kept it in his garage for a long time. He had sharpened it on a grindstone to use it as a bradawl.

Mr Sutcliffe told Mr Boyle that he had not used it for work. When he was asked why he had it in the cab of his lorry, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "I just took it to throw it away, that's all. It looked a horrible thing."

Mr Boyle said he would never forget the moment when Mr Sutcliffe confessed that he was the Yorkshire Ripper. Sutcliffe told him: "I think you have been leading up to it." Mr Boyle had asked him to explain, and Sutcliffe replied: "About the Yorkshire Ripper. Well, it's me."

Mr Boyle was cross-examined by James Chadwin, QC, for the defence. Mr Chadwin: "You must have interviewed hundreds, if not thousands, of suspects in your time. Some are easy and very co-operative, while some are very difficult, but would you say Sutcliffe was one of the easiest and most co-operative you've come across?"

Mr Boyle: "Yes, that's a fair comment." He also agreed that Mr Sutcliffe had answered all questions and that he was as co-operative as any man he had interviewed.

Mr Boyle also said that he had offered Mr Sutcliffe the chance to have a solicitor present during the interview but that Mr Sutcliffe said, quite politely, that he did not need one.

Mr Boyle also agreed that after Sutcliffe confessed to the murders he had said a number of things which did not "show him in a very good light," including his comment: "I would have killed that girl in Sheffield if I hadn't been caught."

Mr Boyle also agree that Sutcliffe remained calm, at times incredible calm, throughout the interview. Mr Chadwin: "Did you at any stage see Sutcliffe in all these interviews become excited or distressed?"

Mr Boyle: "No."

Mr Boyle agreed that Mr Sutcliffe had wanted to throw the best light he could on his activities. Mr Sutcliffe told him: "It grew and grew until I became a beast." He also had said: "I know I would have gone on and on and I'm glad I was caught. I just want to unload the burden."

Mr Chadwin began to read phrases from Mr Sutcliffe's statement. He had told police that after his first killing, of Wilma McCann: "I carried on trying to act as normal, living with my wife. After that first time I developed a hatred for prostitutes in order to justify within myself a reason why I attacked and killed Wilma McCann."

Mr Chadwin: "That does not make sense when you remember his previous attacks, does it?"

Mr Boyle: "Of course not."

Mr Chadwin read Sutcliffe's remark: "I felt an inner compulsion to kill prostitutes. I went looking for prostitutes because I felt I could not justify what I had done before. Looking back, I can see how that first murder unhinged me completely."

Mr Boyle agreed that further on in the statement, Mr Sutcliffe had said: "I wanted to do what I had got in my mind as soon as possible."

Mr Chadwin: "What he had in mind was to kill a woman?"

Mr Boyle: "Yes."

Mr Chadwin continued reading from Mr Sutcliffe's statement: "I had a feeling of satisfaction for what I had done." Mr Boyle said he believed Mr Sutcliffe meant one less prostitute.

Mr Sutcliffe had stated: "After the Richardson killing, prostitutes became an obsession for me – I could not stop myself, it was like some sort of drug."

Of Jayne MacDonald's murder, he had said: "At this time the urge to kill prostitutes was very strong and I had gone out of my mind."

Of Jean Jordan's murder in Manchester, he had said: "My desire to kill prostitutes was getting stronger than ever and it took me over completely." After describing "in revolting detail" the murder, he had said: "I have been taken over completely by this urge to kill and I cannot fight it."

Of Helen Rytka's murder, he had said: "I had the urge to kill any woman. The urge inside me to kill girls was now practically uncontrollable."

Of the Vera Millward's murder, he had said: "The urge inside me still dominates my action. Following Millward, the compulsion inside me remained dormant, but then the feeling came welling up. I had the urge to kill any woman. It sounds a bit evil now. There I was walking along with a big hammer and a big Phillips screwdriver in my pocket ready for the inevitable (Whitaker murder)."

Mr Sutcliffe had also said: "My urge to kill remains strong and was totally out of control."

Mr Chadwin also read from Mr Sutcliffe statement about his last murder, of Jacqueline Hill: "The girl fell down and was making a noise. By this time I as in a world of my own, out of touch with reality."

Mr Sutcliffe said he had forced Jacqueline Hill's bra over her head to expose her breasts after she was dead, so he could stab her more easily. He had stabbed her through the eye with a screwdriver. Mr Sutcliffe said: "I just put it to her lid and with the handle in my palm I just jerked it in."

Mr Boyle said that he had interviewed Mr Sutcliffe four days after the arrest, when he had been formally charged with the murder of 20-year-old university student Jacqueline Hill. Mr Sutcliffe had said: "Well, I'm terribly sorry about the tragic loss to her family and friends and I would do anything to alter what has happened. I'm glad that I've been apprehended, because I was totally out of my mind when I committed this and other acts."

Mr Boyle was asked whether Mr Sutcliffe had dealt with all his offences in a way that did not: "tone down or soften the enormity of them."

Mr Justice Boreham interrupted to say that was a matter for the jury, not for Mr Boyle.

The next prosecution witness was Detective Sergeant Peter Smith of West Yorkshire police, one of the officers to whom Mr Sutcliffe made a detailed confession of his killings. Harry Ognall, QC, for the prosecution, read out the questions from police officers to Mr Sutcliffe, while Mr Smith read Mr Sutcliffe's replies to those questions.

Mr Sutcliffe had said that he had been in a motorcycle accident in 1965 or 1966, after which he began to feel ill. Mr Sutcliffe: "I was left with severe bouts of morbid depression. I used to be subject to hallucinations, just seeing things that aren't there, and getting strange noises in my head, humming and buzzing. I used to think I was hearing things and I started conversing with myself. When I had these sort of attacks I knew what I was doing but I had this inner conflict. My mind was in a haze and I didn't know what was right or wrong. I did not know whether I was acting rationally or not."

Mr Sutcliffe told the police that he might get two attacks per month, sometimes he thought he was all right, but then the feeling would come back. He said there was no pattern to these attacks. He later stated: "The inner torment was unimaginable because, strange as it may seem, I didn't want to kill anyone at all. I just had to get rid of prostitutes, like it or not."

The police interviews with Mr Sutcliffe also dealt with the time he was duped out of £10 by a prostitute in Bradford, and then went looking for her to get even with her. In a statement referring to what led to his hitting a woman on the head with a stone in a sock, Mr Sutcliffe said: "I was out of my mind with the obsession of finding this prostitute. I had been out with Trevor (Birdsall, his friend), looking out for this particular one and it was getting late. I just gave vent to my anger on the first one I saw."

Mr Sutcliffe also stated: "I was over the brink and had it in my mind to kill her, but I never saw her again and it developed into a general loathing for prostitutes."

The interview also went on to describe other attacks on women carried out by Mr Sutcliffe in Halifax, Keighley, and Leeds.

Mr Smith said that Mr Sutcliffe was at no time reluctant to discuss his state of mind. On one occasion, Mr Sutcliffe had said: "If I ever get into one of those depressed states it would lead to the state of hallucination."

When Mr Smith asked about the knife found in a lavatory cistern at the Sheffield police station, Mr Sutcliffe said: "I threw it in there. I went there straight away as soon as I got to the police station. I dropped it in the top of the water cistern so it wouldn't be found in my possession." Mr Sutcliffe also told Mr Smith that he hadn't used the knife in any of his attacks.

Mr Smith read the statement in which he asked Sutcliffe whether all the details he had given were correct. Mr Sutcliffe then told him that his account of the Helen Rytka murder was not completely accurate, as he had confused it in some ways with the Irene Richardson murder.

Mr Sutcliffe had told Mr Smith that: "I know the one purpose I had in mind was to kill at first opportunity." He had also stated that he had meant to kill Dr Bandara, who was attacked in September 1980 in Leeds.

Mr Smith was told by Mr Sutcliffe that, prior to his arrest, when he was questioned by police: "Sonia automatically gave me an alibi on the occasions I was questioned. These occasions were weeks, sometimes months after the event. My wife would agree that we were at home, as we were practically all of the time."

Mr Smith was told by Mr Sutcliffe that he was not responsible for letters and tape recordings sent to police. Mr Sutcliffe had said: "It is not part of my attitude. I am not proud of doing any of the murders."

On a large number of occasions, cars belonging to Mr Sutcliffe, including a Ford Corsair, a Sunbeam Rapier, and a Rover, had been seen in the prostitute areas of Leeds, Bradford, and Manchester. None of the sighting coincided with any of the killings. The police put it to Mr Sutcliffe that on these occasions he was "touring round these areas seeking to do a prostitute harm." Mr Sutcliffe had said: "It is quite obvious there were occasions when I did not see any prostitutes. After a certain length of time if I didn't see any prostitutes I would go home. It was my intention to get rid of the prostitutes at any cost."

When cross-examined by James Chadwin, QC, for the defence, Mr Smith recalled that when Mr Sutcliffe was being questioned about the attack on Dr Bandara, he had said that he had not wanted to kill any of his victims. Mr Smith said Mr Sutcliffe told him: "I think my intentions were to kill her. At this point I wanted to say that, in myself, I didn't want to kill any of them. It was just something that had to be done."

Mr Smith said that during the interviews Mr Sutcliffe had remained calm, polite and had never become angry.

On a number of occasions Mr Sutcliffe had shown disgust with prostitutes and stressed that there was no question of him seeking sexual gratification when seeking them.

Mr Smith also said that Mr Sutcliffe had talked about his state of mind from time to time, and had mentioned having morbid depressions, hallucinations and brainstorms.

Mr Sutcliffe was asked to explain the 12-month gap between the murders of Emily Jackson and Irene Richardson. He had said: "The main reason, really, is my state of mind. It seemed OK, apart from having a personal battle with my own mind, which was in absolute turmoil about whether the right thing was to kill people or not."

Mr Smith said that when questioned about a 46 week gap between two other attacks, Mr Sutcliffe had told him: "I was never urged to do this again until then."

Mr Sutcliffe had said that in his state of mind: "It did not take me any time at all to decide women were prostitutes – something clicked then."

Referring to the letters and tape sent to the police, Mr Chadwin asked Mr Smith if it was correct that

the attitude that emerged from them was of someone who was proud of what he had done. Mr Smith replied: "You could say that."

Mr Chadwin: "In the tapes, there is an air of taunting police in not being able to find him?"

Mr Smith: "Yes."

The next prosecution witness was John Leach, a hospital prison officer at Armley jail, Leeds. He was questioned by Sir Michael Havers, QC, the Attorney General.

Sir Michael inquired about the circumstances under which Peter Sutcliffe was kept in prison. Mr Leach replied that Mr Sutcliffe was in a room by himself in the hospital wing. The room had a shower. Mr Sutcliffe was supervised 24 hours a day, and was escorted on each outing from the ward. A logbook was kept by prison officers in which they noted anything about the prisoner they thought relevant, including any signs of illness.

Sir Michael hand the hospital occurrence book to Mr Leach and asked him to look at the reference for January 8 1981. Mr Leach said that Mr Sutcliffe's wife had visited him that day in the company of his solicitor, Kerry Macgill, although he was not present for the whole visit.

Sir Michael: "Do you remember anything of significance that Sutcliffe said to his wife that day?"

Mr Leach: "What I have written down here, yes, sir. I made that note directly after I came back into the ward, within two hours of the conversation. They were left for a short while together, Mr Macgill wasn't there. Mrs Sutcliffe used to run the visits, inasmuch as she used to take the lead very much. She brought pieces of paper with itemised things on them because of the limited time of the visits."

When asked what sort of matters, Mr Leach answered: "I think personal matters between Sutcliffe and his wife. Sutcliffe said at one stage, 'I would not feel any animosity towards you if you started a life of your own. I am going to do a long time in prison, 30 years or more, unless I can convince people in here I am mad and maybe then ten years in the loony bin.'"

Sir Michael: "Do you know the expression 'loony bin'?"

Mr Leach: "I thought it was a southern type of expression. I thought it strange coming from Sutcliffe in Yorkshire."

Mr Leach also said that Peter Sutcliffe frequently made the remark to Sonia about her starting a new life.

During cross-examination by Mr James Chadwin, QC, for the defence, Mr Leach was asked if he put down in his prison logs the exact words of conversations between Mr Sutcliffe and his wife. Mr Leach replied: "I always remembered the gist and put down anything which I think will help the doctors or the governor. I certainly don't remember the exact words but the gist is right."

Mr Leach was asked if he could have been mistaken about some of the words he wrote down about the remarks Mr Sutcliffe had said about the time he might have to serve in prison. Mr Leach replied:

"When I wrote this down it would be the passage I felt would have been relevant to the visit as far as the doctors were concerned."

Mr Chadwin asked: "Is it possible that he could have said 'if I can prove' rather than 'get people to believe'?"

Mr Leach replied: "Not to my recollection, I don't think he used the word prove but I'm not 100 per cent sure. I suppose that could have been one of the words."

Mr Chadwin said: "Is it not possible that he said not 'I' but 'we'?"

Mr Leach: "I don't think so."

Mr Chadwin: "I am not meaning his wife, but as you know he had already on one or more occasions seen his solicitor. Maybe that is what he meant."

The next day, after another visit from Mrs Sutcliffe, Mr Leach made a new entry in the log: "A little less frantic than previous visit from his wife but she completely overwhelms and dominates him and the situation."

Mr Chadwin: "Your record says that Sutcliffe told his wife he was guilty of the murders and he could expect to do at least 30 years. Did that have any effect on Mrs Sutcliffe when he told her that?"

Mr Leach: "Not that I can remember. She didn't become excited or agitated – or not more than she became excited or agitated on other occasions."

Mr Leach's first report was on January 7th: "Sutcliffe had visit from wife in the p.m. He said very little, but she never stopped talking."

Mr Chadwin then read several reports by prison officers at Armley Jail who observed Peter Sutcliffe. A report for January 6th read: "He has need to talk at times and boasts about near-misses with police, e.g. having blood all over his hands and being chased by police. Says does not go out intending to kill, but gets compulsion to."

Another entry read: "Very confused. Seems to lose track of time. Seems to think he has been here longer than he has."

A report on January 16th said: "Something said by wife during visit. She kept asking why he had not informed her of his compulsive thoughts, so he could get medical advice. He told her to leave it to the medical people to find out."

A report from January 18th: "Appears quieter than of late. Reading a lot. Begins talking over experiences. Says it seems as if it was his purpose to do what he did."

January 28th: "Talkative, but only about crimes and any possible trial outcome. Has no intention of disclosing anything about himself when not involved in crimes. Now says he was possessed when he committed offences."

February 10th: "Talkative tonight, especially about prisoners on D-wing calling and shouting to each other from windows and an extremely noisy cockroach outside. Quite cheerful talking about trying to rid country of prostitutes and the merits of our police force. Very talkative. Spoke about when gravedigger and used to hear voices which he was convinced came from the grave. One occasion heard voice from Polish tomb. Eyes open very wide and seemed to gleam – obviously when he reached points of conversation interesting to him."

One time Mr Sutcliffe had said he was concerned about the long wait for his trial to start, saying he: "wanted to get his 400 years."

Mr Leach stated that he had read the other prison officers' reports while Sutcliffe was under his care.

Mr Chadwin: "Did he fluctuate from being very talkative to being very quiet?"

Mr Leach: "Yes."

Mr Chadwin: "Did he sit with a book in front of him, but not reading it – just staring into space?"

Mr Leach: "Yes."

When asked by Mr Chadwin if Mr Sutcliffe's mood had fluctuated from being co-operative to being quiet, but had kept a considerable calm throughout the time he was in custody, a certain degree of coolness, Mr Leach said: "He didn't fluctuate much up or down from a normal line."

Mr Chadwin suggested there were certain "stormy visits" when Sutcliffe's wife, Sonia, had become angry and excited. Mr Leach: "Excited, not necessarily angry."

Mr Chadwin inquired whether officers had been warned to be on their guard against Mr Sutcliffe losing his composure and had been warned to watch his behaviour after visits from his wife. Mr Leach replied: "We knew the situation. We knew Sutcliffe, and the staff there were able to take care of him."

The next prosecution witness was Anthony Fitzpatrick, a prison officer from Armley Jail. He said that his duties included maintaining a full watch over Mr Sutcliffe. He was questioned by Sir Michael Havers, QC, the Attorney General.

Mr Fitzpatrick said that during the evening of April 5th he had a conversation with Mr Sutcliffe, which he noted in the log book as he felt it was of sufficient importance. Mr Sutcliffe, after tea, had been reading, and was behaving as he normally did. The two started discussing the possibility that Mr Sutcliffe would be spending time in a long-term prison.

According to Mr Fitzpatrick, Mr Sutcliffe stated: "I am not going to a long-term prison. I am going to Park Lane (a special hospital). A bed has been reserved for me there."

Mr Fitzpatrick said that Mr Sutcliffe also told him: "An agreement has been reached between the defence and the prosecution for a plea of diminished responsibility to be accepted. Kerry Macgill (his solicitor) has told me."

Mr Sutcliffe had also said to him: "I've been told by a psychiatrist that I will have to do no more than ten years, to satisfy the public."

Sir Michael: "What was his attitude like?"

Mr Fitzpatrick: "I think he was quite cocky about it. It was unusual for him to be so cocky but he was so sure, quite adamant about it."

James Chadwin, QC, for the defence, asked Mr Fitzpatrick which psychiatrists had seen Sutcliffe in prison. Mr Fitzpatrick replied that he was not sure, but thought it was Dr Milne and Dr Kane.

Mr Chadwin suggested whatever was said was to the effect that a plea of diminished responsibility would be accepted. Mr Chadwin: "If the word agreement was used I would suggest it was in this context that the doctors had all agreed – is that correct?"

Mr Fitzpatrick: "No."

Mr Fitzpatrick also said that Mr Sutcliffe was: "arrogantly confident that his plea of diminished responsibility would be accepted."

The next witness was Frederick Edwards, an Armley hospital prison officer. He stated that he was supervising Mr Sutcliffe on April 14th. Between 9:00 pm and 10:30 pm Mr Sutcliffe, who was "cheerful and bright" was talking to Mr Edwards. This was just after Mr Sutcliffe's trial had been moved by Leeds Crown Court to the Old Bailey.

Mr Edwards: "He told me he was going to the Old Bailey for his trial and he was very pleased with that news. He was saying to me that the doctors considered him disturbed and he was quite amazed by this and was smiling broadly and leaning back in his chair. He was not protesting that the doctors were wrong about him, he appeared amused. He said to me: 'I am as normal as anyone.'"

Under cross-examination by James Chadwin, QC, for the defence, a prison report was read that stated that Mr Sutcliffe had said that the doctors thought there was something wrong with his mind because he heard God's voice. The report said: "But he said why should he be classed as mad because of this."

After the conclusion of Mr Edwards's evidence, Sir Michael Havers said that the case for the prosecution had finished.

Mr Chadwin said that the recent evidence had to be explored thoroughly. Mr Chadwin: "In all the circumstances I would like your Lordship to postpone the opening of the defence case until Monday morning."

Mr Justice Boreham agreed, and the trial was adjourned until Monday.

(NOTE: Trial source material: Burn, Cross, Jones, Yallop, Daily Telegraph, London (Canada) Free

Press, The Times, The Guardian.)

THE TRIAL

WEEK TWO

MONDAY, MAY 11 1981: PETER SUTCLIFFE

Case: Regina v Peter William Sutcliffe

Place: Number One Court, Central Criminal Court, "Old Bailey", London

Judge: Mr Justice Boreham

Prosecution: Sir Michael Havers, QC, the Attorney General

Prosecution: Harry Ognall, QC

Defence: James Chadwin, QC

Defence: Sidney Levine

Detective Inspector John Boyle was called by the defence to outline some of Peter Sutcliffe's history, which included the reputation that Mr Sutcliffe had of being a "somewhat reserved man," and had no interests in sports or other social activities.

Mr Boyle said that Mr Sutcliffe was born in June 1946 at Bingley, leaving secondary modern school at age 15. Since then he had a total of eleven jobs. He had been dismissed from his grave-digging job with the Bingley Parks Department in 1965 because of bad time-keeping. In 1968 he began work as a labourer with the water board, but was sacked because of unauthorised absence. Mr Sutcliffe was a heavy goods vehicle driver earning about £75 a week at the time of his arrest.

Mr Boyle agreed with James Chadwin, QC, for the defence, that Peter Sutcliffe did not have any convictions for violence, nor had the police ever received any reports of domestic altercations.

Mr Boyle said that Mr Sutcliffe had some convictions for driving and other minor offences. In October 1969, he had been fined £25 at Bradford for going equipped for theft. He had been found with a hammer in his possession.

The court proceeding had only gone on for seventeen minutes when Mr Chadwin asked for an adjournment so he could "take more detailed instructions." He told the judge, Mr Justice Boreham, that there were "certain events over the weekend," but did not elaborate as to what they were.

The court resumed after an hour's adjournment. Mr Chadwin then said: "I call Peter William Sutcliffe."

Once Mr Sutcliffe was in the witness box, Mr Chadwin asked: "Is it right that you have admitted both to the police and by your pleas you have tendered in this court that you have killed 13 women?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I have."

Mr Chadwin: "You have plead guilty to attempting to kill seven other women?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

Mr Chadwin: "You are recorded as having said it was your intention to kill Miss Reivers, the girl in whose company you were when you were arrested."

Mr Sutcliffe: "It was."

Mr Chadwin asked if, while talking to Miss Reivers in his car and the police approached, he wanted to run away. Mr Sutcliffe replied: "I had an opportunity to drive away."

Mr Chadwin: "That is not the answer to the question. Did you want to get away at that stage?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No. I could have done. I could have literally driven away before the police knew I had false number plates."

Mr Chadwin: "Did you want her to try and make a run for it?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

Mr Chadwin: "Were you intending to get away at that stage?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I thought so."

Mr Chadwin: "Why did you want to get away?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I am not entirely sure that I did."

Mr Chadwin: "You said you had thought of it, why didn't you make any attempt?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Because, by the time the police had arrived, I didn't feel the vengeance. I felt very little animosity at all towards Miss Reivers."

When asked whether the hammer he was carrying, when convicted for going equipped for theft in 1969, had been intended for the purpose of attacking women, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "That is right."

Asked if he remembered an incident where he had left a friend's car taking a sock with a stone in it along with him, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "Yes."

Asked by Mr Chadwin what he had done with the sock, Sutcliffe replied: "I hit a woman on the head with it."

Mr Sutcliffe had two spells of employment at Bingley cemetery, the second one ending in November 1967. Mr Chadwin: "Was it in the first or the second of these spells that something occurred there?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "In the second term of employment."

Mr Chadwin: "During that second spell, what age do you recall you were?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Twenty, I think."

Mr Chadwin: "What was it that happened at Bingley cemetery that you particularly remember?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Something that I felt was very wonderful at the time. I heard what I believed then and believe now to have been God's voice. I was in the process of digging a grave."

Mr Sutcliffe said that he was in the Catholic section at the top of the cemetery, but could not remember which grave he was digging at the time. Mr Sutcliffe: "I was digging and I just paused for a minute. It was very hard ground. I just heard something – it sounded like a voice similar to a human voice – like an echo. I looked round to see if there was anyone there, but there was no one in sight. I was in the grave with my feet about five feet below the surface. There was no one in sight when I looked round from where I was. Then I got out of the grave. The voice was not very clear. I got out and walked – the ground rose up. It was quite a steep slope. I walked to the top, but there was no one there at all. I heard again the same sound. It was like a voice saying something, but the words were all imposed on top of each other. I could not make them out, it was like echoes. The voices were coming directly in front of me from the top of a gravestone, which was Polish. I remember the name on the grave to this day. It was a man called Zipolski. Stanislaw Zipolski."

Mr Sutcliffe was shown a photograph of Bingley cemetery, and pointed out the grave of a man called Stanislaw Zapolski. Mr Chadwin: "There are a number of graves in that photograph. Which one is the grave of Stanislaw Zapolski?"

(NOTE: The name on the gravestone is really Bronislaw Zapolski.)

Mr Sutcliffe: "It is the one with the statue of Christ on the top."

Mr Chadwin: "In relation to what we can see on that photograph, where had you been working when you heard the voice you described?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "To the left of the grave, lower down the slope."

Mr Chadwin: "Up to that moment in time had you ever heard a voice which you could not identify, a voice which you could not attach to some human source?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I had never heard this voice before. That was the first occasion."

Mr Chadwin: "Did you look at Mr Zapolski's grave?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

Mr Chadwin: "Why did you look particularly at this grave?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Because that is where the sound was coming from. That is what made me walk closer to it."

Mr Chadwin: "What did you see on that grave when you looked at it?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I remember getting a message from the grave. I looked at several graves. I was looking round to determine where the sound came from. After looking at the grave I walked back. I was kind of transfixed because of the voice. I just stepped back and I didn't know what to think at first." Reading on the gravestone the Polish word "Jejo", he assumed it meant "Jesus".

Mr Chadwin: "Did that convey anything to you in particular?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Something did, because immediately afterwards as I stepped back to the path immediately in front of the grave, I saw what I took to be a definite message about the echoing voice. I always thought it was on the same grave."

Asked what the message was, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "I recall, as Jesus was speaking to me." He also remembered the phrase: "We be the echo."

Mr Chadwin: "What is your recollection, not of what you heard, but of what you saw, that conveyed a message to you?"

Mr Sutcliffe replied he read the words "Wehvy" and "Echo" in Polish. "Echo" was spelt "Ecko." Mr Sutcliffe: "I thought the message on the gravestone was a direct message telling me it was the voice of Jesus speaking to me."

Mr Sutcliffe was then asked to look at a photograph of the gravestone. He agreed that the words he had described did not appear on the gravestone. Mr Sutcliffe: "I remember seeing them." He also said that he had looked at other graves in the vicinity of that particular one.



(The gravestone of Bronislaw Zapolski. From the above exchange, it appears that the photograph Peter Sutcliffe was shown did not display any part of the lower section of the gravestone which contains the words "POKOJ JEGO DUSZY")

(Photo credit: Guy Hatton, 2001)

When asked whether anyone else was working with him at the time, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "No, I was digging on my own."

Mr Chadwin: "What effect did all this have on you?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "It had a terrific impact on me. I went down the slope after standing there for a while. It was starting to rain. I remember going to the top of the slope overlooking the valley and I felt as though I had just experienced something fantastic. I looked across the valley and all around and thought of heaven and earth and how insignificant we all are. But I felt so important at the moment."

Mr Chadwin: "As a result of that experience, you felt important. Why did you feel important?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Because I felt for some reason I had been chosen to hear the words of God."

Mr Chadwin: "What at that time, if anything, was being said to you in any words you heard?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I could not tell at all. I had no idea what was being said."

When Mr Chadwin asked what he thought about that, Mr Sutcliffe answered: "It was not the context of what was said, it was how it was said. It was so real, yet it was so unreal in quality."

Mr Chadwin asked whether he told anyone of his experiences. Mr Sutcliffe replied: "I told no-one because I thought that if it was meant for everyone to hear they would hear. I felt I had been selected."

When Mr Chadwin asked whether he knew why he had been selected, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "No."

Mr Sutcliffe said he had been a regular church-goer during his school life and for about two years afterwards. He followed the Roman Catholic faith. In response to a question from the judge, he stated that he was interested in religion between the ages of 15 1/2 and 17 1/2. As well, he had been an altar-server for three years. He first heard the voices when he was approximately age 20.

Mr Chadwin: "Did it puzzle you why you were selected when you weren't active in any religious way?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes, it served to create even more puzzlement."

Mr Chadwin: "Did you find any answer?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No. I tried but I couldn't find any reason why I should have been selected."

Mr Chadwin: "Who did you think that voice had come from?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I thought it was the voice of God."

Mr Chadwin: "At any stage from that incident until now have you changed your mind about that?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Mr Chadwin: "Have you ever stopped thinking that it was the voice of God?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I have stopped thinking that on several occasions for maybe a day or two, but never more than that. Then I got very depressed, especially if I read in the newspapers where somebody

was supposed to be innocent and I had killed them. I had been quite convinced by the message I received that they were prostitutes. I would be very depressed by this, but had advice during the depression which lifted me out of the depression and I thought I was all right and I wasn't wrong. God didn't make mistakes and the newspapers did."

Mr Sutcliffe said that he had met Sonia, whom he later married, on St. Valentine's Day, 1967, when she was 16 and attending Grange grammar school, Bradford. He saw Sonia at the weekends after he first met her. Mr Sutcliffe: "I did not go to her home for the first few months. I used to see her on Saturday and spent half the day and the evening with her."

When asked whether he had any contact with any prostitute at this stage of his life, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "No." He said he had no interest in prostitutes and was really not aware of the red-light areas.

Asked whether his relationship with Sonia was happy at that time, Mr Sutcliffe replied that it was. Five months after they had met, Sonia left school to go to Bradford Technical College for A-level studies. It was while she was there that something happened which first caused any trouble between them. Mr Sutcliffe: "It was an involvement with another man. I was informed about it by my brother."

When asked if he had believed his brother, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "Yes, I had no reason to think that he would deceive me."

Mr Chadwin: "Did you raise the matter with Sonia?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes. I was working on contract with the waterworks and had an assistant with me who did not understand very much about the workings of the job. I had arranged to leave early that day to catch Sonia coming out of the tech." The other man had taken advantage of the fact that Mr Sutcliffe could not meet Sonia during the week.

Mr Sutcliffe: "I wanted to catch her before she got home and before she got into his company again. I left early and unfortunately there was a disaster at the waterworks which nearly drowned several men through the assistant. I was blamed for that, although they said I could leave at the time suggested. I caught Sonia going down the road. I approached her but she walked the other way as if shocked to see me, so I knew what I had heard was true."

Mr Sutcliffe confronted Sonia about what he had been told of her relationship with the other man. They had argued all the way to her home. Mr Chadwin: "Did you resolve this argument by the time she got home." Mr Sutcliffe said they had not, nothing had been settled, and: "we just parted."

Asked what had happened about his absence from work on that occasion, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "I was asked to go to the head office for a meeting with the water works chief." Subsequently, he had been demoted for leaving his post.

Mr Sutcliffe said that he was depressed because of the situation between himself and Sonia. His depression was also a result of an earlier motorcycle accident. He said that his depression dated back to 1965 or 1966. He also said that he did not recalled suffering from depression before that time.

Mr Sutcliffe said that the motorcycle accident was a result of a tyre having been partly let down: "after some trouble with a coach-load of engineers." As a result, the motorcycle skidded and he hit a lamp-post head-first.

When asked by Mr Chadwin how long it took before the situation was resolved with Sonia, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "It was resolved eventually when she gave me her word that she was not going to see this chap any more."

Mr Sutcliffe said that approximately six months elapsed between the time they first quarrelled and when she gave her promise. He also said that during that time he had been very depressed at first. Mr Sutcliffe: "I was so depressed, in fact, that this led to my first encounter with a prostitute."

Mr Justice Boreham inquired whether, in the end, Sonia had admitted she was seeing this other man. Mr Sutcliffe replied: "She was seeing him, yes."

Mr Justice Boreham: "And you wanted her not to see him, is that the sum total of it?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

Mr Sutcliffe also stated that prior to that incident he had not had any encounters with prostitutes.

Mr Chadwin: "The quarrel with Sonia led to that encounter?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "It did. I could not resolve the situation, no matter how I tried, because I saw her once a week and he was meeting her twice or three times during the week. When I saw her at weekends, she would tell me where she had been with him and I gathered that it must have been two or three times she had been with him. The only times I saw her was on Saturdays and we used to end up arguing."

Mr Sutcliffe, when asked why this had led to his first prostitute, replied: "I didn't know where I stood at all." He had been blaming Sonia and was suspecting that the relationship with the other man was not just platonic, that something more was going on. He had asked whether anything more was going on, as he was sure it was. He hadn't wanted to blame her, and decided his only way out was to do it himself.

Mr Sutcliffe: "So I got involved with my first prostitute. By this time I knew there were prostitutes operating in Manningham Lane, Bradford, because I'd seen them blatantly along the road. I approached one and she agreed to get into the car. We were on the way to her place and I realised what a coarse and vulgar person she was. By this time we were practically there and I realised I didn't want anything to do with her. Before getting out of the car I was trying to wriggle out of the situation, but I felt stupid as well."

(Mr Sutcliffe:) "We went into the house and when she got into the bedroom she started taking her clothes off. She had told me it was £5 and when we were in the car I gave her a £10 note. She had told me that when we got to her place she would change it, but she started getting undressed and I asked her if she was going to change it. She said 'No' without looking at me. I said to her: 'We'll call it off then,' because I was only too glad to call it off. She didn't want to call it off and said we could get the note changed at the garage where I picked her up."

(Mr Sutcliffe:) "We went back to the garage by car and she went inside and there were two chaps in there. I don't know whether she did this regularly, but she wouldn't come back out. One of the men came banging on the car roof when I refused to go away and the other escorted her away. There wasn't much I could do about it, but I was a bit annoyed and drove off."

Mr Chadwin asked whether it was a case of being out of pocket and having nothing to show for it. Mr Sutcliffe replied: "It wasn't just the money. It was the fact that I felt annoyed because I wanted to resolve the situation with Sonia and hadn't done. It made me feel worse than ever."

When asked why he felt worse than ever, Sutcliffe replied: "Because I thought I had got involved with someone like that in that way."

When Mr Chadwin asked if he had any strong feelings about prostitutes, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "No." He also had not had any desire to harm prostitutes up until that point.

Mr Chadwin: "You said you felt not only had you lost your money but that you felt worse because of the way you felt about Sonia?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "That is right. I felt more depressed as I felt I would feel better and that it would put me in a better frame of mind – but it had an adverse effect."

Mr Sutcliffe said that he would get so depressed he didn't think he could go on with anything, and then he would receive messages from the voice. Mr Sutcliffe: "Then I would get reassurance and was brought back to a state where I felt all right."

Mr Sutcliffe said that he had received hundreds of messages from the voice. Mr Sutcliffe: "Soon after this incident my attitude towards prostitutes changed."

When asked by Mr Chadwin about the connection of the voices to his change in attitude towards prostitutes, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "I heard a voice which kept saying I had got to go on with a mission and it had a purpose. It was to remove the prostitutes. To get rid of them."

Mr Chadwin asked him when he had got the message of a mission or purpose. Mr Sutcliffe said it was during the episode with Sonia and the other man, who was an Italian. When asked to explain what he meant, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "When I was depressed, when she was involved with this man, I had the incident with the prostitute in Manningham Lane. It went worse and I felt worse than ever. I went home and I was really feeling bad. I felt so depressed that I was reassured again."

Asked what had reassured him, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "This is what I believed was the voice of God saying it was prostitutes who were responsible for all these problems."

About two or three weeks later, Mr Sutcliffe saw the same prostitute with another woman, who he assumed was also a prostitute, in a Bradford public house. Mr Sutcliffe: "The two were talking to men in the pub and acting in the way you expect prostitutes to act. I went and approached the one I had been with three weeks earlier and told her that I hadn't forgotten about the incident and that she could put things right so that there would be no hard feelings. I was giving her the opportunity to put things right and give back the payment I had made to her. She thought that this was a huge joke and, as luck would have it, she knew everybody in the place and went round telling them all about the

incident. Before I knew what was happening most of the people were having a good laugh."

At the time of the visit to the pub, he did not hear any voices from God. Mr Sutcliffe: "I heard it later when I was thinking all kinds of things about Sonia, perhaps not reasonable things to think about an innocent person. My mind was in turmoil and it could have passed through my mind that she was a prostitute as well, but I had reassurances that she wasn't and she was a good girl. They told me that the prostitutes were responsible for all the trouble."

He did not know what had made him believe Sonia was a prostitute. Mr Sutcliffe: "The reassurances that she wasn't one still made me think along the lines that the prostitutes were responsible for everything." Up until that point he had never attempted to harm a prostitute. Later he did attack one, with a sock containing some gravel, in Manningham Lane, Bradford. That attack took place between one and four weeks after the incident in the pub.

Mr Chadwin asked why he had attacked the prostitute. Mr Sutcliffe replied: "I was attempting to kill her."

Mr Chadwin: "Why?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Because it was what I had to do. It was my mission."

Mr Chadwin: "Why?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Because I had been told they were the scum of the earth and had to be got rid of."

Mr Chadwin: "Who had told you?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "God."

Mr Chadwin: "How did the message come to you?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Exactly as I just said. The same voice that I had been hearing for a matter of years."

When asked how he knew the woman was a prostitute, Mr Sutcliffe answered: "Because she was walking slowly along the kerb, looking at cars across the road. I think I was accompanied by another man."

When told he did not need to be coy about naming him, Mr Sutcliffe agreed that the man in question was Trevor Birdsall. Mr Sutcliffe continued: "I got out of the car, went across the road and hit her. The force of the impact tore the toe off the sock and whatever was in it came out. I went back to the car and got in it."

Mr Chadwin: "Did you enjoy striking that blow?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Mr Sutcliffe also said that the police had spoken to him at the time about the incident, but no charges had been brought against him.

Mr Chadwin: "What did you feel about the fact that the lady whom you had hit with the sock had not pressed any charges and nothing had come of it?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I felt I was not meant to be caught or punished for the attempt."

Approximately four weeks later, Mr Sutcliffe had taken a hammer into the Manningham area, where he intended to kill a prostitute. He was caught and later convicted of going equipped for theft with a hammer.

Mr Sutcliffe said that during the period from 1969 to 1975 he took no interest in the activities of prostitutes, and did not attempt to attack one until July 1975. During this period he had married Sonia, and at first they lived with her parents, and later got a home of their own.

Mr Chadwin: "How were you during that period 1969 to 1975 yourself?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Just the same. I suffered from depression. I came to live in London for a year and then I went to work on nights because I didn't like carrying on with the mission and I was in turmoil a great deal of the time."

In reply to a question from Mr Justice Boreham, Mr Sutcliffe stated he went to live in London for a year in 1970 while Sonia was at the MacMillian Teacher's Training College at Deptford. Before she finished her teacher training course he returned to Bradford and got a job at Bairds Television, Lidgett Green.

Early in 1972, Mr Sutcliffe and Sonia's family first realised that she had mental problems. Mr Sutcliffe: "It was while I was there (Bairds Television) that I got a telegram from Sonia saying 'Meet me at King's Cross station.' That was all, no time, no date, nothing. I thought there was something strange about it. So I took it to her parents. She was still their responsibility. Her father dashed off to London and found she had had a nervous breakdown and had been taken to Bexley (a mental hospital)."

The full implications of the telegram were brought home to him the next time he saw Sonia. He had last seen her a week before and she had been highly excited and agitated, as well as having lost about a stone of weight. When he saw her at Linfield Mount Hospital in Bradford, all the colour had gone from her face. Mr Sutcliffe: "She just looked grey. She looked terrible."

Mr Sutcliffe said that Sonia's parents had advised him not to see her. She was taking tablets and had started to put on a great deal of weight. He had not recognised her as the person he used to know, as she had lost her personality altogether. Sonia received treatment for about two or three months, and then she suffered a relapse. By the time they got married, that episode was over.

Mr Sutcliffe was asked by Mr Chadwin whether he was happy with Sonia. Mr Sutcliffe : "Very much so, yes."

After they were first married they lived with Sonia's parents, which Mr Sutcliffe said was "difficult." He kept suggesting that they should find somewhere on their own and move out. However, Sonia's mother insisted they should stay there and save for a house of their own.

Mr Chadwin asked whether between years 1969 and 1975 he had any doubts in his mind or asked himself about the mission. Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes. Why it should be me that did it because I found it so difficult. When I went to live in London, I saw Sonia practically all the time and it never had the chance to get on top of me. Then, I went to work nights for about three years and this kept me busy every night, and at weekends I saw Sonia, so I was able to overcome it."

Mr Justice Boreham: "In London, when you were seeing Sonia, you still got messages and resisted them, or what?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I didn't see any prostitutes."

Mr Sutcliffe said that he had taken a night job to keep away from his problem, and that he did nothing to prostitutes from September 1969 until 1975. Mr Sutcliffe: "There was a voluntary redundancy scheme at work and I accepted that so I was no longer on nights and I did the attack. I took the job on nights to keep myself away from the problem and having taken voluntary redundancy... it just became possible for me to carry on."

In reply to Mr Chadwin's question about whether he heard any voices in 1975, Mr Sutcliffe said: "Yes. Before the attack on Anna Rogulskyj and during the time I worked on nights. They kept reminding me that I had a mission and wanted to know why I was on nights. I knew why I was on nights and stayed there as long as possible. The voice reminded me where I had to go next. I went in my car. I was told again that this was the night to go. It was about two days after hearing the first voice. I went there and it culminated in the attack on Anna Rogulskyj."

Mr Sutcliffe had taken a hammer and knife with him "with the purpose to killing a prostitute." He had hit Anna Rogulskyj on the head, but had been disturbed by someone on the road. He did not think he had stabbed her.

Mr Sutcliffe was questioned about his attack on Olive Smelt in Halifax in 1975. He was asked why he had gone to Halifax. Mr Sutcliffe: "I went with Trevor Birdsall. We went for a couple of drinks. In one of the public houses I had seen her and on the way back, I saw her again. I said to Trevor that is a prostitute we saw in the public house."

After he stopped the car, he got out and followed her down the street, and then hit her. Mr Sutcliffe: "She fell down. I was going to kill her. I had the knife with me at that time. I was going to kill her, but I did not get the chance." He had been disturbed by a car.

Mr Sutcliffe stated that earlier in the night he had very strong feelings that he must kill a prostitute. These feelings did not subside as he hoped they would: "Consequently, I did it with Trevor still in the car. I knew it was my mission. I heard voices – echoes. Sometimes it was the voice, sometimes an echo, sometimes it was very clear, sometimes not."

Mr Chadwin: "I have dealt with the first two out of 20 incidents. The next one, two-and-a-half months later, was the first time you had killed. Did you go out intending to kill a prostitute that night?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

When asked why, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "The same reason as before. I was reminded it was my mission. It had to be done, so I went."

Mr Chadwin: "This time you did kill."

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

Mr Chadwin: "Did you enjoy striking the blows you struck?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Mr Chadwin: "How did you feel about the physical act of striking those blows?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I found it very difficult, and I couldn't restrain myself. I could not do anything to stop myself."

Mr Chadwin: "Why could you not stop yourself?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Because it was God who was controlling me."

Mr Chadwin: "How was he doing that?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Before doing it, I had to go through a terrible stage each time. I was in absolute turmoil, I was doing everything I could do to fight it off, and asked why it should be me, until I eventually reached the stage where it was as if I was primed to do it."

Mr Chadwin: "Did you ever look forward to killing anyone with pleasure?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No, certainly not."

Mr Chadwin: "Did you ever try to resist what you had been told to do?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "There was one time. It is not in the records because nothing happened. I was on my way to the Leeds red-light area. I got halfway there and I was still in turmoil. I do not think I was quite in that state where I could possibly do it. I was arguing all the time. I was not always getting answers, and there was a lot I did not understand. I finally stopped the car, and turned it round. I was shouting in the car. I set off back and was changing up and down the gearbox. Eventually, I got back home, locked the car in the garage, and went to bed. I felt a great sense of achievement at that stage."

Mr Sutcliffe claimed that he had been advised by God how to carry out each attack and murder, except for one. He had received no instructions in regards to the murder of Yvonne Pearson. Mr Chadwin asked him why he had murdered Yvonne Pearson.

Mr Sutcliffe: "Because of the directness of what she said and the way everything happened."

Mr Chadwin: "What did that convey to you?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "That it was all arranged."

Mr Chadwin: "By whom?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "By God."

Detailing the events that led up to the murder of Yvonne Pearson, Mr Sutcliffe said: "It was a sequence of events. I was simply on my way home from work at the time. As I was proceeding along Lumb Lane, a car backed out into the road. He obviously hadn't looked where he was going and I had to stop suddenly. She came straight round the same corner the car had reversed from. She tapped on the window and opened the door. It was a complete surprise to me because I wasn't looking for a prostitute at all. She said, 'Are you' – you know, having business or something. I asked her where she sprung from because it happened so suddenly. She said, 'It's good timing, or you can put it down to fate.' Unfortunately for her, I thought this was my direct signal. I had a hammer on the car floor, and she said very little after that. I took her to where she wanted to go and after I killed her I apologised. I said I was sorry and she could get up, and that she would be all right."

Mr Chadwin: "Did you think she would be able to get up?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Oh, yes. I thought if I was wrong she would be perfectly all right and she would be able to get up. She didn't and I realised it was meant to be."

Mr Chadwin said Yvonne Pearson skull was completely shattered, and that she was the worst-injured in the series of killings.

Mr Chadwin: "If that incident, so far as you were concerned, and all the other incidents, had not been arranged by God, would you have committed any of these attacks?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

The type of women Mr Sutcliffe thought he was attacking in all the cases were: "Prostitutes every time," and that he had never attacked one whom he didn't think was a prostitute.

When asked if his relationship with his wife, Sonia, had involved any violence, he replied: "No. I have taken hold of her wrists, but I never hit her. When she loses control over absolutely nothing she maybe hits me or starts kicking, but I just get hold of her wrists. She loses control quite often."

Mr Chadwin asked whether he remembered the first time that he read in the newspapers that a victim of his was not a prostitute. Mr Sutcliffe: "I am not sure – but I do remember the effect it had on me. Oh, yes, it was the MacDonald one in Leeds." He had no doubt that she was a prostitute at the time he had killed her.

Mr Chadwin: "When you read in the Press she was not, how did you feel?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I felt utterly shattered. Mentally I could not accept it. I felt terrible – full of remorse."

Once or twice he thought the woman he was attacking might not be a prostitute. Mr Sutcliffe: "But my feelings were completely overruled." When Mr Chadwin asked if he could identify these occasions, Mr Sutcliffe said that one time was the Josephine Whitaker murder in Halifax.

Mr Chadwin: "How did it come about that you entertained some doubt at the time but were reassured?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Because I was walking along chatting to her, and she was telling me things which I thought sounded completely innocent – she had been to her grandma's, she had bought her a watch, and liked to go horse-riding."

Mr Sutcliffe said that at the same time he was getting advice saying: 'This is a likely tale. She is really trying to play tricks on me. She is very clever, this one.' The voice also said: 'You are not going to fall for all this.' Mr Sutcliffe said: "It resulted in the killing eventually."

Because he was being guided and protected by God, Mr Sutcliffe wasn't frightened by the search for the Yorkshire Ripper: "I was intended to go on and carry on doing it all the time."

Mr Chadwin: "Intended by whom?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "By God."

In regard to the anonymous letter the police had received from someone purporting to be the man responsible, Mr Sutcliffe said: "I thought it was a diversion, so I could be left to carry on."

Mr Chadwin: "Who did you think was responsible for this diversion so you could carry on?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I thought it was an indirect act of God."

When asked by Mr Chadwin whether he remembered hearing the cassette tape with the Geordie accent, and the publicity involved, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "Yes, I heard the tape as well."

He realised that many inquiries were then being made in the Wearside area. Mr Sutcliffe: "It served to take a great deal of police investigation elsewhere."

Mr Sutcliffe said that he did not have anything to do with the sending of the tape: "I don't know who sent the letters and the tape." He agreed that he had friends or acquaintances who had Wearside accents, and also said that he used to deliver steel in the area.

When asked how many times he had been interviewed by the police in connection with the attacks, Mr Sutcliffe: "I can't remember how many times the police interviewed me. So many times I have lost count." He also knew what was behind their questions and dates that they were inquiring about.

Mr Chadwin: "Did that frighten you?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Mr Chadwin: "Did you think that the net was going to close in and that you would be caught?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "It was a miracle that they didn't apprehend me earlier. They had the facts. They knew it was me. They had the facts for a long time, but then I knew why they didn't catch me."

When asked why the police had not caught him, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "The police did not catch me before because everything was in God's hands. The way I escaped, the way they went away satisfied. There was no chance of them getting me."

Mr Sutcliffe said of the police detectives: "They questioned me at work and at home. One of them said they knew it was me and that he had no doubts at all, but he did go away. He must have had doubts. Another officer said that he knew it was me and he had a picture in front of him with my bootprint on it. He had been in my car accusing me of being the Yorkshire Ripper."

He also had to climb up four big steps to get in his lorry. Mr Sutcliffe: "If he wasn't going to catch me, nobody ever would. The boots were new and the soles and the heel were quite plain to see. The pattern was the same as he had on the picture. I knew they knew it was me. I expected them to come back, really, and question me again, but they didn't. I had no option but to tell them it wasn't me. Not that it was a deliberate lie, but that the mission was more important."

Mr Chadwin then inquired about why Mr Sutcliffe had returned to the scene of the Jean Jordan killing to try and find the £5 note he had given her. Mr Sutcliffe replied: "Because I was told that this would point a finger directly at me and I would be traced, and the mission would have to stop unless I retrieved it."

Mr Justice Boreham: "Who were you told by?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "By God. I thought it would probably be found and the voices told me that I ought to get it back. I was persuaded that it was perhaps better not to go back, because there were cars going in and out with prostitutes taking their clients into the allotments. I got the message that it would probably be too risky to go back, but couldn't understand why there was nothing in the news about the body being found."

Mr Sutcliffe said it seemed impossible that the body had still not been found a week after the killing: "By the following weekend, I was getting advice again to get the £5 note back. I realised the reason it had not been found was to give me the chance to go back and get the note."

Mr Sutcliffe could not find the banknote when he went back to the body. He was also eventually questioned by the police about. He had also received further advice about the banknote. Mr Sutcliffe: "If it was traced back to me, to say I knew nothing about it and it would be all right. This did happen and as it turned out, it was all right, although I could not see why I had not been discovered. But then again, God took care of the situation. I was puzzled that I did not get advice to where the £5 was when I was looking for it. I was quite often left to work things out for myself. I was not able to do so and this troubled me."

The trial was adjourned until tomorrow.

TUESDAY MAY 12 1981: PETER SUTCLIFFE, DR MILNE

James Chadwin, QC, started the day by continuing to question his client, Peter Sutcliffe. He asked Mr Sutcliffe why he had placed the weapons he was carrying against a wall in Sheffield shortly

before his arrest. Mr Sutcliffe replied: "Because they were obvious pointers to what my intentions were."

Mr Chadwin observed that throughout the interviews with Detective Sergeant O'Boyle, Mr Sutcliffe had not made any admissions about the offences. Mr Sutcliffe: "I did not expect to be charged with murder even when I was caught with that prostitute in Sheffield. I had confidence in God. I gave a false name and address to the police, because the fact that I had been caught in that situation had no bearing on the mission being terminated whatsoever. Even when I was transferred from Sheffield to Dewsbury I told the police lies because the point had not been reached where I could do otherwise. I was waiting and hoping that I would get advice from God."

It was not until he was later interviewed by Detective Inspector Boyle that he had admitted to being the Yorkshire Ripper. Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes, that's right."

When asked what had made him admit to being the Yorkshire Ripper, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "I had just been given a signal through the police that it was time to tell them."

Mr Chadwin: "How did that come about?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I was asked if I remembered going to the wall where I had parked the car in Sheffield and I realised that this was the time to tell them, because they were saying, in other words, that they had found the weapons I had hidden."

Mr Chadwin: "I want you to explain to the jury; you have said you had been given the signal through the police that now was the time to tell them. You said through the police – from whom?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "From God."

Mr Sutcliffe was then asked if, up to that point following his arrest, he had heard any voices or had had any advice from God. Mr Sutcliffe replied that he had not.

Mr Chadwin: "At that stage, could you understand in your own mind why God was giving you a signal to tell the police?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No, I just realised that it was time to tell them everything I had done."

Mr Sutcliffe agreed that he had said to the police that he was: "glad it was over." When asked why, he replied: "Because I had been through terrible suffering all the time."

Mr Chadwin: "In what way did you suffer?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Through having to go through with the mission against my will."

Mr Sutcliffe was reminded by Mr Chadwin that, at first, he had only admitted to the police twelve killings and two attempted killings. He was asked whether he thought it would make things worse for him by admitted to all twenty attacks. Mr Sutcliffe replied: "No, not at all."

Mr Chadwin: "One thing you don't mention is the incident in Bingley cemetery. Why not?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Because I thought that would lead them to find out about the mission. I didn't want them to find out about the mission. I was by no means convinced it was finished."

Asked by Mr Chadwin how he envisaged his mission would continue, Mr Sutcliffe stated: "I had no definite thoughts in that direction. I did not know how, but God was in control of the situation and anything was possible so I said nothing about the cemetery."

When Mr Sutcliffe had told the police the various places he had been employed, he had not told them about his employment at Bingley cemetery. When asked why he had not mentioned it, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "I did not want them to have the faintest idea about the vision at the cemetery. I thought they would ask me all kinds of questions about why I worked there, I just thought it best to steer clear of the place altogether."

When the police asked about a cord found in his possession, Mr Sutcliffe had admitted the attack on Dr Upadhyaya Bandara, but not to the murder of Marguerite Walls, whom he had strangled with the cord. Mr Sutcliffe: "This was because there was so much pressure on me. But I was aware that admitting to this would probably open lots of new lines of inquiry that were nothing to do whatsoever with me and I thought I would deal with the ones which were attributed to me."

Mr Sutcliffe also said that he had not been responsible for any other killings using the method of strangulation.

Mr Sutcliffe had used the cord on Dr Bandara, but said that he could not go through with it when he attacked her. Mr Sutcliffe: "At the time I was having messages. I simply heard the word 'Stop' and I felt that way about it myself so I left the scene. I was having a conflict and found it extremely horrible, the act of strangling her. That is when I heard the word 'Stop.'"

Mr Chadwin asked about the conversation with prison officer Anthony Fitzpatrick, where he had said that an agreement had been reached to accept the plea of diminished responsibility. Mr Sutcliffe: "I simply told the truth of what I believed and what I had been informed, and that was that the prosecution had agreed to accept the plea of diminished responsibility."

In Armley Jail, while talking to Sonia, he mentioned something about how long he would be in prison. Mr Sutcliffe: "She was very upset and I thought I could try and make her forget me and start a new life. I suggested that to her, but I don't think she was prepared to do so. She was alarmed by it. I tried, against what I wanted to do, to persuade her and I said I would be serving 30 years or more and it was pointless her wasting her life, waiting for me. I could see the effect what I was saying was having on her and I couldn't go through with it, pretending I didn't care and turning her away."

Mr Chadwin asked him if he had said anything to her about spending less time in custody if he could make people believe he was mad. Mr Sutcliffe: "I said something like that, yes."

When asked how this came about, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "I had seen what affect my words had on her and how distraught she was and it was my means of cheering her up that I said something to the effect of: 'Not to worry, they will probably think I was a loony or I was mad, and I would spend maybe 10 years in a loony bin.'"

After telling her this it had succeeded in cheering her up. She was crying and he had wiped the tears

from her face and licked them. Combining that with what he had said had cheered her up. At that time he had a solicitor and had admitted a very substantial number of attacks.

Mr Chadwin: "Had you by this time any idea of the defences to the charge of murder which might be available to you?" Mr Sutcliffe replied that he had not.

Mr Chadwin: "Did you then, or at any time, have it in mind to pretend to be mad?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Mr Chadwin: "Do you think you are mad?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Mr Chadwin: "Do you think there is anything wrong with you mentally?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Nothing serious at all, no."

Mr Chadwin: "Do you think you will spend less time in custody if people think there is something wrong with you mentally?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No. There would be something wrong with me mentally if I thought that."

Sir Michael Havers, QC, for the Crown, then cross-examined Mr Sutcliffe and began by asking about the night of his arrest.

Sir Michael: "On the night of your arrest you picked up Miss Reivers, intending to kill her?" Mr Sutcliffe agreed that had been his intention.

Sir Michael: "Because God expected it?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

Sir Michael: "When did God last speak to you that night?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "When I arrived and when I picked Miss Reivers up – and on the journey with the girl in the car."

Sir Michael: "And then no more?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Mr Sutcliffe also agreed that he had suggest that Miss Reivers run away from his car when the police arrived. He also agreed that it was his instinct to protect himself that led him to say he had gone to urinate, when he was in fact hiding weapons behind a oil storage tank, and to make an excuse to go to the lavatory on arrival at the police station, where he again hid a weapon when he placed a knife in the cistern.

Sir Michael: "Then for a considerable time, you lied, and lied, and lied again."

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

Sir Michael: "You had a ridiculous explanation about picking up people on the motorway."

Mr Sutcliffe: "Ridiculous, yes."

Sir Michael: "All to protect yourself?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "The mission."

Sir Michael: "All to protect Peter Sutcliffe?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

Sir Michael then turned to the confession, which Mr Sutcliffe had given to the police when he realised that they had found the hammer and knife he had hidden. Sir Michael: "Do you understand the phrase 'bang to rights'?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Sir Michael: "Do you understand when I say 'I have got you. I have all the evidence well and truly. The game is up'? And you say 'God told me to tell,' or was it just that you realised the game was up. Did you say you were the Ripper because you knew the game was up?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I knew it was the time to tell them."

Sir Michael: "Then, when found out, you decided to tell the truth, like any other criminal?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Like any criminal – not any other."

After receiving the message from God, Mr Sutcliffe said he had told the police everything they wanted to know.

Sir Michael: "No, Mr Sutcliffe. The police were being perfectly friendly. With God's message ringing in your ears, telling you to tell them everything, the first sentence you tell them is a lie (referring to the number of victims)."

Mr Sutcliffe: "It is, yes. I interpreted it that God said tell everything. I did not have a message."

Sir Michael: "If God's message was so clearly instructing you to tell the truth why on earth did it take you so long?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "On the contrary, I wanted to tell them as quickly as possible."

Mr Sutcliffe said that it had been "a great ordeal" for him to get through with his confession to the police. He admitted that, at first, he had not told them about the attempted murder of Dr Bandara or

the murder of Miss Walls. Sir Michael picked up the piece of rope and inquired whether it was the same piece of rope he had used on both victims. Mr Sutcliffe confirmed that it was. He also said that he had had the same piece of rope with him in his Rover when with Miss Reivers. Sir Michael then pointed out that he also had a hammer and knife. Sir Michael: "You were keeping your options open."

Sir Michael then questioned Mr Sutcliffe about the time he had first heard the voices when he was working as a grave-digger at Bingley cemetery, and how Mr Sutcliffe had described being "transfixed" by the voice and felt he had been chosen to hear the words of God.

Sir Michael: "At this time Sonia was your girlfriend. Were you in love with her?" Mr Sutcliffe replied that he was, and that he trusted her.

Mr Sutcliffe also agreed that he was devoted to his mother, who was still alive at the time. He also stated that he was a lapsed Catholic at the time, so there was not a priest he could go to. He also stated that he did have a best friend, Eric Robinson.

Sir Michael: "This was the most stunning thing in your life and you did not tell Sonia?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Sir Michael: "You didn't tell your devoted mother?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Sir Michael: "You didn't tell anyone until years and years had gone by and then you told them on the eighth interview in Armley Jail?" Mr Sutcliffe agreed with Sir Michael that "it is very odd".

When Sir Michael asked why had he not mentioned a word about it during his otherwise exhaustive confessions to the police, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "Because I was waiting for a direct message saying that it was over, to fully convince me that the mission was terminated."

Sir Michael: "What you are saying is that you had to have a 'mission finished' or 'mission terminated' signal? Did you ever get that?" Sutcliffe replied that he hadn't.

Mr Justice Boreham: "Do you mean never? You still haven't had it?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Sir Michael: "To this day you believe you are an agent for God in a mission only partly fulfilled?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

Mr Sutcliffe also said that he hadn't realised that he had mentioned to the doctors the mission until "shortly afterwards."

Sir Michael: "What was so secret about this marvellous message?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "The first two years were the best. There were no signs of purpose or why I had been chosen to be here. None whatsoever."

Sir Michael: "Then there was nothing to be ashamed of in telling Sonia, your mother, your priest or anyone."

When Sir Michael asked what the words of the first message were, Mr Sutcliffe replied that he hadn't heard them. Sir Michael: "The first time the line was clear, what was said?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "That I should have faith and that I should believe and that there was no need to be so depressed."

Sir Michael: "Should that not have encouraged you to go back to the Catholic faith?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No, because I had been chosen when I was out of faith."

Sir Michael: "But you have gone back now?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes"

Sir Michael: "So for all these years, this great miracle – to you it must have been a miracle – was kept entirely to yourself?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes".

Sir Michael asked Mr Sutcliffe about his Catholic upbringing, and Mr Sutcliffe agreed that he had learned about a great range of miracles involving: "healing, restoring faith, comforting in sickness, and in loss."

Sir Michael: "When did it first pass your mind that the God you were in touch with was very evil, quite contrary to the sort of miracles you had been told about as a Catholic boy?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "It seemed similar to the contradiction between the Old Testament and the New."

Sir Michael: "It must have been a great experience, this miracle – and you were transfixed – suddenly turns out to be instructing you to become a murderer?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

Sir Michael: "After you had been taunted by a prostitute, the first one you had met, you developed a hatred for her and her kind, that is a fact." Mr Sutcliffe agreed.

Sir Michael: "So God very conveniently jumped on the bandwagon after that and said: 'You have a divine mission, young Peter, to stalk the red-light districts and avenge me by killing prostitutes?'"

Mr Sutcliffe: "It is a very colourful speech, sir, but it does not apply."

Sir Michael asked whether he realised that his divine purpose in life had come about after he had

been short-changed by a prostitute. Mr Sutcliffe added: "And the incident with Sonia."

Sir Michael: "After you began to hate prostitutes."

Mr Sutcliffe: "No, I do not hate prostitutes."

Sir Michael: "But you were pretty cross, especially after she taunted you – you came out frustrated and tormented?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

Sir Michael: "Humiliated, outraged and embarrassed?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "That is what I said."

Sir Michael: "God had not spoken to you then."

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Sir Michael said that, by his answers, he was saying that he hated prostitutes before God had spoken to him about his mission. Sir Michael: "When forced to accept that you hate prostitutes, God comes to the rescue as far as this case is concerned?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "That is after the incident when I got into a very depressed condition."

When asked whether he had seen a doctor about his condition, Mr Sutcliffe said that he had not.

Mr Sutcliffe also said that he remembered that he told one of the doctors about becoming unconscious and falling down, and that his wife had given him artificial respiration. He said that the incident had taken place probably in 1978 or 1979.

Mr Sutcliffe also agreed that he had given different answers to doctors about the length of time he had been unconscious at the time of his motorcycle accident. He denied that he was making it up to persuade doctors that he was "loony."

Sir Michael asked Mr Sutcliffe whether the blackouts he suffered were of significant importance that it had made him go to see a doctor. Mr Sutcliffe replied: "No. I was frightened of going to the doctor's."

Sir Michael said that he could have told the doctors he had been in a motorcycle accident and could have told them he suffered blackouts and depression. Why was he frightened? Mr Sutcliffe replied: "I was in control. I thought to go to the doctor's would probably result in a brain operation or something like that which I did not want."

Sir Michael: "I suppose you read newspapers?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I get a daily yes – the Daily Mail."

Sir Michael: "They covered the Ripper murders pretty heavily?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "They had items, yes."

When asked what sort of man the newspapers were making the Ripper out to be, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "They made him out to be a monster. Oh, a terrible thing."

Sir Michael: "Did you read articles which seemed almost unanimous that the Ripper had a loathing of prostitutes?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

When asked when he had realised that there could be a special defence involving his state of mind, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "I can't be sure exactly."

Sir Michael said that Mr Sutcliffe must have heard about such a defence within a few days after being arrested. Sir Michael: "You were telling your wife on January 8 that you were expected to get 30 years in prison but if you could convince people you were mad then it would be 10 years in a 'loony bin.'"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I said that quite openly."

Sir Michael asked how he knew that. Mr Sutcliffe replied: "I couldn't possibly know I would get 10 years in a 'loony bin'. The sole reason was to cheer her up and bring her out of a depression. I tried to comfort her, to tell her things weren't that bad. I didn't like to see her crying."

Sir Michael: "You are over 30 years of age, you read newspapers, you have a higher than average intelligence, and you have been murdering and attempting to murder people for years. There has been endless talk in pieces in the newspapers. Are you going now to turn round and tell members of the jury that on January 8 you had no idea what you were talking about?"

Mr Sutcliffe turned to the jury and said: "Yes, I had no idea it would be less if I got sent to the loony bin."

Sir Michael said that when Mr Sutcliffe had spoken to a prison officer on April 5th, he had been cocky and arrogant.

Mr Sutcliffe: "I can see why he thought I was arrogant." He also said that his solicitor had told him that the plea of diminished responsibility had been accepted.

Sir Michael: "You can take it from me that there was no agreement of any kind."

Mr Sutcliffe: "I was told that the doctors were agreed. My solicitor said that the doctors for the prosecution had agreed."

Sir Michael asked Mr Sutcliffe what sort of symptoms his wife, Sonia, had when she was suffering from schizophrenia. Mr Sutcliffe replied: "She told me later that she thought all the machinery was stopping and the world was coming to an end."

Sir Michael asked in Sonia had ever if Sonia ever hallucinated. Mr Sutcliffe replied: "Yes, if you call that a hallucination." He also said that, because of her illness, Sonia had not been able to work for three years.

Sir Michael asked Mr Sutcliffe to explain the different versions of the attack on Wilma McCann. Mr Sutcliffe had told police that he had killed her because he had lost his temper, while telling the doctors he had left home with the purpose of killing a prostitute and that he always intended to kill her. Sir Michael: "Was it because you realised that what you had said about McCann would not be of much help to you if you wanted to pull the wool over the doctor's eyes?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No. That wasn't the reason." Mr Sutcliffe explained that he had not been telling the whole truth when he had been talking to the police.

Mr Sutcliffe denied that he had heard about the case of Mark Rowntree, who had been sent to Broadmoor after being found guilty of manslaughter on the grounds of diminished responsibility, and asking prison officers if he was at all like Mr Rowntree.

Sir Michael said that Mr Sutcliffe, having decided to persuade the doctors he was mental ill and that the series of attacks and murders was part of a mission, knew that the mission story would collapse if he admitted to the doctors that five or six of the women he attacked he knew were not prostitutes. Sir Michael: "Is that why you had to maintain through thick and thin in the face of the clearest evidence that these six women were prostitutes?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No, I knew when I did it that each one was."

Sir Michael: "Your story would have gone straight down the drain if you had to say to the doctors that six of them were not prostitutes?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "It is not a story, sir."

Sir Michael: "But the mission requires them to be prostitutes."

Mr Sutcliffe: "It didn't require them to be, they were."

Sir Michael then referred to the statement Mr Sutcliffe made to the police about the killing of Josephine Whitaker and the phrase: "I realised she was not a prostitute," when he attacked her. Sir Michael: "Had you got to the stage where your lust for killing meant that everybody that you saw, if in a quiet spot, could meet their death at your hands?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No." He also explained that he told the police that because he: "couldn't divulge anything else." He had believed that she wasn't a prostitute until he received a message that she was one and not to believe what she was saying to him.

Sir Michael also referred to Mr Sutcliffe statement that shortly before killing Miss Whitaker he had said to her: "You can't trust anyone these days." Sir Michael: "Can you think of a more horrible and cynical thing to say to someone you were just about to murder?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Sir Michael: "Why did you say it?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Because I couldn't trust myself."

Sir Michael: "You were trying to convince her she was safe with you?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes, in a sense."

Sir Michael: "Did God tell you to do that?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Sir Michael: "It was a bit of private enterprise on your part, was it?"

Mr Sutcliffe agreed that his confession to the police about the attack on Miss Whitaker was of "a cold-blooded, calculated, sadistic murderer." He also agreed that he had asked her to look at the time on a clock to get her to stop, and had feigned poor eye sight himself.

Sir Michael: "Was this a sort of macabre play-acting while you got her jockeyed into the right position?" Mr Sutcliffe conceded that it was, and insisted that God had been giving him detailed instruction while it was taking place.

Sir Michael: "Did God tell you to tell that poor girl to look at the church clock?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

Sir Michael: "Did God instruct you as far as Yvonne Pearson and the horsehair was concerned? Did he tell you to hide behind the garden wall when you were escaping after attacking Theresa Sykes?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

Mr Justice Boreham: "Did you need God to tell you that unless you did hide you might be caught?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Maybe, maybe not. I am not sure."

Sir Michael: "When Yvonne Pearson was lying there gurgling and moaning and there was someone in a car nearby, with your high average intelligence you must have known you were in danger of being caught. You don't need God to tell you to ram it (the horsehair) down her throat?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Sir Michael: "Did God tell you?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Mr Sutcliffe admitted that he removed some of his victim's clothes once they were unconscious, but it was only so that they "would not hinder" him while he stabbed his victim. It was also "to show them for what they were." He denied that there was anything sexual in his actions.

Sir Michael said that Mr Sutcliffe had sometimes inserted his knife several times into the same wound. Sir Michael: "Do you realise how difficult it must have been to do that?" Mr Sutcliffe denied that he had done it.

When Sir Michael began to read from a pathologist's report, Mr Sutcliffe interrupted and said that he might have moved a knife about inside a wound. Sir Michael: "It hasn't been challenged, Mr Sutcliffe, by your very experienced leading counsel."

Mr Sutcliffe denied that he had stabbed his victims "in areas of sexual attraction in order to get sexual gratification" such as the breasts, and one victim in the vagina. When asked why he had placed a piece of wood against Emily Jackson's vagina, Mr Sutcliffe replied that he was: "just pushing her out of sight with it. I pushed her with it because I could not bear to touch her again."

Sir Michael: "How did you use this rusted old screwdriver, that has been sharpened to a hideous point, to stab Josephine Whitaker through the same wound three times. How can you get that into the same place three times?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "By moving it about."

Sir Michael: "Your case throughout has been: no sexual gratification, not doing it for lust or anything like that."

Sir Michael then moved on to the case of Helen Rytka. Sir Michael: "You say you feel contaminated by the blood of a victim. You talk about your mission, and then surprise, surprise, here's pretty little Helen Rytka and you have sex with her. Why?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I didn't have sex. I entered her, but there was no action. It was to persuade her that everything would be all right." Mr Sutcliffe said that he had had no choice, it had been important to keep her quiet due to the nearby taxi drivers.

Sir Michael: "Of course you had a choice. God didn't tell you to put your penis in that girl's vagina."

Sir Michael asked about the stabbing of Jacqueline Hill in the eye with his screwdriver, and want to know why he had done it. Mr Sutcliffe replied that her eyes had been: "staring at him accusingly."

Sir Michael: "You are not going to tell the jury she was not entitled to look accusingly at you?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I don't know. I think she was already dead but her eyes were open."

Sir Michael: "Do you have any regrets about what you did to her eyes?" There was no response from Mr Sutcliffe to the question. Sir Michael: "Do you find that a difficult question to answer?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes."

Sir Michael: "Is it difficult because you are not quite sure which is the right answer to give for the jury and the doctors?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "You are much quicker than I am, sir, I have not considered this at all."

Sir Michael: "Did it matter whether she was giving you an accusing look? You had God on your side. She was a mere mortal who you were about to take off the face of the earth."

Mr Sutcliffe: "Despite being told what to do, still partly inside I feel guilty."

Sir Michael: "So you felt sorry about what you were doing? I'm sure you don't want to say that you enjoyed it."

Sir Michael: "Did it occur to you that God is meant to be merciful and you are killing people in a painful way?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I'm quite sure that the ways I killed them meant they never knew anything."

Sir Michael: "You mean to say that your victims never felt anything at they were lying there moaning, groaning, gurgling, a screwdriver in the eye, stabbed, and one disembowelling?"

Sir Michael then asked if Mr Sutcliffe had ever had a favourite dog or cat, and: "would you have ever killed them in any of the ways you killed these women?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Sir Michael said that Mr Sutcliffe's occasional ability to resist the commands of the voice, his choice of sites, and his quick thinking and play-acting during the events of the attacks, all suggested that he had a great capacity for personal control. Mr Sutcliffe denied it.

Sir Michael: "Are you saying that if the urge came over you in the middle of Piccadilly Circus, you would have done it there?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes. That's exactly what I said in my police statement."

Sir Michael then asked, repeatedly, why Mr Sutcliffe had never killed inside his car. Mr Sutcliffe replied, repeatedly, that it would be impossible because there was no room. Sir Michael persisted in the question until Mr Sutcliffe added: "They would probably make a lot of noise and there would be evidence all over the car."

Sir Michael: "That's it. Well done. Stop there. There would be blood all over your car. It would make your detection more likely. A messy job to get rid of it. That's what I am getting at: your capacity for control. Do you see?"

Mr Justice Boreham asked Mr Sutcliffe why he had tried to cut off Jean Jordan's head with a hacksaw. Mr Sutcliffe replied: "Because she was in league with the Devil and between them they had hidden the £5 note and I was going to do the same thing with her head."

Pointing out that Mr Sutcliffe had not found the £5 note, Mr Justice Boreham said: "I don't want to get into a theological argument, but are you saying that she and her colleague the Devil had beaten you and your God?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes. It seemed very much so."

Sir Michael: "Had you realised by about mid-February that you were not getting on too well in persuading these learned gentlemen that you were fit for the loony bin?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Sir Michael: "And then did you say: 'Right. We'd better pull some more aces out of the pack.' The mission was the floater and the bait on the hook was God's message, and they (the doctors) fell for it hook, line and sinker. Is that what happened?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "No."

Peter Sutcliffe was briefly re-examined by his defence counsel, James Chadwin, QC, where he again denied that he was trying to feign insanity. He also stated that he had never been told by a doctor that he would only get 10 years if in an asylum.

Mr Chadwin said that Mr Sutcliffe had told the doctors that he would kill again, if he was released.
Mr Sutcliffe: "Yes, yes."

Mr Chadwin: "What is your view about that now, Mr Sutcliffe?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "I still feel the same."

Mr Chadwin: "Under what circumstances might you kill again?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "If I am allowed out."

Mr Chadwin: "Yes, but who would you kill if you were allowed out?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Prostitutes."

Mr Chadwin: "Why?"

Mr Sutcliffe: "Because I still do not believe the mission is finished."

The first medical expert witness called by the defence was Dr Hugo Milne, a consultant psychiatrist for twenty years. He said to James Chadwin, QC, for the defence, that he had dealt with 200 homicide cases, personally examining them for both the Crown and the defence. He first saw Mr Sutcliffe on January 14th, after being instructed by the defence and had interviewed him on eleven occasions at Armley jail.

Dr Milne agreed that he had come across cases of simulation of mental illness. He had: "always been very much on my guard" about possible attempts by the defendant to persuade him that he was mentally ill. Dr Milne: "There was no evidence whatever to say he was simulating. I had been looking for this all the time, and I cannot accept that, in the sequence his symptoms were made known to me, that he could have been simulating."

Mr Chadwin: "What conclusion did you eventually come to at the end of all your examinations?"

Dr Milne: "I do not believe that the accused is, in fact, simulating mental illness. He is suffering from schizophrenia of a paranoid type."

Mr Justice Boreham: "When you talk of simulating mental illness, do you mean simulating the symptoms and manifestations of the that illness?"

Dr Milne: "Yes, I think it is what lay people may think what madness may be."

Asked by Mr Chadwin how it was possible to diagnose paranoid schizophrenia, Dr Milne replied: "By taking into consideration not only one symptom but a series of symptoms together which eventually, like a jigsaw, complete the full picture."

Asked by Mr Justice Boreham what was meant by symptoms, Dr Milne replied: "The great difficulty is that what the individual says is very often the symptom, is in fact the sign of underlying schizophrenic disorder. If a man says that he is the king of Siam when it is patently obvious he is an ordinary office clerk, the symptom he presents is 'I am the king of Siam'. But the nigh would be that he has grandiosity."

Asked by Mr Chadwin if there were any other symptoms, apart from what the patient told the doctor, Dr Milne replied: "The way he might behave as if he was suspicious of other people's behaviour. The way he may misinterpret people's behaviour and the way he may react to what he believes."

Mr Justice Boreham: "It sounds as if you are saying that you are very much dependent upon what you are told and, rather as we in these courts, you have to test its accuracy."

The hearing was adjourned until tomorrow.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 13 1981: DR MILNE

Dr Hugo Milne, a consultant psychiatrist, returned to the stand, James Chadwin, QC, for the defence continued his questioning.

Mr Chadwin asked Dr Milne to list the signs and symptoms of Peter Sutcliffe mental illness. Dr Milne said that he had discover them at various stages during the eleven interviews that he had with Mr Sutcliffe.

Dr Milne said that part of his observations of Mr Sutcliffe's condition included suspicion, and uncontrollable impulse and paranoia concerning prostitutes. A further symptom was the preoccupation with prostitutes to the extent of delusion.

When asked by Mr Chadwin to what he was referring, Dr Milne replied: "I am referring to his phrases that have come out in court here about prostitutes being the scum of the earth, and being responsible for all sorts of problems to the extent that he could not see beyond that idea."

Another symptom observed was ideas of grandeur with special powers. Dr Milne: "By that I mean

an individual who demonstrates this, believe himself or herself to have powers greater than those endowed within a normal individual."

Dr Milne also listed hallucinosis, where an individual may have experiences where they hear, see, smell, or feel something when there is no identifiable external stimulus to account for it.

Other symptoms that Dr Milne found were feelings of depression, including ideas of suicide, and ideas of reference. Dr Milne: "This is misinterpretation of that which is written, spoken or demonstrated by some form of behaviour which misinterpretation implies a different meaning to that which a normal person might apply."

When asked by Mr Chadwin to give an example of what he meant, Dr Milne replied that someone suffering from the illness might see people across the street and might immediately think that they were talking about him, or if he saw people laughing might think they were making fun of him.

Another symptom was misidentification. Dr Milne: "I use this in particular, relating to what has been given in evidence, relating to his confusion at times to identify absolutely and with certainty who and who were not his victims – that is prostitutes."

Dr Milne also mentioned over-controlled behaviour. In Mr Sutcliffe case it applied to his ability to remain completely calm in the most stressful situation, such as giving evidence. Mr Sutcliffe had also been completely calm during interviews and questioning by the police and by doctors. Dr Milne: "He always showed a tremendous degree of control, which to my mind, was to an abnormal degree"

Dr Milne also included psychotic detachment, which in Mr Sutcliffe case was his ability to detach himself from the enormity of what he had done. Schizophrenics could be both in touch and out of touch with reality, and schizophrenia was a psychosis, and a sign of which would include psychotic detachment.

Mr Justice Boreham asked Dr Milne to explain what he meant by psychosis. Dr Milne replied: "In layman's terms, it is madness, but what I wish to say is that because people might be clinically mad they are not necessarily out of contact with reality."

Dr Milne said another symptom was a lack of insight, where someone would lose touch with what he was doing, and would distance himself from it, and no longer realised he was ill.

Mr Justice Boreham: "That might imply that he doesn't realise that he is hitting someone over the head with a hammer."

Dr Milne: "No, I don't mean that. I am referring to the reason why he is doing it."

Dr Milne said that another classic sign of schizophrenia was thought argument. Dr Milne: "This was where an individual may tell you, and it may take him a long time before he does, that he is having an internal argument between his mind and his voice or a voice. He may feel torn between the two, not knowing which way to go."

Mr Justice Boreham: "You mean the voice he thinks he is hearing?"

Dr Milne: "Yes."

Dr Milne said that another side of the illness was schizophrenic thinking. This involved a person thinking illogically, where deductions from what was going on were made, and drawing illogical conclusions from them.

Dr Milne said that another sign was where a person no longer believed there was anything wrong with him. They would be completely satisfied that the experiences and behaviour caused by the illness were acceptable to himself, and therefore should be acceptable to others.

Dr Milne also said that primary schizophrenic experiences were a sign of schizophrenia which was not always identifiable. Dr Milne: "It is the one the text books describe and the majority of schizophrenics are never able to describe in a clinical interview because the experience has usually happened so long ago that it is completely buried in years and other symptoms."

Another symptom Dr Milne found was religious delusion, which dealt with ideas of grandeur and special powers.

Mr Chadwin asked Dr Milne if he could detect paranoid schizophrenia merely by recognising one of the symptoms on the list. Dr Milne replied that, in his mind, the primary schizophrenic experience was: "the most crucial symptom in the diagnosis of schizophrenia. With that initially and after the other aspects relating to his delusional content and his hallucinations, and disappearance of perception – one would confirm a diagnosis of schizophrenia."

Dr Milne agreed with Mr Chadwin that an example of a delusion was like looking at a microphone and thinking it was a tree. Dr Milne also agreed that an example of a hallucination was like looking at a spot on the floor and thinking a voice was coming from it, although no-one else could hear it.

Mr Justice Boreham: "Or even if others could hear it but, in fact, there was no voice?"

With laughter from the court, Dr Milne replied: "Yes."

Mr Chadwin: "Let's grasp the nettle. It is easy for anyone to allege they have heard voices urging them to do what they have done?"

Dr Milne: "Yes, this is something frequently put to someone like myself."

Mr Chadwin: "If that allegation was made to you, would you then look to see if the experience was possible, for example, to see if there was a graveyard where the man says it is and whether he worked there. You would get a picture of a possible schizophrenic but would that be enough to convince you?"

Dr Milne: "No, it is not enough. In general terms this man has more than sufficient symptoms to make up a diagnosis of paranoid schizophrenia."

When asked by Mr Chadwin whether a man suffering from schizophrenia would display all the signs and symptoms at the same time, Dr Milne replied: "No."

Dr Milne said that Mr Sutcliffe's account of his early relationship with his wife, Sonia, also had some significance due to his reaction to being told that she was interested in another man. Mr Sutcliffe seemed to have also over-exaggerated what might have been taking place. Dr Milne: "He became, if one accepts his testimony, distressed by it, distressed to the extent he walked out of a job. He seemed to see things in Sonia's behaviour in a way we know could never be borne out in fact. For example, he wondered whether she might be a prostitute."

Mr Chadwin asked Dr Milne whether he attached any significance to when Mr Sutcliffe was mocked in a public house. Dr Milne: "Many men are mocked, no doubt, by prostitutes and somewhat cheated. We do not know whether he was mocked. He thought he was mocked."

Dr Milne said that perhaps this was the beginning of Mr Sutcliffe's "ideas of reference", where he misinterpreted what prostitutes, or women who might not be prostitutes, were saying. Dr Milne said that it appeared that at a later stage Mr Sutcliffe would, based on very flimsy evidence, assume that a woman was a prostitute.

Mr Chadwin: "Would an example of that be saying a woman was a prostitute because she was wearing a split skirt?"

Dr Milne: "That is correct."

Mr Chadwin asked about the words that Mr Sutcliffe said he saw on a gravestone in Bingley cemetery, one of the words being "Eko." Dr Milne: "Once again he is trying to explain to himself what the voice might be and to help identify it. He had already said that the words were echoing and he was using the word 'Eko', which was a misidentification."

Mr Sutcliffe had also seen other foreign words on another gravestone. Dr Milne: "Translated they mean 'somebody is speaking to you.' This is a most incredible place for someone to have a primary schizophrenic experience."

Mr Chadwin: "The jury will have noticed I have in this exercise highlighted parts of the statement and the reference to this urge (to kill) becomes more marked towards the end of the statement."

Dr Milne: "He is beginning to expose that which I know to be a sign of paranoid schizophrenia. He is beginning to use more frequently the phrases that would lead to that diagnosis – that is to show more evidence of his mental illness."

Mr Chadwin then mentioned the evidence that Mr Sutcliffe had deliberately taken weapons with him when he went out to kill. Mr Chadwin: "It is suggested for the purpose of killing he created that horrible, sharpened screwdriver we have all seen. A deal of deliberation and what people might say, premeditation, of what he was going to do. Is that inconsistent with someone suffering from paranoid schizophrenia?"

Dr Milne: "Not at all." He also stated that the ability to act with premeditation and planning like that was not unusual from a person suffering from paranoid schizophrenia.

Dr Milne was asked if, during the first interview with Mr Sutcliffe, he had gotten anywhere near to concluding that Mr Sutcliffe was suffering from a mental illness. Dr Milne replied: "No." He also

said that he had always been "very much on my guard" about possible attempts by the defendant to persuade him that he was mentally ill.

Dr Milne also said that during the January 27th interview Mr Sutcliffe continued to have paranoiac ideas in relation to prostitutes. Uncontrollable impulses, in relation to the stone in sock attack in Bradford and to the attack on Olive Smelt in Halifax, were other symptoms observed.

Dr Milne said that a further interview on February 5th was of particular importance, as it was then that Mr Sutcliffe first mentioned having a mission. Dr Milne: "I didn't respond to this in the clinical sense because I wanted to avoid getting drawn into what might have been an attempt to persuade me that he was mentally ill."

Dr Milne said that the second interview had left him: "slightly suspicious that the man was not as mentally well as he might be."

When asked by Mr Chadwin about the third interview, Dr Milne replied: "If I could have detached myself from the reason I was seeing him, I would have thought that he was a paranoid schizophrenic. But because he was charged with such violent offences, I could not come to that conclusion as readily as I would have if it was someone else."

Dr Milne said that Mr Sutcliffe later told him: "I know it is wrong to kill. If you've got a good reason, it's justified and all right." When asked if he felt justified in killing, Mr Sutcliffe had replied: "Yes, I have no doubt whatsoever. I was not as rational then as now but if there were women around now it would not take long to get those thoughts again. I'm glad to be here because of the innocent people. I am not glad really because of the trouble and the family. The prostitutes are still there, even more on the streets now, they say. The mission is only partly fulfilled."

During one of the interviews Mr Sutcliffe had told Dr Milne that at the time of his last killing in November 1980, he thought lots of women were prostitutes. He also had claimed he had been at the stage when he could have gone into a town while people were shopping and attacked any woman.

When asked by Mr Chadwin how long Mr Sutcliffe had been a paranoid schizophrenic, Dr Milne said that it was since the date of the primary experience in Bingley cemetery, when he was aged 19 or 20.

Mr Chadwin asked Dr Milne whether Mr Sutcliffe could have been misleading him and simulating symptoms. Dr Milne: "There was no evidence whatever to say he was simulating. I had been looking for this all the time, and I cannot accept that in the sequence his symptoms were made known to me, that he could have been simulating."

In a later interview, Dr Milne had asked Mr Sutcliffe about religion. Mr Sutcliffe told him: "I wondered if God's purpose was to get me back into the Faith. I had been having Mass regularly and had been asked about confession."

Mr Sutcliffe had also told Dr Milne that he thought all the doctors who had seen him and diagnosed his illness were wrong. Dr Milne: "I think he thinks we are all wrong and he is right."

Dr Milne said that since his interviews he had seen Mr Sutcliffe four times, three of them after the

trial began. Dr Milne: "He is quite pleased to be seen, affable, pleasant and extremely controlled."

Dr Milne said that nothing had happened to affect his opinion that Mr Sutcliffe was suffering from paranoid schizophrenia.

Mr Chadwin: "Have you ever, in any interviews with Peter Sutcliffe, suggested to him that if he was found mentally abnormal, he would have to be kept in custody for 10 years to satisfy the public?"

Dr Milne: "Certainly not."

Mr Chadwin: "Do you believe that at intervals he has indicated if he were at liberty, he would likely kill again?"

Dr Milne: "Yes."

Mr Chadwin: "Do you regard him as dangerous?"

Dr Milne: "Not dangerous, extremely dangerous."

The trial was adjourned until tomorrow.

THURSDAY, MAY 14 1981: DR MILNE

The day began with Dr Hugo Milne, a consultant psychiatrist, being cross-examined by Mr Harry Ognall, QC, for the prosecution.

Mr Ognall began by inquiring about the symptoms of Sonia Sutcliffe's illness. After consulting the judge on the ethics of the matter, Dr Milne replied: "Sonia suffered from schizophrenia in 1972. She heard voices talking to her."

Mr Ognall: "Sonia is described as having grandiose ideas. That is what this man (Sutcliffe) has set out to display to you. This man has spoken of being in communication with the Almighty and Jesus, hasn't he?" Dr Milne agreed.

Mr Ognall: "Sonia had the delusion she was Christ, didn't she?"

Dr Milne: "Yes."

Mr Ognall: "Prison officers have told us that six days before you first saw Sutcliffe he had said: 'I'm going to do a long time in prison, 30 years or more, unless I can convince people here that I'm mad. Then I'll do 10 years in the loony bin.' What do you make of that Dr Milne, in the context of your evidence?"

Dr Milne: "I think it is a very straightforward decision to make. Is this man pretending to be mad, and has duped me and my colleagues, or am I, from my clinical examination right in saying that he is a paranoid schizophrenic? As far as I can see in particular case, either he is a competent actor, or I

am an inefficient psychiatrist."

Mr Justice Boreham: "This is not for any of us to decide, it is for the jury."

Dr Milne: "Perhaps I have been duped. It is for the jury to decide."

Mr Ognall inquired why Mr Sutcliffe had told the court he was not mad, but had told the doctor that he was mentally ill. Dr Milne replied: "His mental state fluctuates and so does his insight into his illness. Sometimes he would think he was mentally ill, and at times he would completely deny it."

Mr Ognall: "It is possible that he was very much on the alert as to what you and other doctors wanted to hear?"

Dr Milne: "If he knew the symptoms and signs of schizophrenia and he was as cool and calculated as he might have been, then it is possible."

Mr Ognall: "Morbid depression. That's a very learned phrase for a lorry-driver? And 'pathological hatred'. That's a rum phrase for a lorry-driver to use? He is an intelligent lorry-driver."

Dr Milne: "Yes he is." Dr Milne said that Mr Sutcliffe had an IQ of between 108 and 110, whereas the average was between 90 and 100. While not a genius, Mr Sutcliffe was of above average intelligence.

Mr Ognall said that Mr Sutcliffe was also: "articulate."

Dr Milne: "Yes."

Mr Ognall: "And astute."

Dr Milne: "He is."

Mr Ognall noted that with the timing of the attacks, exactly half of the twenty attacks had taken place on a Friday or Saturday night when Mr Sutcliffe's wife was working. Mr Ognall: "This is a man who is prompted by God, the hapless and hopeless victim of God's will. This is a man who believed he was God's instrument. Why did God direct him only on Friday and Saturday nights?"

Dr Milne replied that he didn't think God had, and that: "paranoid schizophrenics are extraordinarily cunning, extremely involved in premeditation and determined not to be found."

Mr Ognall: "A very great proportion of normal criminals are also cunning, clever and anxious not to be found. That isn't the hallmark of a schizophrenic. It is the hallmark of the normal criminal. I suggest that this pattern is a badge of a premeditated killer."

Dr Milne: "I don't accept that."

Mr Ognall said that paranoid schizophrenics often found it very difficult to relate socially with other people and progressive introspection and withdrawal, with loss of interest in friends, relations, and hobbies. Dr Milne agreed that Mr Sutcliffe had not shown a loss of drive or will, often associated

with the illness, or shown any of the other symptoms Mr Ognall mentioned.

Dr Milne said that he had found three external matters which helped verify Mr Sutcliffe's account of his illness. These were photographs of Bingley cemetery, where Mr Sutcliffe claimed to have first heard God's voice, Mr Sutcliffe's own evidence, and forensic evidence that related to the injuries inflicted on Yvonne Pearson.

Dr Milne: "I don't think I can draw any other practical external matters to confirm my diagnosis."

Mr Ognall: "This is all to be seen in the context that you recognise as a psychiatrist that people do sometimes often try to pull the wool over your eyes."

Dr Milne: "Yes."

Dr Milne also agreed with Mr Ognall that Mr Sutcliffe had not previously displayed signs of mental illness. Dr Milne: "Yes, I agree that my inquiries have shown that Sutcliffe never displayed to family, friends or workmates any external indications of mental disturbance."

Mr Ognall then asked about the event where Mr Sutcliffe, upon hearing that his trial had been switched to the Old Bailey from Leeds, had appeared to a prison officer to be cheerful, bright, and very pleased at the news. Mr Sutcliffe had seemed highly amused that the doctors thought he was disturbed, and told the officer: "I'm as normal as anyone."

Asked by Mr Ognall what the court was to make of that statement, Dr Milne: "Perhaps he does believe he has fooled us and he believes that we think he's mad, yet he knows he is not mad. This is a very long 'Catch 22' situation where he has set out to make us think he is ill. If this is so he has finished up by making us accept he is ill and now denies it. If it is a simulation it is a very incredible simulation where he has completely lost insight and does think he is normal."

Mr Ognall detailed the various explanations that Mr Sutcliffe had given for his attacks and murders. He had given explanations of Sonia having an affair with another man, being humiliated by a prostitute who had duped him out of £10, he had developed a hatred of prostitutes, and he had been given a divine mission from God. Mr Ognall suggested that Mr Sutcliffe had built up a hatred of prostitutes in order to justify why he had killed his first victim, Wilma McCann.

Dr Milne: "I believe that the most crucial thing in this matter was that he was, prior to meeting that first prostitute, pre-disposed, because he was schizophrenic. It was chance that led him to meet the prostitute because he had a row with Sonia. From that moment on it is the logical, in psychological terms, development of his illness. It might have been something else that had gone wrong and his delusions might have taken a different form."

Mr Ognall suggested that all the differing explanations Mr Sutcliffe had given could not be reconciled. Dr Milne disagreed, saying they could all 'hang together', and they described a long-standing paranoid schizophrenia and gradual loss of insight. Dr Milne: "It is an eventual admission of the full symptoms of long-standing paranoid schizophrenia."

Referring to the pattern of attacks and the gaps between them, Mr Ognall said that Mr Sutcliffe had told of having morbid depression and hallucinations and described them as being attacks. He had

told police that he sometimes had two attacks a month. He would think he was all right, but the attacks would always returned. He had said the attacks did not fit any regular pattern. Mr Ognall asked whether any pattern could be discerned from Mr Sutcliffe's crimes.

Dr Milne: "This has been one thing which has occupied my thoughts before he came to trial. The only pattern that I can see that eventually makes clinical sense is that towards the end there were an increasing number of attacks. Earlier on they seemed to be much more sporadic and then a cluster. It was only in the last few months one seemed to follow another, when he became much madder."

After referring to Mr Sutcliffe's statement where he mentioned a "grudge" against prostitutes, Mr Ognall asked if this was what started things off, and where did the diagnosis of paranoid schizophrenia lie. Dr Milne replied that Mr Sutcliffe's hatred for prostitutes was perfectly logically developed, which had extended into delusion. This had to be accounted for to himself by identifying it, as he did, with his experience in the cemetery. If the jury did not accept that, then it did not accept Mr Sutcliffe was mentally ill.

Mr Ognall: "In reaching this conclusion were you satisfied you had all the necessary information at your disposal?"

Dr Milne: "Yes"

Dr Milne was asked whether Mr Sutcliffe had related to him the incident in 1969 when he had been caught with a hammer by his car, and subsequently charged with going equipped for theft. Dr Milne replied that Mr Sutcliffe had not informed him of the incident.

Mr Ognall: "How can you possibly say that he has not withheld information from you and has satisfied you that he has told the whole truth?"

Dr Milne: "I agree that as he lied to the police, he could have also lied to me."

Dr Milne said that during the period between 1969, when he first claimed to hear voices, and 1975 when he first killed, Mr Sutcliffe's illness may have been in some remission. As well, he may also have been closely involved with his wife, which might have diverted his underlying desire.

Commenting on Mr Sutcliffe's lack of criminal activity during the year he was in London, Mr Ognall said: "This appears to be a very local God, speaking to him in Yorkshire but not in London." Dr Milne said that Mr Sutcliffe schizophrenia might have been in a period of remission.

Mr Ognall suggested that Mr Sutcliffe was a selective liar to suit his own purposes. He had deliberately told lies to both the police and to the doctors. He had said that his first attack was on Wilma McCann when, in fact, he had attacked four times before then. Mr Ognall said that the central weakness of Dr Milne's diagnosis was that it was based almost exclusively on what Mr Sutcliffe had told him. The doctor had now admitted that he could have told him lies. Dr Milne stressed once again that he didn't feel that Mr Sutcliffe had "wilfully misled" him.

Mr Ognall: "You take the view so far as this man is concerned that there is no underlying sexual component to his homicidal attacks?" Dr Milne agreed.

Mr Ognall then pointed out that in one statement, later altered, Mr Sutcliffe pulled up the clothing of one victim in order to satisfy some sort of sexual revenge. Mr Ognall: "When you say there is no underlying sexual component, what do you mean?"

Dr Milne: "In simple terms, although his victims were female and it might be thought he might be a sexual killer, I am not of the opinion that he is primarily a sexual killer."

Suggesting that it would be a minus against Dr Milne's diagnosis if Mr Sutcliffe had been disposed to mutilate his victims or show an unhealthy interest in their sexual parts, Mr Ognall asked: "If we can discern here a sexual element, that tends markedly to go against the divine mission theory, do you agree?" Dr Milne agreed.

Mr Ognall then referred to remarks in Dr Milne's report that suggested that injuries caused to Josephine Whitaker's vagina might have been accidental rather than deliberate. While holding up the seven-inch sharpened screwdriver, Mr Ognall said: "How on earth are we to reconcile the pathologist's evidence of three stab wounds deep into the vagina with what you said? There is no doubt that this wicked agent was introduced with almost no injury to the external parts of the vagina. I suggest that indicates the most fiendish cruelty, deliberately done for sexual satisfaction, do you agree?"

Dr Milne: "It may be a most vicious and foul thing to do, but not necessarily for sexual satisfaction. Mutilation of the genitalia for sadistic satisfaction would have to be repetitive, and there is no evidence, as far as I know, that this man has attacked any of the other victims in this way. There is no other evidence that he has in any way despoiled them or carried out any unnatural acts with them during the killings."

Mr Justice Boreham asked Dr Milne, if Mr Ognall was correct, would the observations made in his report still stand. Dr Milne replied that it did not seem as accurate as it should be, and that he would withdraw the observation that it was accidental.

Asked by Mr Ognall what else the screwdriver attack could be but sexual, Dr Milne said: "It may well have been sexual."

Mr Ognall: "What else could it have been? I will have an answer."

Dr Milne: "I do not think it could have been anything else other than sexual."

Mr Ognall said that the screwdriver attack on Josephine Whitaker was not the only example, although by far the most horrendous, of a sexual component. When asked whether Mr Sutcliffe had told him that the injury had been accidental, Dr Milne replied that he had not.

Mr Ognall: "Did Peter Sutcliffe tell you there was no sexual element in the attacks?"

Dr Milne: "Yes."

Mr Ognall: "Well, that doesn't seem to be right, does it?"

Dr Milne: "No."

Mr Ognall: "He deceived you. Why did he do that?"

Dr Milne: "Perhaps he might have been very reluctant to talk about this because of what people might think of him."

Mr Ognall: "He had admitted thirteen killings and seven attempted killings. But he thought he might be worse thought of, because he stabbed one of them in the vagina? Is that a considered reply?"

Dr Milne: "It is a considered reply. He has said he never ever wanted to be seen as a sexual killer."

Mr Ognall: "I expect he has never wanted to be seen as a sexual killer because, if he puts himself forward as a sexual killer the divine mission goes out of the window. That's why, isn't it?"

Dr Milne: "It could be."

Mr Ognall: "If you were to find a number of instances of sexual molestation, the more instances you find, the more it would erode the validity of the diagnosis?"

Dr Milne: "It would lead to erosion, yes."

Mr Ognall reminded the jury of how Mr Sutcliffe had exposed, and then stabbed Jacqueline Hill's breasts. He had told the police that he did it because: "It's just something that comes over me." Mr Ognall: "Unless I'm very naive, that betrays a specific, clear sexual element in his killing."

Dr Milne: "If you interpret it in that way, it does suggest that there may be a possible sexual component."

Dr Milne was again asked by Mr Ognall if he still thought there was no suggestion that Sutcliffe had specific sexual reasons for the killings. Dr Milne again repeated that he still did not think that Sutcliffe was a sexual sadist.

Mr Ognall then discussed the evidence of how Mr Sutcliffe had attacked Olive Smelt and then scratched her buttocks with a hacksaw blade. When asked what he made of that, Dr Milne replied: "I don't make very much of it, apart from the fact he thought she was a prostitute and I don't see any particular sexual significance, certainly not as a sexual sadist."

Mr Ognall then mentioned the Emily Jackson murder, where Mr Sutcliffe had pushed a two-foot to three-foot piece of wood against her vagina. In relation to her murder, Mr Sutcliffe had told police that he pulled her clothes up: "In order to satisfy some kind of sexual revenge as, on reflection, I had done with Wilma McCann."

Dr Milne: "If in fact you believe what he said, then it obviously could imply a sexual component."

Mr Ognall: "Helen Rytka – he had sexual intercourse with her."

Dr Milne said there was a sexual component to the murder, but it was not an abnormal act.

Mr Ognall reminded Dr Milne of Mr Sutcliffe's description of the murder of Helen Rytka, by hitting

her with a hammer, having sex with her, stabbing her, and taking her clothes off. When he had sex with her after hitting her with the hammer, he complained: "She just lay there limp and didn't put much into it." Mr Ognall: "Normal?"

Dr Milne: "Not normal, no."

Mr Ognall: "Could you think of anything more obscenely abnormal than his behaviour with that unfortunate girl?"

Dr Milne: "I entirely agree with you, but I still think that this was a use of sexual behaviour for entirely the wrong reason – to avoid detection, quieten her and get away."

Mr Ognall: "Why did he have to have intercourse with her to keep her quiet? I don't suppose he could have just put his hand over her mouth?"

Dr Milne: "As he himself said, this was what the girl expected."

Mr Justice Boreham: "At that stage did she really expect it, doctor?" Dr Milne conceded that he didn't know whether she did or not.

Mr Ognall: "Look Dr Milne, he is having intercourse with a woman who has been cruelly attacked and is near death. I ask you again – no underlying sexual component?"

Dr Milne: "A sexual component, yes."

Mr Ognall contended that the killing of Marguerite Walls also had a sexual component, in that Mr Sutcliffe had left fingernail scratches at the entrance to her vagina. Dr Milne was asked if he agreed that there was an underlying sexual component in that case. Dr Milne replied: "You may possibly be right."

Mr Ognall: "I put it to you that the injuries to these women betray quite clear sexual components in the attacks. Do you agree?"

Dr Milne: "Yes."

Mr Ognall: "This isn't a missionary of God, it is a man who gets a sexual pleasure out of killing these women."

Dr Milne: "I don't accept that."

Mr Ognall: "It is not God telling the tortured soul, 'You must kill.' It is a man who craves for it like an addict for the next shot of heroin. What he is saying is: 'I am hooked on it.'"

Dr Milne agreed when Mr Ognall suggested that the "mission to kill" was central to the diagnosis. Mr Ognall: "If there's a sexual component in the attacks, how is that to be reconciled with the divine mission simply to put their lives to an end? If the central point of the divine mission doesn't bear close analysis in the eyes of the jury, where then lies your diagnosis of paranoid schizophrenia?"

Dr. Milne: "Very simply, nowhere."

Mr Justice Boreham asked Dr Milne whether any of this could come to pass without the primary schizophrenic experience. Dr Milne said that it could not.

Mr Ognall: "Without the incident at the grave this man is a murderer?" Dr Milne agreed.

Mr Ognall: "If the jury were to decide that Sutcliffe knew full well that the last six women he attacked were not prostitutes, then the divine mission to kill prostitutes as a theory lies in smithereens?"

Dr Milne: "I agree. If he knew they weren't prostitutes, and killed them knowing they were not, then the diagnosis fails."

Mr Ognall: "He then becomes a murderer."

Dr Milne: "Yes."

Mr Ognall then mentioned the comments Mr Sutcliffe had made after the Vera Millward murder. Mr Ognall: "I would put this to you, as he said himself to the police: 'There was a compulsion inside me. Sometimes it would lie dormant but eventually it would come welling up, and each time they were more random and indiscriminate. I now realise I had the urge to kill any woman.' This is what the circumstances of those six killings show, isn't it?"

Dr Milne: "I do not agree."

Mr Sutcliffe had also said he had driven round aimlessly before he killed Josephine Whitaker: "The mood was in me and no woman was safe." Mr Sutcliffe had also said: "I realised she wasn't a prostitute but at that time I wasn't bothered. I just wanted to kill a woman." Mr Sutcliffe had completely changed his method of operation for the last six victims, instead of going to red-light areas and luring prostitutes into his car, he had driven to isolated spots, parked, and attacked innocent women. Dr Ognall asked Dr Milne why Mr Sutcliffe last victims were not prostitutes and had not been lured into his car in the same way as his earlier killings.

Dr Milne: "It was a change of behaviour, a sign of Sutcliffe's increasing madness."

Mr Ognall: "I suggest that the circumstances of these last six killings show this man, with compelling clarity, to be a liar and a fake." Dr Milne said he did not agree.

The trial was adjourned until tomorrow.

FRIDAY, MAY 15 1981: DR MILNE, DR MacCULLOCH

The day began with the resumed cross-examination of Dr Hugo Milne, a consultant psychiatrist, by Harry Ognall, QC, for the prosecution.

Mr Ognall said that Mr Sutcliffe's experience in the Bingley cemetery fifteen years previous, where he claimed to have heard a message, had never been disclosed to anyone until after his arrest when he spoke to psychiatrists. Mr Ognall asked whether it was possible that, due to the type of questions that Mr Sutcliffe was asked by the different psychiatrists, he had been prompted into talking about some sort of message. Therefore, it could have been "planted" in his mind by those who were questioning him.

Dr Milne stated that he always recognised that Mr Sutcliffe might be trying to convince the doctors that he was ill when perhaps he was not.

Mr Ognall: "He could have been deliberately trying to deceive you."

Dr Milne: "Yes."

Replying to another question by Mr Ognall, Dr Milne said: "Yes, he could have learned 'ideas of reference' and learned some of the symptoms from Sonia's mental illness but I do not believe that anyone could learn schizophrenic thinking."

Dr Milne also said that, from his 29 years of experience, he would have expected that someone who was trying to simulate schizophrenia would show some outwards symptoms, for example, jumbled speech, irrational behaviour, excessive moving or running about, or frequent dressing and undressing.

Dr Milne also noted that Sonia Sutcliffe during her illness had at times been violent, aggressive, restless, and would often dress and undress at inappropriate times. Despite the fact that Mr Sutcliffe had probably seen this type of behaviour in his wife during her illness, he himself had displayed none of these signs.

Mr Ognall said of Mr Sutcliffe: "That man is one who has set out deliberately to deceive the doctors as to his mental state, because rightly or wrongly he confidently believes that it may be to his enormous advantage to be convicted of manslaughter on the grounds of diminished responsibility."

Dr Milne agreed with Mr Ognall that many men who killed repeatedly were not necessarily suffering from a mental abnormality or from diminished responsibility. Dr Milne: "I am not saying because someone is a multiple killer that it would point to schizophrenia or any other abnormality."

Dr Milne did say that, having diagnosed Mr Sutcliffe as a paranoid schizophrenic, he did believe that Mr Sutcliffe fell into the category of diminished responsibility.

The next witness for the defence was Dr Malcolm MacCulloch, medical director of Park Lane special hospital in Liverpool, who was questioned by James Chadwin, QC, for the defence.

Mr Chadwin: "What in your opinion was his mental condition at the time of the killings in this case?"

Dr MacCulloch: "He was suffering from paranoid schizophrenia."

Dr MacCulloch told the court he had interviewed Mr Sutcliffe on three occasions in Armley jail. Dr

MacCulloch: "I concluded within half an hour of my first meeting with him that he was suffering from schizophrenia of the paranoid type."

Dr MacCulloch added that he had continued to check the diagnosis, and still had the same opinion. He also stated that nothing he had heard in court had caused him to change his mind.

Dr MacCulloch said that in some cases of the illness there were also external signs, such as certain kinds of movement or expression. In other cases no such external signs were evident, even during examinations lasting ten hours. Dr MacCulloch: "As far as I am concerned there were no external signs on Peter Sutcliffe when I saw him on three occasions in Armley prison."

Dr MacCulloch said that he had been observing Mr Sutcliffe during the trial, and had noticed that he had displayed certain signs which were immediately consistent with his schizophrenia. He said that one such sign was Mr Sutcliffe's persistent and repeated looking up, on approximately thirty-eight occasions, to the same spot, a light cluster about ten feet above Mr Justice Boreham's head.

Dr MacCulloch also said that he had noted Mr Sutcliffe's abnormal lack of emotion, especially during heated exchanges about the weapons he had used and the wounds that he had inflicted on his victims. Dr MacCulloch: "I think he has appeared unduly passive in his expression. I don't put that forward as a diagnostic sign, but it is consistent with someone suffering paranoid schizophrenia."

When he first met Mr Sutcliffe, Dr MacCulloch had expected to find a man suffering from an abnormality of personality, as well as some sort of sexual deviation. While the possibility of schizophrenia was also in his mind, it was on a much lower level of probability.

In reply to a question from Mr Chadwin, Dr MacCulloch said that there were eight 'first rank signs' which aided the diagnosis of paranoid schizophrenia. If a patient had just one of these signs, it would be fair to say that they would be diagnosed as a paranoid schizophrenic. Dr MacCulloch said that Mr Sutcliffe had four of these first rank signs.

Dr MacCulloch said that Mr Sutcliffe had bodily hallucinations, which involved either a sensation of being touched, or an electrical sensation, or feelings, deep in the chest or abdomen. Mr Sutcliffe had mentioned a feeling of a hand gripping his heart.

The second sign displayed by Mr Sutcliffe was influence of thought, where Mr Sutcliffe had believed that his thoughts were influenced, or tampered with, by an outside force. As well, he thought he could read the thoughts of others. This was best exemplified in the case of Josephine Whitaker.

Mr Sutcliffe had also displayed delusional perception. Dr MacCulloch: "If a person was having a schizophrenic experience and he saw a piece of screwed-up paper, he would see it and know it was a piece of screwed-up paper, but the delusion was the instant and certain knowledge that he himself was 'all screwed up.' The point is that there is an instant knowledge which is unshakable, which cannot be deduced logically from the perception. He would think it had a meaning special to him and would not be shaken from that conviction."

An example in Mr Sutcliffe's case was where he had read in a newspaper that a priest had described Manchester as a wicked place. Mr Sutcliffe had interpreted this statement as a message from God that he should go to Manchester and kill a prostitute. Mr Sutcliffe had said: "Prostitutes should be

exterminated. They corrupt men. It affects their lives. The mission is from God. I have read something in the Bible which confirms these women should be shown up."

The fourth sign displayed by Mr Sutcliffe was his passivity, where he had a feeling of being driven or controlled and was able to do things under the influence of this outside force.

Dr MacCulloch also said that unless the diagnosis could be excluded for some other reason, any person who heard a hallucinatory voice that lasted for as long as a sentence, should be assumed to be suffering from schizophrenia.

During the first 50-minute interview in Armley jail, Mr Sutcliffe claimed that he could read the thoughts of his victims, telling Dr MacCulloch that he knew, and he was quite sure about it, what his victims were thinking during the conversations before he attacked them. Mr Sutcliffe had given an example of what he meant by referring to Josephine Whitaker. Mr Sutcliffe had told Dr MacCulloch: "She was clever. She thought she could fool me. She said she was coming from her grandmother's, but I knew she was a prostitute and that she was lying."

When asked by Mr Chadwin whether Mr Sutcliffe had told him what Miss Whitaker's thoughts were, Dr MacCulloch replied: "No, he said her thoughts were not what she was telling him."

Mr Justice Boreham: "What he said was that she was lying, in other words he knew she was a liar?"

Dr MacCulloch: "He knew she was lying because he knew the thoughts were not the same as what she was telling him, and that is a description of delusional deception." It was this symptom which led him to his diagnosis.

Dr MacCulloch said that Mr Sutcliffe had told him that when he saw in the newspapers that Miss Whitaker was an "innocent" victim, he couldn't come to terms with the fact that the voice from the Bingley cemetery could have been wrong about her. At that time Mr Sutcliffe concluded that the voice could have been the Devil's, but was: "not sure whether it was God or the Devil."

Realising the fact that there was a danger that Mr Sutcliffe might be simulating the symptoms of paranoid schizophrenia, Dr MacCulloch said: "If somebody is seeking to deceive, in my view, they would not be able to stand up to questioning on such fine details as delusional perception, which go right through this man's history."

Dr MacCulloch also stated that he regarded Mr Sutcliffe as "an extremely dangerous" man.

Mr Chadwin asked about possible medical treatment. Dr MacCulloch: "It is difficult to prognose in medicine, but I think it likely that some amelioration will take place under drug treatment."

Mr Chadwin: "Enough to make him other than dangerous?"

Dr MacCulloch: "No."

Dr MacCulloch also told the court: "I have considered the alternative diagnosis of personality disorder involving sexual abnormality and sadism, but there appears to me to be no evidence of it."

Dr MacCulloch also said there was nothing in Sutcliffe's history to suggest a personality disorder such as was often linked to a sadistic killer.

Dr MacCulloch was cross-examined by Harry Ognall, QC, for the prosecution, who asked what, in the doctor's vocabulary, a man had to do to be a sexual deviant.

Dr MacCulloch replied that a man would have to derive pleasure or sexual arousal from his behaviour or fantasies. He stated that he had found no such evidence of that in Mr Sutcliffe.

While holding up the sharpened Phillips screwdriver that Mr Sutcliffe had used on Josephine Whitaker, Mr Ognall said that Mr Sutcliffe had thrust the screwdriver three times: "deep within the luckless girl's body. Do you say in this man there is no element of sexual deviation?"

If Mr Ognall was inquiring whether there were sexual elements in the case, Dr MacCulloch said that the answer was: "Yes." However, the way in which he used the term sexual deviation was a different one.

Mr Ognall: "When did you first learn of the Crown's case?"

Dr MacCulloch: "On April 28th."

Mr Ognall: "Are we to understand that the first time you considered the Crown's case against Peter William Sutcliffe was the day before he was due to appear here to stand this trial?"

Dr MacCulloch: "Yes."

Mr Ognall: "You say that with remarkable calm and apparent indifference. How were you going to, if called upon, justify your diagnosis on oath, without knowing the nature of the Crown's case? How on earth do you diagnose a man's psychiatric condition without knowing the nature and quality of that which he is alleged by outside evidence to have done?"

Dr MacCulloch: "By examining the mental state and taking history."

Mr Justice Boreham: "Are there not truly occasions when that homely old phrase applies, that a man's actions speak louder than his words?"

Dr MacCulloch: "I am sure there are occasions."

Mr Justice Boreham: "I think that is what Mr Ognall is getting at."

Dr MacCulloch also confirmed that he had not made any other inquiries. Dr MacCulloch: "Yes, Mr Ognall, I would agree that in reaching my diagnosis I made no enquiries of Sutcliffe's family, friends, workmates or general practitioner."

Mr Ognall inquired why Dr MacCulloch had not looked at the police interviews before he came to his conclusions. Dr MacCulloch said that a police interrogation was not the same as a psychiatrist's interrogation.

Mr Justice Boreham: "There comes a moment of time when he is asked if he wants to make a statement. As you know, that is a voluntary act – no more questions, no nonsense. The duty is to write down exactly what he wants written down so his case can be put. Perhaps the jury don't know that and there is no suggestion here that he was not allowed to write down exactly what he wanted to say. Do you think it is wise to look at that voluntary document before you made up your mind?"

Dr MacCulloch: "Yes, I think it would be wise."

Mr Justice Boreham: "And in this case you did not do that?"

Dr MacCulloch: "No, my lord."

The hearing was adjourned until Monday.

(NOTE: Trial source material: Bilton, Burn, Cross, Jones, Yallop, Daily Telegraph, London (Canada) Free Press, The Times, The Guardian.)

THE TRIAL

WEEK THREE

MONDAY, MAY 18 1981: DR MacCULLOCH, DR KAY

Case: Regina v Peter William Sutcliffe

Place: Number One Court, Central Criminal Court, "Old Bailey", London

Judge: Mr Justice Boreham

Prosecution: Sir Michael Havers, QC, the Attorney General

Prosecution: Harry Ognall, QC

Defence: James Chadwin, QC

Defence: Sidney Levine

The day began with Dr Malcolm MacCulloch, a consultant psychiatrist and medical director at the Park Lane special hospital in Liverpool, back on the stand being cross-examined by Harry Ognall, QC, for the prosecution.

When asked by Mr Ognall if Mr Sutcliffe had in any way misled or deceived him, Dr MacCulloch replied: "I am sure he deceived me here and there on one point or another. I think it most likely. However, I had been asked specifically to consider deception by another psychiatrist. I will admit that I could not determine whether Sutcliffe was a liar."

Mr Ognall: "Your diagnosis stands or falls by what this man has told you. That is the beginning and end of it."

Dr MacCulloch: "I don't think it's the beginning and the end, but it is substantial."

Mr Justice Boreham: "If what he has told you is not true, then what of your diagnosis?"

Dr MacCulloch: "It falls."

Mr Justice Boreham asked if he would still have diagnosed Mr Sutcliffe as a schizophrenic if Mr Sutcliffe knew at the time he killed his last victims they were not prostitutes. Dr MacCulloch said he would, but in those cases it would then be murder.

The final witness called by the defence was Dr Terence Kay, a consultant forensic psychiatrist, whose day-to-day work involves examining prisoners at Leeds and Wakefield prisons. Dr Kay had originally been engaged by the Crown to examine Mr Sutcliffe.

Dr Kay said that he felt sure that Mr Sutcliffe was suffering from paranoid schizophrenia. Dr Kay: "I felt safe in the diagnosis, but was uneasy because of other factors. I work in the prisons more than any of my colleagues and have a very good relationship with the prison officers. They told me quite frankly that we were being fooled."

Asked by Mr Chadwin whether that worried him, Dr Kay replied: "No, I wasn't troubled with the diagnosis, but as the officers quite rightly said they spent far more time with Sutcliffe than I did. They were with him 24 hours a day and he had made that remark about going to a loony bin." However, the conversation had not given him any cause for concern about his diagnosis.

Dr Kay had interviewed Mr Sutcliffe on eight occasions, four of them before he had submitted a interim report on April 9th, and had compiled a final report eight days later. The first interview took place on March 4th, where he took the standard psychiatric history of Mr Sutcliffe, including his early development and work history. Dr Kay: "I wanted his life story, really."

Dr Kay said that he only found one thing relevant to his subsequent diagnosis in what Mr Sutcliffe had said to him during the interview. During the last sentence of the interview, Dr Kay said: "He mentioned that all prostitutes were scum but I didn't take the interview any further at that stage."

Dr Kay was told by Mr Sutcliffe that he had gotten involved with prostitutes after an argument with his wife. He also mentioned the period when he was living in London, saying that he had not attacked prostitutes then. He had also not attacked prostitutes when he was working at night.

Dr Kay: "I asked him how he managed for sex while his wife was away in London, and he said he went regularly to see her at college and sex took place then."

Mr Sutcliffe also described when he was working at Bingley cemetery he had heard a voice, which seemed to be the voice of God. He had heard the voice over the next few years and he took notice as it had a message. Mr Sutcliffe said that the voice had said: "The Lord giveth life and takes away life." Mr Sutcliffe had also said: "When I was on a mission (to kill prostitutes) as time went on, I felt privileged. There were far better Christians than me, but it made me special. Once I went to Leeds, angry, but the voice said: 'Stop. Not there. Wait 10 minutes.' When I was visited by the police I knew God would protect me. It was my duty. I knew God would put them off. I was living in a protected way."

Dr Kay said that when he had asked about the letters and tape sent to the police, Mr Sutcliffe had replied: "Not me. God putting police off."

When Dr Kay asked about his attacks on women, Mr Sutcliffe had said: "Usually very depressed. Did not hear voice unless depressed. Day or two of depression. Once felt suicidal. Voice persuaded me not to. Sat an hour in the car. Voice said I had a purpose. Not right. Purpose unfulfilled. Afraid of voice. I had a purpose to drive them all off the streets."

Mr Sutcliffe had told Dr Kay that he carried on with "God's mission" even though he found it "distasteful." Dr Kay said that Mr Sutcliffe had told him: "I can't stand the sight of blood anyway. I wondered if it was the Devil."

When asked by Dr Kay if he was angry, Mr Sutcliffe replied: "Angry because of conflict. I killed them with a screwdriver and knife. I have given them to the police."

Dr Kay then asked where he had stabbed them, and Mr Sutcliffe said that he "gave it to them" in the back, and once or twice in the heart or throat. Dr Kay had asked: "What about suffering?" and Mr Sutcliffe had replied: "Never thought. Singularity of purpose." When Dr Kay had asked if Mr

Sutcliffe had stabbed below the belt, he did not answer him.

Mr Sutcliffe's manner sometimes did not match the seriousness of what he was discussing. Dr Kay: "At times he smiled, almost giggled, when we were discussing very serious things. Sometimes he treated it almost as a joke and laughed."

Dr Kay said that Mr Sutcliffe told him that at the time of the attack on Yvonne Pearson he had not been depressed, nor was he hearing voices.

Dr Kay said that when he asked what had brought on his depression, Mr Sutcliffe had told him: "Quarrels with wife, worries, problem losing licence. Two or three occasions packed my cases. Wife has had nervous breakdown. Hell to pay if I entered the house with boots on."

When Dr Kay had asked how he had covered up any blood on his clothes, Mr Sutcliffe had told him: "Just a few specks. Didn't do anything to conceal them. Sponged down trousers. Never had to get rid of clothes or sent clothes to the cleaners. She wouldn't let me use washer. She washed own clothes. I washed mine."

Dr Kay had then asked whether Mr Sutcliffe's wife was worried about excessive cleanliness regarding sex. Dr Kay: "It would tell me a lot about his wife if she insisted on him taking a bath before sex." However, Mr Sutcliffe said that she didn't, but she did use towels on the bed when she had just put clean sheets on the bed.

Dealing with the proposition that Mr Sutcliffe could have been simulating schizophrenia, Dr Kay said that he was aware of the dangers that Mr Sutcliffe might have read a book on psychiatry. Mr Chadwin asked what Dr Kay might have expected Mr Sutcliffe to do if he was simulating schizophrenia, if copycatting the symptoms of Sonia Sutcliffe's illness, as the prosecution had suggested. Dr Kay replied: "She had shown terror, aggression, dismay, a fatuous smile, things that could be seen on her face."

Dr Kay said that Mrs Sutcliffe thought she was the second Christ, which could have been useful to Mr Sutcliffe in simulating schizophrenia. Dr Kay also added that: "Sonia Sutcliffe also complained about having the stigmata of the cross on her hands and she complained of wanting to be a teddy bear."

Mr Chadwin asked if Mr Sutcliffe was not schizophrenic, what was he? Dr Kay: "If he is not schizophrenic, only a psychopath would kill this many people and the origins of that must be sexual."

Dr Kay said he had inquired about Mr Sutcliffe's: "lifestyle and daydreams." For a number of reasons, he did not believe that he fit into the category of a sadist-killer. Firstly, a sadist-killer can very rarely relate to adult women and therefore is very rarely married. Secondly, the sadist-killer has a rich sexual fantasy life, dreams about sex, and is usually very anxious, when given the opportunity, to discuss his fantasies. Thirdly, such people usually stimulate their fantasies with pornography. As well, they would be interested in torture, whips, and female underwear. Dr Kay stated he was unaware of any such evidence of that nature in Sutcliffe's case.

When asked by Mr Chadwin whether there was anything that struck him about the killings in that

context, Dr Kay replied: "I would have expected the sexual aspect to be present in all except the first one or two cases, and I would have expected it to spread so that in the last killing there would have been greater mutilation than in the earlier ones."

Dr Kay also said that the use of the hammer did not suggest a sadist–killer, due to its speed. With a sadist–killer, the usual emphasis was on the slowness of death and the agony of the victim. The sadist–killer needed to see the suffering of his victim, and needed to control the terror. Dr Kay said the speed of the hammer blows from behind seemed to contradict the sexual pleasure the sadist–killer would get from the need to see the face of the victim.

Referring to the injuries suffered by Josephine Whitaker, Mr Chadwin asked: "I suppose it is obvious to all of us why a sadistic killer would inflict that injury – why would a schizophrenic inflict it?" Dr Kay explained that as a schizophrenic went on, his sensitivity would be eroded.

Sir Michael Havers, QC, the Attorney General, then began his cross–examination of Dr Terence Kay. Sir Michael: "Do you know of a reported experiment in the United States where eight perfectly normal people simulated schizophrenia?"

Dr Kay: "Yes, I do."

Sir Michael: "I understand they stated they could hear voices and that they also described other symptoms. Apparently they were all diagnosed by psychiatrists as schizophrenic and admitted to various hospitals?"

Dr Kay: "That is correct."

Sir Michael: "I understand they fooled doctors at seventeen mental institutions, but the patients considered them fakes declaring, 'You are not crazy—you're just journalists checking up on hospitals'?"

Dr Kay: "That is correct."

Mr Justice Boreham made the observation that Sir Michael must not blame Dr Kay for what happened in America (which caused laughter in the court).

Sir Michael: "Would you accept that if Sutcliffe was a cold–blooded killer who had an enormous desire to kill prostitutes or just to kill women, he could be bad rather than mad?"

Dr Kay: "Yes, I would accept that."

Sir Michael then proceeded to review the evidence that he contended pointed to Mr Sutcliffe as being a sadist–murderer. When asked what his reactions were to the injuries inflicted on sixteen–year–old Jayne MacDonald, Dr Kay said: 'Like everyone else – horror. I tried to detach myself to make a clinical decision. I tried to balance for and against, very savage and brutal, I searched for a motive.'

When asked about the Helen Rytka case, Dr Kay conceded that Mr Sutcliffe's sexual involvement with Helen Rytka as she was dying was "a very unusual act." Dr Kay said that from a

sadist–murderer he would expect that sort of behaviour in every case, not just in one.

Turning to the case of Josephine Whitaker, who had been stabbed in the vagina with a screwdriver, Sir Michael asked: "Wasn't it much more like the work of a sadist–killer than somebody on a mission?"

Dr Kay said that while multiple stabbings were a common method of killing, deliberate stabbing through the same hole was very rare. Dr Kay: "I have to balance whether this was done for sexual excitement or pleasure, or whether it is the act of a man whose feelings for human beings are blunted by schizophrenia."

Dr Kay said that Mr Sutcliffe believed that Josephine Whitaker was: "in league with the Devil." He also said that it was the Devil who made her cunning, prompting her to say she had been to visit her grandmother. Dr Kay said in would be more evidence of Sutcliffe's schizophrenic thinking, that he would consider it made her look cunning in her attempt to appear innocent.

Dr Kay was handed the screwdriver which Mr Sutcliffe had used on Josephine Whitaker. Sir Michael: "There must be a sexual component there. That was introduced inside the vagina three times through the same entry hole."

Dr Kay agreed and stated that when asked about the injury, Mr Sutcliffe had replied that he had: "waggled it about two or three times." Dr Kay also said that it didn't affect his diagnosis significantly.

Sir Michael: "Why would any man want to do that to a girl?"

While acknowledging that a sexual motive was the most likely explanation, Dr Kay insisted that he could not know what went through a schizophrenic's mind all the time. Dr Kay: "I do not know what particular thoughts they have in regard to sex or anything else under every condition."

The trial was adjourned until tomorrow.

TUESDAY, MAY 19 1981: CLOSING SPEECHES

After consultant forensic psychiatrist Dr Kay finishing giving his evidence, where he re–iterated that he believed that Mr Sutcliffe was suffering from paranoid schizophrenia, the defence finished its case. The closing speeches began with Sir Michael Havers, QC, the Attorney General, for the prosecution.

Sir Michael said that the jury would have to bring a common sense view "to the sickening and nauseous" events of the case. Sir Michael: "You must not flinch or feel afraid. It may be the most notorious or infamous multiple murder case of the decade but it is no different from any other ordinary case. The gruesome details should not cause you more anxiety than if it was a man charged with one murder."

After Sir Michael took the jury through the evidence that had been adduced, he also reminded the

jury that Mr Sutcliffe had been "quick to inflict pain." As well, he had been willing to prolong death.

Sir Michael: "He was willing to take unexpected opportunity and willing, in the end, to kill any woman. Is that an unfair catalogue of this man's vices?" Continuing, he said that if all these facts were true, then Mr Sutcliffe was: "a sadistic, calculated, cold-blooded murderer who loved his job. The crimes are horrible and sadistic, beyond our ordinary comprehension. Does it mean he is mad, or just plain evil?"

Sir Michael said that if it was possible to put the reports of the three doctors who had given evidence to music, then it could be compared to a "symphony". The opening had been very quiet with little of great interest happening, a pianissimo passage where things needed to be stirred up, and then finally the "primary schizophrenic experience" when Mr Sutcliffe believed he had heard God's voice in Bingley cemetery.

Sir Michael said that the jury would have to test the medical evidence against the known facts of the case, which were not in dispute. As well, that evidence would also have to be tested against the evidence Mr Sutcliffe had himself supplied during his testimony. Sir Michael: "You are going to have to ask yourself how much you believe of what he said. It is the doctors' belief in what he said about Bingley, the voice of God and the mission which leads them to their diagnosis. If you do not believe that he is telling the truth, then the doctors' diagnosis collapses. If you are not satisfied that he did hear voices of God or he did have a mission, that is an end to it."

Sir Michael said that only thing they may agree on was when Mr Sutcliffe had said: "I am not stupid." Sir Michael pointed out the Mr Sutcliffe was, in fact, of high average intelligence and had a good command of the English language.

Sir Michael asked the jury if they really believed that there had been any sort of message. There were several other alternatives. Sir Michael: "The first is that it is just a pack of lies. He never heard any voices in Bingley graveyard and never had any voice telling him to kill. He is a cold-blooded, calculated murderer who has made this up because he knew he was going to go to a loony bin for 10 years instead of 30 years in prison.

Sir Michael: "The second is that he was having a rough time with his marriage. His wife, because of her own illness, poor soul, was really behaving impossibly. He had to take his shoes off when he got home, wasn't allowed to use the washing machine and had to do his own washing. She was obsessed with cleanliness, cleaning the carpet with a brush and pan, pulling the television plug out and shouted at him. Do you think this was some part of what follows?"

Dr Milne had believed everything that Mr Sutcliffe had told to him. Sir Micheal: "This was incredible. But when he was taken through the facts he had to admit that Mr Sutcliffe had lied and he could have been deceived."

Mr Sutcliffe had been described by Dr Milne as a man who enormously enjoyed killing prostitutes. Sir Michael: "How was that to fall in line with God's mission to rid the world of prostitutes? He didn't want to mutilate them, simply wipe them off the face of the earth. Would it be unfair to describe this man as a calculated and skilful man who is quick to protect himself? He was rather quick to inflict pain, especially on the last girl who was stabbed in the eye with a screwdriver."

Accusing the doctors of prompting Mr Sutcliffe, Sir Michael said: "All the doctors do it, but some prompt a little harder than others. And after the prompting, out comes the Bingley cemetery experience. Mr Sutcliffe's graveyard experience must have been something which he was treasuring. This was a very moving experience and he wasn't going to tell anyone. Another explanation is that he simply hadn't thought of it before."

Sir Michael pointed out that Mr Sutcliffe had not thought of it when he had his interviews with the police, or during meetings with Dr Milne, but then Mr Sutcliffe had remembered he had heard God's voice while he was digging a grave.

Sir Michael: "The doctors are then all agreed that he is a paranoid schizophrenic because God has spoken to him in Bingley graveyard. It must have been the most joyous occasion in his life, yet he never told his devoted mother or fiancée. Is it not conceivable that he would not tell them, or at least one of them? That is a very good test. If he had said to someone else at the time that it had happened, then there would be no question of him making it up."

Sir Michael also said that whenever anyone tried to find some sort of evidence to confirm Mr Sutcliffe's story: "you get nowhere at all."

Mr James Chadwin, QC, for the defence, in his closing speech, said that he had an "unusual task" in this case as it was for the defence counsel to prove the defence case. The prosecution did not have to prove anything. Normally, it was the role of the defence to attack the prosecution case and convince the jury that there was a reasonable doubt in the case. Mr Chadwin: "For any counsel this is a heavy responsibility, but I ask for no sympathy because your responsibility is heavier than mine."

Mr Chadwin: "Because Peter Sutcliffe has admitted these killings, and has said they were done with the intention of killing, it follows that they are murders unless I can persuade you that because of the evidence it is probable that Peter William Sutcliffe, at the time of these killings, had a sick mind, a diseased mind which had the effect that it substantially impaired his responsibility for what he did. If you are persuaded by the evidence that it is more probable than not, that, at the time of the killings, Peter Sutcliffe was suffering from a disease of mind that substantially impaired his responsibility, then that is enough. Then the defence succeeds and the verdict should be one of guilty of manslaughter and not guilty of murder."

Mr Chadwin told the jury that if he did not comment on all the evidence, it was not because he was trying to distract them: "from the enormity of this man's acts. At best I would be a poor or a very great fool if I thought I could ever get you to lose sight of the enormity of what he has done. But if this man is to face justice, not vengeance, do not be overawed by the enormity of these acts."

Mr Chadwin stated it would not be right to try to persuade them Mr Sutcliffe had a diseased mind: "at large. I am trying to persuade you what he did suffer from at the time of each killing is a known disease of mind called paranoid schizophrenia."

Mr Chadwin said that the "fundamental question" was the key symptom to the illness, Mr Sutcliffe's graveyard experience at Bingley: "If there was no such experience, I would have the greatest difficulty to try to persuade you he was suffering from that disease of the mind. I suggest it is a man with a diseased mind, who is under that influence of what he is convinced is God, and he has a mission to kill."

The hearing was adjourned until tomorrow, when Mr Chadwin was expected to finish his closing speech, and the judge would begin his summing up.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20 1981: CLOSING SPEECHES, THE JUDGE'S SUMMARY

Mr James Chadwin, QC, defending Peter Sutcliffe, continued with his closing speech, stating that Mr Sutcliffe's mental illness was such that he believed he was beyond capture. Mr Chadwin: "He believed he had to carry out instructions which he thought he was getting from God to carry out the killings."

Mr Chadwin: "Either, as the doctors have expressed their belief, this series of events arises because of the schizophrenic illness, or he must be a man, who, for some reason, enjoys killing." Mr Chadwin said he disagreed with the prosecution's view that Mr Sutcliffe wanted to kill and enjoyed killing. Mr Chadwin: "He loathed prostitutes because he had been told they were responsible for all the troubles in the world, and they were the scum of the earth. That was a total delusion, just as it is a delusion to think that you can rid the world of prostitutes through one single agent."

It was up to the jury to decide whether Mr Sutcliffe had: "deliberately manufactured material in a clear and calculated way to deceive three experienced forensic psychiatrists."

Because his statement to police had left out references to attacks on Anna Rogulskyj and Olive Smelt and the killing of Marguerite Walls, it had been suggested that this was "self-serving." Mr Chadwin: "Does anyone seriously suggest that the man who had just admitted he was the Yorkshire Ripper was serving some purpose that benefitted him by restricting his admissions to 12 killings? I hope I do not sound in any way frivolous, but can you see in what way a man is worse off if he admits 13 killings rather than 12, or if he adds four more attempts to the two attempts he is admitting? I suggest you have to look elsewhere for the reasons why that statement was incomplete."

Mr Chadwin said that it was superficial and facile to say that Mr Sutcliffe was lying for his own ends. Mr Chadwin: "But there is a sensible explanation," which fitted the defence, and not the prosecution. Mr Sutcliffe was concealing his mission which was why he didn't make a full disclosure and go back to 1969.

Mr Sutcliffe had not even gone back to 1975. The further back Mr Sutcliffe went, the nearer he would be to the strange history of compulsion and inevitability. The evidence from the doctors was that a paranoid schizophrenic with a primary experience such as Mr Sutcliffe's would be overprotective about it. The evidence given by the psychiatrists was that there was nothing unusual in the reluctance of a person suffering from paranoid schizophrenia to disclose the original source of the primary schizophrenic experience.

Mr Chadwin said that the attacks left out of Mr Sutcliffe's voluntary confession were because he had wanted to get the police interview over with. Mr Chadwin: "Is it surprising? It lasted 15 hours or more."

Referring to the comments Mr Sutcliffe had made to his wife that he would be in prison for 30 years unless he could convince people that he was mad and could do 10 years in a "loony bin," Mr

Chadwin asked the jury to remember the context in which they were said. Mr Sutcliffe had given his wife the chance to leave him and make a new life for herself, but she wouldn't have it. Mr Chadwin: "It is the most natural thing in the world that she would want to know, if she was standing by him, how long he would be away."

Mr Chadwin said that when Mr Sutcliffe told Sonia he may only do ten years, he was trying to console her: "Let's not make a mystery of it. There are only a limited number of defences available to charges of murder. He was hardly in a position to say he hadn't committed these murders. He could hardly say they were in self-defence. The only possible defence is if there is really something wrong with his mind."

Challenging the theory that the prosecution had put forward that Mr Sutcliffe had attacked women due to a grudge he had after being belittled by a prostitute in 1969, Mr Chadwin asked what had happened to this seething hatred of prostitutes by Mr Sutcliffe between the years 1969 and 1975? Mr Chadwin: "If this man had been activated merely by resentment, then by 1970, 1971 or 1972 the matter would have been over."

A healthy mind, as opposed to one which was diseased, would have been most unlikely to start killing and attacking prostitutes in 1975 due to an incident that had taken place six years prior. Mr Chadwin: "But a man who had become convinced through sickness of mind that it was God's will that he should attack prostitutes might well have taken time to become so convinced to start his attacks."

Mr Chadwin then dealt with the prosecution's contentions of a sexual component or motive to the attacks. Referring to the scratch on the small of Olive Smelt's back, Mr Chadwin said: "Isn't that really stretching things too far? It is for you to say. Are you impressed either by the suggestion made at one stage that a series of wounds near the tummy button are some indication of sexual gratification? Surely not."

Citing another example of Mr Sutcliffe's alleged sexual motive, the Emily Jackson case, Mr Chadwin said: "This man was obsessed by prostitutes, paranoid about prostitutes, and would see special significance about a part of a prostitute's body. But is there anything to suggest he enjoyed anything sexually?' Mr Chadwin suggested there was not.

While Mr Sutcliffe had left Marguerite Walls's body in a humiliating position, this fitted in with Mr Sutcliffe's consistent explanation in cases when clothing had been disarranged or when he placed a victim in a humiliating position. Mr Chadwin said Mr Sutcliffe had said it was: "to show them for what they are. To show them as a disgrace." Mr Chadwin added: "He loathed their bodies and he attacked in many cases with excessive violence, one woman having something like fifty-two stab wounds."

The sexual intercourse with Helen Rytka could not be brushed aside, and the prosecution was entitled to claim a sexual element there, Mr Chadwin stated. As well, they were also entitled to suggest the same in Josephine Whitaker's murder. However, it was for the jury to say whether they attached any sexual significance to the way in which the weapon had been inserted more than once. Mr Chadwin said that they might feel that this was more in line with Sutcliffe's loathing of prostitutes.

Mr Chadwin also pointed out that the prosecution had drawn attention to only six cases with some hint of sexual gratification. They had ignored the fourteen other cases where the injuries did not point to any sexual enjoyment.

Mr Chadwin also said: "But bear in mind that, whether stabbing or strangling, the pattern was always blows to the back of the head. Is it even probable that this is a pattern of someone who enjoys to see the suffering of his victim, or enjoys killing? Or is consistent with the feeling that he was destroying what he, in his own way, regarded as the scum of the earth who were responsible for all the ills of the world?"

Beginning his summing up, Mr Justice Boreham said that the time had come for a: "quiet, calm and objective look at the evidence. It would be humbug to pretend I have not got my own views. I have been sitting here as long as you, and of course I have my own views." He said that if the jury did not agree with his views, they should reject them.

The doctors, whose evidence is that Peter Sutcliffe is mentally ill, and which the prosecution disputes, are not themselves on trial. Mr Justice Boreham: "If you take a hard, calm, quiet look at the evidence and abide by the facts you decide are true, you will come to a just verdict. Nobody is ever found guilty except on the verdict of his fellow men and women. It is no disgrace to a judge if a jury takes a different view of the facts from his own, or any disgrace to a doctor if you were to put a differing view on the evidence to which they hold. The doctors are not on trial. No one doubts their integrity or their professional competence."

Mr Justice Boreham said that, probably justifiably, the jury would feel that the defendant was the most important witness in this case. The only one who could tell them what was in his mind was the defendant himself.

Mr Justice Boreham: "I mention this at this early stage because you have heard with regard to some of those early witnesses, Mr Birdsall and the Barkers, how they were paid money for their stories or for the pictures, and how the others have been similarly offered money. Don't let that rub off on him (Sutcliffe) whatever you do. No-one is suggesting that he is a party to anything like that."

The judge stated that the evidence fell into two categories. The first was the purely medical evidence, the doctors giving their expertise. The second was the evidence of fact. Mr Justice Boreham: "It is for you to decide where the truth lies so far as what this defendant had or genuinely thought he had in his mind."

Mr Justice Boreham said that the law normally did not trouble with issues such as motives, reasons and motivations, which the jury had to deal with: "But in this case they are central to the issue."

Normally the law requires proof of intention in such cases. Mr Justice Boreham: "That is very easy if you see a man battering a woman over the head with a hammer. You know what his intention was, whatever he says about it. That is why I say that actions speak louder than words very often. His intention is to kill or do some really serious harm. But you couldn't have the vaguest idea what his motive for doing it was. Maybe he just disliked her, maybe she was an outworn girlfriend. You could go on multiplying, but you could never divide them unless he would tell you truthfully. That is really the central matter here. Has he told you the truth as to what moved him to kill and kill again? That, in the end, is going to be the fundamental question." If the defendant was prepared to

truthfully divulge the facts, these could be tested for the truth against other matters.

Mr Justice Boreham: "In effect and in fact this defendant has admitted murdering 13 women subject to this one special defence so that there is no mystery about it. If a man attacks another person without lawful excuse and with intent at the time of the attack either to kill or do really serious injury and as a result the victim dies then that is murder. Through his counsel, this defendant has admitted that he did kill 13 women, and he has admitted that when he killed he intended to do so. He has admitted, subject to the special defence, murder in 13 cases."

The defence followed the passing of an act in 1957. That act provided for a partial defence to a charge of murder. Mr Justice Boreham said that the section of the act that applied to Mr Sutcliffe was: "Where a person kills another he shall not be convicted of murder if he was suffering from such abnormality of mind, whether arising from inherent causes or induced by disease, as substantially impaired his mental responsibility for his acts in doing the killing."

Mr Justice Boreham said that if the jury was satisfied with the defence, then Mr Sutcliffe should be found guilty of manslaughter, rather than of murder.

Mr Justice Boreham said there were three essential ingredients of the defence and three questions the jury would have to ask. The first was: "At the time of each of these killings was this defendant suffering from abnormality of the mind? There is nothing troublesome about those words. By abnormality of mind it is meant was his state of mind so different from that of an ordinary being for you to describe it as abnormal."

The jury was to note the phrase: "at the time of killing". The ability to form rational judgment and to exercise willpower in accordance with rational judgment was dictated by a man's mind. Mr Justice Boreham: "It is that factor which has special significance. It is said his mind was directed or influenced by a divine outside force. It is said his mind was abnormal. By being directed by that force, was his mind not normal as an ordinary human being? If he had hallucinations and delusions, did it merely make it more difficult to exercise his will and was the degree such that it amounted to abnormality?" That was the second question the jury should consider.

Commenting about the doctors' evidence, Mr Justice Boreham said it was important: "but it is not conclusive by any means. You look at all the evidence, including what the doctors say and what the defendant says now and in his prior statements, and ask yourself do we think it more probable than not that he was suffering from abnormality? If the answer to that question is no, then that is the end of it, it is murder. If it is yes, then there is another question, does the abnormality result from mental illness? You and I are not capable of deciding whether this mental illness gives rise to the abnormality, so you may feel you should take the advice of the doctors, particularly as there is a consensus among the three of them."

The final question the jury should consider, Mr Justice Boreham said: "Was the abnormality such as to substantially impair his mental responsibility for his acts? That involves considering the extent to which his own mind was answerable, or whether it was overborne by the divine exterior force. It is sometimes a good test to ask oneself, on ordinary layman's terms, was this man on the borderline of insanity, partially insane? Here again, while the medical evidence is of importance, it is by no means conclusive, though I venture to think if the answers to the first two questions are in the defence's favour, you may think the answer to the third might also be."

Mr Justice Boreham: "It may be that you will take the view this whole problem can probably be narrowed down in this way. The doctors say that their diagnosis and opinion are based certainly in the main and almost exclusively on what the defendant has told them. They all agree that if the defendant does not establish the truth of what he has told the doctors their diagnosis cannot stand. What these basic facts are that the doctors put their opinion on are that he, the defendant, believed that he heard the voice of God in that cemetery in Bingley. In other words he was hallucinating. He genuinely believes that he hears a voice which is not there to be heard."

Mr Justice Boreham stated that Dr Hugo Milne had said that if Mr Sutcliffe had not hear the voice in the cemetery, then the diagnosis collapses, as that schizophrenic experience was fundamental to the doctors' diagnosis. Firstly, Mr Justice Boreham said: "Did he (Mr Sutcliffe) honestly believe he had that experience in the cemetery 15 years ago?"

Mr Justice Boreham said that the second plank of fact on which the diagnosis rested, was whether Mr Sutcliffe was deluded into believing he had a divine mission to exterminate prostitutes. Not just a mission to exterminate women, but a divine mission to exterminate prostitutes.

Thirdly, and this had been accepted by Dr Milne as being perhaps the touchstone of the whole case, did Mr Sutcliffe believe that at the time of each killing that each of his victims was a prostitute? Mr Justice Boreham: "If that was not established, if, as the prosecution says, he knew jolly well in the case of the last six that they were not prostitutes, the diagnosis goes and the defence fails."

The court adjourned until tomorrow, when Mr Justice Boreham would continue his summary of the evidence.

THURSDAY, MAY 21 1981: THE JUDGE'S SUMMARY

Mr Justice Boreham continued with his summary by referring to remarks Mr Sutcliffe was alleged to have made while in custody at Armley Jail, Leeds. Mr Sutcliffe had been overheard by prison officers saying to his wife, Sonia, that he would only serve 10 years in a "loony bin" if he could convince people that he was mad.

Mr Sutcliffe had explained that he had said this only because his wife had become upset after he told her that she should make a new life for herself. Mr Justice Boreham: "If you think that this is an indication that he had made up his mind to be deliberately deceitful and try to prove he was mad, then it could be very significant. But if you think it is something he just said on the spur of the moment in order to comfort his distressed wife, then far from having any significance, I suspect it would invoke your admiration."

Referring to Mr Sutcliffe alleged remarks about the belief that his pleas relating to diminished responsibility had been accepted, Mr Justice Boreham said: "I do not know whether a plea had been agreed or not, but I would have thought that everyone would have realised that, although there might have been an agreement, there was no agreement as to whether a plea would be accepted."

As for Mr Sutcliffe's suggested pleasure on hearing that his trial had been moved to London from Leeds, the judge said: "I do not imagine he fancied much the idea of being tried in Yorkshire and

you would not blame him for that."

Mr Justice Boreham reminded the jury of the prosecution claim that Mr Sutcliffe had shown his real ability to deceive, when he put his mind to it, when he had used false car number plates in Sheffield prior to his arrest.

Mentioning the schizophrenic illness suffered by Mr Sutcliffe's wife, Sonia, in 1971 and 1972, Mr Justice Boreham added: "Now it is said that this man, her husband, whom nobody thought was abnormal in any way, was in fact schizophrenic four years before she was, and he has been a schizophrenic for some 15 years."

Mr Justice Boreham said that they had heard from Mr Sutcliffe's friends, who had not thought of him as an aggressive man, or in any way mentally abnormal. This would fit in with the evidence if the jury accepted that here was a rare form of the disorder. While schizophrenia was not rare, paranoid schizophrenia was rarer, and the encapsulated form, which Mr Sutcliffe was said to suffer from, was very rare. Since the rest of the personality was left untouched, perhaps his relations and friends would not realise that anything was wrong with him.

Giving a summary of Mr Sutcliffe's comments about his feelings after certain killings and attacks, Mr Justice Boreham reminded them what Mr Sutcliffe had said about the MacDonald killing: "I realised what sort of monster I had become." Mr Sutcliffe had later said: "My desire to kill prostitutes was getting stronger than ever and it took me over completely. I wanted to tell someone what I was doing but I thought how it would hurt my wife and family."

After the Yvonne Pearson killing Mr Sutcliffe had sat in his car trying to figure out why he had killed: "There was an urge inside me to kill girls and it was now practically uncontrollable. The urge inside me still dominated my actions."

Mr Sutcliffe had told the police that the compulsion would lie dormant, but eventually came welling up and his attacks became more random and indiscriminate: "I now realised I had the urge to kill any woman. No woman was safe when I was in this state of mind."

Both the defence and medical experts agreed that not too much notice should be taken of such comments, because Mr Sutcliffe wanted to hide his divine mission. Mr Justice Boreham: "I do not know, you must judge, but do you necessarily have to say things like: 'I realize she was not a prostitute but at the time I was not bothered and I just wanted to kill a woman.' Why say that if it is not right, and why go to that length if all you are trying to do is simply hide the mission?"

The judge then reminded the jury of other comments Mr Sutcliffe had made. The Barbara Leach killing: "My urge to kill remained strong and it was totally out of my control." The Jacqueline Hill killing: "By this time I was again in a world of my own, out of touch with reality."

The jury might find it useful to mark such remarks as they might be of considerable relevance. Mr Justice Boreham: "Certainly, here is the first real revelation, if it is true, of what the defendant's feelings were and what were his motivations."

If the jury believed that revelation, then much had been said by this time to the police, and much had been revealed. Mr Justice Boreham: "But everybody accepts that so far there is nothing here to

support a diagnosis of medical illness. One of the questions you may want to ask is, was this man really wanting to unburden himself truthfully, or is it more likely that he had a great secret of a divine mission which he was still keeping to himself and was not going to reveal?"

In regard to the medical evidence, Mr Justice Boreham said: "It is not disputed to this extent, that if the doctors had been told the true story and if they have got the facts right about the mission, then nobody challenges the diagnosis they have formed upon it. The doctors, whichever side they are instructed by, are here as professional men giving their profession opinions and they would not be biased, whichever side they are on."

Mr Justice Boreham: "What is challenged, is the factual basis which they have all accepted, mainly that this man was deluded into thinking that he had a divine mission to kill prostitutes. The fact that the doctors have accepted that is a matter of considerable significance. It is substantial but it is not conclusive; but this is a matter for you all. The emphasis I am going to place on it is whether or not there is really a solid basis for the belief and how confident they are about it. The doctors, for their part, have accepted that if the factual basis is not reliable then their opinions fall to the ground and their diagnoses go. It is the defendant's evidence which is crucial in this case."

Mr Justice Boreham said that Mr Sutcliffe himself had decided to give evidence, nobody was in a position to make him. According to the doctors, he was capable of giving evidence because his schizophrenia was of the rare type known as 'encapsulated', which means that the rest of his personality is intact. Mr Justice Boreham advised the jury to: "weigh him up as you would any other witness, not just what he said, but how he said it."

Mr Justice Boreham: "If the doctors have been told the true story, that he was deluded into thinking he had a divine mission to kill prostitutes, then nobody challenges the diagnosis they have built on it." In that case, they must find Mr Sutcliffe not guilty of murder but guilty of manslaughter.

Mr Justice Boreham: "But if the factual basis is not reliable, then their opinions fall to the ground." Then Mr Sutcliffe is guilty of murder on all thirteen counts.

Mr Justice Boreham said that he sympathised with the jury who might be asking themselves how they were to judge whether Mr Sutcliffe had told them the truth as to what moved him to kill and to kill again. Mr Justice Boreham: "That, in the end, is going to be the fundamental question. Ladies and gentlemen, the answer to that is very simple. There is no magic or mystique about it. It is your collective good sense and knowledge of the world which you will apply to the issue. If I may venture one belief, I think you will find if you keep your feet on the ground it will stop you getting your head in the clouds."

Mr Justice Boreham said the point at issue was reasonably simple. Did Mr Sutcliffe lie to the police in order to divert them from his mission? Or did he lie to the doctors in order to persuade them he was mad?

Mr Justice Boreham said that Dr Hugo Milne had agreed that, all in all, there was nothing that the defendant had told him that he did not accept. He had been asked about the means of confirming the experience in the cemetery, which was a central element to the doctor's diagnosis.

Mr Justice Boreham: "He (Sutcliffe) says he worked in the cemetery. I do not know how far that

takes you, but you must judge. I do not wish to be flippant in a case such as this, but it is very much like claiming to have swum the Channel, and when your friends doubt you, you take them to see the Channel. It does not prove very much, does it?"

According to Dr Milne one of the symptoms of schizophrenia was formal thought disorder, where the person could not express themselves coherently. Mr Justice Boreham: "It does not seem as though this defendant has any disability of that kind."

It had been suggested that Mr Sutcliffe had used his wife's illness, where she thought she was the second Christ, as a model for his own behaviour. Dr Milne had said that he did not think that it was likely, but did say that it did pose the question as to whether Mr Sutcliffe was acting, pretending he had heard the voice of God.

Mr Justice Boreham said that he hoped the jury would accept the strictly medical evidence and that they would concentrate on whether the diagnosis had been made on the balance of probabilities. Mr Justice Boreham: "In other words, at the time of the killings, did he believe he was directed or instructed by God to kill prostitutes? Put in another way, did he, though deluded, believe that he was acting under a divine mission to kill prostitutes?"

The jury was reminded to keep their minds open until they had heard his final remarks, when they would have as completely balanced a view that he could give them before they retired to consider their verdict. The hearing was then adjourned until tomorrow.

FRIDAY, MAY 22 1981: THE VERDICT

During his final remarks, Mr Justice Boreham said: "There has been some reference to the defendant being 'bad or mad.' It is perhaps a convenient shorthand way of putting it, but you stick to the words I gave you, whether he was suffering from abnormality of mind. In the end you may think the real question, and the one that will be decisive is, do you think it more probable than not whenever he killed he acted under a deluded belief that he had a divine mission to kill prostitutes."

At 10:21 am the judge had concluded his summing-up and the jury was sent to deliberate and seek an unanimous verdict on whether Peter Sutcliffe had been driven by a divine mission to kill prostitutes, or was a callous and brutal murderer, as the prosecution charged.

The jury would deliberate for a total of five hours and 55 minutes. They had briefly returned to court at 3:28 pm to say that they could not be unanimous. The judge stated that he would accept a majority verdict and the jury deliberated another 47 minutes before returning with a 10 to 2 majority verdict of guilty to 13 counts of murder.

After the verdict, psychiatrist Dr Terence Kay returned to the stand and stated that the doctors considered that Sutcliffe should be locked up for the rest of his life.

Mr Justice Boreham: "Peter William Sutcliffe, the jury have found you guilty of thirteen charges of murder, if I may say so, murder of a very cowardly nature. For each was a woman. It was murder by getting behind her and beating her on the head with a hammer from behind. It is difficult to find

words that are adequate in my judgment to describe the brutality and gravity of these offences and I say at once I am not going to pause to seek those words. I am prepared to let the catalogue of crimes speak for itself."

The judge said he had considered several factors in deciding on Sutcliffe's sentence, including the danger that he would represent in the future if he was at large, and the depth of terror he had brought to Yorkshire: "It is a population which to my knowledge does not lack fortitude. But I am left in no doubt that women from a wide area were in the deepest fear, and I have no doubts too that that fear spilled over to their menfolk on their account."

In sentencing Sutcliffe, Mr Justice Boreham said: "I have no doubt that you are a very dangerous man indeed. The sentence for murder is laid down by the law and is immutable. It is a sentence that you be imprisoned for life. I shall recommend to the Home Secretary that the minimum period that should elapse before he orders your release on license shall be 30 years. That is a longer period, an unusually longer period in my judgement, but I believe you are an unusually dangerous man. I express my hope that when I have said life imprisonment, it will precisely mean that. For reasons that I have already discussed with your counsel in your presence I do not believe that I can make that as a recommendation in statute." For the seven attempted murders that Sutcliffe had admitted, he was also given life sentences.

After Mr Sutcliffe had left the court, Mr Justice Boreham commended the members of "the Ripper Squad, as I think they call themselves," and cited Sergeant Desmond O'Boyle, Sergeant Peter Smith, and Detective Inspector John Boyle, the officers who had conducted the interviews which led to Mr Sutcliffe's confession. Mr Justice Boreham: "It is unfortunate but true that there are often allegations of impropriety against policemen. Sometimes, they are, unhappily, well-founded, often they are ill-founded. In this case these three officers behaved quite immaculately. They never put a foot wrong, and that can be said of few of us."

The judge also praised Sgt Robert Ring and PC Robert Hydes of the South Yorkshire police who had detained Mr Sutcliffe: "They were engaged in what I suspect from what I heard, sitting in this court, is often a very humdrum, routine duty. They must be very grateful, and the public in general and Miss Reivers in particular must be very relieved, that these basic police tasks which they perform were carried out assiduously and with such attention to duty. I do not mean to introduce levity but I cannot help but recall the remarks of the officer that he had not fallen off a Christmas tree. We are very grateful that he had not."

In regards to the West Yorkshire police, Mr Justice Boreham said: "I am sure every sensible member of the public feels the greatest sympathy for them for this reason, if no other, that the scent was falsified by a cynical, almost inhuman hoaxer – I refer to the tape and letters. I express the hope that one day he may be exposed."

(NOTE: Trial source material: Burn, Cross, Jones, Yallop, Daily Telegraph, London (Canada) Free Press, The Times, The Guardian.)