Aalborg University

The depiction of Peter Sutcliffe and his victims in the following texts: *The Ripper* (2020) and *Peter:*

A Portrait of a Serial killer (2011)

Farah Talal Al-Nadawy

English, Master Thesis

Marianne Kongerslev

31st May 2022

Abstract

This paper examines a subject within the realm of 'true crime'. More specifically, it examines the portrayal of the real-life British serial-killer Peter Sutcliff, who committed 13 crimes in Britain. The project will begin by analyzing the documentary *The Ripper* (2020) using several elements within documentary theory to establish how the narrative of the documentary is constructed. The analysis of the documentary will also discuss both Sutcliffe's and his victims' griveability with the use of a few feminist concepts such as: 'Femicide', 'The missing white girl syndrome', and 'Grievability'. However, other terms such as 'monstrosity' will also be included to discuss Sutcliffe's monstrosity. The documentary will in the discussion section be discussed and compared in relation to another text, which is the film: *Peter Sutcliffe: A Portrait of a Serial Killer* (2011). The discussion about the comparison between the two texts will involve the narration and portrayal of both Sutcliffe and his victims.

Table of Content

Introduction

The true crime genre is an important topic owing to the fact that murders are committed fairly frequently all around the world. Various texts, such as books, films, and documentaries, include true crime elements. This paper examines the portrayal of Peter Sutcliffe, who is a British serial-killer and who committed 13 murders in Britain. In connection to this, the project examines the documentary named *The Ripper* (2020), which will function as the analytical object of the project. The documentary contains four episodes that dive into the discussion of Sutcliffe's murder cases in detail. It includes not only the narrative and portrayal of Sutcliffe but also his victims as well. Initially, this project was inspired by the observation that it is usually the murderer who receives more attention than the victim. Considering the topic of this project is a serial killer, it is pertinent to define what a serial killer is.

In Professor Scott Bonn's book: *Why We Love Serial Killers: The Curious Appeal of the World's Most Savage Murderers* (2014), he suggests that the term "serial killing" is a relatively recent term invented in the early 1970's (Bonn 7). However, the term became more widely known when the FBI began using it (7). In her book Impact of a Serial Killer: *Looking at the Case of Ted Bundy Then and Now* (2020), Natalie Terranova writes that the term has grown dramatically since the 1970s and gained popularity in recent decades (Terranova 2). A pertinent passage from Christine M. Sarteschi's book: *Mass and Serial Murder in America* (2016) cites Stephen Egger's 1984 definition of serial killing, namely: "all offenders who through premeditation killed three or more victims over a period of days, weeks, months, or years (Sarteschi 45).

To analyze the documentary: *The Ripper* (2020) I will mostly make use of Bill Nichols' documentary theory and a couple of feminist concepts such as: 'Femicide', 'The missing white girl syndrome' and 'Grievability'. In the first part of this documentary's analysis, I shall illustrate how the documentary's narrative is constructed using a few examples drawn from

documentary theory. The second part of the analysis will include discussion and comparison of the grievability of both Sutcliffe and his victims based on the feminist concepts mentioned earlier. I will also discuss a term such as 'monstrosity' in order to shed light on Sutcliffe's portrayal in this section. Additionally, Sutcliffe's murders will be graphically described.

Another text will also be analyzed, which is the following film: *Peter Sutcliffe: A Portrait of a Serial Killer* (2011). The film, however, will be discussed in the discussion section to allow for a more comprehensive understanding of the comparison between the film and documentary in regard to the narration and the portrayal of the grievability of Sutcliffe and his victims. Having said that, the thesis statement of this project sounds as follows: How are Peter Sutcliffe and his victims depicted in the following texts: *The Ripper* (2020) and *Peter: A Portrait of a Serial killer* (2011).

Literature review

This section will provide a description of other scholarly sources that relate to my own topic. I will give a brief description of the contents of four different sources and compare my own work in relation to these sources.

The first article that I will give a description of is the following article: "When does violence against women matter? Gender, race and class in Australian media representations of sexual violence and homicide" (2018). This paper draws on intersectional feminist theory and the usage of corpus linguistics, such as critical discourse analysis to examine the language that is used in Australian news media to describe how "victims, perpetrators and the violence as a whole are represented in three relatively high profile cases of sexual violence and homicide" (Hart & Gilbertson 1). Specifically speaking, Chelsea Hart and Amanda Gilbertson use Judith Butler's concept of 'grievability' to have a critical look at how media representations of violence against women are constructed. Besides grievability, they also use Butler's term 'framing' throughout the

whole study to give a description of the way in which the information concerning violence against women reported in the Australian news media "is selected and organized to direct a reader's perception" (4).

As mentioned above, Hart and Gilbertson examine three cases that revolve around the murder of women. The first case that Hart and Gilbertson examine involves a murder committed against a 29-year-old Irish woman whose name was Jill Meagher. As Meagher walked home from her local bar, she was raped and murdered by Adrian Bayley, a man whom she did not know in person. The murder case of Meagher gained extensive media coverage and has been defines by the media "as the 'crime that shocked the nation'" (1). The next case concerns the murder of an Indian woman, Jyoti Singh Pandey, who was gang raped and murdered. The case of Pandey made headlines in Australian news and was described as "'The Delhi Gang Rape'" (1-2). Pandey's murder case was "framed in terms of 'the problem of sexual assault in India' of epidemic proportions" (1). The third and last case that Hart and Gilbertson examine involves the case of an Indigenous woman, Lynette Daley, who died as a result of "a violent sexual assault by her alleged partner" and another male acquaintance (2). Each case has received different representations in the media because the gender, class and social variables of each female victim play a significant role of the way in which the victims' case were represented. In overall terms, Hart and Gilbertson argue that the three cases as a whole show that "classed, racialized and gendered narratives intersect to distance violence against women from normative White middle-class society and masculinity" (2).

The following article "Missing White Woman Syndrome: How Media Framing Affects Viewers' Emotions" (2015) also investigates the media's framing of missing people like the previous source. This source uses the term 'the missing white woman syndrome' to examine the viewers' emotions towards missing women and children of different race in terms of extended video coverage. The study compares several television news stories about women and children of

different race who are portrayed differently "in both visual and nonvisual frames" (Conlin & Davie 36). Additionally, the relation between race and framing effects were carried out "through a factorial design experiment and posttest questionnaire" (36).

When that is said, Conlin and Davie use certain framing elements in order to carry out their case. Conlin and Davie argue that the reason why they incorporate the term 'frame' in their study is because framing can affect the emotions and perceptions of viewers about a subject in two different ways (40). First, framing affects how a person "thinks about a topic after having viewed a frame" (40). Secondly, framing can also affect "how society itself functions through a change in perception that leads to changes in politics and cultural values" (40).

Conlin and Davie found out that the results of their study proved two significant points. The first point is that the visual framing "associated with missing white woman syndrome" has an effect on the viewers' emotions in general terms (46). The second point shows that "the race of a missing child is relatively unimportant to the emotional responses of the viewers" (46). Conlin and Davie argue that this experiment shows that race alone does not have an excessive effect on the audiences' emotional reaction. However, it is argued that race does generally have an impact on the framing of a missing person, however it is not considered the only problem that impacts the story of a missing person (46).

The third article that will be given a description of is "Revisiting the Yorkshire Ripper Murders: Interrogating Gender Violence, Sex Work and Justice" (2015). Instead of incorporating stories about different people's media portrayal, this source narrows its study by only focusing on the media's portrayal of Peter Sutcliffe's female victims.

The article begins by discussing "the serial murder of women as a gendered structural phenomenon within the wider context of violence, gender, and arbitrary justice" (Wattis 1). In support of this claim, the article reviews the case concerning 13 murders committed by Sutcliffe

between 1975 and 1980 (1). Louise Wattis discusses how serial killings are connected to "male violence and misogyny" (3). In connection to this, the article also discusses "the culture of misogyny and victim blaming that characterized the cultural habitus of police officers involved in the Ripper investigation" (3).

To give an overall explanation of the article's structure, it starts with providing some background information about the Peter Sutcliffe's case and proceeds to discuss the socio-structural nature of serial killing. Then Wattis goes on to explain how serial murder can be linked to violence against women. Afterwards, an explanation of gender violence is brought forth and lastly a discussion of the criminalization and victimization of prostitutes. Wattis marks that the case of Peter Sutcliffe's murders "reflects extremes of patriarchy" (14). Also, Wattis suggests that the Peter Sutcliffe's case shows how the police at the time when Sutcliffe was killing women, failed to protect them from violence, which Wattis adds that it "serves as a powerful example of the connection between gender, power inequalities, and violence" (14).

The last source that I will provide a short description of is named: "Homeless Killer": An Analysis of the Media's Portrayal of the Victims of a Serial Killer" (2016).

This study concerns the examination of online news coverage concerning specific homicide cases that involve homeless people that were targeted and killed by a serial killer in 2012. The homeless people that were targeted and murdered are men. This study involves how these men were "portrayed in the articles as homicide victims" (Donley & Gualtieri 231). More specifically, this study investigates three fundamental questions that involves "the articles published on the Ocampo serial killer case" (231). The question that this study will answer are the following: "What was the overall focus of the articles? How were the homeless victims portrayed in the articles? Specifically what language was used to describe the victims? How were the victims portrayed, if mentioned at all, in the titles of the articles?" (231).

In order to answer the stated questions, the study examines 84 news articles to determine how many times 'homeless' "was used in each article and what other characterizations were used to describe the victims in the text and titles of the articles" (231). This source takes up this aspect in focus to gain a better insight "on how homicide homeless victims are portrayed in the online news outlets" (231).

Amy Donley and Marie Gualtieri found out that the articles they examined focused more on the serial killer rather than the victims (236). The interesting aspect of each article was the attention put towards the perpetrator (236). However, when the victims were mentioned in the articles "their housing status and sex were the most salient characteristic" (237). Each article used the word 'homeless' at least once, which Donley and Gualtieri believe that these news media find such piece of information important (237).

Having given a short description of each article, I would like to state that each article mentioned relates to my own focus in that they all center around the topic of true crime. Moreover, each source contains discussions of terms such as the 'missing white woman syndrome', femicide and gender violence, which are also aspects I will be touching upon in my project. The sources focus mostly on the victims, especially female victims and their portrayal composed by the news media outlets. However, apart from the last source that examines media's portrayal of homeless homicide male victims. In addition to the first two articles' usage of the term 'the missing white woman syndrome', as mentioned, they also use terms such as 'framing' and 'grievability' to discuss the media's portrayal of victims. These terms I also intend to use in my project, and they are essential for my project in relation to the discussion of the media's portrayal of people in the field of true crime.

As mentioned previously, the sources I gave a description of all describe the media's portrayal of homicide victims. Several online articles and videos have been used to examine how

media's portrayal of the victims are constructed. My focus will also point on the portrayal of Sutcliffe's victims. However, what differs from my work and the sources mentioned is my focus of the portrayal of the perpetrator, who in this case is Peter Sutcliffe. What also distinguishes my work from the sources is the discussion and comparison of both Sutcliffe's and his victims' grievability. I gave chosen to use film- and documentary theory in order to analyze the analytical objects chosen for this project, while using the terms: 'grievability', 'framing', 'missing white woman syndrome' and 'femicide' throughout the whole project for the discussion of the portrayals of the victims and the perpetrator.

Theory

Documentary theory

General ideas about documentary have frequently provoked censorious debate regarding specific films and programmes, however, there exists a series of explanations which attempts to address the overall genre of documentary work. It is marked in John Corner's book *The art of record* (1996) that the various explanations involving the discussion of the documentary genre is often alluded to as 'documentary theory' (Corner 9). The said theory comprises an assemblage of proposals and concepts dealing with "the socio-aesthetic nature" of documentary practice (9). In the book *Television form and public address* (1995), John Corner illustrates that the term 'documentary' was defined by the pioneer film maker John Grierson in 1926 (Corner 77). Grierson's invention of the term 'documentary' partly derives from the French word 'documentaire', a term mostly operated within travel films (77-78). Grierson defines the documentary as 'creative treatment of actuality', and this definition has to some degree gained acceptance, but raises philosophical questions regarding stagings and reenactments in documentaries. Grierson accounts that, documentaries

involve certain features of dramatization to present an actual event. However, he recognized the

term he invented lacked a few precisions (78). Accordingly, the American film critic, Bill Nichols,

who is best known for being the pioneer of the work within the field of contemporary study of

documentary film, agrees with Grierson's reflection on the dramatization of documentary films.

Nichols has contributed to certain elements within the said field and expands on it in his book

Introduction to documentary (2001). The book contains a series of questions about documentary

film and video that provide a fresh and defined overview of this art form. The questions touch on

issues as ethics, definition, content, form, types, and politics (Nichols 11). However, I will refrain

from going into detail about all the mentioned issues, as some of them are irrelevant for my case

study. Nichols asserts that some documentaries violate some conventions, such as scripting, staging,

reenactments, rehearsals, and performances, which are common practices in fictional works. He

points out what distinguishes documentary films from fiction in the following sentence:

> "…Documentaries address the world in which we live rather than a world imagined by
>
> the filmmaker, they differ from the various genres of fiction (science fiction, horror,
>
> adventure, melodrama, and so on) in significant ways. They are made with different
>
> assumptions about purpose, they involve a different quality of relationship between
>
> filmmaker and subject, and they prompt different sorts of expectations from audiences"
>
> (11).

A substantial part of the documentary tradition is the ability to convey an impression of authenticity

to the audience. Documentary filmmakers wish to engage us in topics or issues that interact directly

with the historical world in which we all live (13). Moreover, Nichols suggests that the editing in

fictional works "is achieved by history in documentary film: things share relationship in time and

space not because of the editing but because of their actual, historical linkages (28). The editing process therefore illustrates these connections. The illustrations can either be "convincing or implausible, accurate or distorted but it occurs in relation to situations and events which we are already familiar, or for which we can find other sources of information" (28). Documentary is considered much less "reliant on continuity editing to establish the credibility of the world it refers to than is fiction" (28).

Two types of film

Nichols stresses that there exist two types of film: "documentaries of wish-fulfillment and documentaries of social representation" in which each case there is a story implied, though, the stories, or narratives differ in kind (1). He argues that the documentaries of wish-fulfillment are normally classified as fiction. In *Introduction to documentary, third edition* (2017) Bill Nichols argues that fictional works constructs around allegories and "create one world to stand in for another, historical world" (Nichols 5). As fiction includes allegory, its work contains a second meaning, which means that what the films reveals may be a "commentary on actual people, situations, and events" (5). Also, fictions usually contrive "dialogue, scenes, and events" that can be based on real facts, however, they are not necessarily historically verified" (5). Within the fictional work, a story usually starts to unfold that reveals the "aspects of the human condition" (5). Fiction may be confined to suspending disbelief by accepting "its world as plausible" (2). These films can give "tangible expression to our wishes and dreams, our nightmares and dreads" (1). They bring imagination to life by making it visible and audible and provide the audience with an insight into the type of reality they wish for, or fear about what "reality itself might be or become" (1).

Contrastingly, documentaries of social representation fall under the category of nonfiction. Work of nonfiction "often wants to instill belief by accepting its world as actual" (2). In these films,

the audience are able to conceive and realize aspects of the world they already inhabit (1). In contrast to documentaries of wish-fulfillment, documentaries of social representation thus present actual situations and aspects and honor known facts. Thus, "they do not introduce new, unverifiable ones: they speak directly about the historical world rather than allegorically" (Nichols 5). The purpose of a documentation of social representation is to display and bring to light the material of social reality (1-2). Documentary films about social representation present a fresh perspective on our interaction with the world, allowing us to explore and better understand it (2). Nichols argues that both types of documentary films involve a story that are to be interpreted. However, documentaries of social representation are intended to engage the audience by providing them with a sense of authenticity (2). According to Nichols, 'belief' plays a prominent role in documentary films, as they often tend to have an impact on the historical world, and thus must convince or persuade the audience "that one point of view or approach is preferable to others" (2).

Representing others

In terms of representing people in films, whether it be fiction or nonfiction: they are often treated as general 'actors' (5). The people who are involved in fiction films, possess a role that is "defined by the traditional role of the actor", which means that they act like theatrical performers (5). Fiction films involve inventions of characters, thus the people acting do not play themselves: they are assigned a specific role to play. The camera functions more as an invisible object rather than an object the actors are aware of. In nonfiction films, that being documentary: people are treated as social actors (5). In essence, this means that the people present in a documentary film are cultural performers, rather than theatrical performers (5). Nonfiction documentaries present people of the actual world, who "play" themselves and touch upon prior experiences, they have witnessed in the actual world. The individuals also express their opinion about the subject that is being discussed

and are aware of the camera's presence, which "they address directly" (5). Addressing the camera directly means that the "individuals speak directly to the camera or audience" (5).

In respect to people's representation in films, Nichols adds that there are various ways in which filmmakers choose to treat their actors. He claims that actors within a documentary film, in particular, can either perform as a first-person narrator or a third-person narrator. The former type of narration is considered a common posture of a documentary film. In this type of narration, the emphasis "may shift from convincing the audience of a particular point of view or approach to a problem to representing a personal, clearly subjective view of things" (14). Nichols adds that the emphasis shifts from persuasion to expression, and this expressive quality is related to the representations of the social and historical world that are addressed to the viewer (14). The narrator speaks about a certain topic or issue, that involves either "telling a story, creating a poetic mood, or constructing a narrative" (14-15). The filmmaker represents other people, who are not necessarily experts within the field which they are communicating. On the other hand, the third-person narrator makes the audience "receive a sense that the subjects in the film are placed there for our examination and edification" (15). They are people with form of expertise that are set to inform the audience about a certain subject. In this sense, the filmmaker addresses the audience as "members of general public or some specific element of it" (15). Hence, third-person narrators are not identical with those of whom they speak.

Documentaries' representation of the world

A document typically deals with solving a problem. Each documentary deals with a story happened in real life. Usually, a story in a documentary begins as a hypothesis or includes certain questions concerning the specific topic of the documentary. The story is characterized by a compelling beginning, an unexpected middle, and a satisfying ending, sharing either a story of a

single individual or a story of a society. First the documentary will typically present the problem or issue at stake, then unfolds background information about the certain issue.

Nichols accounts that a documentary serves as a purpose to present the world in two distinct ways. The first explanation that he brings forth of how documentaries represent the world is "through the capacity of film, and audio tape, to record situations and events with considerable fidelity" (2-3). In overall terms, documentaries showcase "people, places and things" (3). Photographic images in documentaries compels the audience "to believe that it is reality itself represented before us" (3). The second and last explanation of documentaries' representation of the world lies within "the same way a lawyer may represent a client's interests: they put the case for a particular view or interpretation of evidence before us" (4). In this sense, documentaries "actively make a case or argument; they assert what the nature of a matter is to win consent or influence opinion" (4). Also, the representations in documentaries tend to give rise to arguments, or "formulate persuasive strategies of their own, setting out to persuade us to accept their views as appropriate" (5). Nichols marks that each documentary film will have a different degree to which these aspects of representation are present, but a central aspect of documentary is the theme of representation itself (5). The different ways of presenting the world in documentaries are also manifested in various modes that will be touched upon below.

Documentary modes

Nichols proposes that there exist six different types of modes of a documentary that are supposed to function as "sub-genres of the documentary film genre itself" (99). These modes are: "poetic, expository, participatory, observational, reflexive and performative" (99). The modes set up a loose framework within which individuals and films may operate. They also establish conventions which a film may follow and set out specific expectations which viewers may expect to

be met (99). Each mood are examples of prototypes or models that give "exemplary expression to the most distinctive qualities of that mode" (99-100). Though, a documentary does not necessarily have to be identified with one specific mode. On the other hand, a documentary can constitute several modes at the same time. The characteristics of a mode functions "as a *dominant* in a given film: they give structure to the overall film" (100). Each mode has a variety of elements that contributes to the structure of a documentary. However, before elaborating on the mentioned modes above, I would like to clarify that not every mode is going to be mentioned nor described thoroughly as some elements of each mode do not match the structure of the analyzed documentary I have chosen to focus on.

The first mode that is going to be described is the poetic mode. This kind of mode particularly adept at transferring information or give a "presentation of reasoned propositions about problems in need of solution" (103). The poetic mode draws attention to the mood and tone of the documentary film and how these kinds of elements affect the audience emotionally (103). The way in which the poetic mode opts at building a tone and mood is with the use of "[…] voices that recite diary entries and haunting music" (105). Also, the poetic mode of a documentary film "promotes subjective interpretations of the subject(s) of attention" (103).

The expository mode constructs several "fragments of the historical world" (105). Expository films have either a "voice-of-God commentary […] or utilize a voice-of-authority commentary" (105). The former means that the speaker is neither seen nor heard, whereas in the latter, the speaker is both heard and seen. The voice-over commentary has the ability to judge "actions in the historical world" (107). Images also play a supporting role in expository documentaries, as "they illustrate, illuminate, evoke, or act in counterpoint to what is said" (107). The speaker in the expository documentary serves to account for the images presented (107). The

audience hence gets a sense of understanding that the images serve as evidence and support "the basic claims" of what is being discussed (107).

Fictionality & Fiction

Sheila Bernard's book *Documentary storytelling for video and filmmakers* (2004) accounts for some basics of film and documentary storytelling. Bernard brings forth examples of a few features of how fictional films relate to documentary films stating:

> "Films are often described as either plot-or character-driven. Character-driven means that the action of the film emerges from the wants and needs of the characters. Plot-driven means that characters are secondary to the events that make up the plot. In documentary, both types of films exist" (Bernard 17).

Dramatic storytelling in films often contain character-driven stories and there exist a few elements that shape this specific type of storytelling. Bernard argues that dramatic storytelling often involves "*somebody* with whom we have some empathy" (18). The 'somebody' is the protagonist who the story regards (19). Often the dramatic storytelling is a story that is "told for maximum *emotional impact* and *audience participation* in the proceedings" (18). Bernard states that stories that involves emotional impact and audience participation are often described as "show, don't tell" (22). This means that the filmmaker must offer a few information or evidence that aid "the viewers to experience the story for themselves, anticipating twists, and turns and following the story line in a way that's active rather than passive" (22-23). Finally, the story must have a "*satisfying ending* which does not necessarily mean a happy ending" (18).

Fictionality

This part of the theory will explore the term 'fictionality'. Simona Zetterberg Gjerlevsen is an associate professor at Aarhus University who engages with the study of fiction and how fiction influences people. She has written an article named "Fictionality" (2016) published on the website *The living handbook of narratology*, that involves a profound definition of the term 'fictionality', which will be elaborated on in the following paragraph.

In her article, Gjerlevsen explain the history and concept behind fictionality. She states that 'fictionality' has its root from the latin word 'fingere', which consists of several meanings, such as "to shape, to invent and to make a pretense of" (Gjerlevsen 2016). The term has been employed in connection with fictional work to define the characteristics and affordances of the fictional genre (2016). Furthermore, the concept of fictionality has been "understood as a rhetorical communicative mode" (2016). Regarding the rhetorical communicative mode, Lynn Hall and Leah Wahlin have published a book named *A Guide to Technical Communications: Strategies & Applications* (2016) which provides an insight into rhetorical principles. I intend to elaborate on the elements of the rhetorical principles that I find relevant for my case.

Before giving an explanatory presentation of what the rhetorical principles consist of, Hall and Wahlin deliver a description of what 'rhetoric' is, to give the readers a deeper understanding of the subject. They mark that rhetoric is an art form that pertains to the study of the techniques used by authors or speakers to inform, persuade, or motivate specific audiences within specific contexts (Hall & Wahlin 5). The concept of rhetoric is the application of dominant strategies and approaches to communicating whether this is through textual, verbal, or visual means (5). When communication is used "to different types of audiences about the same topic, we make strategic decisions on what details to include or omit, what types of evidence or support to use" (5). Hall and Wahlin argue that the details we deliberately decide to include or not include in a conversation is

"based on the particular rhetorical situation" of our discussion (5). Our communication style is determined by: "the writer, author, creator, also known as the rhetor" (5). The communication style is also determined by the audience, the topic and purpose of the communication. Lastly, it is shaped by the context and culture within which the communication is taking place" (5).

Within 'rhetoric' exist three forms of rhetorical appeal, which are ethos, pathos, and logos (6). These three appeals are originally founded by Aristotle. Ethos is an appeal that is directed to 'character', particularly "authority and expertise" (6). This appeal focuses attention on the speaker's trustworthiness. Pathos, however, "is about the emotional state of the audience" (6). Generally speaking, pathos refers to an appeal of both positive and negative emotions (6). A rhetor may appeal to the feelings that an audience already has about certain topics or elicit feelings (6). Regardless of whether we are conscious of our emotions, Aristotle argues that they play an important role in our decision making (6). If a rhetorician wishes to persuade a particular audience, the rhetorician must be aware of the ruling emotions about the topic and about the target audience in question (6). The rhetorician must be aware of "what makes the audience angry (or pleased) […] and why does that particular audience become angry (or pleased) within a specific context?" (6). The last rhetoric appeal is logos, which is an appeal directed to logical reason and is "about the clarity, consistency, and soundness of an argument, from the premise and structure to the evidence and support" (7). Rhetors use logos by offering reasonable and substantiated arguments that are backed up with statistics, facts, and other data (6).

Having described briefly the three rhetorical appeal that exist within the rhetorical communicative mode, I will return to Gjerlevsen's article that defines 'fictionality'.

Gjerlevsen suggests that there are a few theorists that use fictionality as form of "describing something which is imagined" (2016). Moreover, there have been endeavors to utilize fictionality not only in respect to fictional texts but "to explain broader concepts such as 'as if' as

well as, […] proposals to connect the term fictionality to the phenomenon of 'make believe'"

(2016). In connection to the just-mentioned Gjerlevsen goes into depth about these concepts by

taking inspiration from John Searle's theory of fiction "as a pretended speech act as that has been

described as an 'as if' theory" (2016). Also, she uses Kendall Walton's theory of fiction that is

characterized as "a role in make-believe" (2016). Gjerlevsen states that Searle's theory of fiction as

an 'as if' theory, suggests an idea that "human beings create model and assumptions 'as if'

something were the case in order to make sense of the world" (2016). Moreover, it is mentioned

that what defines fictional discourse is when "the rules of sincerity are suspended, and the rule of

reference is out of place" (2016). Fiction always contains a representation of something, however,

the 'fictionality' "shows that what is represented is merely an 'image' […] and thus accorded the

status an 'as if'" (2016).

Gjerlevsen mentions that Kendall Walton "has used fictionality to describe how a person

can be engaged in a game of make-believe" (2016). Gjerlevsen argues that Walton equates fiction

with representation and suggests that all representations share the characteristics of creating a sense

of "make-believe" (2016). Walton accounts that "certain objects serve as props to activating

imagination" which he regards as fictionality (2016). Furthermore, it is mentioned that fictionality

is believed to occur "only when the author has intentionally aimed at communicating the fictional

status of a work to the audience" (2016). The next paragraph will describe the term 'femicide', that

involves the discussion of the act of killing.

Femicide

All forms of killing, including homicide, suicide, and femicide, are considered as acts of killing. In

the book *Femicide across Europe: Theory, research and prevention* (2018) it is marked that the

feminist movement introduced the concept of femicide as a means of politicizing and challenging

male violence against women (Grzyb et al. 21). Since 1976, Diana Russell has been utilized the term "femicide" to describe the act of the killings of women. Though, Russell points out in her article "Defining Femicide" (2012) that the term 'femicide' has existed for many years prior to her usage of the term (Russell). However, the term was redefined by her in 2001 as being: "[...] the killings of females by males because they are female" (Russell). This definition is inclined to the definition of "racist killing" as it emphasizes that only in cases in which females have been killed due to their gender, are classified as femicide. However, Russell mentions that it does not embrace "the accidental killings of women or girls by men, or the murder of women by men in which the victims' gender is irrelevant, say, in the course of a robbery, or murder of women by their female partner…" (Russell). Furthermore, this definition implies that it cannot be femicide if the perpetrator is not male and it must be noted that females can also kill each other because of their gender, however, femicide cannot result from this act. An additional suggestion of the definition of 'femicide' is proposed by Liz Kelly, that highlights "the gendered nature of forms of violence against women and focuses on the man's desire for power, dominance and control" (Weil et al. 20). Also, Kelly frames the concept of femicide as being "a form of sexual violence and extreme form of violence in the continuum of sexual violence against women" (20).

Media portrayals of femicide differ depending on various factors, which can be linked to grievability. Femicide is a type of murder happening to women because of their gender, and in this type of killing some are deemed more grievable than others, depending on who they were when they were alive. Femicide is a form of murder opposed on women due to their gender, and in such cases, some killings are considered more grievous than others, depending on the victims' social status and lifestyle. Diana Russell and Professor Jane Caputi argue in their article "Femicide: Sexist Terrorism against Women" (1992) that "Femicide [...] are variously ignored or sensationalized in the media, depending on the victim's race, class, and attractiveness (by male standards)" (Caputi &

Russell 15). They suggest that the media and law enforcement authorities show apathy and blame the victims who do not conform to the norms, such as being nonwhite, a prostitute, a drug addict or poor.

The subsequent term that will be touched upon is a concept known as 'The missing white girl syndrome'. This term can be related to Grievability in that both terms can be used to determine whether a victim is 'worthy enough' of grievance. It is widely believed that the mainstream media outlets portray certain endangered young women as valuable, whereas others are ridiculed as insignificant. These factors influence how society view the victims.

The missing white girl syndrome

The professor and journalist Sarah Stillman has written the article "The missing white girl syndrome: disappeared women and media activism" (2007), which includes a discussion of how the media uses certain techniques to portray certain victims as 'worthy' or 'unworthy' victims.

In her article, Stillman argues that some female serial killer victims are categorized as either worthy or unworthy victims. Thus, it can be said that the media portrays these female victims in a certain way that renders them either grievable or nongrievable. Though, this portrayal is carried out implicitly which is done by specific discursive techniques that position certain female victims as grievable while dismissing others (Stillman 491). The media position women who are white, attractive, and wealthy as worthy of media attention and police investigation (491). Meanwhile, they portray other female victims, particularly women of color, and individuals with low positions and income as unworthy (491). As Kenna Quinet argues in the article "Prostitutes as Victims of Serial Homicide: Trends and Case Characteristics, 1970-2009" (2011), serial killers are known for targeting vulnerable women, especially prostitutes, more than others ("Prostitutes as Victims" Quinet 74). Stillman argues that such women are often deemed unworthy of news coverage

(Stillman 491). Steven Egger marks in his book *Killers Among US: An Examination of Serial Murder and Its Investigation* (1998) that prostitutes are women who do not follow the norm, thus their deaths are not considered significant (Egger 88). Egger asserts that all women are at risk of being victims of serial killings, however, prostitutes have a higher risk of being killed, yet their death are not always publicly addressed (83).

Such women are what Quinet would call 'the missing missing'. In the 2007 article "The Missing Missing: Toward a Quantification of Serial Murder Victimization in the United States," Quinet discusses how the people who fall under 'the missing missing' category never were regarded as missing and states that "some of [them] may be serial murder victims" ("The Missing Missing" Quinet 319). Due to their lifestyle and unstable communities, prostitutes are often in this 'missing missing' category (Quinet, "Prostitutes as Victims" 79). According to Stillman, when these women are covered by the news media, they are often depicted as being to blame for their own deaths due to their social class and way of living (Stillman 492). The next section involves a description of the term Grievability developed by the philosopher and gender theorist Judith Butler.

Grievability

Judith Butler has written a book named: *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* (2009), that discusses the portrayal of victims of war as well as how a person can be considered less grievable than another person. The term 'grievability' is a term that refers to all victims and how they are portrayed in the media. Butler argues that certain people cannot be apprehended as lost if they were not considered 'living' to begin with (Butler 1). She stresses that 'living' is understood as living a life followed by the norm. If a person deviates from the norm, they are considered nongrievable. In other words, it means that a person is viewed as insignificant by the law enforcement authorities. Regarding this, Butler marks this sentence to account for the above stated: "[...] a living figure

outside the norms of life, not only becomes the problem to be managed by normativity but seems to be that which normativity is bound to reproduce; it is living, but not a life. It falls outside the frame furnished by the norm" (8). Additionally, a person's social status, which includes their position and financial condition, also contributes to their grievability. For instance, a person holding a high social position has a higher chance of becoming grievable in a society. In this regard, it means that they conform to what Butler defines as 'the norm'. However, those who do not fall within the norm, such as people who are homeless, sex workers, or drug dealers, are perceived as not being particularly grievable.

Besides this, Butler's theory also provides a useful insight into the framing of the differential representation of victims of violence perpetrated by US soldiers. She dissects the issue by drawing upon examples of war, to illustrate how the media frames certain victims of war as lost, while positioning others outside the frame of grievability (42). Those victims of war that Butler argues about are people from Iraq, whom the US media portrayed as people who are not quite human. The US media framed them as people who possess a threat to a society instead of framing them as people who are a part of a society and people who need help (42). Butler highlights that the reason why the US media discriminated certain groups of victims is because of their religious believes and norms that differ from that of the western world (42). Such framing can be compared to how the media frames people who fall outside the category of the missing white girl syndrome, due to their social variables.

Method

This project will center around the portrayal of the serial killer Peter Sutcliffe and his victims in both texts mentioned above. The project will use different feminist concepts such as: 'Femicide', 'Grievability' and 'The missing white girl syndrome' to both describe and discuss the framing of

his victims and compare them to each other. More specifically, the term 'Femicide' is included in this project as more of an 'umbrella term' to the feminist concepts mentioned. Also, the term 'femicide' is included because the project deals with the killings of women: as Sutcliffe's victims were all women. 'Grievability' is intended to be used to address the manner in which Sutcliffe's victims are framed in the media, which will then lead to an argument of whether or not they are grievable or nongrievable. However, even though, grievability is meant to discuss the portrayal of all kinds of victims, this project will also discuss and compare Sutcliffe's grievability to his victims. The term 'The missing white girl syndrome' will be used to have a coherent discussion of whether Sutcliffe's victims fall within or outside or within the category of 'the missing white girl syndrome'.

The documentary theory described under the documentary section will be used to analyze and discuss how the documentary conveys the narrative of Sutcliffe's murder cases, but also how the documentary conveys the narrative that of Sutcliffe himself. Also, the documentary's different elements and techniques are also going to be used in order to touch upon the discourse concerning the narrative as well as framing of Sutcliffe's victims.

The term 'Fictionality' is included in this project to define how the film: Peter: A portrait of a serial killer, meets the demands of the fiction genre. Also, the term will be used to clarify and discuss how the narrative and portrayal concerning the victims as well as the main character corresponds with the narrative and portrayal that of the documentary that surrounds the same person. Moreover, it should be noted that what is informed about 'the rhetorical communicative mode' in the section 'Fictionality', will only be used in the analysis of the documentary.

Analysis

Peter Sutcliffe's Background & Personal Life

The following section provides an analysis of the documentary *The Ripper* (2020). Before analyzing the documentary in question, I would like to provide a few background details regarding Peter Sutcliffe's personal life. In presenting Sutcliffe's personal information, I intend to use them as supporting evidence to raise a discussion later in the project about whether some of the things Sutcliffe experienced in his personal life may have contributed to his decision to become a killer.

Parents

In Dirk Gibson's book *Serial Killer Around the World The Global Dimensions of Serial Murder* (2014) a few background information regarding Sutcliffe has been established. I intend to use this book to draw on a few information about Sutcliffe's life, familial background and childhood.

Gibson draws up details concerning Sutcliffe's parents and his relation to them stating Sutcliffe's father, John Sutcliffe, loved him deeply to the extent that "he went to school daily for a while to encourage Peter to participate in playground activities and play with the others" (Gibson 113). However, Sutcliffe's father had another side to him as well as he would perform aggressive behavior towards his wife and was described by his children as an "insensitive extrovert" (113). Also, he was "arrested for breaking and entering" (113). Sutcliffe's parents were under unstable conditions "as both parents engaged in blatant acts of infidelity" (113). Gibson notes that Sutcliffe's relationship to his mother differed from his relationship to his father. Sutcliffe was devoted to his mother and would run errands for her quite frequently. Sutcliffe was the only child whom his mother "had a special place in her heart for" (114). His mother, Kathleen Sutcliffe was described as loving and gentle, however, her affair with a police officer devasted Sutcliffe.

Family

Peter Sutcliffe was the eldest son of six siblings. He had three sister and two brother, however one of the brothers had a criminal record and was "in and out of jail as an adolescent" (114). John and Kathleen Sutcliffe thought of Peter Sutcliffe "as a virtually ideal son" (114). However, Sutcliffe's relationship with his father was dissatisfactory, "as John wanted a tough and sports-minded son while Peter preferred staying inside and reading" (114). Peter Sutcliffe, on the other hand, was not fond of his father's frequent absence from home.

School & Childhood

Peter Sutcliffe was considered "different […] scrawny and miserable" by others (114). His interests differed from that of his classmates, because he did not like rough sports and games as they did. On the other hand, his favorite pastime during his adolescence was reading comic books. Besides that, he grew up having friend who were "amateur burglars" (114).

Sutcliffe always disliked school. He started school "at St. Joseph's R.C School in September of 1948 and hated every minute of it" (114). He then exchanged to another school a few years later where he "refused to integrate with his classmates and […] stood in a corner by himself during recess (114-115). However, Sutcliffe was, in fact an intelligent student "with an IQ of 110" (115). His academic performance was considered normal; however, he did not manage to finish school as he left it "at the age of fifteen" (115). Sutcliffe chose to leave school as he was suffering from bullying.

Personality

One of Sutcliffe's schoolmates recalled that "he was very shy and not like the other boys in our class" (115). Also, his teacher considered him "to be a bit of a class clown" (115). Gibson notes that

Sutcliffe was generally shy: "his dominant personality trait was his debilitating shyness" (115). As a child, he would always "hide behind his mother […] and cling to her dress" (116).

Besides this, after Sutcliffe's employment at a cemetery he developed a sense of humor that was not liked by everyone as it was considered rather "morbid" (116). He used to utter "practical jokes" which others deemed offensive (116).

Marriage

Peter Sutcliffe had a little interest in females; however, he did manage to meet a woman by the name Sonia. They married in 1974 and Sutcliffe "was considered to be a good husband who was considerate, attentive and loving" (117). Sonia did have an affair with another man, which Sutcliffe became angry and upset about. Sutcliffe's hatred against women reportedly commenced after he found out about Sonia's infidelity. Consequently, he visited prostitutes in retaliation. The next section concerns the presentation and analysis of the documentary *The Ripper* (2020). The analysis will include a discussion how Peter Sutcliffe and his victims are portrayed in the just mentioned documentary.

The Ripper (2020)

The documentary: *The Ripper* (2020) contains four episodes that dive into the heart of the real-life murder cases committed by the British serial killer Peter Sutcliffe's. The opening episode entitled *Once Upon a Time in Yorkshire* revolves around the story of Sutcliffe's early moves that inflicted the deaths of five of his first thirteen victims. The second episode *Between Now and Dawn* focuses on the eye-witness reports from those who survived Sutcliffe's attacks and scraps of evidence as West Yorkshire Police begin to investigate with a keener sense of urgency. The third one *Reclaim*

the Night provides an overview of the events that happened in 1979 after the police receive a letter and a tape from Sutcliffe himself. The final episode of the documentary, *Out of the Shadows,* illustrates the public's anger in relation to the Sutcliffe case. Also, the last episode sets a conclusion to the case regarding the inept police who had to interview Sutcliffe nine times before being convicted.

The Ripper (2020) has an overdramatized opening sequence that is accompanied by foreboding music at the beginning of the documentary. Each episode has a beginning that is constructed as a form of 'trailer' because there appear various clips from the documentary itself right after each other which are intended to create an element of excitement for the viewer. Also, these dramatized clips are supposed to give the viewer a sketch of the events they will come to terms within each episode.

The actors within the documentary

This documentary is narrated by several individuals throughout, and these individuals are the ones who give the viewer an insight into Sutcliffe's case. These individuals who are participating in the documentary are what Bill Nichols would call 'social actors' or 'cultural performers' (Nichols 5). They are referred to as such because of their participation in a nonfiction documentary. The documentary presents them as people who are a part of "the actual world, who 'play' themselves and touch upon prior experiences, they have witnessed in the actual world" (5). Reflecting on their prior experiences revolving the Sutcliffe case, makes the viewer 'witnessing' their story of the case, getting an impression of coming closer to them. Also, the documentary displays pictures of each social actor from when they were younger, which grabs the attention of the viewer. Furthermore, when the social actors address information about the mentioned case, they "address the camera directly" (5), which means that they are generally aware of the camera's

presence (5). Additionally, by looking straight into the camera, makes the social actors engage directly to the audience. Compositions such as this aim to give the viewer a sense of involvement in the subject matter.

Besides this, the filmmakers of *The Ripper* (2020) treat their actors as both first and third person narrators. That is because the social actors talk about the story associated with Sutcliffe's murders in connection with their own position and expertise. However, some of the social actors do construct the overall narrative about Sutcliffe's murder cases in depth aside from concentrating on their expertise within the subject matter (14-15). The social actors that are experts within the subject matter conversed about in the documentary are set to inform the audience about Sutcliffe's murders and investigation in detail. These actors act like third-person narrators who make the audience receive a sense that the subject in the documentary is placed for their "edification" (15). Accordingly, it should be clarified that the actors with forms of expertise are connected to the appeal of Ethos. Since the social actors who are experts within the subject matter discussed in *The Ripper* (2020), they are most likely to be perceived as 'trustworthy' for the viewer (6). They provide information regarding their "authority" in relation to the case (6). Furthermore, the 'social actors' who are treated as third-person narrators that the viewer observe throughout the whole documentary are the police officers, forensic scientists, and news reporters.

The 'social actors' who are treated as third-person narrators, that the viewer observes in the first episode are Andy Laptew, Keith Hellawell and John Domaille. These three social actors are expertized within the field of police work. Laptew was a Yorkshire police officer involved in the hunt for Sutcliffe between 1970s and 1980s. Hellawell and Domaille were superintendents at the time when Sutcliffe's murders were on-going, which means that they rank above Laptew. Nevertheless, they were all three involved in the same matter. They provide some information related to their involvement with the police work associated with the investigation of Sutcliffe's

murders. Laptew took part in Sutcliffe's murder cases for the first time in 1975, when one of his superiors informed that a murder had taken place in a city named Leeds. The victim found murdered in Leeds was Wilma McCann, who was Peter Sutcliffe's first female victim. Additionally, Hellawell was also associated with the investigation of Sutcliffe's first female victim. However, Domaille got involved in the investigation after Sutcliffe killed his fourth victim in Bradford in 1977.

The social actors who are expertized within the field of forensic science are Angela Gallop and Mike Green. They appear on the screen to give information regarding the forensic science associated with Sutcliffe's murders. Green was working as a forensic pathologist in the early 1970s. He presents himself by adding that he was "a senior lecturer in forensic medicine at the University of Leeds (00:44:38-00:00:44:30). Green was one of the forensic scientists who was in charge of performing a postmortem on McCann's body at the time when the police found her body. He enlightens the viewer in detail how McCann was murdered adding she had been "struck twice at the back of the head - she had three groups of stabs wounds; twice in the breasts, the bra had been pulled up, and one in the abdomen" (00:44:30-00:44:14). According to Green, not much forensic science was made in the case of Wilma McCann and therefore she was not given a fair treatment as a victim. All actors express their "opinion about the subject that is being discussed" with the audience (5). For instance, Green expresses his opinion about Sutcliffe's behavioral pattern, stating that the individual who did such heinous crime against Wilma McCann is rather "disturbed, to some considerable degree" (00:43:54-00:43:45). Gallop states that she was "the first woman to join the forensic science lab" in 1978 (00:23:32-00:23:00 *Between now and Dawn*). Like Green, Gallop performed a postmortem on one of Sutcliffe's victims. This victim was Helen Rytka: Sutcliffe's seventh victim. Besides giving a few information of herself, Gallop also states her opinion about

Rytka adding that while she was doing a postmortem on Rytka's body, she noticed how beautiful she was and also "looked very serene" (00:23:21-00:23:09).

Throughout the documentary, both male and female news reporters who were working in that specific field at the time when Sutcliffe committed his murders are showcased. The reporters shown in the documentary are present to illustrate how both Sutcliffe and his victims were portrayed by the media at the time. In overall terms, the social actors in the documentary who are experts in the mentioned fields edify the audience about Sutcliffe's murder case in relation to their position. This means that they address the audience as "members of general public or some specific element of it" (15). Therefore, it can be mentioned that the social actors who are treated as third-person narrators are "not identical with those of whom they speak" (15). This is because the audience does not possess a similar knowledge or position to that of the social actors.

The filmmakers of this documentary also represent "other people, who are not necessarily experts within the filed which they are communicating" (15). A few of the social actors who are participating in the documentary without an expertise are a few of the family members of Sutcliffe's victims. These participants are present to address the viewer of how deeply saddened they had been when finding out one of their relatives had been murdered. Examples of that will be shown below.

Examples of some of the social actors who are family members of Sutcliffe's victims presented in the documentary are Richard McCann and Neil Jackson. Generally speaking, the family members of Sutcliffe's victims involved in the documentary are not experts within the subject matter, however, they are present in the documentary to give an account of what they saw and experienced during the time of the death of both their mothers. McCann recalls the circumstances under which the police approached him and his siblings to question them about their mother: Wilma McCann. He remembers the residents of their neighborhood showed them care and affection at that time, which he notes how quite unusual it was for them. However, he states that

they "did not know what was going on" (00:45:09-00:45:03 *Once Upon a Time in Yorkshire*). The officers eventually told them that their mother had passed away. McCann goes on to recount the story of him and his siblings being taken to live at the children's home, and it is from that moment that McCann came to realize that he would not see his mother ever again. In addition, it should be noted that the reason for displaying the family members of Sutcliffe's victims in the documentary may have been "to appeal to the emotional state of the audience" (6). The "ruling emotions about the topic" discussed in *The Ripper* (2020) are associated with negative emotions since it deals with a sensitive topic such as murder (6). McCann's loss of his mother at such a young age has the potential to evoke "negative emotions" in the viewer (6). In this regard, including the families of the deceased in the narrative can be a very effective means of evoking different emotional responses in the viewer.

In 1976, Jackson was in the age of 17 when he first learned of the death of his mother, Emily Jackson. Police appeared at his door and inquired about his mother. At first, he did not realize the gravity of the situation regarding his mother, until the police revealed that she was involved in prostitution, adding that "it really hurt deep down" inside of him when he learned of it (00:32:22-00:31:50). Furthermore, Jackson is also forthcoming about how his mother was killed, adding that "she'd been stabbed 56 times" (00:31:32-00:31:26).

Regarding the documentary's presentation of people without expertise within the subject matter: it also features interviews with some of Sutcliffe's survivors. It is stated in the documentary that Sutcliffe "was also accused of seven charges of attempted murder" (00:21:56-00:21:52 *Out of the Shadows*), however, five of the survived victims are featured in the documentary. Footages and clips of each survived victims are shown in the documentary in which they are being interviewed by news reporters as well as police officers. These survivors are depicted in the documentary to illustrate the story of how they were attacked and eventually how they managed to escape from

Sutcliffe. Furthermore, some of them express their dissatisfaction with the misogynistic manner in which the police and news reporters handled the incident. A discussion of the victims' remarks regarding the manner in which police officers and news reporters handled the Sutcliffe murder cases will be dealt with further below in the analysis.

The first victim who survived Sutcliffe's attack that the viewer observes is Maureen Long. However, even though she survived Sutcliffe's attempted murder, she was not able to help the authorities in telling what she experienced in detail because Sutcliffe's attack caused her severe brain damage which eventually "destroyed her memory cells" (00:42:04-00:41:57 *Between Now and Dawn*). A second victim displayed in the documentary is Marilyn Moore, who is opposite Long in that Moore was able to provide specific details regarding how she was attacked as well as any physical characteristics that Sutcliffe possessed. The police force thus considered Moore a good witness in the apprehension of Sutcliffe. Moore describes how she was attacked in the following manner:

> "I didn't feel the first one. I felt the second and the third blow, and as I felt the third one, my hands were on top of my head. Then I remember grabbing his trousers, and as I grabbed his trousers, he pulled away. And I heard him go back in the car, and as he drove off, his back wheels skidded on the back" (00:26:00-00:25:32).

The description of how she was attacked represents major information to the authorities. Through Moore's account of the incident, the authorities were able to conclude that Moore had been attacked by Sutcliffe, since the attacks committed on Moore are similar to those perpetrated on the other victims. Moreover, Moore's ability to providing the police with a thorough description of Sutcliffe, enabled the police to construct "an identikit picture" of Sutcliffe (00:25:12-00:25:07).

Based on the photofit that the police constructed, it is estimated that Sutcliffe was approximately around 30 years of age, had a beard and "had dark hair" (00:25:02-00:24:56). The photofit of Moore's attacker was then placed "on the wall of every police station" throughout England (00:24:54-00:24:50).

Mo Lea, a third surviving victim, moved to Leeds in the 1970s in order to attend the University of Leeds. Prior to moving to Leeds, Lea recalls that she was only slightly familiar with Sutcliffe's murder cases. Lea had no conception of becoming one of Sutcliffe's victims and did not wish to live a life restricted by fear due to his crimes. Therefore, she decided to attend a pub with her friends on a weekend. After spending an extended period of time at the pub, Lea goes on to describe that she and her friends eventually ended up leaving the pub adding that her friends "walked up to the park", whereas she opted to walk into town to take a bus to her residence (00:21:22-00:21:03 Reclaim the Night). She describes what happened next after parting from her friends as follows: "I started to walk down Hillary place, I noticed that the lights was out, and it was much darker than the lit streets that I'd come from. And halfway through, a voice came from behind me" (00:20:58-00:20:37). It was a Yorkshire accent that she recognized in the voice she heard. She walked away rapidly but was able to hear the person's footsteps approaching her, and suddenly experienced "a massive blow to the top of [her] head" (00:20:18-00:20:00). Lea managed to survive due to a stranger's intervention. She awoke the next morning to find herself in a hospital bed with massive swelling and "lots of cuts and bruises" (00:19:32-00:19:29). A few doctors explained to Lea that her "injuries were similar to those of other Ripper victims" which shocked her (00:19:20-00:19:12).

Among the survivors of Sutcliffe's attempted murder, Olive Smelt was the only one to have a brief conversation with him before he attacked her. The documentary features an interview with her in which a reporter claims that she was "very lucky" to survive Sutcliffe's assault

(00:06:43-00:06:28). According to Olive Smelt, Sutcliffe was prevented to accomplish what he intended because a passing car's headlight impeded his actions. Further, she asserts that the person who attacked her "without any certainty, had a Yorkshire accent", which is a statement that is parallel to that of Lea's (00:05:44-00:05:38).

The final episode of the documentary features Tracy Browne: the last survivor of Sutcliffe's attempted murder. Brown claims that in 1975, while she was 14 years of age, she was attacked by a man whom she considered to be Sutcliffe. In her description of how she was attacked, Browne states: "I remember the hammer, just really raining down on me so hard, about five times […] it was severe fractures in my skull" (00:37:25-00:36:42 *Out of the Shadows*). In 1977, two years after her attack, Browne came across a photograph in a newspaper of a man who had been assaulting women. According to Browne, the person she saw in the newspaper is the same one who physically assaulted her in 1975. Accordingly, Browne chose to contact the police to inform them of her attack, however, the police failed to take Browne's case seriously.

Presenting facts in The Ripper (2020)

Nichols states that there are two types of documentaries, one of which is a documentary of 'social representation' and the other a documentary of 'wish-fulfillment' (Nichols 1). However, the latter will be discussed in more detail later in the analysis. In nonfiction documentaries, the subject matter usually focuses upon solving a problem that is related to real life (27) and in this regard, *The Ripper* (2020) deals with the similar focus. With regards to the documentary *The Ripper* (2020), it follows the police's investigations concerning Sutcliffe's murders that took place in England between 1975 and 1980.

The Ripper (2020) consists of two modes that is supposed to "give structure to the overall film" (100). One of the modes the documentary possesses is the 'poetic mode' that "draws attention

to the mood and tone of the documentary film and how these kinds of elements affect the audience emotionally" (103). The documentary starts off with a compelling beginning, an unexpected middle, and a satisfying end. Regarding this, the first episode of *The Ripper* (2020) has a compelling beginning because of the opening sequence, that "opts at building a tone and mood" (105) with the use of sounds of footsteps and dogs barking accompanied by ominous music to give the viewer a sense of anticipation for the rest of the documentary. The documentary also adept at transferring information and give a "presentation of reasoned propositions about problems in need of solution" (103). In connection to this, the social actors begin by "transferring information" to the viewer regarding what they already know about Wilma McCann (103). The information the social actors provide for the viewer about McCann are background details regarding her as well as describing the circumstances surrounding her death. In addition, the mentioned episode continues by discussing the murders of four other victims who ultimately appeared to have died in the same manner as Wilma McCann, as their injuries were identical to hers. In relation to this, there are certain questions that pertain to the topic of the documentary in the first episode, which are discussed by the social actors. These questions revolve around the ineptitude regarding Sutcliffe's motives for killing people he did not know personally, as well as his reasoning for killing the 'same type' of women. However, the general issue at stake in relation to the documentary's subject matter is apparent in the second episode, because it involves the police's inability to detect Sutcliffe. The inability of the police's capture of Sutcliffe resulted in him killing women across England for more than half a decade.

Background information about the mentioned issue has been unfolded by social actors, who indicate that there was a misogynistic element involved in the subject matter, which was the police. According to some of the social actors, it is the police's misogyny that rendered them incapable of capturing Sutcliffe earlier in the investigation process. This information may also be

entirely 'unexpected' to the viewers, in that the police positioned themselves in a bad light due to

their prejudice against women of low status. This prompted many women in England to protest. A

few of the social actors present "propositions about problems in need of solution" (103).

They address how narrow-minded the police were at the time, in that they excluded some

"incredibly important eyewitness evidence" (00:06:49-00:06:43 Reclaim the Night). Among the

eyewitnesses is the above-mentioned victim, Tracy Browne, who reported her attack to the police in

1975. The police had labelled Sutcliffe's victims as prostitutes since the death of his first victim,

Wilma McCann. However, because of Browne's unrelatedness to prostitution, the police

overlooked her case. So, social actors believe that the problem might have been solved if the police

had not excluded some of the survivors, who could have provided evidence that helped in tracking

Sutcliffe much earlier in the investigation. Moreover, another characteristic of the poetic mode that

is featured in *The Ripper* (2020) is its way of presenting "subjective interpretations of the subject(s)

of attention (103). One example of the just-mentioned sentence is seen when one of the social actors

who is a news reporter accounts that the reason why the police imposed the identity of the victims

being involved in prostitution is because it fitted "the police's idea of the case" (00:07:46-

00:07:41). Following this, the social actor proceeds to read the police's report written about

McCann and gives a "subjective interpretation" of that report (103). The social actors believes that

by the police's use of language about McCann, the victim is described as "a very vulnerable woman

who is struggling and appears to be a single mother" (00:09:31-00:09:13). The just-stated sentences

illustrate that the social actor first shifted from accounting for the police's "point of view"

concerning Sutcliffe's victims whom, according to the social actor believed were involved in

prostitution and then gave a subjective view of the matter (14). This shift can be argued to present

'persuasion' in that the social actor wants to persuade the audience in to believing the police were

acting wrongfully against the victims (14). The shift from persuasion to expression or subjective

interpretations are generally "related to the representations of the social and historical world that are addressed to the viewer (14).

Besides this, the third episode unfolds information in depth about the issue of women's anger in relation to the police's prejudice as well as continued incapability of apprehending Sutcliffe. The fourth episode, however, can be argued to end on a satisfying note because the viewer is informed that Sutcliffe had finally been located and subsequently incarcerated. Each documentary can either involve the story about a certain individual or an entire society. It can be argued that *The Ripper* (2020) encompasses both matters and the reason to that is because the documentary touches upon Sutcliffe as an individual but also other people who were involved in his murder cases. Further, the film illustrates how the British society views women of low social status and how these women are depicted in the media.

The documentary also includes elements that of the 'expository mode' because of the documentary's use of several images, footages and "audio tapes" that are presented throughout the documentary in order to convey information to the audience (2-3). For instance, in the second episode, viewers are shown a clip where an audio tape is played, featuring a phone call made by a police officer offering information about Sutcliffe's murder cases (00:16:37-00:16:22 Between Now and Daw). Most of the images and footages in the documentary depict people, places and objects that are constructed as "fragments of the historical world" (3) (105). Furthermore, the documentary's feature of images as well as footages play a supporting role because "they illustrate" what the social actors discuss about (107). Another note is that they "act in counterpart to what is said" and emphasize the information conveyed by the social actors (107). Additionally, they also act as a counterpart between the entire subject matter discussed in the documentary. An example of such information is seen in the third episode in which one of the social actors explains that Marilyn Moore had provided the police with information about Sutcliffe's appearance, meanwhile archival

footages, and images from the 70s appear on the screen showing the police drawing a photofit of

Sutcliffe (00:25:17-00:25:07 Between Now and Dawn). A further example is illustrated when one

of the social actors talk about England during the second world war and up to the 1970s, while

footages of people and object from these periods appear on the screen. The connection between the

narrative of these periods is included by the social actors to give the audience an illustration of what

England's social condition was like at that time. Also, these footages are also included to make the

audience "believe that it is reality itself represented before" them (3). Moreover, the usage of such

histotical archival footages makes the audience "realize aspects of the world they already inhabit"

(1).

The social actors also "account for the images presented" in the documentary (107). This is

seen in the second episode: Between Now and Dawn, in which one of the social actors accounts for

the image presented on the screen featuring the photofit of Sutcliffe. While the photofit of Sutcliffe

is being displayed, the social actor describes the photo in detail regarding Sutcliffe's appearance.

Accounting for the images presented in the documentary makes the audience understand that the

images "serve as evidence and support the basic claims" of what is being discussed (107). Another

feature that of the expository mode which the documentary possesses is the use of a "voice-of-God

commentary or […] a voice-of-authority commentary" (105). The documentary features only the

latter aspect: 'a voice-of-authority commentary'. The reason for that is because whenever the social

actors "judge actions" and account for details associated with the subject at hand they are

simultaneously heard and seen throughout the whole documentary (107).

The victims' portrayal in the media

Throughout the documentary there is an emphasis placed on the female perspective. The directors

of *The Ripper* (2020): Jesse Vile and Ellena Wood, have made sure to focus on Sutcliffe's victims

rather than Sutcliffe himself. The reason for that is because there is a focus on the victims featured in the first three episodes of the documentary. Due to the documentary's structure, we are only made aware of Sutcliffe's identity towards the end, which invites a broader conversation regarding femicide, societal judgement, "misogyny evident in the nature of the violence" and the inadequate investigation by the police (Wattis 14).

Sutcliffe was known for killing women, especially "vulnerable" women who were considered prostitutes, thus making the case revolving around femicide (Quinet 74). In respect to this, *The Ripper* (2020) depicts how the law enforcement authorities' as well as the media's portrayal concerning femicide differ depending on who the victim was when the individual was alive. Most of "Sutcliffe's attacks took place in the red-light areas" in the northern English cities of Leeds and Bradford, as well as in Manchester and a few smaller towns in West Yorkshire (Wattis 3). His victims "were approached from behind and hit over the head with a hammer; they were often then slashed across the breasts and abdomen with clothing rearranged to reveal mutilated bodies" (3). Sutcliffe has from the beginning of the case been suspected to be a 'prostitute killer' since seven of his victims had engaged in the selling of sex on a regular basis (3).

The media outlets frequently referred to Sutcliffe's victims as "good-time girls" and girls with loose morals (3). This kind of description of the victims were used for those women who "may not have been prostitutes but were viewed pejoratively due to their lifestyle" (3-4). This is revealed in the following statement made by Detective Superintendent Dennis Hoban following the murder of Emily Jackson in 1976: "We are quite certain the man we are looking for hates prostitution… I am quite certain this stretches to women of rather loose moral who go into public houses and clubs, who are not necessarily prostitutes" (4). Generally speaking, the police positioned a few of Sutcliffe's victims within the category of 'the missing missing', which accounts them as ungrievable. These victims include the ones who were either presumed to be involved in

prostitution and those who were in fact engaged in prostitution as mentioned above. On the other hand, they positioned Sutcliffe's victims who were not engaged in prostitution within the category of 'the missing white girl syndrome', thus making them 'grievable'. Examples of some of the victims' grievability will be discussed below.

Sutcliffe's first victim was Wilma McCann whose body was found by the police in Leeds "near to the Chapeltown red-light area", which made the police assume that she was involved in prostitution (00:41:01-00:40:52 Once Upon a Time in Yorkshire). From then on, the police labeled her as a prostitute, and therefore positioned her outside the frame of grievability (Butler 42). However, it is noticed in the documentary that the police had no basis for suspecting she was a prostitute "other than assumptions about […] the way she lived her life" (00:09:03-00:08:48 Reclaim the Night). Some of the facts about the police's report regarding McCann that is mentioned in the previous section reads as follows: "During the latter months of her life, McCann was neglectful of her home and children. Her house was filthy and in a deplorable condition. She regularly left her children and went out drinking until the early hours" (00:09:27-00:09:15). The social actor who reads that report accounts that the police believed she was a prostitute because of the fact that "she was drinking and left her children sometimes" (00:08:51:-08:46). This is an example of a fact that positions McCann within the category of 'the missing missing' in that she was thought of having an unstable lifestyle (Quinet 79). However, the assumption about McCann being a prostitute is a rather important fact because her case made "the whole theory of a prostitute-killer" start (00:08:34-00:08:25). Another fact that made McCann being perceived as 'nongrievable' is the polices carelessness of her injuries which they did not publicly report. This is a fact that the documentary touches upon using an archival footage in which a newscaster states: "She'd been brutally battered about the head and had horrifying injuries to her body, which the police will not disclose" (00:46:24-00:46:18 Once Upon a Time in Yorkshire). In other words, this regards her as

an 'unworthy' victim whom the law enforcement authorities ridiculed as insignificant. Besides this, Emily Jackson, who was Sutcliffe's second victim, however, did in fact work as a prostitute. Just like McCann, Jackson's body was also found in Chapeltown near a red-light area. However, her case was not focused on that much by the law enforcement authorities, because of their misogyny that portrayed women like Jackson as people who 'were not alive to begin with' due to her involvement in prostitution, thus making Jackson unworthy of both further investigation and news coverage (Stillman 491).

Another victim of Sutcliffe was Irene Richardson, who, like McCann also did not have any previous convictions of being involved in prostitution prior to her death. However, the police though she was actively engaged in prostitution. An archival footage displayed in the documentary showcases a police officer claiming that Richardson might have been murdered because of her involvement in prostitution: "This woman was living fairly respectable up to about ten days before she met her death. She then seems to have gone down in status and may well have been acting as a prostitute" (00:08:08-00:07:57). This sentence suggests that "the law enforcement authorities show apathy and blame" Richardson for her own death because they assume that she deviated from the 'norms' by engaging in an act of prostitution (Caputi & Russell 15).

It is mentioned in the documentary that murders which involved people who were prostitutes or either presumed to be so as "fish and chip murders" (00:39:27-00:39:25). The newspapers that were written about people engaged in prostitution is said to have been used "to wrap up somebody's fish and chips" (00:39:25-00:39:15). Additionally, this might illustrate that the police were not the only ones who were judgmental, but also the British society as a whole discounted such cases. In overall terms, a substantial amount of press coverage was not provided to any of Sutcliffe's victims who were believed to be prostitutes. Additionally, their case was never featured on the front pages, which dehumanizes them and highlights them more as nongrievable.

Though, this differed after Sutcliffe murdered young girls: Jayne MacDonald, Barbara Leach, Josephine Whittaker and Jacqueline Hill who all fitted the criteria of 'the missing white girl syndrome' because they were 'young, belonged to the middle class, and were not involved in prostitution'. MacDonald was the first of Sutcliffe's victims to be featured on the news paper's front pages in that she was the first victim of the young girls murdered who was not a prostitute. The police made a distinction between MacDonald's killing and the killings of the other victims who were portrayed as prostitutes murdered before her. MacDonald was a student who "worked in a supermarket and lived at home" (00:10:40-00:10:30 Once Upon a Time in Yorkshire). They placed her within the category of 'the missing white girl syndrome' because she fits the criteria for a worthy grievable victim, as she is described as a "young, pretty, middle-class girl coming from an ordinary family" (00:05:56-00:08:28 Once Upon a Time in Yorkshire). The news media used certain discursive techniques that positioned MacDonald as grievable while framing Sutcliffe's other victims as ungrievable (Stillman 491). The discursive technique is witnessed in the Police's first letter written specifically to Sutcliffe that was featured "in the Yorkshire Evening Post" following MacDonald's murder (00:04:13-00:04:05). The letter which the police wrote as a response to Sutcliffe's attack sounds as follows:

> "[…] Your motive it is believed, is a dreadful hate for prostitutes. A hate that drives you to slash and bludgeon your victims. But inevitably, that passion went terribly wrong on Sunday. An innocent 16-year-old lass, a happy, respectable, working-class girl from a decent family crossed your path. How did you feel yesterday when your bloodstained crusade against streetwalkers had gone so horribly wrong? That your vengeful knife had found so innocent a target? Sick in mind, though you undoubtedly are, there must have been some spark of remorse as you rid yourself of Jayne's bloodstains" (00:03:44-00:02:51).

This letter accounts for the discrimination the police have against some of Sutcliffe's victims. The discrimination is seen through their use of language such as noting Sutcliffe's motives for killing a prostitute went 'horribly wrong' because of the murder of MacDonald. They explicitly account that the murder committed against MacDonald is a horrible action, while implicitly refraining from expressing their opinion regarding the murders of the other victims believed to be prostitutes. The police are publicly pointing out Sutcliffe for the murder of MacDonald whom they describe with positive word such as 'innocent' and 'respectable'. Meanwhile they are implicitly blaming Sutcliffe's other victims for their own death in that they are not described as 'innocent' like MacDonald, which humanizes MacDonald more than the other victims. Eventually the killings of the young victims resulted in public fear among women, as they realized that Sutcliffe was not targeting specific types of women but all kinds of women. Several women started a march throughout England to protest against 'violence against women'. The reason for the women starting a march is to proclaim, "a woman's right to walk alone at night without fear" (00:12:13-00:12:09 Reclaim the Night).

Sutcliffe's portrayal in the media

After Sutcliffe's first three murders committed on the previously mentioned victims: Wilma McCann, Emily Jackson and Irene Richardson, whom the policed categories as prostitutes: the police believed that they "had a serial killer on the patch", and who thought that Sutcliffe was only targeting women of 'low social class' (00:25:14-00:25:10 Once Upon a Time in Yorkshire). Therefore, it was initially thought that Sutcliffe was some "reincarnation of the legendary" Victorian serial killer, who is known as Jack the Ripper and allegedly only targeted prostitutes (00:24:44-00:24:17). Due to that, Sutcliffe was dubbed the 'Yorkshire Ripper' by the media

because of his criminal actions that are compared to Jack the Ripper. The police started seeing a similar pattern regarding the injuries of Sutcliffe's victims that are compared to the injuries that of Jack the Ripper's victims. That information was forwarded by the police to the news media who started creating sensationalized news stories about Sutcliffe's murder cases in which he would always be referred to as "The Yorkshire Ripper" (00:25:07-00:24:04).

The last episode illustrates that since Sutcliffe was arrested, he was always defined as a 'monster' by the public. Additionally, Richard McCann stresses how shocked he felt when he saw Sutcliffe's picture featured in the newspapers after having been caught. He adds that Sutcliffe did not look the person he had imagined: "he didn't look like this monster, this marvel character, this scary Yorkshire Ripper thing" (00:35:02-00:34:49 Out of the Shadows). This illustrates how people think that killers are akin to monsters. Alexa Wright discusses the illustration of monsters in ancient times as well as monstrous behavior today in her book Monstrosity: The Human Monster in Visual Culture (2013). A research study of the appearance of human monsters in Western culture concludes that monsters are the result of social and cultural constructions made within society. During the 19th century, human monstrosity was primarily associated with the human appearance (Wright 104). Foucault's "lecture on the 'abnormal' from 1975" offers a contrast to this information (28). Foucault discussed in his lecture how the concept of human monstrosity had evolved from being about an individual's appearance to being about a person's character (104). In light of the fact that Sutcliffe is considered a monster, the notion that monstrosity is more about appearance than behavior does not make sense. In the documentary, it is touched upon that Sutcliffe is considered an average looking man and that: "there was nothing about him that would" catch one's attention (00:37:43-00:37:35). This illustrates that Sutcliffe did not have any physical deformities and thus looked 'normal'. His behavior, however, in which he is killing several girls and women, is what characterizes him as a monster.

The last episode of the documentary touches upon his childhood and background information that discusses how the incidents in his childhood must have affected his behavioral pattern. Several interviews of people who knew Sutcliffe in person are interviewed regarding their opinion about him. The people interviewed all state how his personality deviated from 'normal behaviour', but that he was handsome. Wright's argument concerning monsters forming within the society in which they grew up is valid in the case of Sutcliffe because it is mentioned that Sutcliffe had "grown up in an atmosphere where contempt of women and dislike of women was normalized, and the idea that all women are victims […] was there already" (00:31:15-00:30:56). Sutcliffe's father would frequently commit domestic violence against his mother. Arguably, Sutcliffe's past experiences of being exposed to violence against his mother might naturally have influenced his future criminal behaviour and decisions of committing femicide. Also, having experienced his father committing violence might have led Sutcliffe to identify anything to do with women and femininity as weakness. As stated by Jane Caputi: "the murder of women […] by serial killer are the ultimate expression of a sexuality that defines sex as a form of domination/power" (Wright 134). Committing violence against women was perhaps his way of showing domination and power. Sutcliffe told the court that he was hearing "the voice of God" telling him to eliminate all prostitute he could come across, which could be part of a more extensive delusional system involving women and femicide (00:18:52-00:17:48). Furthermore, it is previously mentioned in the beginning of the analysis that his former wife: Sonia was unfaithful towards Sutcliffe, and that his mother was unfaithful towards his father, which are two factors he became devasted about. These incidents might have caused him to have a negative outlook on women and it therefore fueled his misogyny that eventually triggered his criminal actions against women.

The public's opinion about Sutcliffe being a 'monster' dehumanizes him to an extensive degree, which can be connected to Butler's concept of 'grievability'. Technically speaking,

'monster' is a negative word, and connecting Sutcliffe with such a negative expression makes him 'ungrievable'. His 'monstrous' acts such as committing murder is what makes him fall "outside the frame furnished by the norm" (Butler 8). Though, at the same time, Sutcliffe was over-mediated in the 1970's after having committed murders on non-prostitutes, which sort of makes him 'grievable'. The over-mediation is because of the periods in which the crimes were happening. The documentary includes footages showing large number of crowds waiting outside the courtroom to get a glimpse of Sutcliffe (00:40:31-00:40:12) which sparks attention to his grievability, making him 'worthy' of public attention. Amongst the crowd, are several photographers and cameramen standing preparing themselves to documenting Sutcliffe. The people in the crowds had mixed feelings about Sutcliffe: some people were present for pure curiosity while others were present for vengeance who held signs saying: "The Ripper is a coward. Hang him" (00:39:36-00:38:43). The expression 'hang him' illustrates the public's anger towards Sutcliffe, in that he had caused a threat to the British society for several years (Butler 42).

Discussion

The Ripper (2020) and Peter Sutcliffe: A Portrait of a Serial Killer (2011)

The discussion section will discuss the comparison between *The Ripper* (2020) and the film: Peter Sutcliffe: A Portrait of a Serial Killer (2011). The first section of the discussion will focus on how fact and fiction are interlaced in the film using film theory. Additionally, the intention of using film theory is to give examples of how the narrative about Sutcliffe is constructed within the film and how it differs from the narrative of the documentary. The second section of the discussion will account for how both Sutcliffe's and his victim's grievability is illustrated in the film using the feminist concepts. To avoid confusion, I will refer to the film's main character as Peter, and the real-life killer as Sutcliffe.

It is touched upon in the analysis that the documentary *The Ripper* (2020) is a documentary of social representation which falls under the category of nonfiction. Such kinds of documentaries instill a belief for the viewer "by accepting its world as actual" (Nichols 2). The documentary's actors discuss actual situations that have happened in real life and "honor known facts" (5). These known facts are related to the Sutcliffe's case, but the actors also discuss fact concerning the story about Jack the Ripper in which they touch upon in connection to the relation of Sutcliffe's crimes that are alike Jack the Ripper's. The actors mention that the narrative about Jack the Ripper is a part of British history, in that Jack the Ripper committed his crimes in Whitechapel, a district in the East End of London. Therefore, the audience are most likely to "realize aspects of the world they already inhabit" (1).

The analyzed documentary does not touch upon other facts that are related to, for instance fiction, or other facts that do not introduce unverifiable facts (5). The documentary therefore "speak directly about the historical world rather than allegorically" (5). One of the purposes of the analyzed documentary "is to display and bring to light the material of social reality" (1-2). Since *The ripper* (2020) is a documentary about social representation it presents "a fresh perspective on our interaction with the world, allowing us to explore and better understand it (2). The documentary presents other aspects about the world, besides bringing forth information about the murder cases committed by Sutcliffe. An example of another aspect touched upon in the documentary are information about the second world war. The information that is provided about the second world war can be said to give the viewer more comprehension of the subject matter in that the information regarding the second world war are generally used in connection to the subject matter. Moreover, the analyzed documentary intends "to engage the audience by providing them with a sense of authenticity" (2). In connection to this sentence, the documentary's use of news archival footages creates an apparent sense of authenticity for the audience because they were published at the time

when the case was actual. The archival footages are presented in connection to what each social actor state to serve as evidence and support "the basic claims" (107). The story of Sutcliffe is presented in chronological order because the document starts the story with Sutcliffe's first murder which was committed on Wilma McCann and continues to talk about the other murders he had committed in sequence. Furthermore, the documentary also presents the archival footages in chronological order because those shown at the beginning of the first episode are some that date from 1975 and the two last episode of the documentary continue to showcase archival footages up until to 1980, which is within the time period Sutcliffe committed his murders.

Moreover, the way in which the documentary presents facts happened in real life is through the use of modes. In terms of *The Ripper* (2020), it consists of two modes: the poetic and the expository mode. These modes are included to form the documentary's structure and narrative. Each mode has a purpose: the poetic mode mostly operates at affecting the audience emotionally, whereas the expository mode conducts at conveying information with the use of images, news archival footages and clips, to help bringing forth evidence for the audience. A few of the mentioned elements that are touched upon in connection to the analyzed documentary, are also apparent in the film Peter Sutcliffe: A Portrait of a Serial Killer (2011). However, a few elements discussed in connection to the analyzed documentary also differ from the said film. The comparisons which will be touched upon down below.

The film Peter Sutcliffe: A Portrait of a Serial Killer (2011) is a fictional work. Since the film is a work of fiction, it can be connected to the aspects that of 'fictionality', which is "describing something which is imagined" (Gjerlevsen 2016). The aspects of 'fictionality' will be given examples on below. The mentioned film is also based on real events. Nevertheless, the text itself: Peter: A Portrait of a Serial Killer' does in general identify the factual basis of the film alluding to the story of Sutcliffe. Also, another fact that accounts the mentioned film as one which

is inspired by true events is due to its usage of factual archival footages that contribute to the

narrative of Sutcliffe's murder cases. The illustrations of the archival footages involved in the film

are accurate and occur "in relation to situations and events which we are already familiar, or for

which we can find other sources of information" (Nichols 28). The archival footages are connected

only with events that have occurred in relation to Sutcliffe's murder cases both prior to his arrest

and when he got arrested. Some of the archival footages appears on the screen, are displayed with a

caption placed in the middle of the screen to present the viewer what that specific footage concerns.

An example of this is seen when the film includes a footage in which the assistant chief constable,

George Oldfield is talking about the case of Sutcliffe's 13th victim (00:03:06-00:03:15 Peter

Sutcliffe: A Portrait of a Serial Killer).

Karen Boyle and Jenny Reburn have analyzed the film Peter Sutcliffe: A Portrait of a

Serial Killer in their article named: "Portrait of a Serial Killer: Intertextuality and gender in the

portrait film" (2014), stating that some of the archival footages are not presented with a caption,

which is witnessed in the "opening sequence of the film" (Boyle & Reburn 14). Boyle and Reburn

suggest that the opening sequence which showcases a psychiatrist "privileges spectators who have

some foreknowledge of the case" (14). The reason for that is because there is, for instance, "no on-

screen caption to identify the 'real-life' psychiatrist that appears on the screen at the opening

sequence or specify at what stage in the investigation his televised appeal took place" (14)

(00:00:48-00:01:42).

In contrast to the analyzed documentary, the archival footages in the mentioned film are

not chronologically presented. As the film progresses, "the archive footages are spliced to

completely muddle the chronology" (14). While the psychiatrist in the opening sequence "refers to

Sutcliffe's eight victims immediately after the credits, we cut to a news report of Sutcliffe's arrest"

(14-15) (00:02:33-00:02:41). This "is edited together with a further four pieces of archive footage

which jump back and forward between different stages of the story: a mid-investigation appeal for help; a post-trial interview with Sutcliffe's father; a mid-investigation plea for public assistance in identifying the killer from his handwriting and a voice-recording; and a 1975 statement from the Assistant Chief Constable of West Yorkshire Police, in which all cases, a male spokesman and reporter is used" (15) (00:02:33-00:03:15).

The characters that are involved in the mentioned film are given the role that is "defined by the traditional role of the actor" (Nichols 5). Unlike the actors within the analyzed documentary who are presented as 'social actors', the actors within the mentioned film are 'theatrical performers', meaning that the performers within the film "are assigned a specific role to play" (5). Regarding the characters within the film, the main character is Peter, who is played by (Walt Kissack) and Dr. Spencer, who is referred to Peter's physiatrist played by (Gary Sharkey). Kissack is assigned to play the role of the real-life killer, and Sharkey is assigned to play the role of a psychiatrist. Prior to entering the prison, Peter does not often interact with others: he speaks only to Spencer and sometimes to the guards (Boyle & Reburn 16). Within the film, actors are unaware of the camera's presence, making the camera function more as an invisible object (5). This construction differs from *The Ripper* (2020), because the social actors are aware of the camera's presence in that they address it directly whenever they converse about Sutcliffe's murder cases. The film appears to have only male players, however, there is a scene in which one of Peter's victims is showcased in the film. The victim is his seventh victim: Helen Rytka, who is portrayed as dead (00:25:00-00:26:16). There will be a more thoroughly description of the differences between the portrayal of the victims' portrayal in both the film and the documentary further below.

The film reveals certain aspects that are connected to 'allegory' which may be a "commentary on actual people, situations, and events" (5). Throughout the film, the viewer witnesses Peter incarcerated, in which he meets Dr. Spencer and starts to see him quite frequently.

After Sutcliffe was apprehended, he was eventually being incarcerated. However, it is not a known fact whether Sutcliffe was regularly seeing a psychiatrist. Also, it is not a fact that is mentioned in the documentary. This unknown fact can be connected to Gjerlevsen's term about 'fictionality' in that the filmmaker has made a "pretense of" a fact to define the protagonist in a certain way, which can be said to highlight Sutcliffe as a mentally ill individual (Gjerlevsen 2016). In relation to how the narrative is constructed, Sheila Barnard argues that a few fictional stories are constructed to make the audience participate in the storytelling (Barnard 22). In connection to this, the viewers are invited to figure out the reason behind Spencer's general presence. The film does not make any distinction between the "archival footage of the real male psychiatrist's televised appeal" and the fictional psychiatrist, who is Spencer (Boyle & Reburn 13). The real-life male psychiatrist appears twice in the film. The first time he appears is in the beginning of the film as mentioned, and the second time he appears is halfway through the film. This is shown approximately after the viewer sees the fictional psychiatrist having a conversation with Peter. The second time the real-life male psychiatrist appears in the film is seen in an archival footage that displays him talking about Sutcliffe's psyche, stating that he simply does not care about his victims (00:25:02-26:30) The connection between the scene in which the real-life psychiatrist appears on the screen right after the scene in which Spencer is talking with Peter, suggests a connection between their characters. This example can be connection to Gjerlevsen's description of 'fictionality' being connected to the phenomenon of 'make believe' or the concept of 'as if' (Gjerlevsen 2016). The filmmaker might have incorporated the real-life psychiatrist as an 'image' to make him appear "as if" he is Dr. Spencer (Gjerlevsen 2016). However, it can be argued that Dr. Spencer is featured to give the viewer an attempt to journey inside Peter's mind. The reason for that is because "the film taps into the ideas of psychoanalytic therapy" in that Spencer hypnotizes Peter, with the use of a 'countdown'(Boyle & Reburn). After each hypnosis session, "an image of a boy sitting alone in an

attic appears on the screen, suggesting a progress being made in coming closer to the mind of Peter"
(14) (00:41:28-00:41:46). Every time the image of the boy sitting in the attic is featured, the voice
of Sutcliffe's father is displayed who accounts for a few of the incidents of Sutcliffe's childhood
(00:41:28-00:41:46). Boyle and Reburn states that "this dramatized editing may allude to the strong
tradition in serial killer discourse of seeking clues to the killer's crimes through his childhood"
(Boyle & Reburn 14).

Also, the film contrives "dialogues" between Peter and Spencer concerning the discussions
about good and evil, however, these dialogues between them are cut short (Nichols 5). Moreover, a
dialogue between Spencer and Peter illustrates Sutcliffe's motive for killing prostitutes. Spencer
asks Peter why he started committing murder, which Peter responses by uttering: "I told them
already. It was God. God told me to clean the streets of filth. I did what the voice told me to"
(00:10:50-00:11:10). Subsequently, an archival footage of a graveyard is displayed contributing to
give a glooming mood in the film (00:14:44-00:15:05). The fact concerning Peter's delusions about
'hearing the voice of God' is also a fact present in the analyzed documentary, which emphasizes the
factuality of the film in connection to the real-life killer's motives for committing femicide.
Generally speaking, the film portrays Peter as 'insane' which is a notion that is obvious in the
twisted ending of the film that unfolds aspects of Peter's "human condition" to the viewer (5). Peter
is having a conversation with Spencer about whether he thinks Peter is mentally stable to be
released from prison. A guard appears interrupting Peter's conversation with Spencer, who
suddenly disappears from the screen, when seen form the guard's point of view (01:16:03-
01:19:32). This shows that the film is in fact character-driven rather than plot-driven in that "the
action of the film emerges from the wants and needs of the characters" (17). The reason the film is
'character-driven' is because the film is seen through Peter's point of view. The film shows a
fictionalized relationship between the incarcerated Peter and "his" psychiatrist, Dr. Spencer

throughout the whole film (Boyle & Reburn 11). The ending reveals that "Spencer is a figment of Peter's imagination, which means that Spencer is Peter himself" (11). Such portrayal of Peter can be brought back to Gjerlevsen's discussion of 'fictionality' being a description of "something which is imagined" (Gjerlevsen 2016). The viewer witnesses that Peter was in fact a having a conversation with himself as opposed to having a conversation with Spencer, which puts another stress to Sutcliffe's 'delusional' condition, along with his account of hearing the 'voice of God'.

Bernard argues that the filmmaker offers a few information that helps "the viewers to experience the story for themselves, anticipating twists, and turns and following the story line in a way that's active rather than passive" (Bernard 22-23). In this regard, the filmmaker has kind of 'offered' some help for the viewer in revealing Peter's relationship to Spencer by showing the twisted end that illustrates Peter's psyche. It can be discussed that the ending can be described as a "satisfying ending" because the viewer discovers the intention behind Spencer's presence in the film (18).

The documentary: *The Ripper* (2020) shows that after Sutcliffe's testament of hearing voices, essentially led the authorities believe that he was insane. A news archival footage displays a news reporter that states Sutcliffe was seen by three psychiatrists who "gave him his final diagnosis of paranoid schizophrenia" (00:29:39-00:30:03 Out of the Shadows). It can be argued that such information must have inspired the filmmaker of the mentioned film to portray Sutcliffe 'insane' rather than 'sane'. Bernard states that a dramatic storytelling involves a character "with whom we some sympathy" (Bernard 18). The character whom the viewer sympathizes with is the protagonist "who the story regards (19). In regard to this, the film's protagonist is Peter, and it can be discussed that the filmmaker's portrayal of Peter as 'insane' has an "emotional impact" on the viewer (22). It can be argued that people possessing a mental disorder cannot always control their behavioral pattern, and therefore, for some people, it might be difficult to blame people for their actions due to

their disorder. Arguably, if Sutcliffe did not have mental problems, he most likely would not have committed murder.

Besides the film's inclusion of Sutcliffe's father's post-trial interview, the film also includes archival footages of people being interviewed regarding Sutcliffe, stating their opinion about him. These interviews give a slight insight into how he was as a person. One of the interviews that the film provides is one which include some of his few friends that state Sutcliffe had difficulties making relationships with people: "The time I knew Peter, he never had a girlfriend. He was a good-looking lad, but he had no conversations" (00:16:55-00:17:30). The people who are interviewed account Sutcliffe as having a rather odd personality but do not touch negatively upon his appearance. The documentary also includes interviews of people that state their opinion about Sutcliffe, these interviews also touch upon his personality. These interviews in the documentary are basically used to bring up a discussion of what might have caused him to commit murder and what went wrong in his life. In connection to his, the film also portrays the killer as an outwardly normal, because he is not shown as having any deformities. However, he is simultaneously portrayed as 'monstrous' due to the carelessness of the crimes he had committed. This is evident in the mentioned scene in which he tells Spencer that he was simply obeying 'God's words.' In respect to this, the film also emphasizes Peter's relationship to God. Peter is portrayed as 'religious' because there exist several scenes in which he prays. Additionally, there are drawings of Christ on the cross hanging in his wall cell (00:05:30-06:30). Generally speaking, the film is preoccupied with entering Peter's mind rather than understanding his life in a social, cultural, or historical context. This differs in relation to the documentary's context because *The Ripper* (2020) touches upon Sutcliffe's life social, cultural and historical context, to give the audience an overall illustration of Sutcliffe's murder cases as well as diving into his personality.

Comparison between the depictions of the victims

In general, the female victims are of unsubstantial and largely anonymous figures in the film because they are barely mentioned, which serves a focus mainly on the killer. The most striking feature is, however, the complete marginalization of the victims. The narrative is only focused on Peter's story, especially his psyche. Thus, the film adopts his lack of concern about his female victims, which portrays him as cold-hearted. Also, the viewer does not see any of the murders take place, and thus the misogyny of the crimes effectively becomes invisible for the viewer (Boyle & Reburn 15). The way in which the victims were killed is removed out of context (17). Arguably, this tendency empowers the killer's status, but also "partly downplaying his culpability" because the victims appear in the background (17).

The filmmaker of Peter Sutcliffe: A Portrait of a Serial Killer has chosen to portray Sutcliffe's victims as people who lack individuality. It can be discussed that the filmmaker has portrayed the victims as people who fit into the category of the 'missing-missing', and the reason for that is because of their lack of mentioning in the film. They do not receive a tremendous amount of attention compared to their killer. This serves as a dehumanization of them, which simultaneously also portrays them as both "unworthy" and nongrievable (Stillman 491). Simultaneously, by choosing to focus on the killer rather than the victims, does arguably humanize the killer. The victims are only showcased via news archival footages, but no essential information about them is included, such as information regarding their background. Though, the only information the viewer gets to know is their names and ages, which can be argued is of unsignificant information. Additionally, each time a victim appears in the film, they are displayed via sequences of images in an archival news report. This can, for instance be seen in the beginning of the film, in which an archival news report is accompanied by a clip that shows an image of

Sutcliffe's four victims. While this clip is displayed a news reporter states the following: "in the last four years, twelve women have been murdered and mutilated by a sick and sadistic maniac – The Yorkshire Ripper" (00:02:41-00:02:48). The film does have an extensive usage of archival news footage, however there is no reference to 'Reclaim the Night' marches or any information about how angry women were in response to the crimes and police failure. Since the viewer is not exposed to the 'cruel' details of the murders, it can be argued, that it might be difficult for the viewer to grieve them. Though, it can be discussed that if the film exposed the viewer to the crime scenes, the viewer would evoke sympathy towards the victims and hence grieve them. That is because the scenes can help evoke thoughts about how the victims must have felt during the crime scene.

The documentary: *The Ripper* (2020), however, exposes the viewer towards the crime scenes. The directors of the documentary have made the focus directed more on the narrative of each of Sutcliffe's victims rather than their perpetrator. The reason for that is because the documentary uses three of its four episodes only on the narrative as well as portrayal of Sutcliffe's victims. Each victim is described in detail and background information about them are also provided for the audience. Examples of that is mentioned in the analysis section which includes examples of the documentary's descriptions of the victims. The victims' case as well as the way in which the murders were committed are described thoroughly compared to the film. Many of Sutcliffe's victims were being portrayed as nongrievable. However, the directors of the documentary arguably tries to evoke sympathy within the viewer towards the victims, and hence 'grieve' them by diving into each victims' case instead of 'placing them in the background', as the film does. The victims portrayed in the documentary are given a certain 'individuality' because, besides diving into their case and giving background information about them, pictures of them are depicted each time the social actors mention their name. An example of that is witnessed when

Emily Jackson is mentioned in the documentary. When the social actors proceed to talk about Sutliffe's second victim: Emily Jackson, the audience sees a picture of her with her name placed in the middle of the picture (00:16:25-00:16:51 Once Upon a Time in Yorkshire). Depicting each victim with personal pictures each time they are mentioned directs the attention towards the victims, giving them more credit.

To elaborate more on Sutcliffe's victims, he did mainly target women who were in the category of 'the missing-missing', which are mostly "women who do not follow the norm" (Egger 88). Such women are usually 'unworthy' of media credit and are comprehended as nongrievable, making their deaths insignificant (88). The documentary dives into how gruesome and unfairly treated the victims were portrayed in the media at the time when Sutcliffe's killings were still actual. However, it can be discussed that the directors of the documentary intentionally portrayed the victims as falling within the category of 'the missing white girl syndrome' (Stillman 492). This importance is seen in how the documentary uses less time on Sutcliffe but more time on touching upon the victims' background information as well as discussing the victims' murder cases in detail. Furthermore, the documentary makes a clear depiction of the law enforcement authorities' distinctive treatment towards some of Sutcliffe' victims. This discrimination is seen in how police reacted when 16-year-old Jayne McDonald was killed. They began to pay more attention to the matter and reached out to Sutcliffe by writing a public letter. The police did not react in such a way with Sutcliffe's previous victims. This example can be linked to Butler's term concerning 'framing'. In this case, McDonald was framed as being part of a community, who got massive attention both by the law enforcement authorities but also by the public. Whereupon the victims that Sutcliffe killed before McDonald were framed as people who possessed a threat, and people who do not belong to a community (Butler 42). Besides this, the families of the victims that are displayed in the

documentary, can be said to have an emphasis and impact of the victims' grievability, in that the families serve as a 'voice' for them.

Fascination of serial killers

Even though the documentary uses more time on Sutcliffe's victims more than him, there is still an inequality between the victims and their killer. The reason for that is because the documentary still manages to touch upon Sutcliffe's persona and behavioral pattern, which is mostly witnessed in the last episode. The whole documentary is a narrative about the actions that Sutcliffe committed, and thus he is the 'core' of the case. Additionally, naming the documentary 'The Ripper' emphasizes the glorification of Sutcliffe. In terms of the film: *Peter Sutcliffe: A Portrait of a Serial Killer* (2011)*, it also involves the portrayal of Sutcliffe. Since the film refers to a real-life serial killer, the focus and popularity of the individual is quite evident. It can be discussed that it shows that the filmmaker of *Peter Sutcliffe: A Portrait of a Serial Killer* (2011) clearly has a fascination of the real Peter Sutcliffe.

People's fascination with serial killers typically stems from attempting to comprehend why they would kill another person, especially someone they do not personally know (Bonn 169). The actions of these people are "incomprehensible to us", thus explaining why they are intriguing for people to consider (169). The fascination with serial killers is also due to their ability to blend into society very effectively and for extended periods of time (186). This is an aspect that is quite noticeable with Sutcliffe because he was able to commit murder quite successfully for five years without being apprehended much sooner. Generally, the news media's exaggerative depiction of serial killer's also makes them glorified automatically (173). However, even though Sutcliffe is described as akin Jack the Ripper, he is still not as famous as Jack the Ripper. In the book *Jack the Ripper and the London Press* (2002), Lewis Curtis discusses that the reason why Jack the Ripper is

still extremely popular today is because he "was never caught and put on trial", which makes both him and the murders he committed a mystery (Curtis 10).

Conclusion

This paper has analyzed the documentary *The Ripper* (2020) and compared it with the film *Peter Sutcliffe: A Portrait of a Serial Killer* (2011). Both texts do glorify Sutcliffe in that they focus on his portrayal and behavioral pattern. The documentary focuses more on the portrayal of the victims rather than focusing on the portrayal of Sutcliffe. However, it still manages to touch upon the glorification of him by diving into his persona and background information in social, cultural, and historical context in the fourth episode. The narration in carried out by several people who are familiar with Sutcliffe's murder cases. Each social actor is set to narrate the story of Sutcliffe's murder cases in connection to their own position and expertise. The documentary touches upon the case of Sutcliffe's murder cases in detail, but also in chronological order, starting from Sutcliffe's first murder to his last.

The film, however, has been discussed as having the opposite focus in that it puts its attention towards the portrayal of Sutcliffe. The film uses more time on Sutcliffe rather than diving into the case of his 13 victims and the general depictions of the victims. The film focuses on Peter's psyche instead of focusing on his life in a broader context. The filmmaker has made Sutcliffe 'overshine' his victims, which highlights the glorification of him. The paper has analyzed the film by using elements connected to 'film theory', to dive into how fiction and fact are displayed in the film, whereas the documentary has been analyzed with the help of documentary theory. The analyzation of both texts has proved the perpetrator is the one who, in the end, gets all the media credit. The reason for that is because both texts revolve around the narrative of Sutcliffe as well as the violent actions that he committed against other people.

Work Cited

Donley, M. Amy & Gualtieri, C. Marie. "Homeless Killer": An Analysis of the Media's Portrayal of the Victims of a Serial Killer. Deviant Behavior. 2016.

Bernard, Curran Sheila. *Documentary storytelling for video and filmmakers.* Focal press, 2004.

Bonn, Scott. *Why We Love Serial Killers: The Curious Appeal of the World's Most Savage Murderers.* Skyhorse Publishing, 2014.

Boyle, Karen & Reburn, Jenny. Portrait of a serial killer: Intertextuality and gender in the portrait film. 2014. Pp 1-24.

Butler, Judith. *Frames of War: When Is Life Grievable?* Verso, 2010.

Caputi, Jane, and Diana E. H. Russell. "Femicide: Sexist Terrorism against Women." *Femicide: The Politics of Woman Killing*, edited by Diana E. H. Russell and Jill Radford, Open University Press, 1992, pp. 13–21.

Chelsea, Hart, Amanda, Gilbertson. "When does violence against women matter?: Gender, race and class in Australian media representations of sexual violence and homicide. University of Melbourne. Nov. 2018

Colin, Lindsey. Davie R. William. "Missing White Woman Syndrome: How Media Framing Affects Viewers' Emotions. SAGE. 2015.

Corner, John. *The art of record: A critical introduction to documentary*. Manchester University Press, 1996.

Corner, John. *Television form and public address.* Edward Arnold. 1995.

Curtis, Lewis. *Jack the Ripper and the London Press*, Yale University Press, 2002.

ProQuest Ebook Central,

https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/aalborguniv-

ebooks/detail.action?docID=3419898.

Egger, Steven A. *The Killers Among Us: An Examination of Serial Murder and Its Investigation.*

2nd ed., Prentice Hall, 2002.

Gibson, C. Dirk. *Serial Killer Around the World The Global Dimensions of Serial Murder,* pp. 112-

130 Bentham Science Publishers, 2014. ProQuest Ebook Central,

https://www.proquest.com/docview/2131766268/bookReader?accountid=8144

Hall, Lynn & Wahlin, Leah. *A Guide to Technical Communications: Strategies & Applications.* The

Ohio State University, 2016.

Nichols, Bill. *Introduction to Documentary.* Indiana University Press, 2001.

Nichols, Bill. *Introduction to Documentary.* Third Edition. Indiana University Press, 2017.

Quinet, Kenna. "Prostitutes as Victims of Serial Homicide: Trends and Case Characteristics 1970-

2009." *Homicide Studies*, vol. 15, no. 1, Feb. 2011, pp. 74–100,

doi:10.1177/1088767910397276.

Quinet, Kenna. "The Missing Missing: Toward a Quantification of Serial Murder

   Victimization in the United States." *Homicide Studies*, vol. 11, no. 4, Nov. 2007, pp. 319

   339, doi:10.1177/1088767907307467.

Peter: A portrait of a serial killer. Directed by Skip Kite, Nicholas Ball, James Macartney and

   Tansy Adair, performances by Walt Kissack, Gary Sharkey and Adam Lewis, Praslin

   Pictures, 2011.

Sarah Stillman (2007) "The missing white girl syndrome": disappeared women and media activism,

   Gender & Development, 15:3, 491-502, DOI: 10.1080/135520707016306657.

Sarteschi, C. M. *Mass and Serial Murder in America.* Springer, 2016.

Terranova, Natalie. *Impact of a Serial Killer: Looking at the Case of Ted Bundy Then and Now.*
Bryant University, 2020.

"The Ripper". *Netflix*. Directed by Jesses Vile and Ellena Wood. Released on 16 December 2020.

   https://www.netflix.com/watch/81053939?trackId=13752289

Grzyb, Magdalena, Naudi Marceline & Marcuello-Servós, Chaime. *Femicide across Europe:*

   Theory, research and prevention. Bristol University Press, 2018.

Zetterberg Gjerlevsen, Simona: "Fictionality", Paragraph 18. In: Hühn, Peter et al. (eds).: *the living*

   handbook of narratology. Hamburg: Hamburg University. URL = *https://www.lhn.uni-*

   hamburg.de/node/138.html#Walsh.

Wattis, Louise. Revisiting the Yorkshire Ripper murders. Interrogating Gender Violence, Sex Work

    and Justice. Feminist Crimonology, pp. 1-20, 2018.

Wright, Alexa. *Monstrosity: The Human Monster in Visual Culture.* I.B. Tauris, 2013.

      https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=KFcJAwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&o

      utput=reader&hl=da&pg=GBS.PA163.w.0.0.0.0.1