Natural Science | Nov 30, 2025 | 6 min read | By Bryan White

Jack the Ripper: Solved by Science or Sold by Hype?

DNA * Urban Environment * Archaeology

Introduction: The "Definitive Reveal" and the Whitechapel Cold Case

The "Autumn of Terror" of 1888, marked by the brutal slayings of five women in London's East End, remains one of criminal history's most enduring mysteries. Following the release of Russell Edwards' Naming Jack the Ripper: The Definitive Reveal, renewed media coverage declared the 136-year-old case solved based on molecular biology and forensic testing of a silk shawl allegedly recovered from the scene of Catherine Eddowes' murder.[1][2] Working with molecular biologist Dr. Jari Louhelainen (Liverpool John Moores University) and Dr. David Miller (University of Leeds), Edwards asserts that mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) extracted from the garment links the crimes to Aaron Kosminski, a 23-year-old Polish-Jewish barber living in Whitechapel.[2][3]

Accompanied by a CGI facial reconstruction and calls from descendants of both Eddowes and Kosminski for a new coroner's inquest, the announcement exemplifies the tension between commercial cold-case narratives and forensic rigor.[1] Synthesizing the 2019 peer-reviewed data in the Journal of Forensic Sciences with recent forensic critiques reveals that while mtDNA profiles do not exclude Kosminski, claims of a "100% match" are undermined by major breaks in provenance, unmitigated contamination risks, and the statistical non-uniqueness of maternal haplogroups.[4][3]

Historical Viability and Artifact Provenance

Born Aron Mordke Kozmi ski in K odawa, Poland, in 1865, Kosminski emigrated to Whitechapel in the early 1880s and was an active suspect during the original police investigation.[5][6] Sir Melville Macnaghten's confidential 1894 Macnaghten Memoranda named Kosminski among three primary suspects, noting his intense hatred of women and homicidal tendencies.[5] Chief Inspector Donald Swanson's handwritten Swanson Marginalia further recorded that a witness identified Kosminski at a police convalescent home, though no prosecution followed because the witness declined to testify.[4] Suffering from chronic auditory hallucinations and paranoia, Kosminski was committed to Colney Hatch Lunatic Asylum in 1891 -- three years after the canonical murders ceased -- and died at Leavesden Asylum in 1919.[6]

Connecting Kosminski physically to the crimes relies chiefly on an eight-foot Michaelmas-daisy silk shawl purchased by Edwards at auction in 2007.[7][4] Oral family history claims that Metropolitan Police Acting Sergeant Amos Simpson removed the bloodstained shawl from Mitre Square on September 30, 1888, after Catherine Eddowes' murder. However, three major historical contradictions challenge this chain of custody:

* Jurisdictional Conflict: Mitre Square lay within the jurisdiction of the City of London Police, whereas Simpson served in the Metropolitan Police's N Division (Islington), miles away, with no official record placing him at the scene.[4]

* Inventory Omission: The meticulous City Police property inventory for Eddowes cataloged her bonnet, jacket, skirt, and pawn tickets, but recorded no silk shawl.[7]

* Socio-Economic Incongruity: Eddowes had pawned her partner's boots for gin money hours before her death, making ownership of an expensive silk garment improbable unless -- as Edwards speculates without corroboration -- the killer brought the shawl himself.[4]

Forensic Methodology: Vacuum Extraction and mtDNA Amplification

To sample the fragile textile non-destructively, Louhelainen and Miller utilized a custom "vacuuming" pipetting method, injecting sterile buffer deep into the fabric weave and aspirating cellular debris trapped within the fibers.[3] Because nuclear DNA degrades extensively over a century at ambient temperatures, the team targeted mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA), which survives in higher copy numbers per cell and is inherited strictly along the maternal line.[3]

Sequencing of hypervariable regions following Whole Genome Amplification (WGA) produced two reported lineage alignments: bloodstains matched the mtDNA profile of Karen Miller, a direct matrilineal descendant of Catherine Eddowes, while epithelial cells recovered from putative seminal stains matched an anonymous matrilineal descendant of Kosminski's sister.[1][3]

Critical Forensic Evaluation: Statistical Fallacies and Contamination

Despite media headlines proclaiming a "100% DNA match," forensic geneticists have identified fundamental flaws in both the statistical interpretation and physical integrity of the shawl data.[4][8]

* The 314.1C Nomenclature Error and Lineage Non-Uniqueness: In initial reporting, Louhelainen highlighted a rare mutation at position 314.1C to argue for high exclusionary power, which independent geneticists identified as a clerical nomenclature error for 315.1C -- a polymorphism present in over 99% of European sequences in the EMPOP database.[4][8] As forensic geneticist Turi King emphasized, mtDNA is a lineage marker shared by thousands of maternal relatives and unrelated individuals within the same haplogroup; in court, an mtDNA match represents only a failure to exclude, not individual identification.[6]

* Uncontrolled Contamination History: For 119 years prior to auction, the unwashed shawl was stored, displayed, and handled without gloves by Simpson's descendants, museum personnel, and prospective buyers -- and even after 2007, living maternal descendants of Eddowes were brought into physical proximity with the textile prior to sterile sampling.[4] Vacuum buffer extraction cannot temporally stratify 1888 cellular material from 20th- or 21st-century epithelial shedding.[2][4]

* Phenotypic Misrepresentation in CGI Reconstruction: Because mtDNA encodes only oxidative phosphorylation proteins and ribosomal/transfer RNAs -- and zero nuclear single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) governing craniofacial morphology, pigmentation, or hair texture -- the 2024 CGI "facial reconstruction" is an artistic composite informed by historical demographics rather than forensic DNA

phenotyping.[3][1]

| Evidentiary Domain | | Edwards / Louhelainen Claim | | Forensic & Historical Critique |

| Suspect Profile | | Aaron Kosminski identified as killer | | Consistent with 1894 Macnaghten Memoranda and asylum records; historically plausible.[5] |

| Artifact Provenance | | Shawl recovered at Mitre Square (1888) | | Absent from City Police inventory; Metropolitan officer had no jurisdiction at scene.[7][4] |

| Genetic Marker | | mtDNA match to Kosminski & Eddowes lineages | | mtDNA is maternally shared across thousands; 314.1C rarity claim rested on a nomenclature error.[8][6] |

| Chain of Custody | | Deep-weave vacuuming isolates 1888 cells | | Over a century of ungloved handling creates substantial modern contamination risk.[4] |

| Visual Identification | | "Cutting-edge" CGI facial reconstruction | | mtDNA contains no craniofacial phenotypic information (requires nuclear DNA SNPs).[3] |

Conclusion: Probabilistic Inclusion vs. Definitive Proof

While Aaron Kosminski remains one of the most historically credible suspects in the Whitechapel murders, elevating the Mitre Square shawl to definitive forensic proof exemplifies the "CSI Effect" in historical criminology.[5][4] Without an unbroken chain of custody, ancient DNA damage-pattern authentication, or nuclear SNP profiling, the mtDNA evidence provides at best a non-exclusionary data point clouded by modern handling.[3][6] Science has illuminated the methodological limits of retrospective cold-case forensics, a methodological weakness formally underscored when the Journal of Forensic Sciences published an official Expression of Concern on Louhelainen and Miller's paper in September 2024, leaving the identity of Jack the Ripper beyond the reach of a "100% match."[8][4]

Updates... (Nov 22, 2026): Added verified publication date (Sep 8, 2014) to Ref [7], clarified online Mar 12, 2019 vs. Jan 2020 print publication on Louhelainen & Miller (Ref [3]) alongside the August 12, 2024 online / September 2024 print Expression of Concern (Ref [8], doi:10.1111/1556-4029.15595), and added the specific publication date on Ref [6] (Mar 15, 2025).

References

* [1] CBS News (2025). Jack the Ripper victim's relative demands new inquest after possible DNA breakthrough: "A form of justice". https://www.cbsnews.com/news/jack-the-ripper-victim-relative-new-inquest-dna-evidence/

* [2] Sequencing.com (2024). Jack the Ripper DNA Evidence: Was Aaron Kosminski the Killer? https://sequencing.com/blog/post/dna-analysis-forensics-identity-jack-ripper

* [3] Louhelainen, J., & Miller, D. (Jan 2020; published online Mar 12, 2019). EXPRESSION OF CONCERN: Forensic Investigation of a Shawl Linked to the "Jack the Ripper" Murders. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 65(1), 295-303. https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.14038

* [4] The Skeptic (Mar 2025). DNA analysis almost certainly hasn't just solved the

mystery of Jack the Ripper.
https://www.skeptic.org.uk/2025/03/dna-analysis-almost-certainly-hasnt-just-solved-the-mystery-of-jack-the-ripper/

* [5] Macnaghten, M. L. (1894). The Macnaghten Memoranda (Metropolitan Police official documents archive, Casebook: Jack the Ripper).
https://www.casebook.org/official_documents/memo.html

* [6] Criminal Legal News (Mar 15, 2025). 'Jack the Ripper' Meets DNA Analysis.
https://www.criminallegalnews.org/news/2025/mar/15/jack-ripper-meets-dna-analysis/

* [7] The Jack the Ripper Tour (Sep 8, 2014). Naming Jack The Ripper: Catherine Eddowes' Shawl.
https://thejacktherippertour.com/blog/naming-jack-the-ripper-cathrine-eddowes/

* [8] Journal of Forensic Sciences Editorial Notice (Sep 2024; published online Aug 12, 2024). EXPRESSION OF CONCERN: Forensic Investigation of a Shawl Linked to the "Jack the Ripper" Murders. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 69(5), 1938.
https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.15595