

---

## Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by Jamrie - 2008/05/16 16:07

---

How many of you good people agree with Saimo Chahai?

And who's she when she's at home?

Well, she is a very successful legal aid lawyer who enjoys the challenge of taking on difficult cases. Presently she is causing a few ripples in the justice department by demanding the release of Peter Sutcliffe, aka The Yorkshire Ripper.

Apparently Ms Chahai is basing her case on the fact that Sutcliffes rights were violated by the failing of the court to set a tariff, a minimum term when he was sentenced.

She is also of the opinion that he is sane enough to be released

I would hate to think that this evil person could be released on a mere technicality. This person should in my opinion, remain banged up in Broadmoor for the rest of his life.

Full story here:-

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/yorkshire-ripper-seeks-release-over-human-rights-breach-827997.html>

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/16 16:45

---

Jamrie wrote:

How many of you good people agree with Saimo Chahai?

And who's she when she's at home?

Well, she is a very successful legal aid lawyer who enjoys the challenge of taking on difficult cases. Presently she is causing a few ripples in the justice department by demanding the release of Peter Sutcliffe, aka The Yorkshire Ripper.

Apparently Ms Chahai is basing her case on the fact that Sutcliffes rights were violated by the failing of the court to set a tariff, a minimum term when he was sentenced.

She is also of the opinion that he is sane enough to be released

I would hate to think that this evil person could be released on a mere technicality. This person should in my opinion, remain banged up in Broadmoor for the rest of his life.

Full story here:-

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/yorkshire-ripper-seeks-release-over-human-rights-breach-827997.html>

These children are not dead then.

I wonder what their poor parents think of that.

This is one way for a Solicitor to make a name for herself but how does she sleep.

If he is now schizophrenic I am fairly sure Westminster adopted or are adopting the same laws as we did to allow people who are a danger to themselves or other to be put in Broadmore or the likes until they are safe. Hopefully the assessment will show he is a danger.

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/16 16:59

---

---

Jamrie wrote:

How many of you good people agree with Saimo Chahai?

And who's she when she's at home?

Well, she is a very successful legal aid lawyer who enjoys the challenge of taking on difficult cases. Presently she is causing a few ripples in the justice department by demanding the release of Peter Sutcliffe, aka The Yorkshire Ripper.

Apparently Ms Chahai is basing her case on the fact that Sutcliffes rights were violated by the failing of the court to set a tariff, a minimum term when he was sentenced.

She is also of the opinion that he is sane enough to be released

I would hate to think that this evil person could be released on a mere technicality. This person should in my opinion, remain banged up in Broadmoor for the rest of his life.

Full story here:-

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/yorkshire-ripper-seeks-release-over-human-rights-breach-827997.html>

<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/business/bills/billsPassed/b64s1.pdf>

The Mental Health Bill for Scotland

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/16 17:15

---

[http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2007/ukpga\\_20070012\\_en\\_2](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2007/ukpga_20070012_en_2)

Mental Health Act for Westminster unless there is some kind of sympathetic Psychiatrist or judge he may never get out.

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by Jamrie - 2008/05/16 17:52

---

Another worrying aspect of this case is that I remember Sutcliffe being sentenced, it seems like only yesterday, in fact it's over 27 years ago.

How time flies.:( :(

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by TLJ - 2008/05/16 17:56

---

Jamrie wrote:

How many of you good people agree with Saimo Chahai?

And who's she when she's at home?

Well, she is a very successful legal aid lawyer who enjoys the challenge of taking on difficult cases. Presently she is causing a few ripples in the justice department by demanding the release of Peter Sutcliffe, aka The Yorkshire Ripper.

Apparently Ms Chahai is basing her case on the fact that Sutcliffes rights were violated by the failing of the court to set a tariff, a minimum term when he was sentenced.

She is also of the opinion that he is sane enough to be released

---

I would hate to think that this evil person could be released on a mere technicality.  
This person should in my opinion, remain banged up in Broadmoor for the rest of his life.

Full story here:-

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/yorkshire-ripper-seeks-release-over-human-rights-breach-827997.html>

She not seeking his release; she's seeking transfer to the prison system and she's also seeking confirmation of what his tariff will be.

He'll not be released. Not now. Not ever.

---

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by DavieDites - 2008/05/16 18:12

---

He'll not be released. Not now. Not ever.

Agreed TLJ. No politician or government would survive if he were released on their shift.

In any case, he would be insane to want to be released. Imagine what life would be like with a pack of newshounds and vigilantes dogging every footstep.

---

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by Jamrie - 2008/05/16 20:19

---

The way that I understand it is,transferring Sutcliffe into the prison system, is the first step towards the process of bringing this case to court, with the view of obtaining his release.

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/crime/article3932571.ece>

---

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/16 20:46

---

Jamrie wrote:

The way that I understand it is,transferring Sutcliffe into the prison system, is the first step towards the process of bringing this case to court, with the view of obtaining his release.

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/crime/article3932571.ece>

I wonder how much this has affected the decision to try

Parole Board breaches human rights of prisoners, Court of Appeal rules

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/parole-board-breaches-human-rights-of-prisoners-court-of-appeal-rules-777233.html>

---

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by Clare - 2008/05/16 23:13

---

There is some EU directive kicking about which is causing bedlam with cases like this. Some of you may remember last year when the case of Robert Mone was covered and the possibility that he would be released was raised. Mone along

---

with Thomas McCulloch was involved in their now notorious escape from Carstairs many years ago now which left a trail of blood and dead bodies behind them. Prior to those murders Mone had murdered a young school teacher and held her class hostage. Mone's release too is going to be down to his "human" rights and is about challenging the state on sentences which recommend the person convicted shouldn't be released ever. I remember the issue being debated on the Herald threads at the time. I think the whole issue is a very worrying one.

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by Clare - 2008/05/16 23:20

---

Found this on Google. Its about Mone and McCulloch. It isn't from the Herald tho. I recall in the Herald Mone had written about the school teacher and the detail he recalled was alarming. The letter read as if he was getting pleasure out of his recollections. Anyway, the following is from a nurse who worked in Carstairs who was going to be pleading with the authorities not to release Mone or McCulloch.

Nurse Breaks 30-Year Silence On Carstairs Killings  
Dec 21 2007 By Karen Bale

THE NURSE who found the victims of the Carstairs breakout bloodbath has broken his 30-year silence to reveal in graphic detail exactly what happened.

John Hughes, 66, found the horrific scene left by psychotic lovers Robert Mone and Thomas McCulloch.

He spoke out yesterday in a bid to persuade the authorities to keep the evil pair locked up forever.

John revealed how the monsters mutilated their two victims at the state hospital beyond recognition.

They split nurse Neil McLellan's head with an axe, attacking him so viciously that his blood was dripping from the ceiling.

They also peeled off fellow patient Ian Simpson's scalp and left it on a chair.

John has never spoken about his experience - until now. The OAP said: "I was there and saw what these animals did.

These two men are insane, evil, manipulative, psychopathic and devious.

"They fooled psychiatrists, psychologists and senior nurses in 1976 and, mark my words, they will do it again.

"The problem was, everyone thought they could be rehabilitated. But we were all very, very wrong.

"You cannot rehabilitate these people to go back out among human beings. People of their calibre cannot be cured.

"They have not changed. If they were released tomorrow, they would be pals again the day after and history would repeat itself."

Mone and McCulloch attacked Neil and Simpson with a terrifying arsenal of weapons they made in the hospital, before using a rope ladder to scale the perimeter fence and flee.

But the slaughter didn't stop. The madmen attacked two policemen - killing one - and viciously assaulted two workmen.

Former nurse John yesterday spoke about that awful night on November 30, 1976, after the Record printed letters sent by Mone from behind bars. They give a chilling insight into his twisted mind.

John worked with Mone, now 58, and McCulloch, now 57, for several years before their breakout and was on duty that night.

He revealed how he had last seen colleague Neil with Mone and McCulloch at 5pm. The lovers had been friendly and civil, even raising a smile as they walked off.

Neil was meant to be off duty but had come back to work, so the pair could work on the hospital magazine. He'd collected Simpson from his ward as well.

John remembers the duty charge nurse telling him he was concerned, as he couldn't contact Neil, who was in the administration building.

---

John, who was a nurse for 30 years, was sent to the block and discovered his pal's body slumped on the floor. He said: "I found Neil and knew in my heart he was dead as soon as I walked in that room."

"I bent over Neil and I didn't recognise him. I felt a drip on the back of my neck and put my hand to my head. It was Neil's blood dripping off the ceiling.

"They had hit him so hard with the axe, his blood had sprayed everywhere. His face was blown up with the pressure of the axe and was smothered in blood and fluid. All I could see was bone.

"The back of his scalp was open wide where they had used a fireman's axe to slice open his head.

"I didn't recognise him. He didn't have his glasses on. They were broken and on the ground. Then I saw the little tin he used to keep his cigarettes he rolled himself.

"They had cut the back of his belt to take his keys and dropped his tin. That was when it hit me."

Horrified John called for help as he stood alone in the room fearing for his own life. He realised the evil pair had stashed their weapons - cleavers and a garden fork - in the office before their breakout bid.

Knives had been taped behind pictures on the wall.

John said: "I'm not going to pretend I was a hero. I was terrified.

"Neil's assistant had gone off to the female block or she would have been slaughtered too. There is no doubt about that in my mind.

"When I phoned the central nursing office, I thought Simpson must be involved in the breakout.

"I told them, Mone, McCulloch and that b\*\*\*\*\*d Simpson have murdered Neil and escaped."

John realised a small room off the main office was locked and he believed the trio were hiding.

But as he rammed down the door, there was something behind it. It was Simpson's body.

Simpson had already been attacked when Mone speared him with the garden fork. McCulloch had hacked off his ears as a trophy.

John said: "They had really set about him. It was our belief they asked Simpson to join them and he refused, so they killed him. They had scalped him. They had used an axe on his head and his scalp. His hair and skin were lying on top of a chair.

"That's what kind of people they are - that's what we are dealing with."

After their escape, Mone and McCulloch ambushed PC George Taylor, a father of six, and murdered him with an axe. His colleague, John Gillies, was badly wounded but lived.

Workmen Jack McAlroy and William Lennon were also brutally attacked.

McCulloch hit Jack on the head with an axe, while William was stabbed six times by Mone. Somehow, they survived.

Before they were finally caught, they terrorised a young family in their own home. John revealed how every family in the village of Carstairs, Lanarkshire, where he still lives, was terrified.

John said: "My wife worked in the hospital as well and that night my daughter begged us, 'Please stop working there'."

John says the monsters had shown no signs of what they were plotting.

He added: "They were both very plausible characters. They would never get into conflict with nursing staff.

"If you chastised them, they would apologise and back away. But they could manipulate people very easily."

He went on: "They had been given a lot of freedom. They were being rehabilitated for the outside world.

"But, in actual fact, they led psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, nursing staff and therapists down the garden

---

path. They conned everybody into believing they were on the mend.

"I now believe they had been plotting their escape for 18 months or two years.

"They were in a psychotic relationship and fed off each other.

"They were trying to outdo each other making weapons. They used guitar strings like cheesecutters to choke a potential victim. They collected staff uniforms and carved knives from wood and metal."

Mone had been sent to Carstairs after blasting pregnant teacher Nanette Hanson to death and holding her class hostage at his old school in Dundee.

Mone raped one of the children and molested another during the 1967 siege.

After their escape, Mone and McCulloch were jailed for life.

Mone is now training for freedom after 38 years. It's also feared McCulloch could be freed soon after being allowed to leave prison on supervised day trips.

But we printed Mone's letters - written during a violence reduction workshop in Shotts prison - to prove the monster is still mentally ill.

In them, he blames McCulloch for the Carstairs breakout murders.

He shows no remorse for his crimes and boasts 540 people were left traumatised by them. He even awards his victims points to measure their anguish.

John says Mone and McCulloch slipped through the net and begged the authorities to take a lesson from history.

John said: "Mone is still feeding off the past. He remembers every tiny detail of that day. He gets pleasure from it.

"I haven't forgotten that day because I was left traumatised. But Mone and McCulloch are like a couple of vultures feeding off the carcass of 1976. They will never change, ever."

'You cannot rehabilitate these people to go back among human beings. People like them cannot be cured'

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/17 07:04

---

Jamrie wrote:

The way that I understand it is, transferring Sutcliffe into the prison system, is the first step towards the process of bringing this case to court, with the view of obtaining his release.

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/crime/article3932571.ece>

More info on the case that Clare found Mone and McCulloch

<http://www.sundaymail.co.uk/news/newsfeed/2007/12/30/carstairs-killer-s-postcard-from-hell-78057-20269087/>

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/17 07:35

---

This link mentions the fact that Sutcliffe has no tariff set for him but does not confirm that the secretary of state for justice has the same powers as a Scottish Minister to overrule a court ruling.

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/article759322.ece>

=====

**Re:Peter Sutcliffe**

Posted by Clare - 2008/05/17 09:56

I think all this "progress" on the rights of prisoners, especially dangerous ones, really makes one wonder about our own right to live within communities where we can feel safe and secure.

I remember the Carstairs murders very well as obviously the newspapers and tv news programmes were dominated by what had happened. I still can't pass Carstairs on the train south without recalling Mone in particular. It still makes me shudder. I can still recall the picture carried by the media of Mone and those eyes of his.

Sometimes it is right to put people away and never let them out again and I would say Mone is one, so is his accomplice McCulloch and so is Sutcliffe. I don't think you can legislate to cover for the "human rights" of people like that and I believe individual countries cannot allow the EU to start dictating in such a general way regarding such people. Perhaps what we need to do in Scotland as a country is overhaul the entire Criminal Justice system when it comes to sentencing policy. If they want categories, lets give them categories. I realise there is a huge issue just now with accommodation for prisoners but I understand that several new prisons are under construction too. So it might be a good time for Kenny McAskill to make a few announcements in the meantime and start consulting on how we, the people, want our Criminal Justice system to work. Starting with clear sentences for murder and other violent crimes.

=====

**Re:Peter Sutcliffe**

Posted by TLJ - 2008/05/17 10:19

Clare wrote:

I don't think you can legislate to cover for the "human rights" of people like that and I believe individual countries cannot allow the EU to start dictating in such a general way regarding such people.

I'd like to know how the EU is dictating how we act in relation to our prisoners.....

=====

**Re:Peter Sutcliffe**

Posted by TLJ - 2008/05/17 10:24

Clare wrote:

I think all this "progress" on the rights of prisoners, especially dangerous ones, really makes one wonder about our own right to live within communities where we can feel safe and secure.

You have that right.

Tariffs are minimum terms to be served. Release isn't by any means automatic.

=====

**Re:Peter Sutcliffe**

Posted by Clare - 2008/05/17 11:33

TLJ wrote:

Clare wrote:

I don't think you can legislate to cover for the "human rights" of people like that and I believe individual countries cannot allow the EU to start dictating in such a general way regarding such people.

I'd like to know how the EU is dictating how we act in relation to our prisoners.....

Hi T, not sure in what way they are but I know its happening and goes along the lines of the state not having the authority

---

to keep people locked up indefinitely. The EU says that is a breach of their human rights. It says more too. This is where all the appeals have come from regarding the "right" to a wage, even when in prison, the "right" to access to mobile phones, computers et al. It goes on and on. My understanding of being sent to prison is that one loses the right to freedom and the right to function as those outside do. That is the penalty. I think we should be challenging our MPs on this, and our MSPs since we have the advantage here in having our own Criminal Justice system, and demanding that the whole system is looked at and overhauled so that for criminals the penalties will be clear from the beginning and they cannot then demand "rights" later when they committed the crime in full knowledge of what the penalty would be.

I do accept that rehabilitation is vital but I also believe there is simply no hope for some. People like Robert Mone, (I'm sorry to go on about him but that particular event left vivid memories in my own mind) whose crimes proved how completely without conscience they were, should simply never get out.

---

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by TLJ - 2008/05/17 12:07

Clare wrote:

The EU says that is a breach of their human rights. It says more too. This is where all the appeals have come from regarding the "right" to a wage, even when in prison, the "right" to access to mobile phones, computers et al. It goes on and on.

Human Rights comes under our being signatories (and, indeed, one of the original ones too) to the European Convention on Human Rights.

The ECHR comes under the jurisdiction of the Council of Europe, not the EU.

Clare wrote:

My understanding of being sent to prison is that one loses the right to freedom and the right to function as those outside do. That is the penalty.

Which is what happens.

Clare wrote:

I think we should be challenging our MPs on this, and our MSPs since we have the advantage here in having our own Criminal Justice system, and demanding that the whole system is looked at and overhauled so that for criminals the penalties will be clear from the beginning and they cannot then demand "rights" later when they committed the crime in full knowledge of what the penalty would be.

Telling convicted persons what their penalty will be seems to me to be a pretty fundamental part of a fair criminal justice system. When it comes to imprisonment, the penalty is loss of freedom; surely it is important that the period which freedom is lost (or, at least, when it will be reviewed) should be given ? If not, you have the danger of the keys being thrown away for the most minor of crimes.

And for you ? Well, that offers some modicum of protection should you ever be in the unfortunate state of being imprisoned for a crime you didn't commit.

---

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by Levenax - 2008/05/17 12:15

It was folly to sign up for the whole EU human rights nonsense. A disastrous result of it, amongst many other things, is that we can't deport evil foreign criminals like Abu Hamza al-Masri because they might get maltreated in their home country! So as a result of this PC madness the rights of every decent person in our own country are being infringed by the mere presence of these maniacs, and nobody cares. Oh, and we get to keep their huge parasitic families in luxury out of our taxes too plus showering them with free health care, interpreters and social workers. No wonder they don't want to leave.

IMO all current so called human rights legislation should be repealed and replaced with laws that suit the needs of the

---

citizens of this country. That would result in all of these criminal aliens being sent back to where they belong.

=====

**Re:Peter Sutcliffe**

Posted by TLJ - 2008/05/17 12:17

---

Levenax wrote:

It was folly to sign up for the whole EU human rights nonsense.

...except that it's not through our membership of the EU

=====

**Re:Peter Sutcliffe**

Posted by Levenax - 2008/05/17 13:15

---

TLJ wrote:

...except that it's not through our membership of the EU

Of course you're right, I should have said European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). The fact that matters that affect UK citizens can be legally decided outwith our frontiers by non UK judges who are wholly unaccountable is disastrous. It's a dripping roast for hordes of lawyers who have grown rich on the thriving taxpayer funded "human rights" industry and a get out for scoundrels who should be dealt with by UK courts alone.

=====

**Re:Peter Sutcliffe**

Posted by TLJ - 2008/05/17 13:20

---

Levenax wrote:

TLJ wrote:

...except that it's not through our membership of the EU

Of course you're right, I should have said European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). The fact that matters that affect UK citizens can be legally decided outwith our frontiers by non UK judges who are wholly unaccountable is disastrous. It's a dripping roast for hordes of lawyers who have grown rich on the thriving taxpayer funded "human rights" industry and a get out for scoundrels who should be dealt with by UK courts alone.

And which "non UK" judge determined that we couldn't deport Abu Hamza al-Masri ?

=====

**Re:Peter Sutcliffe**

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/17 13:25

---

< Sutcliffe, 61, was jailed for life in 1981 for murdering 13 women and attempting to kill seven more over a five year reign of terror in the north of England, in what became one of Britain's most notorious criminal cases. He was sentenced to 20 life sentences, and told he must serve a minimum of 30 years behind bars.

Sutcliffe has however spent the majority of his 27 years in captivity in a secure mental hospital. It emerged in 2006 that he is not one of the 35 'worst' offenders who have been told that they must spend their entire life behind bars.

Related Links

Ripper case daughter dies

Life in jail for the 35 worst . . . but not for the Ripper

Ripper 'killed many more than 13'

His London law firm Bindmans said the state has a legal obligation to set a tariff, the minimum term that life sentence prisoners must serve before becoming eligible for parole.

---

A statement from Bindmans said today: "This firm is instructed by Mr Coonan (previously known as Peter Sutcliffe) in respect of the setting of a minimum tariff following his conviction. >

This makes it look more worrying until you realise that the secretary of state can overturn this using the mental health act as long as he Sutcliff is deemed still to have mental health issues which are a danger to the public.

=====

---

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/17 13:45

Levenax wrote:

It was folly to sign up for the whole EU human rights nonsense. A disastrous result of it, amongst many other things, is that we can't deport evil foreign criminals like Abu Hamza al-Masri because they might get maltreated in their home country! So as a result of this PC madness the rights of every decent person in our own country are being infringed by the mere presence of these maniacs, and nobody cares. Oh, and we get to keep their huge parasitic families in luxury out of our taxes too plus showering them with free health care, interpreters and social workers. No wonder they don't want to leave.

IMO all current so called human rights legislation should be repealed and replaced with laws that suit the needs of the citizens of this country. That would result in all of these criminal aliens being sent back to where they belong.

I agree but to rid ourselves of these human rights laws which seem to be added to weekly we must leave the EU. It seems our human rights have no importance. The fact that terrorists can blow up our loved ones and endanger their safety is unimportant.

The more I hear, the more convinced I become that we should leave.

It seems there are very few financial benefits to being in the EU as we must share our contracts such as shipping. The last figures I looked at seemed to be saying that trade and grants show a deficit.

We could teach them all to knit which may keep them busy instead of trying to change for instance how long we hang our beef because ours tastes better and sells more in EU.

=====

---

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by Levenax - 2008/05/17 14:19

TLJ wrote:

And which "non UK" judge determined that we couldn't deport Abu Hamza al-Masri ?

We didn't deport him because we're stupid enough to observe the rule that even maniacs like him shouldn't be deported if there's any chance that he might get a hard time when he gets home. No doubt if we had tried he would have got his lawyers that we pay for to take it to the ECHR where, without doubt, after several months of expensive pondering, another foreigner would say we couldn't deport him, and that decision is binding on our government. So now we're cosseting him in jail and paying thousands of pounds to his poisonous family every month in benefits and when he gets out we're still stuck with him. It's completely irrational to treat foreign criminals like this. They, and their sponging families should all be deported without delay.

=====

---

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by TLJ - 2008/05/17 14:29

Levenax wrote:

TLJ wrote:

And which "non UK" judge determined that we couldn't deport Abu Hamza al-Masri ?

We didn't deport him because we're stupid enough to observe the rule that even maniacs like him shouldn't be deported if there's any chance that he might get a hard time when he gets home. No doubt if we had tried he would have got his

---

lawyers that we pay for to take it to the ECHR where, without doubt, after several months of expensive pondering, another foreigner would say we couldn't deport him, and that decision is binding on our government.

So it wasn't a non-UK judge who said we couldn't deport him as you were originally implying ? And the rest is supposition.

---

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by DoricMan - 2008/05/17 14:40

---

TLJ wrote:

Clare wrote:

I don't think you can legislate to cover for the "human rights" of people like that and I believe individual countries cannot allow the EU to start dictating in such a general way regarding such people.

I'd like to know how the EU is dictating how we act in relation to our prisoners.....Interference from the EU has always to be borne in mind, especially if an appeal to them on some "manufactured" abuse of human rights. Against such an appeal should not the violence of the long dead victims be also considered, their human rights in my view far outweigh those of the violent perpetrator.

---

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by TLJ - 2008/05/17 14:52

---

DoricMan wrote:

TLJ wrote:

Clare wrote:

I don't think you can legislate to cover for the "human rights" of people like that and I believe individual countries cannot allow the EU to start dictating in such a general way regarding such people.

I'd like to know how the EU is dictating how we act in relation to our prisoners.....Interference from the EU has always to be borne in mind, especially if an appeal to them on some "manufactured" abuse of human rights. Against such an appeal should not the violence of the long dead victims be also considered, their human rights in my view far outweigh those of the violent perpetrator.

Once again, this is not from the EU.....

Human rights are there to protect all of us against abuse by the State. Much as it may pain some to accept, prisoners are human too, no matter how heinous their crimes but, apart from that, as I have suggested above, their application to prisoners will at least afford some small degree of protection to those who are wrongly imprisoned.

---

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by Levenax - 2008/05/17 16:58

---

TLJ wrote:

So it wasn't a non-UK judge who said we couldn't deport him as you were originally implying ? And the rest is supposition.

I don't think I ever said that Abu Hamza had applied to or received a judgement from the ECHR. However it is an indisputable fact that it is because the UK signed up for the European Convention on Human Rights that we can't deport dangerous criminals like Abu Hamza. There is no point in trying because in every case the publicly funded human rights sharks will milk every opportunity to get paid handsome fees to keep maniacs like him in the UK. These lawyers are even more despicable than the herd they come from since they know full well that their clients are evil and dangerous. However a bulging bank balance is obviously much more comforting than a clear conscience. It is a matter of record that Abu Hamza's large family are living on handouts from the taxpayer. Why can't they be sent back to Egypt since it's only Hamza the authorities there want to interview?

---

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by Clare - 2008/05/17 19:24

---

TLJ wrote:

Clare wrote:

The EU says that is a breach of their human rights. It says more too. This is where all the appeals have come from regarding the "right" to a wage, even when in prison, the "right" to access to mobile phones, computers et al. It goes on and on.

Human Rights comes under our being signatories (and, indeed, one of the original ones too) to the European Convention on Human Rights.

The ECHR comes under the jurisdiction of the Council of Europe, not the EU.

Clare wrote:

My understanding of being sent to prison is that one loses the right to freedom and the right to function as those outside do. That is the penalty.

Which is what happens.

Clare wrote:

I think we should be challenging our MPs on this, and our MSPs since we have the advantage here in having our own Criminal Justice system, and demanding that the whole system is looked at and overhauled so that for criminals the penalties will be clear from the beginning and they cannot then demand "rights" later when they committed the crime in full knowledge of what the penalty would be.

Telling convicted persons what their penalty will be seems to me to be a pretty fundamental part of a fair criminal justice system. When it comes to imprisonment, the penalty is loss of freedom; surely it is important that the period which freedom is lost (or, at least, when it will be reviewed) should be given ? If not, you have the danger of the keys being thrown away for the most minor of crimes.

And for you ? Well, that offers some modicum of protection should you ever be in the unfortunate state of being imprisoned for a crime you didn't commit.

T

I take your points made on my previous posts. I have to say however that people like Robert Mone should never be let out and that there are others who should never be let out and if society wants real justice it is time we started to demand it from our politicians in the way of clear legislation and a Criminal Justice system which truly defends society against the evil lurking within it.

---

=====

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by Meg - 2008/05/17 21:04

---

The reason why the appeal for the deportation of Abu Hamza failed was not because he would get a "hard time" nor even because he could face the death penalty. The UK will deport to some countries with the death penalty if they receive "diplomatic assurances" that the person will not receive the death penalty even though these diplomatic assurances are unenforceable. The reason it failed was because the evidence against Abu Hamza had been obtained under torture. Torture is a criminal offence in the UK and in international law.

If a foreign country accused me of some crime and they presented evidence that had been obtained through torture then I would hope that the law would protect me from extradition. That is where the problem lies, some people think that it is a choice between protecting people's rights to a fair and just hearing and getting rid of the "bad guys". Well, it is not a choice. By eroding our freedoms, we do not stop (in this case) terrorism from occurring.

---

I believe Abu Hamza is still classed as a UK citizen but that his marriage to a british woman was bigamous so his citizenship is being disputed. As frustrating as it might be to have someone like him here, hopefully he will be deported to Egypt at the end of his sentence because he has lost his UK citizenship - that is if he has not been extradited to the USA before that.

=====

**Re:Peter Sutcliffe**

Posted by Levenax - 2008/05/18 09:43

---

Meg wrote:

The reason why the appeal for the deportation of Abu Hamza failed was not because he would get a "hard time" nor even because he could face the death penalty. The UK will deport to some countries with the death penalty if they receive "diplomatic assurances" that the person will not receive the death penalty even though these diplomatic assurances are unenforceable. The reason it failed was because the evidence against Abu Hamza had been obtained under torture. Torture is a criminal offence in the UK and in international law.

If a foreign country accused me of some crime and they presented evidence that had been obtained through torture then I would hope that the law would protect me from extradition. That is where the problem lies, some people think that it is a choice between protecting people's rights to a fair and just hearing and getting rid of the "bad guys". Well, it is not a choice. By eroding our freedoms, we do not stop (in this case) terrorism from occurring.

I believe Abu Hamza is still classed as a UK citizen but that his marriage to a british woman was bigamous so his citizenship is being disputed. As frustrating as it might be to have someone like him here, hopefully he will be deported to Egypt at the end of his sentence because he has lost his UK citizenship - that is if he has not been extradited to the USA before that.

It was alleged that the evidence was obtained under torture but how do we know? It's only heresay.

What kind of "British" woman would have married this beast?

=====

**Re:Peter Sutcliffe**

Posted by Meg - 2008/05/18 11:45

---

Levenax wrote:

What kind of "British" woman would have married this beast?

He married her in the early 80s before he was notorious. She had been married before this and there is doubt about whether she had divorced her first husband. If it was a bigamous marriage then Abu Hamza does not have UK citizenship through his marriage to her.

Levenax wrote:

It was alleged that the evidence was obtained under torture but how do we know? It's only heresay.?

It is not hearsay when the USA is quite open on how it obtains such information. It is well documented. On the 2nd of December 2002, Secretary of Defence Donald Rumsfeld signed a memorandum authorizing the authorities at Guantánamo to use interrogation techniques that included stress positions, isolation, sensory deprivation, hooding, removal of clothing, and exploiting the individual phobias of detainees, such as fear of dogs.

On the 4th of February 2008, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, General Michael Hayden, confirmed that among the enhanced interrogation techniques used by the CIA as part of its secret detention program had been waterboarding, a form of torture that simulates drowning (see ScotsGait forum item "The Torture Team" for more information on this). On the 8th of March 2008, President Bush vetoed legislation aimed at preventing the agency from using this and other enhanced techniques again. In a national radio address, he said that "we need to ensure our intelligence officials have all the tools they need to stop the terrorists". (Though funnily enough, even with all these techniques which are supposed to stop the terrorists, we are constantly being told that things are getting worse.) The USA might call it enhanced techniques but even in the UK which likes to call itself the USA's best buddy, we call it torture.

=====

---

## Re:Peter Sutcliffe

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/18 15:24

---

TLJ wrote:

Clare wrote:

I don't think you can legislate to cover for the "human rights" of people like that and I believe individual countries cannot allow the EU to start dictating in such a general way regarding such people.

I'd like to know how the EU is dictating how we act in relation to our prisoners.....

When I want to check something from Scottish Law I simply go to Scottish Parliament website and eventually I will find what I want. It may take time and effort to understand it but the answers are there. Westminster is not so easy to navigate but eventually you can find what you want. The little spare time I had this weekend I spent trying to find the answers to some of the questions in this discussion on the EU website. It is not very easy to find anything and if it looks as though it may contain the answer it is in french not English very frustrating.

=====