Hypnotising evil: Myra Hindley, hypnosis, and criminal investigations in the UK

In 1987 Myra Hindley submitted a petition to the Home Office requesting permission to undergo hypnosis in an attempt to locate the grave of Keith Bennett. Whilst the request was initially declined, the issue continued to be an administrative challenge for the Home Office for the fifteen years that followed. Drawing on her 'prison records' currently held in The National Archive, this paper details the reasons for the request, how the policy response to it was developed, maintained, and then changed, and how it shaped broader orientations to the use of hypnosis in criminal investigations.

Keywords: Myra Hindley; hypnosis; crime; evil

Introduction

By the mid-1980s, there was a general recognition that community-based and problem-orientated policing was reshaping the ways in which police organisations were conducting their operations, particularly with reference to high-profile cases. These changes had begun in the USA[1], but similar debates were increasingly prevalent in the UK[2]. This meant that the police were beginning to move away from practices that solely emphasised 'rapid response' to critical incidents through the centralised and technological rationalisation of 'command and control'[3]. Instead, community-based policing recognised that police activity was embedded within particular urban environments[4], whilst problem-based policing would highlight the need for the police to examine and address the problems that the public expected them to control[5]. The general need to develop such approaches was especially notable in the Yorkshire Ripper case, for example, which had resulted in much local concern about the capacity of the police to protect the public generally, and women specifically. Suggestions of sexism and misogyny within the occupational culture of the investigating team did little to quell

the suspicion that the police were not sufficiently equipped to respond to the needs of all members of society[6].

But during the 1980s, access to the 'research and development' that would be necessary for local police organisations to respond to community-based problems was still largely confined to haphazard connections with external partners - usually in the form of universities or private business[7]. Whilst large scale impositions such as the HOLMES network could be imposed from afar, local need would often depend entirely on individual advocates of very particular approaches and initiatives. However, given the considerable discretionary power of the police with respect to how local policing was conducted, where such opportunities emerged there was often more than enough scope to explore how such developments could be used within particular criminal investigations[8].

Of course, any such developments were not without constraint. Rules of evidence were still determined by law, and criminal cases were always subject to the discretion of the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). The Home Office would also retain an overarching interest in the practice of criminal investigation, not to mention wider interests in the development of penal policy[9]. At that time, however, the Home Office was also coming under increasing pressure to begin to adapt to the changing public perception of crime and punishment. The prison population had risen considerably since the end of the Second World War and the 1980s would see a series of Home Secretaries attempt to innovate on the Home Office's traditional approach to penal policy, largely in response to the growing cost of the criminal justice system. But despite an apparent and growing need for new ideas, routine, 'bottom up' conventions would still feature in commonplace policy making[10]. This typically involved responding to emergent issues with internal consultation, committee meetings, briefings, and circulars. Unfortunately

for the Home Office, by the end of the 1980s this combination of bureaucratic decision-making, 'what works' efficiencies, and an increasing public desire to be 'tough on crime', would result in a series of politically embarrassing policy reversals[11].

It was within this context that towards the end of October 1987, the UK Home Office became aware of an incoming request from prisoner 964055. It would ask that an unnamed individual be allowed into Cookham Wood prison alongside Chief Superintendent Peter Topping with the intention of hypnotising Myra Hindley. The petition, written by Hindley, suggested that it might aid the ongoing investigation that was attempting to identify the final resting place of Keith Bennett. Believing that it would allow her to recall the exact route taken on the evening of June 16th 1964, she suggested her motivation for making the request was to help Keith Bennett's mother to find the grave and achieve some closure.

Charting the history of the request over a period of fifteen years, and drawing on her ‘prison records’ held at The National Archive, this paper details the very particular history of Hindley’s petition to be hypnotised. It outlines the reasons for the request, how the policy response to it was developed, maintained, and then changed, and how the response helped to shape broader orientations to the use of hypnosis in UK criminal investigations. The history of the petition draws attention to the fact that Hindley was not just a source of outrage and condemnation for the public, she also represented a distinct legal and administrative challenge to those involved in the day to day management of her sentence. Following the Murder (abolition of Death Penalty) Act 1965, Hindley’s life in prison was marked by a series of acute policy uncertainties. Amongst many others, this included questions about the length of her sentence and the prospect of parole, her autobiography, repeated media interest in the case, and some very public visits to Saddleworth Moor. Each issue required an equitable administrative

response that could set precedence, whilst also needing to take into consideration the position of other prisoners and huge public interest in the case. In examining her petition for hypnosis, this paper demonstrates how penal policy was negotiated by those with responsibility for the management of her sentence.

The use of hypnosis in criminal investigations

There is a well-established criminological literature that has considered both the history and sociology of police procedures. This includes how murder investigations proceed, and how those people investigating serious crimes make decisions about the process of investigation[12]. Similarly, there has been much research on the development of penal policy and its relationship to academic evidence and opinion. This discussion has explored both the public presentation of governmental initiatives, as well as those more routine, 'bottom up' policies that 'rise slowly, inconspicuously and methodically through the system'[13]. Within this particular literature, there is evidence to suggest the relationship between academic knowledge and government policy making is sometimes close, sometimes distant, and often conflicted[14]. Indeed, the role of scientific evidence in relation to the policy-making process is subject to a range of competing concerns. It often involves many actors, both within and beyond government departments, and operates under significant political and public pressure and influence[15].

In these respects, hypnosis has long been considered to be a state of mind that can be used to aid recall and recover 'lost' memories[16]. It is not surprising, therefore, that those involved in solving complex crimes have held an interest in such techniques and the use of hypnosis in criminal investigations has a long and chequered history[17]. However, during the 1970s and 1980s academic debate largely focussed on the extent to which it could be deployed to improve testimony[18]. According to one influential

report[19], attempts to refresh memory through hypnosis generally took two forms. The first – 'hypnotic age regression' - was derived from psychotherapy and required the person under hypnosis to relive an experience that they cannot consciously recall[20]. On the other hand, 'hypnotically suggested increased recall' (also known as 'the television technique') involved the use of indirect or direct metaphors to suggest specific events. This might, for instance, involve asking the person under hypnosis to imagine a television screen that is displaying a documentary of a particular event, and then asking them to 'zoom in' on particular frames or sequences[21].

Whilst a number of supporters argued for its utilisation[22], others were much more sceptical as to its efficacy[23]. Debate focussed on three main issues: the validity of the hypnotic process; the admissibility of evidence gained via hypnosis; and, the potential contamination of evidence through the use of pre-trial hypnosis. This discussion was grounded in more theoretical positions that either saw hypnosis as placing a person in a distinctive 'state' with associated special properties, or as a 'non-state' that did not elicit unique behaviour outside of ordinary parameters[24].

The complexity of this technical discussion was not necessarily reciprocated in the general public and despite much evidence to the contrary, the popular perception is still one that sees hypnosis as having special properties that can unlock hidden memories[25]. Indeed, the belief in hypnosis being a 'key' to aid recall received widespread coverage in 1974 when the British Association for the Advancement of Science published a controversial report that drew attention to its potential application in criminal cases[26]. Amongst a number of other emerging forensic techniques, they suggested that hypnosis could successfully be used as a tool to unlock witness testimony.

Public interest in the matter also grew in 1976 when media coverage was directed to the Chowchilla kidnapping, in which a bus driver apparently underwent hypnosis to help him recall further details of his ordeal. It was widely reported that it enabled him to remember most of the registration number of a vehicle that was used in the abduction of himself and 26 children. This information apparently then led to the arrest and conviction of three men[27]. A few years later in 1980, Martin Reiser of the Los Angeles Police Department published an influential book entitled *the Handbook of Investigative Hypnosis* in which he detailed the work of the Law Enforcement Hypnosis Institute. He claimed that his officers had used hypnotism in several hundred cases, and that it led to significant investigative leads in around 60 to 65 per cent of cases[28].

There is also some evidence to suggest that interest in hypnosis as an investigatory tool was being replicated within criminal investigations in the UK. In 1965, for instance, there were reports that it was deployed in the investigation the murder of Patricia Woolard (aka 'The Gatwick Train Murder')[29]. However, due to the largely unregulated and unrecorded nature of its use, little was known about the actual levels of hypnosis being used up until the early 1980s. By then however, the use of hypnosis in criminal investigations was becoming increasingly newsworthy and there were reports that suggested that hypnosis was being used in a number of cases, including: the murder of Genette Tate (1978)[30]; the hunt for the M5 rapist (1980)[31]; the murder of Carole Morgan (1981)[32]; the rape of a woman on a train from Dartmouth to Charing Cross (1982)[33]; the murder of Caroline Hogg (1983)[34]; the rape of a schoolgirl in Harlow (1984)[35]; and, the murder of Stuart Gough[36]. It would also later emerge that hypnosis had been used during the investigation of the murder of Lynette White (1988)[37], and the M50 murder case (1989)[38].

Consultation and the draft Home Office Circular

In response to the growing popular interest in the use of hypnosis in criminal investigations in America, and given increasing reports of its deployment by British Constabularies, in 1983 the Home Office sought consultation with a number of professional organisations to help guide the police on the use of hypnosis in the investigation of serious crime. Views were sought from a number of public bodies. Amongst them, the Royal College of Psychiatrists, the British Medical Association and the Law Society, objected to the use of hypnosis in police work because they regarded the evidence as unreliable, whilst also voicing concern about the potential harmful effects on the participants[39]. The Association of Chief Police Officers, on the other hand, whilst recognising the exceptional use of such techniques, continued to highlight 'a small number of examples' where it had been employed successfully[40].

After further consideration, a revised draft of the circular was put out for consultation in May, 1987. Again, it was generally discouraging about the use of hypnosis, but offered some instruction for those exceptional occasions where it was to be employed. The guidance emphasised clearly that there was no evidence that hypnosis could 'unlock' or enhance memory, and much evidence that it did not prevent lying and could result 'confabulation'[41]. However, taking into consideration the views of the Association of Chief Police Officers it proposed to offer some procedural guidance 'where, exceptionally, consideration is given to the use of hypnosis in a criminal investigation'. It highlighted five distinct issues: hypnosis should only to be used in incidents of serious crime where other methods of investigation had been tried and failed; suspects should not be considered for hypnosis; a witness who may be called to give evidence should not normally be considered; consent must be gained in writing; and finally, that the hypnotherapist should be a qualified psychiatrist or clinical

psychologist with appropriate training in hypnosis[42].

Responding to the consultation document in August 1987, the British Medical Association expressed 'serious reservations about the reliability of evidence obtained in this manner, and other possible harmful effects'[43]. Moreover, they also noted that given the restrictions on hypnotising suspects and witnesses, the guidelines left little room for manoeuvre and it would, in practice, be quite difficult to see where hypnosis could be prospectively applied by the police as an investigative tool: 'As it is suggested that neither suspects nor witnesses should be considered for hypnosis it must follow that the subject of the crime will be the main source of evidence of this nature'[44].

Indeed, whilst the caveat 'not normally considered' does leave open the possibility that hypnosis could be used for forensic purposes, the Home Office considered that it would be difficult to employ within a police investigation[45]. However, if it was the intention of the Home Office to use the circular to effectively supress the use of hypnosis in criminal investigations, it was certainly not the result and hypnosis would figure prominently in a number of high profile cases. These included: The Cardiff Three; the M50 murder investigation; and perhaps most notoriously, Myra Hindley.

Myra Hindley: 'The feminine face of evil'

For much of her life, Myra Hindley was depicted as being 'the most hated woman in Britain', 'the personification of evil', and ultimately as 'pure evil'[46]. Sentenced to life imprisonment with co-defendant Ian Brady in 1966, she was convicted for the murders of Lesley Ann Downey (aged 10) and Edward Evans (17), and of being an accessory after the fact in the murder of John Kilbride (12).

Despite her notoriety, academic discussion of Hindley and the 'Moors murders' remains somewhat limited[47]. Some attention has been paid to the representation of gender in the various accounts of her crimes[48][49], the nature of transgression[50], her public 'confession'[51], and the cultural significance of her crimes[52]. The main focus of this literature has been to examine both the popular portrayal of Hindley, and the cultural impact of the case. Lizzie Seal[53], for example, argues that the public narrative of the moors murders is framed by a wider discourse that has depicted Hindley and Brady within a dichotomy of 'muse/mastermind'. This framing device directs attention to the nature of her relationship with Ian Brady, and the position of women within society more generally. Similarly, Helen Birch[54] highlights how the discourse that surrounded the case variously portrayed Hindley as both passive *and* manipulative. Often positioning her as the antithesis of Ann West - the mother of Lesley Ann Downey – this popular discourse has variously depicted her as doubly deviant. One on hand she was seen to go against the traditional female stereotype of a nurturing and caring mother, and on the other 'she never had the decency to mad'. More recently, Cummins et al[55] have also sought to explore how the popular portrayal of the case has variously functioned as 'a modern archetype of mediatised murder'. Not only did it provide the framework by which cases that followed it could be interpreted and understood, it also functioned as a vehicle to represent very particular ideological position concerning the nature of crime and punishment.

However, an examination of how the case was negotiated and managed by policy actors are notable by their paucity and central aspects of her prison sentence remain relatively unexplored. In this respect, by 1985 Hindley had been in prison for nearly twenty years and she had just seen the first formal review of her sentence result in a recommendation for a further review in 1990. Following heightened public interest,

the police had also re-opened the investigation into the suspected murders of Pauline Reade (16) and Keith Bennett (12), in large part due to the public campaigning of Keith Bennett's mother Winnie Johnson. The original case had been handled by the then defunct Cheshire Constabulary, so led by Detective Chief Inspector Peter Topping, Greater Manchester Police (GMP) had taken charge of reviewing all aspects of the case. Topping made an approach to speak to Hindley and in November, 1986, brought photographs and maps of Saddleworth Moor – where GMP suspected the bodies lay buried - to her to see if she could identify any areas that were particularly significant to Brady[56]. As a result of the conversations he had with Hindley, Topping approached the Home Secretary, Douglas Hurd, to approve a plan for her to visit the Moor in the attempt to locate the graves. Hurd acquiesced and on the 16th of December, under a police escort, Hindley visited the moor[57].

Unfortunately, mid-way through the morning a number of media helicopters circled the party, hovering very low. This distracted Hindley and she struggled to orientate herself to the landscape. The sight of all the people involved in the security and the media attention also unnerved her and she struggled to provide any information of use[58].

Following the visit, Hindley made the decision to formally confess to Topping, and on the 27th of January, 1987, she was interviewed under caution for over fifteen hours about the murders of Bennett and Reade[59]. During the interviews Hindley had admitted to her involvement, and revealed that their bodies had been buried on Saddleworth Moor where they had laid undiscovered for over twenty years[60]. Given this information, Topping asked Hurd for permission to take Hindley back to the Moor and on the 24th of March, 1987 she again assisted the police in the identification of two areas in which it was thought the bodies might be buried - this is most likely to be

Hollin Brown Knoll and the Shiny Brook/Hoe Grain areas of the Moor[61]. In a briefing note sent from P4 division (the Home Office Prison Department that had responsibility for female prisoners), it was noted that 'Hindley gave significant assistance on the Moor commensurate with new evidence which she has given to the police in a series of interviews and statements'[62], and on the 1st of June, Reade's body was eventually discovered at Hollin Brown Knoll. This resulted in Brady also making a very public visit to the Moor in an attempt to identify the grave of Keith Bennett. Whilst that particular visit did not locate the grave, a report prepared by GMP for the Home Secretary suggested that the police were convinced that they knew the general areas in which the bodies were buried, but could not identify the exact location noting that 'Saddleworth Moor is a featureless place'[63].

But beyond her exchanges with Topping, relations between Hindley and the authorities at Cookham Wood prison were at a particularly low ebb and had been for some time. Hindley was engaged in a continuing battle to have regular visits from Reverend Peter Timms reinstated. She had been prevented from seeing Timms in a counselling capacity in January 1986 because the authorities had begun to recognise that he was acting more like a 'public relations agent' than counsellor[64]. Given the need for prisoners to be treated equitably, Timms' visits went some way beyond Hindley's allocation of normal visiting rights - two per month - and the counselling sessions were terminated, much to Hindley's anger [65].

Historically, the various divisions of the Home Office that had an interest in her sentence were always very keen to deal with Hindley - and the multitude of issues that surrounded her – as equitably as possible. This was because they wanted to guard against accusations of favouritism from other prisoners (and any associated unrest), but also because they did not want to attract undue attention from the media. Unfortunately,

this was not always possible. In some cases, policy associated with an issue simply did not exist or was not appropriate, in others, Hindley and other interested parties were particularly vociferous in their demands - and so when her petitions and requests were eventually processed, matters were often already in the public domain.

At the time Timms' visits were stopped, both the Home Office and staff at Cookham Wood were also aware of what they termed 'a marketing job' on Hindley by David Astor and Timms, who they considered to be seeking to 'reduce public opprobrium and exchange that for the public perception that she was a remorseful woman'[66]. The plan involved Reverend Peter Timms acting as a spokesperson for Hindley in the hope that the 'public's unhealthy preoccupation' with her would cease[67]. The 'marketing job' would also involve the planned publication of an autobiography[68], as well a public distancing from Lord Longford. The Home Office largely believed that Astor and Timms were quite genuine in their concern for Hindley, but in light of the content of her confession to Topping and her problematic history within the prison system - which had already included a very unlikely escape attempt - some suspected that Hindley was attempting to distance herself from her crimes in order to prepare to petition to apply for a parole hearing[69]. In a later report to the Parole Board, the Governor of Cookham Wood would wryly note:

> '…she was always very careful not to implicate herself in any of the offences. It was always areas of the moor "significant to Ian Brady" which she said she was willing to identify'[70].

Petition for hypnosis

Following her visits to the Moor and with Keith Bennett's body still undiscovered, on the 20th of October 1987, Myra Hindley wrote a petition to the Home Secretary. It read:

> ‘I am requesting permission for a [name redacted[71]] to come into the prison with Det. Chief Supt. Topping so that one last attempt can be made to locate the grave of Keith Bennett. I want to stress that this request, and the one I made to Mr. Topping, is entirely my own decision, and is made for no other reason than to relieve Mrs. Johnson of some of her grief and to enable the police to eventually close the file on the ‘Moors’ case.
>
> From advice given to me I believe that under hypnosis I will be able to recall and relate the exact route taken on the evening of June 16th 1964 which will, it is also believed, almost certainly enable the police to pinpoint the area in question.
>
> I have no ulterior motive in making this request other than to help Mrs. Johnson and the police, and in addition to asking you to grant it, I would appreciate the whole matter being treated privately and confidentially’[72]

The Home Office were aware that a petition requesting such a procedure was likely and had already begun to inform those with an interest in the matter. Upon receiving a copy of the request, the Governor of Cookham Wood, FJ Meakings, moved quickly to provide further context and after speaking directly with her filed a petition report that suggested Hindley had concerns about the terms of reference for hypnotherapy and was likely to request legal advice. Meakings also stated that he was aware that Reverend Peter Timms had reservations about the procedure, but noted with some irony that ‘it is probable that he would again press for facilities to counsel Miss Hindley following the inevitable “trauma” that hypnotherapy would induce’[73]. There were serious concerns that Hindley saw the request as a way ‘of seeing Messrs Fisher, Timms and Astor out of the hearing of prison officers’. So much so that the Governor turned down the subsequent request from Hindley that would enable her to consult with Timms et al. about the matter, with JM Fowler of the Home Office Prison Department (P4 Division) writing ‘the Governor, Deputy Governor and her Personal Officer have

formed the view that Miss Hindley is once again orchestrating a melodramatic situation which will result in high media profile'[74].

Upon having the request for a visit from Timms et al. turned down, Hindley asked Topping to intervene. Indeed, it was Topping who had initially approached her about the procedure in August, 1987. In his autobiography, he would suggest:

> 'The point of putting Myra Hindley under hypnosis would not be to get evidence to be used in court or as part of a case: it would simply be to try and trigger in her mind some small forgotten detail of the location where Ian Brady buried Keith Bennett'[75].

In her confession, Hindley claimed that she did not actually witness the murder or the burial. Instead she had suggested that she was nearby when it took place acting as a 'look-out'. But because her confession was so detailed, Topping believed that nothing which emerged during the hypnosis would be necessary for a criminal prosecution as they had more than enough material should it be deemed in the public interest. Topping also thought that hypnosis would have the added advantage of being something that could be undertaken without the operational challenges of arranging another visit to the Moor[76].

But the draft circular, which was still under consultation at the time, had not directly anticipated hypnosis being used on a convicted prisoner, and certainly not one of Hindley's notoriety. So whilst Hindley and Topping were pushing for a quick resolution – GMP were suggesting the 11th of November as a date for the hypnosis - there was no operational urgency for the Home Office to rush into a decision. So given the lack of serviceable policy on the matter they would have to put the request out for consultation in order to justify their response. This was a key reason why they began exploring their options before the request was actually submitted.

In response, the Police Department suggested that they were concerned about the difficulties involved in hypnosis for the prison authorities and thought that Topping had underestimated the wide-reaching implications of such a plan. Not only were they worried about the time it would take to set up, they were also wary of dismissing the possibility that it could produce false leads, consuming even more police time. They were also reluctant to rule out the fact that she might say something that would incriminate either her or someone else, and noted that the CPS were generally discouraging of the use of hypnosis in criminal cases, as were the representative bodies of the medical profession. They suggested that it was 'known that the procedure can be potentially dangerous to the mental health of the subject' and highlighted the need to 'establish clearly under what conditions Hindley will agree to the hypnosis and to see that she does not try to manipulate the situation to her own advantage'[77].

F2 Division of the Police Department (with responsibility for quality of service, police powers and procedures, and police complaints) were similarly unimpressed:

> 'the scientific evidence suggests fairly strongly that hypnotically induced recall is unreliable, can lead to "pseudo-memories" (false memories implanted in the subject during the hypnosis), and "confabulation" (the running together or confusing of memories of different events)' [78].

In addition to underlining 'the resolute opposition of the medical profession', perhaps most damning was their assessment that 'a more systematic questioning of a person in a waking state is likely to be at least as effective as securing recall as under hypnosis'[79]. They would also explicate the possibilities for self-incrimination, and the fact that it would be impossible to say that it would have no relevance to any future prosecution. Hindley might, they suggested, say that another victim had been killed, or produce extenuating circumstances which would be relevant to her defence against her charge of being an accomplice, 'such as she was threatened by Brady and in fear of her life'[80].

Taking their cue from the Police Department, the Prison Department were also sceptical and also sought to specifically highlight a number of issues with Hindley's request. Firstly, they noted that whilst the academic credentials for the chosen hypnotist were impeccable, she was not medically qualified, and as such, the Prison Medical Service would not be prepared to allow access to Hindley's case notes. Furthermore, they again pointed out that 'hypnotically induced recall is unreliable, and can lead to false memories implanted in the subject during hypnosis and the running together of confusing of memories of different events'[81]. This was particularly salient as the draft Home Office Circular that was under consideration suggested that the hypnotist should be unfamiliar with the case history of the subject in an attempt to guard against confabulation. Given the notoriety of Hindley's case, this would be difficult to achieve. Like the Police Department, they pointed out that the same draft circular was generally discouraging toward its use generally and allowing hypnosis in such a notorious case could set an 'awkward precedent'. They also questioned Topping's assertion that any information gained would, inter-alia, not be relevant to any future criminal proceedings: 'It is not possible to predict what anyone will say under hypnosis, and therefore it is impossible to state that any details Miss Hindley might give will have no relevance to subsequent criminal proceedings'[82]. This inevitably meant that consent would also be difficult to attain – again compromising the draft circular[83].

Like the Police Department however, the Prison Service would not necessarily have the same reaction should Hindley request to be hypnotised independently: 'In that event, the product of the hypnosis would, as it were, belong to Miss Hindley and it would be for her to determine which parts of it if any to make available to the police'[84].

Elsewhere, after initially distancing themselves from the issue[85], when pressed the Medical Directorate offered a short and terse reply. They emphasised that

hypnotherapy should only be carried out by a registered medical practitioner for psychiatric treatment – 'anxiety, states, phobias etc' – or in the '[t]reatment of physical condition – Mainly psycho somatic conditions'. In cases where 'there are no clinical reasons for this procedure', however, they highlighted the potentially harmful effects of hypnosis, the false hopes it can induce, and the implications of what might be said for the courts. Not choosing their words very well, they suggested that they had 'grave reservations' about improvements in recall, highlighted the problem of suggestibility, and pointed out that they did not see this as a 'DPMS matter' as it was not being used as a curative procedure. But after all that, they confirmed that the 'DPMS would not wish to be obstructing [the course of justice]' if it was deemed necessary in this particular case[86].

P3 division, whose remit included planning the 'careers' of life sentence prisoners, were much more receptive to the idea. They argued that denying Hindley the right to assist in the inquiry at her own risk would not be defensible, given the fact that:

> '…certain informers are released into police custody on the personal authority of S of S [Secretary of State] to provide detailed information about serious crime in the knowledge that the mere provision of much information is certain to place the informer in grave personal danger'[87].

They also questioned fears about the possibility of hypnosis producing misleading evidence as the sole purpose of the endeavour was to assist in the location of evidence – not produce it per se.

Whilst not going quite as far as objecting to the hypnosis, a draft letter from a Mr Taylor at the Crown Prosecution Service outlined that they 'regard the whole proposal with some apprehension' and 'it needs to be borne in mind that hypnotising does not necessarily get the truth'[88]. Having said that, the DPP position suggested that

'if she wishes to be hypnotised, if her legal advisors agree, if the medical advisors consent and Prison Dept agrees then Crown Prosecution Services are content'[89].

After consulting on the matter, the Prison Department provided a final submission to seek the Minister's views on Hindley's request. Aware of public pressure and attempting to avoid criticism that the Home Office has impeded the attempt to find Keith Bennett's body, they advised that the request be granted, as long as it did not involve the police and subject to certain conditions:

> 'These would cover the identity of the proposed hypnotist, to be a fully qualified general practitioner; satisfactory assurances as to the payment of the hypnotist's fee (which there would be no question of the Home Office reimbursing); and arrangements being made, to the satisfaction of the Governor of Cookham Wood and P4 Division, as to the number, duration and timing of those sessions. We would also want to ensure that Miss Hindley's undergoing hypnosis was not being used as a back door to reinstate the special counselling sessions of her by Reverend Peter Timms'[90].

There were two reasons for this approach. First, it was one of public presentation, and secondly one of legal representation. With respect to the former, and suspicious of Hindley's motives with respect to the request, the Prison Department would suggest:

> '…there is no guarantee that Miss Hindley would make available to the Greater Manchester police any product of the hypnosis that might help find Keith Bennett's body, but she would lose face, if she didn't and her advisors would find it very difficult to argue that she was trying to help in the face of Home Office obstruction'[91].

In terms of the latter, whilst the draft Home Office Circular had not anticipated that a suspect or defendant would wish to assist in their own incrimination, there was also a growing recognition in the Prison Department that a defendant would be entitled

to put forward any argument in their defence and a court would be prepared to listen to testimony provided under hypnosis should the defendant choose to submit it in this form.

'Not sufficiently persuaded': Responses to the decision

In an attempt to force the issue, on the 11th of December, Hindley would write a further petition for hypnosis to be approved - and Winnie Johnson would similarly correspond with Douglas Hurd encouraging him to agree. Hindley would write:

> 'I ask you, on humanitarian grounds, to allow this one last effort to find her child. I ask you to weigh the humanitarian concern against the concern of setting a precedent and come down in favour of the former. I ask you to allow the opportunity of helping to bring her nightmare to an end, or at least an attempt to. If the proposed hypnosis is unsuccessful, at least it can be said that everything humanly possible has been done. If it is successful, the immeasurable relief it will bring to Mrs Johnson, the fact that the police can finally close the file on the whole case, and the benefit to society knowing at last that the Moors case which has haunted the psyche of the nation is finally resolved and exorcised will be no small matter'[92].

Somewhat predictably, the letter closed with a focus on Hindley herself:

> 'Please, I plead with you to reach a favourable decision as soon as possible, for everyone's sake, and to bring to an end the acute tension and anxiety that I have been experiencing whilst awaiting a decision'[93].

What Hindley did not realise was that a decision had already been taken by the Home Secretary. At a meeting to discuss the issue held on the 1st of December, Douglas Hurd had been particularly impressed by the case against hypnosis for three reasons[94]. Firstly, the general policy was against the use of hypnosis in criminal cases. Secondly, that there would be no way to 'ring fence' any material from further investigations - and a

decision had not, by then, been made on whether Hindley and Brady would be prosecuted for the murders of Reade and Bennett. Finally, Hurd was, quite simply, 'not sufficiently persuaded' of its likely utility: 'expert advice is that hypnosis may not be more likely than systematic questioning in the waking state to produce detailed recall - and it can lead to erroneous recollections'[95].

However, aware of 'a certain amount of pressure' for the application to be approved[96], the Home Office began to plan how they would announce their decision - and they would try to be as brief as possible in order to try and dissuade any further interest in the matter. But these preparations were soon disrupted by the fact that the Director for Public Prosecutions had taken the decision not to press charges against either Brady or Hindley for the murders of Reade and Bennett. Whilst the DPP thought there was sufficient evidence, it was deemed 'not in the public interest' to take the matter to court. With notification on that decision awaiting final agreement, the Prison Department moved to publically announce that they had declined the request for hypnosis and with little publicity, news of the decision broke on the 7th of January, 1988[97].

Winnie Johnson had already received personal correspondence from Hurd informing her of the decision, but upon reading the news she immediately called the Home Office – who promptly invited her to put her concerns in writing. A letter imploring the Home Secretary to reconsider the decision so that her son might have the chance of 'a proper Christian burial' soon followed on the 14th of January[98]. According to staff at Cookham Wood 'the plan seemingly is for the Home Secretary's reply to be published, and, if the decision is not reversed, for the request for hypnosis to be renewed, accompanied presumably by an orchestrated publicity campaign'[99].

There was also a further problem for the Home Office. The media were now reporting on the successful use of hypnosis in the on-going investigation of the murder of Stuart Gough. However, unbeknown to the public, P4 Division of the Home Office Prison Department had already made some effort to ascertain the facts of the case. Hypnosis was used on four occasions during the Gough investigation; twice on an unnamed paper boy and once on his mother, who had both claimed to have seen a silver car. But '[n]one of this information apparently led to the identification of the suspect. Another boy was hypnotised who claimed to have been the victim of an abduction attempt in Hereford [where] [t]here was much in his conscious account of the attempted abduction that was misleading, and the hypnotist managed to disentangle the truth from the misleading parts of the statement'[100]. West Mercia Police did hypnotise potential witnesses, but it did not lead to the apprehension of the perpetrator. Instead, it was merely 'influential in separating fact from fiction in the mind of a young child witness'[101].

In reviewing the matter, P Division noted that its use by West Mercia would make any argument built around the general policy not to use hypnosis difficult to sustain. Therefore, any response needed to maintain the focus on the lack of utility. P Division subsequently drafted a response to Johnson's letter for approval by the Home Secretary. It would refuse to reverse the original decision, with Douglas Hogg, then then Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the Home Office, commenting 'I suspect that this is part of a Hindley campaign to get publicity. I would refuse the request. This will of course be commented upon but the story will die away'[102].

But even before the draft response could be approved, Chief Superintendent Topping telephoned F3 Division on the 5th of February, 1988, in search of a full explanation for the refusal. During the discussion, he was instructed that 'there had

never been a direct request for hypnosis from the police' and 'if he felt that it would be helpful…then he might set out the reasons for the police support for hypnosis in this case'[103]. On the 11th of February, the Home Office Police Department received such a letter from the Chief Constable of Greater Manchester, James Anderson. He would suggest that he 'was supportive of the view taken by Detective Chief Superintendent Topping'[104], and appended Topping's report. In the document, Topping formally requested for the procedure and noted that the Home Secretary was considering the request from Winnie Johnson. He would highlight how every conventional approach had been attempted and given the resource already committed to the task of finding Bennett's grave 'it would be wholly wrong to conclude the enquiry without this one last avenue being explored'[105]. Topping also pointed out that given the decision by the DPP, any legal argument against hypnosis was rendered mute. It was, therefore, 'a case of minimum risk for maximum gain'[106].

Having seen the report from Topping, and given the request from Johnson, the Home Secretary asked for a meeting to be arranged in order to further discuss the matter. This was, in large part, due to the fact that in responding to Hindley's petition, the Home Office had specifically sought to highlight that it was possible that she could become a defendant in criminal proceedings, and 'the revealing of new facts under hypnosis could have relevance to the success or otherwise of any subsequent prosecution'[107]. But following the decision of the DPP, this was no longer likely to be a cause for concern. Indeed, given that 'the possibility of unrelated information emerging was not of itself an argument against hypnosis…the key question was the medical validity of the technique and the likelihood of it producing information which might be of value in locating the body of Keith Bennett'[108].

But the Home Secretary remained unconvinced. In the meeting, he highlighted:

> ‘Hindley had been questioned exhaustively about the location of Keith Bennett’s grave but had been unable to pinpoint the exact location, despite visiting the Moor and making apparently sincere efforts to assist the police…The overwhelming probability was that by agreeing to hypnosis we would be starting a process which could not easily be halted, and which was neither in the public interest nor ultimately in Mrs Johnson’s…we should maintain our refusal to agree to hypnosis’[109].

Undeterred, Winnie Johnson continued to apply pressure regarding the issue - sending further letters Hurd, and Her Majesty The Queen asking him to reconsider[110]. Johnson believed that Home Office officials were initially in favour of agreeing to the procedure, but Hurd had intervened to quash the decision. Geoffrey Dickens MP asked a question in the Houses of Parliament about the case, and hypnosis specifically[111], and Gerald Kaufman was also prompted by Johnson to ask Hurd to reconsider[112]. Ian Smith, a staff writer at The Times, also sent a letter to Lord Ferrers – the then Minister of State in the Home Office with some responsibility for police matters – also asking for a reconsideration[113]. By April, 1988, as many as 60 letters from the public had also been received in support of hypnosis. Part of the Home Office strongly suspected that an orchestrated publicity campaign was at work, most likely instigated by Topping[114].

Given that nothing had substantively changed in terms of the likely utility of hypnosis, the Home Office continued to decline to review the matter. By July, they were also in a position to make a final decision on the nature of the circular – and the overwhelming weight of evidence was against the use of hypnosis in police investigations. In a briefing prepared for final Ministerial approval by F2 Division, they would highlight the unreliable nature of the evidence, the medical harm it can cause, and legal issues concerning the admissibility of evidence, suggesting that ‘the general view is that evidence obtained through hypnosis would not be admissible in court’[115].

They would also choose to specifically rebut the assertion of ACPO that it had proved useful in three investigations. In closing, the document asked Ministers to choose between a circular along the lines of the 1987 draft that provided guidelines for its use under certain circumstances, or to strongly discourage the police from using hypnosis, although recognising that individual decisions rest with Chief Constables. It was clear that F2 Division were strongly pushing for the second option[116].

Home Office Circular No. 66/1988, Standing Order 16, and 'the truth drug'

In August, 1988 the 'Home Office Circular No. 66/1988: The use of hypnosis by the police in the investigation of crime' was finally published, strongly discouraging the use of hypnosis in criminal investigations and without appending guidelines for its use under certain circumstances[117]. But whilst the circular made the use of hypnosis in criminal investigations by the police very difficult to justify for any Chief Constable, as was noted by the Prison Department during the initial discussions, this would not necessarily prevent a prisoner using hypnosis for their own purposes[118]. This issue was quickly brought to light in December, 1988, when the Daily Telegraph published a story about the case of Anthony Entwistle - imprisoned for the rape and murder of a 16 year old girl - who was authorised by the P3 Division to use hypnosis as a part of his case for appeal[119]. The case highlighted something of a tension in prison policy, and further consultation was taken regarding a prisoner's private use of hypnosis. The problem was that there was a clear distinction to be made between the use of hypnosis by the police to secure evidence and the use of hypnosis by a defendant. Any attempt to stop someone on remand or an appellant using hypnosis as a part of their defence would quickly escalate into accusations of impeding their right to construct their defence as they saw fit.

In the discussions that followed, P3 Division noted that 'the same considerations apply to lie-detector tests' and that it might be worth considering whether policy should be directed toward both techniques[120]. As it was, there was already some guidance for caseworkers on requests for lie detector and truth drug tests, suggesting that they should be refused as any information resulting from them would not be taken into account by a court of law. Evidently, that advice did not correspond to the growing recognition that, if a defendant wanted to make use of such techniques in their defence and at their own expense, the associated divisions of the Home Office should not intervene. This led to a suggested amendment of Standing Order 16 that outlined the conditions through which hypnosis, lie detectors, and truth drugs were permissible[121].

Requests from Johnson for the Home Secretary to reconsider continued throughout 1989, 1990, and 1991 - and the Home Office remained resolute in their decision, not least because there was no new evidence that anything had changed. However, the case would soon move in a new direction. In the correspondence with Winnie Johnson that followed his original decision to turn down the request for hypnosis, Hurd stated:

> 'I am advised that hypnosis does not act like a truth drug. There is no evidence to suggest that 'facts' which appear to be recalled under hypnosis are any more accurate than those which are brought about by ordinary questioning'[122].

And in July, 1992, Johnson's solicitors - Clifford Chapman and Co. - revisited that very idea: if hypnosis does not get to the truth, then why not just use a truth drug? In a letter to Kenneth Clarke, then Home Secretary, they asked him to seriously consider questioning Hindley using the drug pentathol, and they claimed they had been in contact with Hindley's solicitors who had agreed in principle[123]. The request was promptly turned down, suggesting that after carefully considering the matter, the Home Secretary

was unable to agree[124]. Johnson's solicitors immediately requested further justification as to why, noting that such a procedure had been approved for 'the Hickey brothers'[125]. But beyond stating that 'as Miss Hindley is not an appellant we are unable to allow her to be questioned whilst under a truth drug'[126], an explanation from the Home Office was not forthcoming.

With no further justification for the decision, Johnson's solicitors applied for a judicial review, which was heard in April, 1994. Mr Justice Turner rejected the application for review, but was 'highly critical' of the Home Office for its 'abrupt and unreasonable' response, especially as it represented 'a marked contrast with the replies given to the earlier requests for hypnosis'[127]. There was, however, a very good reason why the Home Office had acted in the way that it had, as was highlighted in a Prison Department review of the request:

> 'The gift of hindsight tells us that the subsequent embarrassment…could have been avoided but for the fastidiousness with which the Division declined to break Hindley's confidence by revealing that she had, in fact, withdrawn agreement to receive the "truth drug"'[128].

Hindley did, in fact, initially indicate to Johnson that she would agree to being given a truth drug - and continued to make it clear in her prison reviews that she wished that she could help Winnie Johnson find Keith's body. But by January 1993, she was 'very adamant' that she would not subject herself to the truth drug, because 'she had been warned by GMP that it could be harmful'[129]. Unfortunately she neglected to inform Winnie Johnson of her change of mind and the Home Office chose not to break her confidence.

However, there was another reason why the Home Office failed to reply to Johnson's solicitors. In light of Mr Justice Turner's comments, and although there was

no official compunction to do so, the legal advice team within the Home Office suggested that consideration be given to providing reasons for the refusal to Mrs Johnson. Media interest was also high, and given the negative publicity, the Home Secretary's office requested advice from DOP Policy Group on how to respond. Unfortunately, not only was it difficult finding the files relating to the case, many appeared 'to be in disarray'. The Policy Group concluded that it may have been that Mrs Johnson's solicitors failed to receive a substantive reply to their letter dated 28th October, 1992 simply because of the administrative weight of material they had on file and the changing nature of the personnel dealing with requests[130]. In light of the confusion, and the need to set out the reasons for the refusal, it was decided that the files were to be 'tidied up and put in order' and that it might be an idea to copy some of the material on a thematic basis 'rather than having to trawl through up to 19 PDP files and other related files whenever such a question as this crops up again'[131].

Regardless, within weeks of hearing that the judicial review had been rejected, Johnson's solicitors once again wrote to the Home Office requesting Hindley be hypnotised - with Hindley herself submitting another request a short time later. This time, and now armed with a concise but informative review of the issues associated with the request, the Home Office was more forthcoming[132]. The recognition that Prisons could not stop prisoners using hypnosis in their own defence had served to soften opposition to the plan somewhat and previous reviews of the decision suggested that the request could be approved on humanitarian grounds. There was also a 'backstop' already in place - Standing Order 16 - that would avoid the Home Office or the prison actually having to carry it out. To be clear, internal communications within the Home Office reveal that there was actually little hope that the procedure would provide any information of use, as suggested in one summary of the case:

> ‘we are now advised that the police now believe that due to the nature of the terrain on the moor, even if Miss Hindley could recall the event under hypnosis, the chance of finding the grave would be infinitesimal...Viewed rationally, the likelihood of hypnosis producing a positive result in this instance must be very small indeed’[133].

The single argument in favour of allowing Hindley to be hypnotised was simply one of compassion toward the family of Keith Bennett. For the Home Office, the balance was between approving a likely fruitless exercise that would result in a media frenzy, or ‘being perceived once more to obstruct a family’s search for the body of a murdered child’[134].

Myra Hindley’s Life Sentence

But, as was usually the case with Hindley, there was a further complication. At the time that the Home Office were beginning to think about approving the request for hypnosis, Hindley was also awaiting for the decision on her final tariff. That is, how long she would have to spend in prison before she could be considered for release.

As it was, Hindley was claiming that she expected the recommendation to be one of ‘natural life’ and made it clear at her internal review board in August 1994 that she would fight the decision by applying for a judicial review and take the matter to the European Court[135]. All of this administrative wrangling was being played out alongside her repeated request for hypnosis and just as a letter was being prepared to inform Hindley of her ‘whole life’ tariff, her request for hypnosis was also close to being agreed. Following another letter from Winnie Johnson in November, 1994, and now in full knowledge of the history of the request, the Minister of State for Home Affairs, Michael Forsyth, noted that on no occasion had Ministers actually met with the family of Keith Bennett to explain why the request had been refused. Although he recognised

that the 'issues are finely balanced' a meeting would allow a number of considerations to be discussed[136]. These included: whether there is a body to be found; whether Hindley would withdraw cooperation; the possibility that no new information would emerge; and, media intrusion. Should the family still wish the hypnosis to take place after considering these points it would be viewed as a request from them. This would help to avoid the perception that the procedure was a privilege granted to Hindley, particularly as the decision to undergo hypnosis would be directly under her volition, with GMP then responsible for how to act on any information provided.

The Home Secretary, Michael Howard, agreed with the plan, and suggested that Michael Forsyth would be best placed to carry out the proposal. A meeting was arranged with Bennett's family and in January, 1995, it was agreed that the attempt at hypnosis go ahead and by the middle of February, the logistics of the procedure were already well developed. Unfortunately, it still required the agreement of the prisoner - who, almost immediately no longer felt 'physically and mentally strong enough to undergo hypnosis'[137]. Once again, the authorities suspected that Hindley was using the situation for her own advantage:

> 'Hindley's position is that she needs peace and quiet to pull herself together to be in a state to undergo this forthcoming hypnosis…I believe she will try to maximise its usefulness herself…Her personal belief is that she is quite genuine in her desire to help, [but] Hindley and her Solicitor will seek to reap maximum advantage as a by product'[138].

In April 1995 Hindley would actually fracture her femur in an accident, but in light of her whole life tariff being revealed toward the end of 1994 - and her subsequent attempts to appeal the decision - Hindley intimated that whilst she remained committed to the procedure, she could not 'give her mind to it' until that decision was finalised[139].

Despite the initial planning of the logistics looking favourable, the process also soon became bogged down in procedural detail - not least due to Hindley herself. She almost immediately inquired as to whether she would receive 'immunity from prosecution', and other questions about 'who owns the tapes', 'who is present during hypnosis', and the terms of reference for the hypnotist quickly emerged[140]. Hindley could also not meet the estimated £11,000 cost[141], and given that GMP refused to finance the procedure - by then they were largely opposed to hypnosis, but felt a moral obligation to assist where necessary[142] - the Prison service had to agree to pay. This only further exacerbated administrative concern around issues of harm, liability and precedence. In making payment to the hypnotist it was thought that the Home Office would assume potential liability in the event that the procedure caused harm[143]. It was also noted that the procedure may indeed set another 'awkward precedent':

> 'There is no end is [sic] in sight to the delay that has already arisen, and the funding issue has come to undermine the neutrality of the Home Office's position…If hypnosis takes place, a precedent will be set which may become difficult to argue against. This will become more difficult if the cost is met by the Prison Service rather than Myra Hindley. In effect the Prison Service is funding the continuation of a criminal investigation'[144].

By the start of 1996, Hindley showed no eagerness for the hypnosis to proceed, and her mental fitness was still a matter for medical concern - although prison staff fully expected for her to make further objections should she be actually deemed fit. The emergent complications around potential litigation, and the value of any information gained, led the Prison Department to reconsider their position on the procedure, but they felt it remained 'prudent' to maintain the current course of action - and the Minister of State for Home Affairs Ann Widdecombe thought it impossible to renege on the agreement[145]. Johnson wrote to Hindley again in the summer 1996, which only

prompted Hindley to complain to the prison service and ask who had told Johnson that her health was improving. Meanwhile, Johnson wrote to the Home Secretary to suggest that 'one is inevitably driven to the unwelcome belief that Hindley is yet again choosing to have us all dangling on the chain she is pulling'[146] - and despite more letters from Winnie Johnson, that is how the picture remained until Hindley's death.

Conclusion

In 1995, the criminologist Paul Rock suggested that the organization and politics of the criminal justice system were in flux. The gradual turn away from the traditional decision-making processes of internal consultation and committee meeting found itself co-existing with something less cohesive, more fragmentary, and more subject to external influence. These newer modes of policy-making, Rock argues were the 'fruits of a new politics of populism, moralism, and the market', with Ministers less likely to confer and consult and more likely to act with 'the general will idiosyncratically conceived'[147]. Given this mix of convention and innovation within the internal workings of the Home Office, this paper provides a demonstration of how approaches to penal policy were being negotiated and developed across the late 1980s and early 1990s. In moving beyond the critical examination of gender and culture within the Hindley narrative[148] and 'unusual' female serial killers more generally[149], it demonstrates how supposed innovations in the process of criminal investigation were negotiated over time by a variety of policy-actors. These actors included the prison authorities, the various departments of the Home Office, Greater Manchester Police, the relatives of the victims, the wider media, and Hindley and her supporters.

In these respects, Hindley's sentence was defined by the Murder (abolition of Death Penalty) Act 1965 and the emergent penal policy that grew to structure the management of prisoners with 'life tariffs'. However, given her willingness to actively

negotiate the administrative detail of her sentence, and the media's willingness to report many aspects of that sentence, those within the prison service and the Home Office frequently found themselves faced with making decisions that were finely balanced with respect to public perception, political will, and penal policy and procedure - not to mention repeated media interest. Inevitably, trying to satisfy the needs of all parties, all the time, was often something of an impossible task. Instead, consultation between the various people, departments, and divisions with an interest in her case became a vital tool in the decision making procedure, as did documenting the process of reaching those decisions. Against the backdrop of a media that was increasingly representing Hindley as 'the personification of evil' and an aberration of femininity[150], this detailed discussion provided the necessary detail in justifying *and* defending decisions associated with her sentence. However, it also produced a mass of material that needed to be processed with each iteration of any given issue. Over time, this rendered the business of understanding the key issues and constraints increasingly difficult – something that was made more complicated by staff turnover, departmental/division reorganisation, and prison transfer.

All of which would go on to influence how Hindley's petition to be hypnotised was managed. Beyond the actual efficacy of the procedure, the lack of an established policy meant that wide ranging consultation was necessary to make a considered decision, which then needed to be maintained in the face of further requests – in this case from Johnson, Topping, and Hindley herself. However, when the adequacy of the emergent policy was subsequently tested in other cases, the issue continued to influence the further administrative detail of her sentence. Movements toward penal populism that would eventually see the introduction of a 'whole life tariff' in cases like Hindley's only further complicated matters for the prison authorities. Not only did it remove the

prospect of release and her motivation to co-operate, it also continued to add to the mounting pile of paperwork necessary to facilitate the decision-making process. And at the centre of all of this administration was Hindley herself, who frequently exasperated the authorities with her actions and requests, much to the delight of an expectant media. Unfortunately for Winnie Johnson, none of which helped discover the final resting place of her son.

---

[1] Jenkins, *Decade of Nightmares.*

[2] Jenkins, *Intimate Enemies*.

[3] Reiss, "Police organisation in the Twentieth Century", 51.

[4] Lyman, *The Police: An Introduction.*

[5] Goldstein, "Improving policing: A problem orientated approach", 236.

[6] Wattis, "Revisiting the Yorkshire Ripper Murders", 3.

[7] Reiss, "Police organisation in the Twentieth Century", 51.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Newburn, "'Tough on Crime'", 425.

[10] Rock, "The social organisation of a Home Office Initiative", 141.

[11] Rock, "The opening stages of criminal justice policy making', 2.

[12] Innes, "Investigating Murder".

[13] Rock, "The opening stages of criminal justice policy making', 2.

[14] Drake and Walters, "Crossing the Line", 414.

[15] Stevens, "Telling police stories", 237.

[16] Gravitz, "An early case of hypnosis", 224.

[17] Laurence and Perry, "Hypnosis, surgery, and mind–body interaction", 351.

[18] See, for example: Orne, "The use and misuse of hypnosis in court", 311; Reiser, *Handbook of Investigative Hypnosis*; Haward, and Ashworth, "Some problems of evidence obtained by hypnosis", 469; Hibbard, and Worring, *Forensic Hypnosis*; Sanders, and Simmons "Use of

hypnosis to enhance eyewitness accuracy", 70; Wagstaff, "Hypnosis and witness recall" 793; Wagstaff, "The enhancement of witness memory", 3.

[19] American Medical Association, "Scientific status of refreshing recollection", 1918.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid.

[22] See, for example: Kleinhauz et al, "The use of hypnosis in police investigation", 77; Reiser, *Handbook of Investigative Hypnosis*; Hibbard, and Worring, *Forensic Hypnosis*; Haward, "Hypnosis by the police", 33; and Bowers, *Hypnosis for the Seriously Curious*.

[23] See, for example, Kirsch, "The social learning theory of hypnosis", 439; Lynn, "A nonstate view of hypnotic involuntariness", 21; Spanos, and Chaves, *Hypnosis*; and, Wagstaff, "Compliance, belief and semantics in hypnosis", 362.

[24] See for example, Barber, *Hypnosis*; Barber, Spanos, and Chaves, *Hypnotism, Imagination, and Human Potentialities*; and, Sheehan, and Perry, *Methodologies of Hypnosis*.

[25] Wagstaffe, "Hypnosis and the law", 1284.

[26] Loftus, and Loftus, "On the permanence of stored information in the human brain", 409.

[27] "The Svengali Squad". 1976. *Time*, September 13.

[28] Claiborne, W. 1977. "Threat seen in police using hypnosis", *The Washington Post*, April 08.

[29] Mottahedin, "Investigative hypnosis in south east England", 369.

[30] Lakeman, G. 1983. "Genette murder police fly out for new probe", *The Daily Mirror*, June 27.

[31] "Where will the M5 rapist strike next". 1980. *The Observer*, January, 13.

[32] "Murder hunt hypnosis quiz". 1981. *The Daily Express*, September, 22.

[33] "Rape victim pays a £900 penalty". 1982. *The Daily Mirror*, January, 27.

[34] "Hypnosis in murder inquiry". 1983. *The Guardian*, August 15.

[35] "Rape girl, 11, hypnotised". 1984. *The Daily Mirror*, March 19.

[36] "Killer of newsboy gets life". 1988. *The Daily Express*, November, 04, 1988.

[37] Horwell, "Mouncher Investigation Report".

[38] Wagstaff, "Should 'hypnotized' witnesses be banned from testifying in court?' 186.

[39] HO 336/28 – extract 8. The National Archive.

[40] HO 336/28 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[41] HO 336/30 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[42] Ibid.

[43] HO 336/28 - extract 8. The National Archive.

[44] Ibid.

[45] HO 336/28 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[46] Birch, "If looks could kill", 32.

[47] Clark, "Why was Myra Hindley evil?", 1.

[48] Birch, “If looks could kill’, 32

[49] Seal, *Women, murder, and femininity*.

[50] Jenks, *Transgression*.

[51] Clark, “Normal girl, interrupted”.

[52] Cummins et al, *Serial killers and the media.*

[53] Seal, *Women, murder, and femininity*.

[54] Birch, “If looks could kill’, 32

[55] Cummins et al, *Serial killers and the media.*

[56] Topping, *Topping*, 43.

[57] HO 336/27 – extract 55. The National Archive.

[58] HO 336/27 – extract 56. The National Archive.

[59] HO 336/28 – extract 23. The National Archive.

[60] HO 336/29 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[61] Ibid.

[62] HO 336/28 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[63] Ibid.

[64] HO 336/28 – extract 50. The National Archive.

[65] HO 336/28 – extract 35. The National Archive.

[66] HO 336/30 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[67] Ibid.

[68] See Clark, ‘Normal girl, interrupted’.

[69] Ibid.

[70] HO 336/32 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[71] Whilst the name of the hypnotist in question is redacted within the files held at The National Archive, Topping would later reveal her to be Una Maguire.

[72] HO 336/29 - extract 39. The National Archive.

[73] HO 336/29 – extract 36. The National Archive.

[74] HO 336/43 – extract 97/98. The National Archive.

[75] Topping, *Topping*, 227

[76] HO 336/28 – extract 9. The National Archive.

[77] Ibid.

[78] HO 336/26 – extract 9. The National Archive.

[79] Ibid.

[80] Ibid.

[81] HO 336/28 – extract 6. The National Archive.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Ibid.

[84] Ibid.

[85] HO 336/28 – extract 26. The National Archive.

[86] HO 336/29 – extract 18. The National Archive.

[87] HO 336/29 – extract 31. The National Archive.

[88] HO 336/29 – extract 39. The National Archive.

[89] Ibid.

[90] HO 336/28 – extract 7. The National Archive.

[91] HO 336/29 – extract 30. The National Archive.

[92] HO 336/43 – extract 81. The National Archive.

[93] Ibid.

[94] HO 336/29 – extract 102. The National Archive.

[95] Ibid.

[96] HO336/43 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[97] See, for example: "Put me in a trance pleads Myra". 1988, *The Daily Mirror*, January 7.

[98] HO 336/45 – extract 45. The National Archive.

[99] HO 336/79 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[100] HO 336/29 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[101] HO 336/29 – extract 90. The National Archive.

[102] HO 336/43 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[103] HO 336/43 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[104] HO 336/29 – extract 95. The National Archive.

[105] Ibid.

[106] Ibid.

[107] HO 336/29 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[108] HO 336/29 – extract 82. The National Archive.

[109] Ibid.

[110] HO 336/79 – extract 15. The National Archive.

[111] HO 336/29 – extract 47. The National Archive.

[112] HO 336/29 – extract 57. The National Archive.

[113] HO 336/29 – extract 71. The National Archive.

[114] HO 336/29 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[115] HO 336/29 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[116] HO 336/29 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[117] Home Office Circular No. 66/1988.

[118] HO 336/28 – extract 7. The National Archive.

[119] HO 336/30 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[120] HO 336/30 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[121] HO 336/30 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[122] HO 336/29 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[123] HO 336/33 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[124] HO 336/33 – extract 103. The National Archive.

[125] HO 336/33 – extract 87. The National Archive. This is presumably a reference to the Hickey cousins, not brothers, Vincent Hickey and Michael Hickey. As part of 'the Bridgewater Four', they were convicted of the murder of Carl Bridgewater in 1979, although the decision was overturned by the Court of Appeal in February 1997.

[126] HO 336/33 – extract 87. The National Archive.

[127] HO 336/33 – extract 37. The National Archive.

[128] HO 336/152 – extract 16. The National Archives.

[129] HO 336/33 – extract 79. The National Archive.

[130] HO 336/33 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[131] Ibid.

[132] HO 336/33 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[133] HO336/43 – extract 5. The National Archive.

[134] HO336/43 – extract 5. The National Archive.

[135] HO 336/120 - extract 44. The National Archive.

[136] HO 336/33 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[137] HO 336/149 – extract 12. The National Archive.

[138] Ibid.

[139] HO 336/14 – extract 6. The National Archive.

[140] HO 336/14 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[141] HO 336/14 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[142] HO 336/14 – extract 3. The National Archive.

[143] HO 336/14 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[144] HO 336/14 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[145] HO336/282 – extract unnumbered. The National Archive.

[146] HO336/282 – extract 2. The National Archive.

[147] Rock, P. "The social organization of a Home Office initiative", 2.

[148] Cummins et al, *Serial killers and the media.*

[149] Seal, *Women, murder, and femininity*.

[150] Birch, "If looks could kill", 32.

Bibliography

American Medical Association. "Scientific Status of Refreshing Recollection by Use of Hypnosis." *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 253 (1985): 1918-1923.

Anderton, C. H. "The Forensic Use of Hypnosis." In *Clinical Applications of Hypnosis* edited by F. A. De Piano & H. C. Salzberg, 197-223. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1986.

Barber, T. *Hypnosis: A Scientific Approach.* Oxford: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1969.

Barber, T., Spanos, N.P. and Chaves, J.F. *Hypnotism, Imagination and Human Potentialities*. New York: Pergamon, 1974.

Birch, H. "If Looks Could Kill: Myra Hindley and the Iconography of Evil", in *Moving Targets* edited by H. Birch, 32-61. London: Virago, 1993.

Clark, T. "Why was Myra Hindley evil?" Working paper for the Department of Sociological Studies, University of Sheffield (2011)

Clark, T. "Normal Girl, Interrupted: An Auto/biographical Analysis of Myra Hindley's Confession." *Deviant Behaviour*, online first (2019).

Cummins, I., Foley, M., and King, M. *Serial killers and the media: the Moors Murders Legacy.* Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2019.

Drake, D.D. & Walters, R. "Crossing the line: Criminological expertise, policy advice and the 'quarrelling society.'" *Critical Social Policy*, 35 (2015): 414-433.

Goldstein, H. "Improving policing: A problem-orientated approach." *Crime and Delinquency*, 25 (1979): 236- 258.

Gravitz, M. A. "An Early Case of Hypnosis Used in the Investigation of a Crime." *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 31 (1983): 224–226.

Haward, L. "Hypnosis by the Police." *British Journal of Experimental and Clinical Hypnosis*, 5 (1988): 33–35.

Haward, L. and Ashworth, A. "Some Problems of Evidence Obtained by Hypnosis." *Criminal Law Review*, August (1980): 469–485.

Hibbard, W. S. and Worring, R. W. *Forensic Hypnosis: The Practical Application of Hypnosis in Criminal Investigation*. Springfield, IL: C. C. Thomas, 1981.

Innes, M. *Investigating Murder*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Jenkins, P. *Intimate Enemies: Moral Panics in Contemporary Great Britain*. New York: De Gruyter, 1992.

Jenkins, P. *Decade of Nightmares: The End of the Sixties and the Making of Eighties America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Jenks, C. *Transgression.* London: Routledge, 2003.

Kirsch, I. "The Social Learning Theory of Hypnosis", in *Theories of Hypnosis: Current Models and Perspectives* edited by S. J. Lynn & J. W. Rhue, 439-466. New York: Guilford, 1991.

Kleinhauz, M., Horowitz, I. and Tobin, T. "The Use of Hypnosis in Police Investigation: A Preliminary Communication." *Journal of the Forensic Science Society*, 17 (1977): 77–80.

Loftus, E. F., & Loftus, G. R. "On the Permanence of Stored Information in the Human Brain." *American Psychologist*, 35 (1980): 409-420.

Lynn, S. J. "A Nonstate View of Hypnotic Involuntariness." *Contemporary Hypnosis*, 9 (1992): 21-27.

Mottahedin, I. "Investigative Hypnosis in South East England." *Hypnosis: Current Clinical, Experimental and Forensic Practices*, 1988: 369.

Newburn, T. "Tough on crime: Penal policy in England and Wales." *Crime and Justice*, 36 (2007): 425—470.

Orne, M. T. (1971). "The Simulation of Hypnosis: Why, How, and What it Means." *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 19 (1988): 183-210

Orne, M. T., Soskis, D. A., Dinges, D. F., & Orne, E. C. "Hypnotically induced testimony." In *Eyewitness testimony: Psychological perspectives* edited by G. L. Wells & E. F. Loftus, 171-215. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Perry, C., & Laurence, J.-R. "Hypnosis, Surgery, and Mind–Body Interaction: An Historical Evaluation." Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 15 (1983): 351-372.

Reiser, M. *Handbook of Investigative Hypnosis.* Los Angeles, CA: Lehi, 1980.

Rock, P. "The social organisation of a Home Office initiative." *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*, 2 (1994): 141-167.

Rock, P. "The opening stages of criminal justice policy making." *British Journal of Criminology*, 35 (1995): 1-16.

Sanders, G. S., & Simmons, W. L. "Use of Hypnosis to Enhance Eyewitness Accuracy: Does it Work?" *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68 (1983): 70-77.

Seal, L. *Women, Murder and Femininity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2010.

Spanos, N. P., & Chaves, J. F. (Eds.). *Hypnosis: The Cognitive Behavioral Perspective*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus, 1989.

Sheehan, P. W., & Perry, C. W. *Methodologies of Hypnosis: A Critical Appraisal of Contemporary Paradigms of Hypnosis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1976.

Stevens, A. "Telling police stories: An ethnographic study of the use of evidence in policy-making in the UK." *Journal of Social Policy*, 40 (2011): 237-255.

Topping, P. *Topping: The Autobiography of the Police Chief in Charge of the Moors Murders Case*. London: Angus and Robertson, 1988.

Udolf, R. *Forensic Hypnosis: Psychological and Legal Aspects*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1983.

Wagstaff, G. F. *Hypnosis, Compliance, and Belief*. Brighton, UK: Harvester, 1981.

Wagstaff, G. F. "Hypnosis and Witness Recall: A Discussion Paper." *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 75 (1982): 793-797.

Wagstaff, G. F. "The Enhancement of Witness Memory by Hypnosis: A Review and Methodological Critique of the Experimental Literature." *British Journal of Experimental and Clinical Hypnosis*, 2 (1984): 3-12.

Wagstaff, G. F. "Compliance, Belief and Semantics in Hypnosis: A Nonstate, Sociocognitive Perspective", in *Theories of Hypnosis: Current Models and Perspectives* edited by S. J. Lynn & J. W. Rhue, 439-466. New York: Guilford, 1991.

Wagstaff, G.F. "Should 'hypnotized' witnesses be banned from testifying in court? Hypnosis and the M50 murder case." *Contemporary Hypnosis*, 13 (1996): 186-190.

Wagstaffe, G. F. "Hypnosis and the law: Examining the stereotypes." *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 35, 10 (2008): 1277-1294.

Wattis, L. Revisiting the Yorkshire Ripper murders: Interrogating gender violence, sex work, and justice." *Feminist Criminology*, 12 (2015): 3-21.