

## The Jo Cox Detectives

### Summary

*On 16<sup>th</sup> June 2016, a British MP, Jo Cox, was murdered in broad daylight outside a library in Birstall, Yorkshire. The murder was witnessed by several people. The attacker allegedly shot Jo Cox three times and allegedly stabbed her several times. The attacker wore a baseball cap, and none of the witnesses knew the identity of the attacker. The attacker was not named by anyone at the scene of the crime. There is a long list of anomalies in this case which point to a serious miscarriage of justice. The alleged attacker, 52 year old Thomas Mair was arrested over a mile away from the murder scene and I suspect at the time of his arrest he had no knowledge about the murder, therefore there is doubt about whether the police arrested and charged the correct man. There is also doubt about whether the man who was interviewed by the police and stood trial WAS Thomas Mair. There are four witnesses I have interviewed independently of each other, all who knew Thomas Mair, and all state that the man being interviewed shown on video by police is not Thomas Mair. I suspect the two officers being interviewed for a TV documentary were involved in framing an innocent man for a murder he did not commit. Does the language of the two detectives show guilty knowledge that Thomas Mair is innocent and played no part in the murder of Jo Cox? Please note that in the CCTV evidence mentioned by the detectives, the suspect is wearing a baseball cap which is obscuring his face, therefore in no CCTV sequence can Thomas Mair be identified.*

*The statements from the two police officers are taken from this BBC documentary  
<https://www.dailymotion.com/video/x5qcktn>*

### Detective Superintendent Nick Wallen

*It's a brutal attack, he is gonna kill her and there is nothing gonna stop him from doing so.  
There's rage, there's real rage.*

- 1) The statement did not start with the pronoun “I” which indicates a lack of psychological commitment which may reduce reliability. This maybe because this isn't a statement of the FEP (free editing process) where the subject is starting and speaking with his own words but responding to a question from an interviewer. If it is a question I do not know what the question was. The video this is taken from is heavily edited and that will have to be considered in this analysis. If the subject has been cautioned on what he may or may not be free to speak, the pronoun “I” is not expected as the reduced psychological commitment can arise from a fear of consequence professionally or personally. In any and all conditions, it reduces reliability.
- 2) The detective speaks as he is aware of *what is in the mind* of the killer. This is unexpected from a seasoned detective. The detective also states that her death is a forgone conclusion and by extension inevitable. Possibly sensationalising for personal reasons or the camera?
- 3) *“it's a brutal attack”* does the detective add *“brutal”* so he can claim as he states *“There's rage, there's real rage.”*
- 4) *“There's rage, there's real rage.”* Repeated word or phrases show those words to be sensitive to the speaker. Here *“rage”* is repeated, but more then repeated the word *“real”* is added. Is this to presuppose that there is *“rage”* that isn't real. Is this a NTP (need to persuade) the audience that the detective is sincere? Is the subject experiencing post trauma stress and perseveration?
- 5) *“he is gonna kill her and there is nothing gonna stop him from doing so.”* The use of the negative in a statement is always flagged as significant to the speaker, here the detective tells us that *“nothing gonna stop him”*. Why is this sensitive to the detective? Could a bodyguard not have stopped him? Was it a pre-gone conclusion that Jo Cox was to be killed?

...

*I know that his mother formed a relationship with an African Caribbean man, eeer, and from that time onwards their relationship deteriorated.*

- 1) *“I know ...”* the detective tells us he knows but not how he knows. The detective is being authoritative yet he is using passivity to state what he knows. Passivity is used to conceal identity and or responsibility. If his source of information needs to be confidential that it could be appropriate to use passivity but it also may mean he is concealing information *for other reasons*. Here it is interesting that he uses the pronoun “I” and not the expected “we” referring to the police or the investigators. If this is a false narrative is he the architect?
- 2) *“I know”* is unnecessary. A subject can only tells us what he knows. This is an indication that he is choosing what he can and cannot tell us. He is concealing information.

- 3) *“I know that his mother formed a relationship with an African Caribbean man, ...”* *“African Caribbean man”* is brought into the statement. He is introduced without a complete social introduction; his name is withheld and this may well be appropriate due to the nature of the case. The bringing up of an *“African Caribbean man”* may not be inappropriate.
- 4) His mother *“formed a relationship.”* What is meant by “formed” rather than “had” a relationship? To “form” (past tense) is to indicate passage of time and elements within the relationship that warrant investigation into why the subject used this language. To “form” indicates detail which is not offered here.
- 5) Then there is a pause. Pauses in statements can mean the person is thinking about what to say and it is not flowing smoothly or it can indicate self-censoring what was about to be said. *“eer, and from that time onward their relationship deteriorated.”* Here the detective uses passive voice, he does not tell use what time frame he is referring or where the information comes from. He gives the signal of what he “knows”; that is, he is withholding information here.
- 6) Is this information being withheld due to oversight by his superiors?

...

*There’s a obsessive compulsiveness about him. The tins are facing the right way [image showing that tins of food in the cupboard are all facing same way]. Err, it’s that classic OCD-ness.*

- 1) *“There’s a obsessive compulsiveness about him.”* This is a character description; not a testimony or statement of fact. First there is the reference that this person, Thomas Mair has rage =anger second there is a reference that made him racist now third he is OCD = crazy.
- 2) Concern: the need of portrayal If the target indicates behaviour that appears to be repeating or compulsive, the expectation is a description of such. This is particularly a norm from a detective or investigator.
- 3) Another pause followed by clinical diagnosis. *“Err, it’s that classic OCD-ness.”* The detective did not quote a psychiatric report or any other official diagnosis as could be expected. This is a commentary; not a report.
- 4) The present tense language is a reduction of commitment. This must be understood in light of beginning his statement without the pronoun “I”

...

*Nobody knew this guy, his own mother didn’t really know him.*

- 1) Commentary continues. Commentary is not testimony, but processed information that is often used to persuade or narrate, rather than report fact. It is conclusionary in nature. We note it comes in his statement without the pronoun “I” and in the present tense language. *“Nobody knew this guy ... own mother didn’t really know him.”* One sentence and to items presented in the negative highlighting the importance to the speaker. Adding to the speaker’s sensitivity is the addition of the word “really” an unnecessary word. Unnecessary words are important and flagged

in analysis. It goes along with the need to foster a narrative (persuade) by the subject, as the subject has a need to enforce or present a perception rather than what was witnessed.

*Almost on a daily basis Thomas Mair was looking at web pages relating to the Nazis.*

- 1) **“Almost on a daily...”** the detective qualifies his claim with the addition of the word **“almost”**. It is passive language as is **“related to the Nazis”**, passivity is used to conceal identity or responsibility. We can ask how could he have worded this? What would be expected if this statement were fact? Expected is a clear strong commitment such as **“Thomas Mair was viewing web sites of Nazi material and sympathizers.”**
- 2) The detective also uses the article **“the”**. **“the Nazis**. The detective is indicating to us that he is familiar with **“the”** Nazis in his narrative. This is an indication of prior discussion. Did the subject expect his audience to already know the connection to Nazi? Or was this rehearsed earlier as an accepted narrative?
- 3) The detective is linking /associating Thomas Mair to **“Nazis”**. The detective has added another disparaging note, the forth so far, in his description of the character of of Thomas Mair. We will look to see if it is appropriate or if the detective is merely building a narrative in a NTP (need to persuade).

...

*He volunteered at the libraries in Batley and Birstall and that gave him access to the internet. There was no online activity going on at his home address, there's no, there was no ipad, ipod or laptop or anything like that in his own home.*

- 1) The detective tells us why Thomas Mair volunteered at libraries to connect Mair to the internet since there was no evidence of him on the internet at his home. Is this to clear up the inconsistencies of the investigation?
- 2) The detective goes on in the negative to explain what *wasn't* happening and what *wasn't* in Mair's home. Things in the negative are flagged as sensitive and elevated in importance to the subject. We expect to hear what happened; not what **“wasn't”** happened or what **“wasn't”** found in the home. This is a very sensitive point for the subject.
- 3) In a peculiar way the detective says what wasn't happening **“at his home address”**. The addition of the unnecessary word **“address”** means it is significant to the detective. Here, in the negative, he unnecessarily tells his audience what was not at the location which would be most frequently used by the target. This theme of reporting **“in the negative”** of what did not happen continues:

...

*He wasn't in chat rooms with other people in political groups. He wasn't on any online forums engaging in any healthy social debate.*

- 1) Again, the detective use language in the negative to tell us what Mair wasn't doing. So far the detective has told us a lot of what Mair wasn't doing. This in itself is unexpected as you would expect to be told what he was doing. Is the detective trying

to indict by what Mair wasn't doing? This would belie a lack of evidence and a need to persuade on the part of the detective.

- 2) ***"He wasn't on any online forums engaging in any healthy social debate."*** This could be the 5<sup>th</sup> disparaging remark, adding to the negative image of the character of Mair. The implication being that Mair was unhealthy socially since he was not engaged in ***"healthy social debate."***
- 3) ***"healthy social debate"*** is a commentary that suggests a form of political influence (political correctness; or acceptance). It is an unexpected classification in context.

He was able to immerse himself in this hatred and this ideology and nobody knew about it.

- 1) People avoid direct fabrication as it is often stressful. The detective didn't say Mair immersed himself in this hatred and this ideology ... the detective said he was able to, not that he did. What caused this inclusion? This is a weak assertion.
- 2) The detective also uses the word ***"this"*** for hatred and ideology. By using the word ***this*** the detective brings the issue close to himself. By using it twice he doubles down on the closeness as using the rule of economy the word ***"this"*** would only be used once. The rule of economy is that a person will use the fewest words to convey a thought. When we encounter extra or unnecessary words we should be on the lookout for deception.
- 3) While bringing the hatred and ideology close to himself the detective also employs the passive voice, he does not tell us what hatred or what ideology.
- 4) Note negative: ***"and nobody knew it."*** What has caused the subject to make a conclusion that is unprovable? This is not the language of investigation. He does not offer that ***"no one near him"*** or ***"those close to him..."***

In a sense, this is to close off all further investigation. Since ***"nobody knew it"***, there is no purpose in further collateral contacts in the investigation. It is to assume that no other person possibly could have knowledge. This is not an assumption made by experienced investigators.

...

The 7<sup>th</sup> of June is kind of focal moment really for him.

- 1) ***"The 7<sup>th</sup> of June..."*** The use of ***"kind of"*** and ***"really"*** do not belong in statements of fact and provide no context to Mair.
- 2) ***"focal moment"*** This is incongruent. Incongruence is an indicator of story telling as it is lacking support of experiential knowledge. The entire sentence is incongruent as well as passive. If the date is known, it is not ***"kind of"*** nor ***"really."***
- 3) ***"for him"*** this sentence ends with ***"for him."*** This is an example of persuasion. The subject continues to ***"mind read"*** rather than report as fact.

One of the searches that Thomas Mair did was a, a general wikipedia search on Jo Cox. And then there is a whole section on her political career and the causes that she was very very engaged with. You can almost imagine him sitting becoming quite angry.

- 1) The detective continues in the passive voice. We expect that the detective would present facts that could stand on their own.
- 2) The detective stutters on the article “a” repeating it. This could be self-censoring, changing what he intended to say or needing time to formulate his words. It weakens his narrative.
- 3) Why does the detective include the word “general” before wikipedia search? He described a brutal attacker filled with rage and now he is a poor sod doing a “general” search. It is not even a “general” search but a “general wikipedia search”. A “general” search is now thus compared to a specific search. The context of “search” is very sensitive to the subject.
- 4) “*And then ...*” The detective adds the element of time and begins the sentence with “and” indicating missing information between “and” and the preceding sentence. So we have the possibility of the detective leaving out information while adding the element of time.
- 5) “*then there is a whole section on her political career and the causes that she was very very engaged with.*” The detective does not state that Mair read the section. The detective even adds the word “whole” to “whole section” emphasising, drawing attention to this section.
- 6) “*and the causes that she was very very engaged with.*” The detective uses the qualifier “very” twice in “*very very engaged in.*” The need for emphasis comes from a weakness. Did the subject expect his audience to not believe him? Did the subject not believe his own assertion? This is not consistent with testimony nor reporting of fact. We see that the detective has used qualifiers to emphasize Jo Cox’s political career and the causes she is engaged in. Are the “*political causes*” different from her “career”? Why the sensitive of this topic to the subject?
- 7) “*You can almost imagine him sitting becoming quite angry.*” The detective should tell us what we do not need to imagine. To “imagine” is to acknowledge the lack of facts. The subject doesn’t say “I” but uses the universal “you”, this is distancing language from what he is saying. The word “almost” reduces the strength of his assertion. It is weak and unnecessary language. The detective suggests he may not believe his own words as he has added qualifiers which distances him from his words.
- 8) Body posture: Here the detective has used the word “*sitting*” in this sentence. This is unnecessary (whether he was sitting, standing, laying down) and is often an indicator of an increase in tension. Since the subject is telling “you” to “imagine”, the distancing should not be stressful as it is not experiential memory, but an imagination. It appears that asking the audience to “imagine” rather than listen to his testimony, may be a cause for increased tension to the subject.

...

*And then he starts looking at an image of a point 22 rimfire rifle. And then a search on Youtube of some individuals in the United States test firing one.*

- 1) When a sentence begins with “and” we are on alert for missing information between the word “and” and the preceding sentence which was a weak assertion. Please note: This statement is possibly heavily edited and the statement is a response to unknown question (s) by the interviewer.

- 2) We note the continued lack of commitment via verb tense.
- 3) Throughout the statement there has been a large element of time in the detective's language. An example is here; "And then he starts looking ..." the detective has gone into the present tense. This is unexpected as all this occurred in the past. When we see shifting back and forth through tenses we should be on the look out for deception / storytelling and the lack of experiential memory within the words. He stated: "starts looking ..." this is an incomplete action spanning time and it is incongruous as one would expect facts not incomplete actions.
- 4) "And then ..." the phrase is repeated from the sentence before, missing information and the element of time. The detective again using passive language "a search ..." and "of some individuals". Thus far, the detective's narrative seems to be the reverse engineering or construction of an event to check off requisite points to substantiate what occurred. This suggests narrative and is consistent with his reporting of what the target was thinking, feeling and the need for his audience to enter into imagination, rather than reporting of fact
- 5) "of some individuals in the United States test firing one." The word "test" is unnecessary. A .22 rimfire is a common rifle but small calibre and not a likely weapon for murder. One only test fires if one is unsure of the rifle's condition or if one is discharging different types of ammunition yet there is no such references.

*I'm presuming that at that stage he either knows how he's gonna get hold of such a weapon or in fact at that point has come into possession of that weapon.*

- 1) The detective finally uses the words "I'm presuming ..." since a lot of what he has stated to this point were his presumptions or the "read of the mind of Mair." This sentence should, therefore, be considered important to him, above his other descriptions. Why is presumption needed here, but not during the narrative or "story telling" portion?.

*Around about that time there would have been posters up in that library saying Jo Cox will be here on the 16<sup>th</sup> of June, and she'll be doing a surgery on that day.*

- 1) The sentence starts with the element of time. Somewhat appropriate as the narrative is the timeline of the event or at least the detective's timeline of the event. However, there is an unnecessary word added "about", the law of economy would expect the phrase to go "around that time" but the detective said "around about that time". It is already a vague time with "around" adding "about" makes it even more vague. It weakens the language and is distancing of the detective from what he is saying in this sentence.
- 2) Further weakening the detective's own words is "there would have been", the detective did not say "there were posters ..." so we have two points of weakness regarding the posters in the library. This is a basic fact we expect to hear from a detective.

*All around him he will have been, right - motive – opportunity, ooh opportunity, big time opportunity.*

- 1) “*All around him he will have been, right* –“ this is a statement of persuasion and it is a statement of **presumption**. We now consider why the word “presumption” came into his language just prior.
- 2) “ , *right - motive – opportunity, ooh opportunity, big time opportunity.*” “*right ...*” is consistent with “scripting” or narrative building from language that may have been rehearsed.
- 3) “*motive - opportunity, ooh opportunity, big time opportunity.*” “*opportunity*” is repeated 3 times, “*ooh opportunity*” the “*ooh*” providing emphasis, then the third time “*big time*” qualifying “*opportunity.*” Repeated words are sensitive to the subject. The word “*motive*” did not elicit the same response from the detective as did “*opportunity.*” Why does “*opportunity*” cause this response? For whom is this an “*opportunity*”?”

...

*Thomas left his own home address around about half nine in the morning. Took himself up to the Birstall retail park just by the M62, where he spent a large amount of time simply kind of window shopping. Went into WH Smiths, read a few magazines and looked at the local paper.*

- 1) **Passive voice is employed throughout these sentences. Passivity is used to conceal information, often regarding identity and or responsibility. It begins in strength, including the past tense verb, but the commitment turns weak with “Took himself...” dropping the name (or pronoun).**
- 2) “*own*” “*address*” “*about*”, the law of economy states that the shortest way (fewest words) are what is expected when someone is communication information intended to be understood by the recipient. When that is not the case we should look for possible deception as the extra words are only extra to the listener not the speaker. These additional words are important. How could this have been said? “Thomas left home at around half nine in the morning.” Is this storytelling? This is the second instance in this statement where the detective uses unnecessary words regarding Mair’s home.
- 3) “*Took himself ...*” Does one take oneself or does someone else take you?
- 4) “*where he spent a large amount of time simply kind of ...*”. Passive voice and incongruent wording. “*simply kind of ...*” is vague.
- 5) “*. Went into WH Smiths, read a few magazines and looked at the local paper.*” We note that there is no pronoun to tell us who in this sentence while noting the detective has been saying “he” in the preceding sentence. Dropping pronouns can be an indication of distancing from the statement due to the stress caused by lying outright. The subject himself does not commit to these actions.
- 6) The detective says “*read*” for magazines and “*looked*” at for the “*local paper.*” This maybe a change in language which signals a change in reality (the linguistic reality of the speaker). When we don’t note a change in reality we need to be on the



**lookout for deception/storytelling. It can be a signal of “falling off script” for one who is giving a narrative rather than engaging experiential memory to report fact.**

...

[ the next statements refer to the perpetrator after he has carried out the murder and then entered a garden in a street some distance away from the murder scene. ]

*So having done that he has then jumped back over the fence and comes and re-emerges out of the side of the Vaults pub.*

- 1) **“so” a point of sensitivity, telling us why something was done instead of stating facts. The additional information about the target’s actions (reported weakly) slow down the pace of the account unnecessarily.**
- 2) **The switch from past tense is noted. The language of narration, instead, is used. This will cause the reader/listener/analyst to question the veracity as the verb change reduces commitment.**

*I’ve got a marauding terrorist at loose. I didn’t know if this individual was now shooting other people, stabbing other people err in the streets in the area.*

- 1) **The detective now brings himself into the event with the pronoun “I”. Why? Why not “we”, “we” is expected? Is this his project in more than an investigative way?**
- 2) **“I’ve got a marauding terrorist at loose.” Generally the police refrain from labelling people terrorists until an investigation is complete. Here, he is speaking in the present tense, of what he would have known, *at the time of the event*. The descriptive term, “*marauding*” to describe the “*terrorist*” is inflammatory. Has the subject rehearsed or repeated this account many times prior?**
- 3) **The detective again employs the negative in telling us “*I didn’t know*” in his account.**
- 4) **Change of language as the “*marauding terrorist*” becomes “*this individual*”. Given the allegation, this does not appear justified by context.**
- 5) **Note: “*other people*” is mentioned twice in this sentence. The word “*other*” is an unnecessary addition as “*people*” would be the expected concern for the police and “*other*” would signify the detective is think about something else. Was Jo Cox supposed to be the only victim?**
- 6) **The detective pauses after the second “*other people*”, did this sensitivity cause him to stop himself? Did he need to think about what to say next? He finishes up with location. “*err in the streets in the area*”.**

...

*Did he anticipate that the officers who would engage with him would be firearms officers? We see aerr particularly in the States, we see this phenomenon called suicide by cop. Was that what he anticipated those two officers were going to do to him? Was he intending to die in a blaze of glory err, shot by the police? Err, if that was his intention, unluckily for him he was challenged by unarmed officers.*

- 1) The detective asks a rhetorical question in an open statement. This is consistent with provoking an effect upon listeners, rather than reporting of fact.
- 2) Tangent: In a hormonally significant event (such as this), the focus pre-empts tangents. The subject goes off the account to comment on something distant from the event: “*We see aerr particularly in the States, we see this phenomenon called suicide by cop.*” The analyst should be concerned with scripting in such an unusual tangent found in the critical part or the account. Note: “*particularly in the States ...*” by bringing in the “*States*” is the subject trying to frame a political position (gun control, US laws, etc)? Is the subject wishing his audience to believe that Mair is suicidal? The detective goes on to ask two more question.
- 3) Another pause, “*Err, if that was his intention, unluckily for him he was challenged by unarmed officers.*” Why “*unluckily for him ...*” did he want Mair to be killed? The subject began his statements earlier reporting what Mair thought rather than what happened. Here, he does not commit to suicidal ideation or intention on the part of Mair, but implies it through the use of narrative building (scripted) story telling. It is used in emotionally persuading an audience but is not expected in a reliable statement of fact by a detective.

*I was one of the first senior police officers that arrived at the scene. There was a real palpable sense that something really horrific had occurred.*

- 1) “*I was one of the first senior police officers that arrived at the scene.*” Here is a rare short sentence, starting with the pronoun “*I*” increasing reliability.
- 2) Note that he is a “senior” police officer. This is important to him. Consider that he should not be questioned regarding his account because of his status. Rather than give a reliable report, he has given an entertaining narrative and here he buttresses his own words. This is an indication of **linguistic weakness**.
- 3) “*There was a real palpable sense that something really horrific had occurred.*” Why the need to add the qualifiers, “*real*” and “*really*”? He knows what has happened (see above “terrorist”) yet now, in the account, he offers a very qualified statement. This could leave an audience with the question: Was there a question to the reality of the event?
- 4) “*There was a real palpable sense that something really horrific had occurred.*” This sentence is to comment on his own emotions and thoughts, rather than report what happened. This, too, will leave his audience with more questions. Is the detective storytelling or sensationalising for the camera? Is this to *need to portray* Mair as a crazed killer? What causes this need?

...

*He is strong, he is savage, it's a brutal attack, he is gonna kill her, there is nothing gonna stop him from doing so. There's rage, there's real rage. She didn't stand a chance.*

1) ***“He is strong, he is savage, it’s a brutal attack, he is gonna kill her, ...”*** Hyperbole or something more? Is the detective in the mind of Mair? Or is the detective leaking a plan? The detective has continued to guide our perception of Mair. The need to persuade is excessive. Note the present tense language indicates a lack of commitment of reliability.

[ note: the claim about there being “rage” contradicts all witness accounts who say the attacker was emotionless and calm ]

...

*I was very interested in finding out all about Thomas Mair.*

- 1) The subject again uses “*I*” where I would expect “*we*”. He introduced police presence, though needed the audience to know he was the “*first*” and he was the first “*senior*” officer. This is unusual focus upon self.
- 2) “*all*” is unnecessary addition to the sentence.

*You know immediately upon his arrest the first question I asked is, who is he, what do we know about him.*

- 1) “You know” This is not what he knows, but what “you” know.
- 2) The need to persuade continues with “immediately” and “the first question ...”. The “first” means that the detective is thinking about more than one thing, since “*first*” is followed by second, third and so on. Yet we do not get a second or third.
- 3) The sensitivity to “*who is he, what do we know about him*” is strong. Why? Does the detective already know about Thomas Mair?
- 4) Why was the “**first**” question not “why?” in a murder case?

*Somebody does a check on the police national computer, ‘n’ we’ve never heard of Thomas Mair. I mean the question is always, why ?*

- 1) The subject reported that he had “*never*” having heard of Thomas Mair. This is not necessary information in relating facts of a murder. It is commentary and its focus is upon self; not the murder. (event)
- 2) “I mean the question is always, why ?” The question is “always” but it was not his first.

*Of course his psychiatric history for me is very important.*

- 1) “*Of course ...*” The phrase “of course” is to accept without question. He then states its importance, not to police, but to himself. The language change into present tense that is not reliable and consistent with story telling is sometimes found in “grandstanding” or attention seeking behaviour. This includes when one is not cognizant of the facts of the case, further exasperating the language.

*The doctor who had seen him at the police station hadn't diagnosed him with any significant mental illness. And said he is fit to be interviewed, he understands what's going on.*

- 1) The “doctor who had seen him” is not “examined him”
- 2) “*significant*” mental illness. What “*insignificant*” mental illness had he been “diagnosed” with while being “seen” at the police station?

*It's not uncommon for the police to sit in an interview room and listen to somebody saying no comment. But it is uncommon for us to sit and listen to somebody saying nothing. And he just simply didn't react to anything.*

- 1) Again, the detective uses the negative “*it's not*” in the negative. There are police who would disagree.
- 2) “*sit*” which is repeated in the next sentence, a body posture. Body posture mentioned in an open statement indicates heightened tension to the topic.
- 3) There is another change in language from “*police*” to “*us*” when speaking in regards “*to sit and listen to someone ...*”. What caused him to include himself here? Did he sit in and listen to the interview?
- 4) “*But it is uncommon for us to sit and listen to somebody saying nothing.*” What does “*saying nothing*” sound like? Saying “*but*” in an open statement refutes or minimises what was said before.
- 5) “*And he just simply didn't react to anything.*” Starting the sentence with “*and*” indicates omitted information between the word “*and*” and the sentence before. Again in the negative, telling us what Mair didn't do. The word “*just*” tells us that the speaker is thinking about something else since “*just*” is a comparative word it only works when there is a comparison. Here “*simply*” is an unnecessary word. A point of sensitivity. The subject's self focus is muted at this point in his story.

...

*The gun that was used is a point 22 rimfire rifle.*

- 1) Note the passivity. He did not state “the killer used...” but “*the gun that was used.*”
- 2) We should consider politics as an influence upon the language of the subject.
- 3) There is no description of the rifle. The size of said rifle, if unmodified, would be difficult to conceal.
- 4) Here the refusal to assign the sentence to the accused (target) is of concern. Our subject wanted to get to “know” him; yet he linguistically removes the target of the investigation from the responsibility of “using” the gun.

*Generally used in the pest control world.*

- 1) Here we have some unnecessary words, “*generally*” and “*world*”. A shorter way to say this is “Used for pest control.” Why the sentence is even in the statement is unexpected.

- 2) Does the subject have a need to convince readers that he is knowledgeable about firearms?

*It was stolen in August 2015, it has passed I would presume through a number of hands before it's got to Thomas Mair, through the criminal fraternity.*

- 1) *"it has passed I would presume through a number of hands before it's got to Thomas Mair, through the criminal fraternity." Why would the detective say it passed "through a number of hands ..." even with the qualifier "I would presume ..."?*
- 2) *"I would presume ...". Here the detective isn't saying "he presumes" but that "he would presume". This is distancing language from his own words.*
- 3) *"through the criminal fraternity." This wording has the effect of linking Mair to the "criminal fraternity" while no evidence has been stated to make such a link.*
- 4) *In his language, Thomas Mair does not obtain the firearm. Instead, note the passive, "it got to..." as if the firearm, again, has control or a will of its own.*

*I'd taken that firearm to bits, but we found no DNA fingerprints or any traces of anybody else.*

The subject did not say, "We found Thomas Mair's DNA..." which would have been strong. Instead, he begins with his own involvement to report what he did not find. This unnecessary addition of "anybody else", *if not as a result of a direct question*, should be considered very important to the subject. He is not proving Mair did it; but disproving "anybody" else. If this is a result of a direct question, it is not sensitive. If it is offered freely (in the negative), the reader/listener/analyst is likely to ask if others were suspected.

- 1) Again, the detective uses the pronoun "I" where the pronoun "we" is expected. This brings the detective very close to the gun. There is also a change in language from "gun" in previous sentence to "firearm". Is the linguistic change in reality for the speaker the closeness? Did he "take it to bits"? It was reduced by having the stock and the barrel removed. "that firearm" does distance somewhat (that vs this) after the closeness of the pronoun "I".
- 2) After saying "I'd taken that firearm to bits," he does not say they found those of Mair.

*So acquiring a firearm for a criminal purpose is not easy unless you are a criminal yourself, and you know how to get one.*

The subject reports that it is easy to obtain a firearm for a criminal. This is a statement that is both unnecessary and is persuasive. Consider: **The subject, a detective, has a need to persuade his audience that a murderer is a "criminal."**

- 1) "so", to tell us why. The detective feels the need to tell the audience why/how Mair got the gun. This is speculation on the part of the detective.

- 2) The implication is that Mair is a criminal because he used the gun for “*a criminal purpose*” as it “*is not easy unless you are a criminal yourself ...*” in the negative. This shows sensitivity of the subject’s need to persuade.
- 3) Would anyone consider a murderer with a firearm not a criminal? What has produced this in the subject’s language?

*As an adult male in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, he is like all of us an owner of a mobile telephone, but in three years has sent three texts, and there is no call data.*

- 1) “*he is like all of us an owner of a mobile telephone,...*” The detective spent a lot of time making Mair not like all of us that now in his language, “*like all of us*” makes this sentence unnecessary.
- 2) The subject is talking about a murderer, while actively engaging thoughts of many others (“all of us”) unnecessarily. What would cause him, while focusing in upon a unique person (murderer) to think of a crowd?
- 3) “*but in three years has sent three texts, and there is no call data.*” Now using the word “*but*” the detective refutes or minimises his previous sentence. We also note the use of the word “*three*” which is used twice in this sentence. Sometimes referred to as the liar’s number because when lying people need to chose a number between one and ten will pick “*three*” as two is too small and four is too big

*So he’s not somebody who is immersed in criminality, making calls, wheeling and dealing, trying to get himself a firearm.*

- |                |   |
|----------------|---|
| 1) Mair is not | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) immersed in criminality</li> <li>b) making calls</li> <li>c) wheeling and dealing</li> <li>d) trying to get a firearm.</li> </ol> |
|----------------|---|

**Prior, we had the subject with the need to inform his audience that a murderer with a firearm is a criminal. Here we are told what he is not actively doing.**

*That begs the question how on earth did you, Thomas Mair, get that gun. It’s an active line of enquiry and er, I will not rest until I find out how he got that gun.*

- 1) The detective poses a question in the third person. Questions when we expect answers is a concern of possible deception. He could say “*we don’t know how he acquired the gun.*” This may be political grandstanding for the camera (as could much of the exaggerated talk) but even as such reveals a lack of experiential knowledge.
- 2) There is another change in language as the “*firearm*” returns to the status of “*gun*”. Here we do not have a clear linguistic change in reality for the speaker from the previous sentence. We must consider deception regarding the firearm.
- 3) “*It’s an active line of enquiry and er, I will not rest until I find out how he got that gun.*” The detective pauses and seems to self-censor as when he starts speaking again it does seem to flow properly. The detective also comes back to inserting the

pronoun “I” where “we” is expected. He appears to be taking certain parts of his narrative personally. He maybe aggrandizing portraying himself in a political light (anti gun)

The concern is not that one has been murdered, but the mystery of how a criminal obtained a firearm.

This is to move the audience away from the topic (murder) and on to a minor point. An audience would want to know why he committed this murder; the subject offers a priority of obtaining the means used in the murder.

What has caused the subject to need to move the attention away from the murder, the victim, the murderer, to the firearm?

...

[ please note: no person who knew Thomas Mair has stated he had far right political beliefs ]

*The place he had been to immediately before killing Jo was his home address. We, we found lots of literature, books, magazines that all seem to link back to the far right.*

- 1) *“The place he had been to immediately before killing Jo was his home address.”* This avoids saying *“he was at home before going to kill Jo.”* Which would have been reliable. Note: *“the place he had been to”* this is incongruent wording, it is as if it is uncommon or unusual to be at home. Why say it that way? Plus, the addition of the qualifiers, *“immediately”* (which is out of place) as is adding *“address”* after the word *“home”*. These qualifiers make an incongruent sentence even more pronounced. It indicates sensitivity to his home on the part of the speaker.
- 2) The detective stumbles/stutters on the pronoun *“we”* repeating it. Note: *“we”* is the expected pronoun but given the use of *“I”* by the detective it isn’t a given and may indicate he wishes to not be alone with this sentence.
- 3) *“We, we found lots of literature, books, magazines that all seem to link back to the far right.”* Here there are qualifiers weakens his claim. This is a murder case in which *“literature, books and magazines”* represent a significant amount of information. Either it was *“far right”* or it was not. That he refuses to linguistically commit indicates that he is either **deceptive** or he is without knowledge of the content.
- 4) The detective also uses passive voice regarding the literature further weakening his claim of a *“far right link”*. Passivity could be either deception or lack of knowledge.

*Thomas Mair’s life meant that nobody else ever went to his home. Nobody was able to say, blimey Thomas this is a little bit unhealthy.*

Note the minimization of the wording: Would “far right” literature that leads to murder be “a little bit unhealthy”?

- 1) Note the presence of “others” in the language of the subject; “*Thomas Mair’s life meant that nobody else ever went to his home.*” This is an assertion of a negative and also halts further investigation. The subject wishes his audience to believe that any and all possible collateral contacts are known.

*We know he stood above Jo as he was murdering her and shouted “Britain First”, we asked him what he meant by it and we didn’t get an answer. And so an immediate line of enquiry was, right, let’s get into “Britain First”, and find out is he a member of yours. But no he wasn’t a member of Britain First. It’s simply the case that Thomas Mair just could not have coped with a Britain First meeting. He wouldn’t have wanted to be in the company of a large number of other people. He just wouldn’t have been able to function.*

- 1) “*we know ...*” again we see the detective use the expected pronoun, “*we*”. Policing and investigating are a group activity. This make the subject’s earlier insertion of “*I*” stand out.
- 2) “*we know he stood above Jo as he was murdering her ...*” He did not say, “He stood above her and said...” but stated “we know.” Recall that a subject can only tell us what he knows. This additional qualifier of information raises doubt in an audience.
- 3) “*And so ...*” starting with the word “and” indicates missing information between “and” and the previous sentence. The word “so” indicates the detective is telling us why but ending up asking a question.
- 4) The sentences in this block are *all* in the negative; a) “*we didn’t*”  
b) “*but no he wasn’t*”  
c) “*simply ... just could not have*”  
d) “*he wouldn’t have*”  
e) “*he just wouldn’t have*”.
- 5) Why so much information in the negative? Why this level of sensitivity?

...  
*Brexit did play a part.*

- 1) “*Brexit did play a part.*” Short political statement avoids telling us the motive. This (“Brexit” only played a “part” but was not the motive for the murder, according to the subject.

Note the politicizing narrative continues:

*The country was divided, so that played a part in tensions within the community.*

- 1) Why does the detective use the past tense, “*was divided*”? Did the murder of Jo Cox unite the country? This additional and unnecessary commentary may cause his audience to wonder if the murder is being capitalized upon. Such inquiry of political



is likely to also bring scepticism and concern; particularly since the subject has been very sensitive to the topic of motive.

- 2) *“so that played a part in tensions within the community.”* Note his words, *“play”* and *“played”* are not expected from an experienced investigator regarding a murder. The use of these words are concerning.
- 3) Note the change in language from *“country”* to *“community”* is consistent with local appeal (political).

But Thomas Mair’s a terrorist there’s no doubt about it.

- 1) ***“but”*** refutes or minimizes what came before.
- 2) ***“a terrorist there’s no doubt about it.”*** Is a weak assertion. Why would he need to persuade that an act of terrorism is an act of terrorism? Why would he need to persuade that there is **“no doubt”**? **The wording elicits doubt via introduction.**

His target was a political figure, but is he different to other terrorists from other organisations that we see.

- 1) Note he does not use the victim’s name here, but **“his target.”**
- 2) Note the need of the word **“but”** here, to classify Mair differently from his own terminology.

Why do young Muslim men and women take themselves out of society, travel via western countries to Syria and join ISIL?

- 1) This is a tangent away from the topic.
- 2) Note the inclusion of a known terrorist organization.
- 3) Consider the subject’s need to associate the murderer with terrorism.
- 4) **Note the emotionally inflammatory language of “Syria, ISIL, young, women”** suggesting not only a need to elicit a response from his audience, but to do so in an unrelated murder in which he did not state that the murderer was **“far right.”**
- 5) The subject’s use of **“ISIL”** with a murder investigation, if freely offered (not as a result of a question) suggests a subject who is comfortable both manipulating and deceiving his audience.

Note next the attempt to arouse pity for Islamic terrorists:

Why, why do they do that? **BECAUSE** they feel disenfranchised in many ways, **BECAUSE** in many ways they’re brainwashed. Erm, but there are comparisons and similarities between what they do and what Thomas Mair ultimately did, and how he became associated with his cause and what he was engaged with. **So** although they are poles apart, actually they’re very similar in many many ways.

- 1) The subject recognizes the absurdity of his own argument; acknowledging the distance between the two.
- 2) This dialog becomes speculation unless the detective knows things about the political nature of the murderer that he is withholding.
- 3) These sentences also reverses what he said about Mair a few sentences back where he stated Mair was *“different to other terrorists from other organisations that we see.”* *The detective’s words bring him to be the same or similar to these other terrorists. “actually they’re very similar in many many ways.”* The inconsistency (conflict) of his own assertions is acutely noticeable to him at this point.
- 4) Here the detective poses questions and then goes to answer them. Some of his answers are the political talking points of today. *“Why, why do they do that?”* Repeating *“why”* shows sensitivity to the question. Besides the sensitivity in his questions there is sensitivity in his answers, *“because”*. He repeats *“many ways”* for both *“disenfranchised”* and *“brainwashed”*. He repeats *“because”* for both as well, telling us why for a question he asked himself.
- 5) *“brainwashing”* is a word that the detective brings into his language. Why? Is there evidence that Mair was brainwashed? Is there evidence Mair was *“disenfranchised”*?
- 6) As a criminal investigator who is referencing ISIL, he avoids stating the teaching of Islam in waging war against non adherents. Instead he offers a psychological portrayal of individuals, rather than ideology. This is not expected from an investigator, but from a politician.
- 7) *“Erm, but there are comparisons and similarities between what they do and what Thomas Mair ultimately did, and how he became associated with his cause and what he was engaged with.”* Again, a pause making a broken sentence allowing him to further think of the contradictory nature of his words. The topic becomes different when he continues talking. *“but there are comparisons and similarities between what they do and what Thomas Mair ultimately did, ...”* Here the detective draws down the differences and bolsters the similarities between Mair and a Muslim terrorist? *“what Thomas Mair ultimately did, ...”*. Why add the word *“ultimately”*?
- 8) *“and how he became associated with his cause and what he was engaged with.”* This is passive as the detective does not tell us what the *“cause”* was. If we go back there is the weak assertion of *“far right”* but no evidence was present that he was either violent or political. The claims of *“far right”* was weakened by the detectives own qualifying words.

*What are we doing as a society to engage with people like that? And I suppose it’s sad that if you are not interested or you are not able to interact that you can be left to your own devices to such an extent.*

- 1) The detective ends by moralising and asks another question.

## Conclusion

As to the murder of Jo Cox: **Unreliable.**

This statement is taken from a video which may have editing issues.

The subject does not give a reliable statement. He frequently changes verb tenses and qualifies some of his responses.

His is narrative driven and in some points, deceptive. This indicates he is not speaking from experiential memory.

He is manipulative and familiar with the language of deception. He does not commit to motive, and his attempt to persuade of political motive of “far right” is so weak that he calls upon his audience to consider “ISIL, Syria and young Muslim me” in a deceptive attempt to label this murder an act of terrorism.

It is the subject, himself, who brings his audience to the point of questioning motive.

The subject’s failure to engage experiential memory is also seen in his need to continue an entertaining use of imagination. This highlights a distinct lack of commitment on his part.

Yet, is this portion of his statement unreliable because he is lying? Or is it because he is fabricating because he does not know certain facts?

The need to portray Mair as alone in the murder is linguistically met with “crowd sourcing” of information. This is to say that as he indicated a need to persuade that Mair was alone, he continued to reference “others” in his language. This should be unnecessary if he believed Mair acted alone.

There is a very strong political influence in his language. He does not use the language of a “cop” or a seasoned investigator.

He took his audience as far away as the United States and Syria, while showing a stronger linguistic priority to learning how the weapon was obtained, than to the murder itself. The connection to “Africa” was regarding Mair’s mother; something he did not follow up upon, but also revealing a lack of information regarding.

This is an example of emotional manipulation while employing tangents for his audience.

This was not about Islamic terror nor about a civil war in another country.

This was not about the United States and suicide.

The statement does reveal the author’s need to move the topic away from

- a. The murder
- b. The investigation
- c. The motive

To Brexit, gun control and immigration.

This is a powerful need of which he met with manipulation.

He indicated unreliable information with a **need to persuade** regarding the target, Thomas Mair, including

- a) Brutal: Brutal attack
- b) Anger Issues: “There’s rage there’s real rage”
- c) Possible racism? His mother married and “*African Caribbean man and from that time onward their relationship (with mother) deteriorated*”
- d) Mental Health Diagnosis: OCD, “*there’s an obsessive compulsiveness about him*”
- e) Loner: “*Nobody knew this guy, his own mother didn’t really know him*”
- f) Nazi inflammatory language: “*almost on a daily basis...looking at web pages relating to Nazis*”
- g) Evil: “*immerse himself in this hatred*”
- h) Terrorist: “*I’ve got a marauding terrorist at loose*”
- i) Criminal: “*acquiring a firearm ... unless you are a criminal yourself*” which is said to be easy but a mystery that must later be solved
- j) “Britain First” members are terrorist: Implies Mair is member of Britain First even though he can’t link him to Britain First.
- k) Far Right means terrorism: “*literature, books, magazines ...link back to the far right.*”
- l) Far Right is not only terrorism, but similar to Islamic Terrorism.
- m) Brexit is terrorist
- n) The murder of Jo Cox served a political purpose of “uniting” while “country” becomes a “community.”

The statement is political, it tries to address particular view of the world. Many political talking points are touched on trying to frame in context to Thomas Mair. The murder does not stand on its own, as expected.

The need to persuade is strong, when the expectation is a description of the attack, told in the past tense, without qualification.

The language of the detective is not to inform the public but to guide his audience to a conclusion.

The language weakness has the opposite effect. As he gave us little detail, yet gave us the inner thoughts of Thomas Mair, he did so without employing the reliable language of experiential memory.

There are indicators of scripting, including rehearsal, in the language. This is not consistent with a law enforcement or security mandate to withhold critical points of an account.

The politicized nature of the statement and the sensitivity indicators point to deception through both fabrication of reality and omission of truth. The detective could be following a narrative given to him, he may be the architect of the narrative and his seeming inappropriate use of the pronoun "I" indicates he is. It is unexpected for an investigator using opinion to present a closed case.

The subject has introduced unanswered questions via his language.

#### QUESTIONS;

- 1) What is so important about the date "the 7<sup>th</sup> of June"?
- 2) Why is there no detail about the actual event in this report?
- 3) Why is there no mention of the gun other than to call it a .22

.22 is a small calibre size of a bullet; pictures of the alleged weapon indicate it to be a bolt action modified by cutting the barrel and stock off. A bolt action .22 would not likely be a weapon of choice for a political terrorist intent upon an assassination. The modifications to the bolt action .22 would make it difficult to shoot rapidly (each bullet would have to be chambered with the bolt and would be very awkward for a right-handed shooter to rechamber rounds) and accurately.

- 4) Where was the gun and knife found?
- 5) Who scheduled Jo Cox to be at the library that day and when was it scheduled?
- 6) Why does the detective talk about ISIL and bring in Muslim into the language?
- 7) Why did the detective bring into his language "brainwashed"?
- 8) Why did he avoid motive?
- 9) Why the need to rule out, via the negative, others?
- 10) Why the need to politicize?

It is difficult to determine motive of some subjects. Here, for example, he is not reliable. He could be "bluffing"; that is, he does not know the facts of the case. He could be more deliberate, particularly since political elements are very strong in his language.

Although not known, he is unreliable and shows a self awareness of his lack of candour.

He is deliberate in deception, manipulation and in moving the topic away from the murder.