

The Jo Cox Detectives

Summary

On 16th 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 Sergeant Andy Cass

Thomas Mair was eight years of age when his Mum and Dad separated and they came to live in the Birstall area, which is where his grandmother lived.

- 1) The statement does not begin with the pronoun “I”. This can show a lack of commitment on the part of the speaker. Did the subject (speaker) do his own research? If so, we expect that he would, in fact, begin with what he, himself, learned, utilizing the pronoun “I” due to such experience. Here we do not know what the editing process was or what questions are being asked and answered.
- 2) The detective makes a short introduction of Thomas Mair. I question why the detective needed to start with Mair at age eight. Was it to introduce the parent’s separating? This goes into Mair’s background therefore we enter into this with an expectation of relevancy to the case.

He spent every evening reading or writing stories. His Mum describes him as an intellectual child, quite gifted at school. Certainly sat Mensa exams.

We look for the relevancy of this specific background to the case; imagination-talent (listed first) followed by intellect.

His creativity and intellect should be relevant to the subject’s overall statement.

In his teens not interested in girls not interested in going to the Pub. All the regular things you would expect from a teenager, Thomas wasn’t interested in. His mother re-married and had another son.

- 1) “not interested” repeated twice in the same sentence highlighting the sensitivity. “. All the regular things you would expect from a teenager, Thomas wasn’t interested in.” Is the intent to make Mair appear strange and an outsider?
- 2) The author moves from age 8 to teenager.
- 3) The detective doesn’t tell us what age he is referring to as “teenager” spans a number of years and most of them under the age of going to the “pub”.
- 4) It is part of the subject’s own norm to go to a pub as a teenager. This should be examined in light of cultural context.

...

[referring to the inside of Thoma Mair’s house]

Very cold, very impersonal, clearly, he was a very well-ordered individual. Single bed very very neatly made. Everything had its place. He had a very well-structured lifestyle in terms of his his daily routine. It was evident that he ate the same things.

- 1) “very” is repeated six times in three sentences. The need to persuade is elevated. Where this is used and repeated, the author seeks to make emphasis.
- 2) The subject is seeking to present a specific verbal portrait, and we continue to look for relevancy.

He'd wash his hands with the use of brillo pads. His Mum described them as blue almost his hands cos they'd basically taken the skin off.

- 1) Note the wording: "with the use of..." and not "with brillo pads."
- 2) Does the author know of any mental health diagnosis?
- 3) "*with the use of brillo pads ..*" the addition of the words "use of" is peculiar.

Nobodies come forward to say that they've been in any sort of relationship with him at all. Just not communicated on any level with anybody really. Lived a solitary life and in fact some witnesses have described him as almost being a hermit.

- 1) "nobodies" "just not communicated" "with anybody really" two sentences and three instances of language in the negative. Language in the negative is flagged for sensitivity. When someone tells us what didn't happen (language in the negative) we need to be alert for missing information and or deception.
- 2) "Nobody's come forward" causes us to ask if investigators located some. He only reports what did not happen. This investigation should include collateral interviews.
- 3) Note the use of "witnesses" in context of relationships. Why does the detective consider to the people as "witnesses" though he is not talking about a crime but of relationships. Does one "witness" someone being lonely?
- 4) "In fact" seeks to build his narrative of creative, intellectual, loner with a type of obsessive behavior, yet not tied to the crime.
- 5) The qualifier "almost" weakens the commitment to Mair being a "hermit". Is this a quote? Is it his classification? Why are they called "witnesses" in context? Were they friends and acquaintances? Are they neither but actual "witnesses" to something? The subject raises more questions.
- 6) The reader/analyst should be concerned that a portrait is being given, yet driven by narrative ("witnesses") more than investigatory collateral interviews or a psychological profile.

[please note I have spoken to 6 of Thomas Mairs neighbours and friends and they describe him as friendly]

Thomas has never worked and that's because he's been signed off due to his anxiety. But what that did allow Thomas to do was to work voluntary.

The subject has a need to report "anxiety" here, while classifying "work" as voluntary only. Formal disability ("signed off") is relevant, but whether he was formally paid ("Thomas has never worked") or unpaid ("work voluntary") leads us to ask about relevancy to the crime.

[please note Thomas Mair was a gardener up to the time he was arrested and on a regular basis would do gardening for tenants of the estate where he lived. He was paid cash in hand for these jobs.]

Indeed there's an article, I think that was in the Huddersfield Examiner, going back some years where Thomas is interviewed and describes the fact that those types of groups, errr, were far more beneficial than anything, errr, that medication could ever do for him.

- 1) The author begins with a magazine as source of information rather than the investigation.
- 2) "errr, that medication could ever do for him." Please note that the detective brings "medication" into his language after handwashing and "anxiety."
- 3) The detective doesn't say Mair is on or was requiring "medication". He said what medication "could" accomplish in the article.
- 4) If Mair was on psychotropic medication that could impact
- 5) The addition of the unnecessary word "ever" in "errr, that medication could ever do for him." This shows the sensitivity the detective has with his own statement.

He spends majority of his spare time in the library. His internet er search history which we we we **were able to access** which would indicate that he'd been using that facility since 2012. Anything far right he appears to have had an interest in for some time.

- 1) This is an investigation which should be reflected in the language.
- 2) The subject begins in the present tense; not the past tense of what would have been uncovered in an investigation.
- 3) The detective pauses or self-censors after "his internet. He then stutters on the pronoun "we" repeating it three times. This indicates heightened tension on the part of the speaker.
- 4) "we were able to access" is unnecessary to state for an investigation. Accessing information is what an investigation is.
- 5) The detective then uses future conditional to tell us something that should be in the past tense. This adds another point of sensitivity to what the detective is talking about, Mair's internet history.
- 6) Anything far right he appears to have had an interest in for some time." The detective uses the words "he appears to have had ..." this distances the detective from a commitment to his own words. He adds to the weakened commitment weakening it further with "for some time."
- 7) Does the subject believe his own words?

13th of June, he's researching, is a point 22 shot to the head deadly.

- 1) The detective goes to present tense. This is unexpected from an investigation that has not only been completed, but is to be presented as a fact.

There'd been some search history about human anatomy, locations of organs etc, so I've no doubt in my mind he'd planned exactly er where he wanted to put that knife.

- 1) "There'd been some search history" avoids saying, "He searched on..."
- 2) The detective commits with the pronoun "I" to a sentence that one might expect "we" as previously used (and stuttered upon)
- 3) The detective reports "no doubt" in the negative making it sensitive to himself.
- 4) This lack of doubt is only in his "mind", which not only reveals weakness, but would cause us to learn if other investigators' minds fail to share his opinion..
- 5) The detective pauses, an indicator of self-censoring or needing time to think.
- 6) The subject reported the desire or planning with what he "wanted" to do. How did the subject know both the planning and the intention?
- 7) To answer the above question, we consider that he introduced this intention and desire with the weak assertion of "no doubt" and only in his "mind."
- 8) If the subject was of this opinion, he could clearly state is as such with reporting what the searching revealed. Detectives offer opinions in investigations. This is more akin to narrative building via suggestion, than one who offers an opinion confidently.

[he is referring to CCTV evidence here]

The earliest point that we've got him within the library is on the previous day on the 15th when he's in speaking to members of staff specifically asking about the Jo Cox surgery that was due to take place the following day.

- 1) "The earliest point that we've got him within the library is on the previous day ..." this language seems to indicate they were aware of Mair's actions before the attack "that we've got him ...". What is expected is for the detective in explaining how they worked backwards to track his movements.
- 2) Passivity is noted. The detective does not quote or explain his information.
- 3) Interesting to note the language here that follows "no doubt" in the subject's "mind."

Asking questions about the time. Asking questions about whether he need to book an appointment.

- 1) "asking questions ..." repeated twice showing sensitivity to the words.
- 2) Who asked questions?
- 3) What questions were asked?
- 4) He does not linguistically commit to Mair asking questions in the library.
- 5) We note the need to persuade that Mair was in the library and asking questions about Jo Cox. This leads us to question the narrative:

If he wants us to believe that a creative, intellectual and obsessive compulsive loner killer was asking questions, including if he needed an appointment to attack, why not state as such?

He had a black holdall sports holdall, it does appear to containing something heavy. I think he's pretty much had hold of the weapon whenever he's had it in his possession, you know, he's had it with him.

- 1) "*He had a black holdall sports holdall*" The word "*handall*" is repeated unnecessarily. Unnecessary words are only unnecessary to the listener, they are important to the speaker and therefore the analyst. The inclusion of "*black*" and "*sports*" to describe the "*handall*" shows familiarity to the "*handall*" as well as sensitivity.
- 2) "*it does appear to containing something heavy.*" Why is this description necessary? The gun was cut down to maybe two or three pounds, one and half kilos
- 3) "*I think he's pretty much had hold of the weapon whenever he's had it in his possession, you know, he's had it with him.*" Here the detective distances himself from his own speculation. "*I think*" indicates conjecture which is unexpected after the fact of the attack where we expect facts. "*pretty much*" distances even further from his words. "*had hold*" is a third point of distancing. "*whenever he's had it*" expands time. How would he know this? From what is this based upon? "*you know*" at this point indicates an awareness of his audience at this point in the statement.

...

[referring to his alleged visit to WH Smiths 3 hours before the murder]

*For want of a better expression he's killing time. **Significantly** he's in possession of the bag containing the firearm.*

- 1) "*For want of a better expression he's killing time.*" Note the use of this term and its introduction as both on the mind of the subject, with a need to classify its usage.
- 2) "*Significantly he's in possession of the bag containing the firearm.*" Why does the detective go to present tense? Was Mair in possession or was he "*significantly*" in the possession? To be "*significantly*" in possession, would indicate an insignificant portion of possession. Did he put it down? Did someone else handle it? Is there video tape that may be thus in doubt?
- 3) The subject's weakness of assertion, including the need to explain the thought process of Mair raises questions.
- 4) ***Does the subject possess a belief that the video may not prove this assertion?***

[note : no firearm can be seen, only a bag. The CCTV image used in this case, is most likely not Thomas Mair, this has been confirmed by his neighbours].

Equally as important he's wearing the two baseball caps, a black one underneath the cream baseball cap.

- 1) This is unexpected wording; he equates weapon ("significantly possessed") with "the" two baseball hats. Why is it "equally as important"? It is strange that he would wear two hats and strange that of all the other things the detective speculates on he does not speculate on this. If Mair needed to disguise himself would he not carry the second hat in the "handall"? Did he need two hats to match the conclusion the police give us?
- 2) Giving equal importance to the baseball hats that is given to the weapon bag is concerning. It suggests weakness of belief (commitment) on the part of the speaker.

[note : this is disputed, the image does NOT look like he is wearing two baseball caps]

Doesn't make any purchases and then leaves, and, and basically tracks the same route back towards his home address and indeed goes home err for a short period of time.

- 1) This sentence seems both incongruent and out of sequence.
- 2) This make indicate a lack of experiential memory. Did this subject actually investigate? Or is he repeating what others have told him?
- 3) It may be consistent with "scripting" language.
- 4) Whatever it may be, his attention ("interest") is caught:

Interestingly, every time he seems to leave the address he's got err a bag of rubbish with him, seems to be part of his routine that err leaving his property he takes err his refuse with him and dumps it just round the corner.

- 1) This sentence is long. Long sentences often indicate inclusion of emotion.
- 2) The words "interestingly" shows increase of emotion for the subject.
- 3) What does it mean to "seem" to leave?
- 4) Why does the subject not report what is on video, or via surveillance instead opting for only what is "seem" or presented in perception as such?
- 5) The subject indicates to us that Mair was under surveillance by telling us what Mair did "every time he seems to leave the address he's got a bag of rubbish ...". This is unnecessary information.
- 6) What impression does the subject with to make, rather than report and allow the information to impress the audience?
- 7) The detective uses the article "the" in "the address" when referring to Mair's home. The expected would be "his" address not "the" address. One may consider the subject's lack of knowledge of this action.
- 8) In this language, the location is firmer than the alleged activities. "The address" is specified with the article, "the", which may suggest that the subject has more confidence describing the locale than Mair's activities.

- 9) There is a change of language where the detective goes from “*the address*” to “*his property*”. Also “*rubbish*” becomes “*refuse*.”

The ***subject’s knowledge of the activities is in doubt***. It is the subject’s own choice of wording that suggests a lack of experiential knowledge.

Instead of turning left towards the retail park, he takes the, the right hand turn and goes effectively down towards Birstall town centre.

- 1) “*Instead of turning left towards the retail park,*” Why does the detective tell us what Mair didn’t do?
- 2) Is there a potential conflict with investigatory claims or with CCTV?
- 3) “*effectively*” is an unnecessary term. Did Mair go down towards town centre? Or did Mair “*effectively*” (qualifying the direction’s intent)? What one does and what one does “*effectively*” can often be the difference of intent, with the latter being inadvertent. It also could indicate an attempt by the subject to fulfill a belief. This is as if to say “he didn’t go down to town centre but in a round about what, he did...” which would raise more questions. It could be a fulfillment of narrative, rather than report where Mair went. It may be a prophylactic response to questions from either CCTV or surveillance discrepancies.
- 4) This unnecessary term remains in his language:

There’s significant CCTV in an around Market Square from both local authority systems and also from private systems, and we can effectively track his movements.

- 1) The word “*significant*” is an unnecessary word of persuasion. If it is evidence on the CCTV, it needs to qualification; it stands upon its own merit.
- 2) CCTV, including from various set ups, tracks movement of a person. It does not “*effectively*” track movement.
- 3) This is a subtle form of distancing language.
- 4) The detective also does not say “*did track*” his movements but that they “*can*”, “*we can effectively track his movements*”
- 5) If the detective is referring to looking back historically at the CCTV footage he has not said so.

*His movements from the CCTV would indicate that he’d done some form of reconnaissance before the incident, and ***therefore*** knew what vehicle to look out for.*

- 1) Note the passive and weakened statement with the words “*indicate*” and “*some form of reconnaissance*”.
- 2) He did not say “*Mair went from...to...*” but “*His movements.*” This slight passivity indicates the subject does not possess confidence in his assertion.
- 3) What causes the subject’s doubt? Has he seen the CCTV? Is the CCTV in doubt?
- 4) The subject gives the conclusion with “*therefore*” citing knowledge that Mair would have.

- 5) The conclusion indicates a need to explain how the subject knows this;
- 6) The conclusion indicates a need to explain why Mair would know something where no linguistic commitment is made.

He's milling about, he purchases a chocolate bar, we, we see him eat the chocolate bar and dispose of the wrapper just opposite a shop called the Vape Lounge where he's got a perfect vantage point down towards the library.

- 1) The detective returns to present tense, similar to story-telling or reliving an event due to trauma.
- 2) The subject slows the pace down and offers specific detail of “purchasing a chocolate bar” and “eating a chocolate bar” and then the “disposing” of the wrapper.
- 3) This is an abundance of detail.
- 4) This is stated with an increase in reliability of language;
- 5) This is an “over abundance” of detail which suggests:

A man on video is seen purchasing, eating and disposing of the wrapper of a candy bar.

The subject is confident in these three actions.

Please consider that when one is deceptive (including if in ignorance of facts), confidence is lacking and many deceptive people will emphasize something they are no longer concerned about stating. It is a signal that although this portion of information is true, its inclusion and unnecessary detail, suggest to the contrary regarding other assertions.

An example:

If someone is fabricating, exaggerating or not speaking from experiential memory (for whatever motive) and can alleviate the internal stress of deception by accentuating something that really did happen, they will take advantage of this respite. From school children who suddenly show newfound confidence at a single point, they give additional and unnecessary information to belabor a point that “proves” they must be telling the truth.

This is a “need” to finally offer something confident after reporting that which was not confident.

The confident “candy bar” sequence ends and the subject returns to weaker assertions:

He's constantly looking down towards the library, certainly on one occasion he makes his way across as if heading down towards the library.

- 1) The element of time and the subject's use of present tense, stretching time with the word “*constantly*” is noted.

- 2) “*down toward*” is repeated. The person in the video could have been looking at buildings or items anywhere, but the subject tells us of a specific location with “library.”
- 3) This is offered as “certain” in the language; which is unnecessary commentary. By using it he tells us that there are other points in this account that may lack such “certainty.”
- 4) The speaker then minimizes his claim by adding the possibility of such with “*as if*”.

My view there is it's a potential false call if you like, that er, something's drawn his attention potentially a vehicle arriving that contained Jo Cox, and then clearly er he turns round and comes back to his vantage point at the side of the, the bus stop.

- 1) The detective now adds his own speculation and acknowledges it as his own, “*my view*”.
- 2) Do other investigators (or the audience) have a contrary view to this?
- 3) “*My view there is it's a potential false call ...*” What is a “*false call*”? Who made a “*false call*”, the detective a surveillance team or Mair?
- 4) Why would it be only a “*potential*” false call?
- 5) Several pauses could be self-censoring or needing time to formulate his words. Sensitivity.

Bernard Kenny sees the commotion, and goes to the scene effectively to try and jump on Mair's back.

- 1) “*Bernard Kenny*” is not given a complete social introduction, due to editing we do not know if he was previously or not. It may be that the subject's audience will recognize the name.
- 2) Present tense noted.
- 3) Would Bernard Kenny try to jump on Mair's back, or would this also be to “*effectively*” jump on Mair's back? This form of distancing away from commitment continues in the subject's language.
- 4) The detective speaks as if he knows the mind of the would by bystander rushing to help. Note “*goes to the scene*” the “*scene*” this is stated in an awkward manner. It allows for the location to be a foregone conclusion rather than an event unfolding (note the present tense language).

However before he gets there, Mair turns to face him and without thought plunges a knife directly into his abdomen.

- 1) “*without thought*” Again the subject speaks as if he knows the mind of Mair.
- 2) “*to face him*” also knows the thought process of another;
- 3) To report this as witnessed from a video would be “event based” language; not to include the mind of the actor in the event. This is particularly noted in law

enforcement language of fact. For example, “Mair turned and stabbed him” or “Mair immediately turned and stabbed him...” highlighting the element of time (immediacy)

- 4) The descriptive language is not consistent with law enforcement reporting, but with commenting, journalism, story telling, etc.

Thomas Mair turns on to John Nelson Close where he basically walks into the rear garden of a property which was quite heavily overgrown, where he makes efforts to change his appearance.

- 1) “*basically*” tells us there is missing information, information that is being withheld.
- 2) Additional unnecessary detail “rear garden of a property which was quite heavily overgrown” may anticipate the challenge of CCTV or witness statements contrary to this account.
- 3) The detective adds another point of weakness when he states that Mair, “*where he makes efforts*” with the words “*makes efforts*” unnecessary as well as diminishing and weakening the detective’s statement. “*makes efforts*” is similar to “*trying*” meaning unsuccessful. Expected is to tell us what he did, not what “*efforts*” would be utilized. This is consistent with “knowing the mind” of the actor (alleged to be Mair) rather than reporting what happened.

*Basically, removed his, his outer clothing **so** he’s just now wearing a grey err t-shirt, and, and the black hat.*

- 1) In a sequential sentence the detective again uses the word “*basically*”. This indicates he is purposely leaving out information about the topic.
- 2) The subject remains in a present tense.

Expected is: “he took off his overcoat” without the need to explain that one would not want to be recognized, or caught with blood.

The overcoat was discarded, was forensically examined and contained blood of Jo Cox.

- 1) The subject now speaks in the past tense.
- 2) Note the passive voice of “the overcoat was discarded” rather than “he threw it away” (or anything similar).
- 3) There is a change in language as the “*outer clothing*” becomes “*the overcoat*”. There does not appear to be a change in reality to account for the change in language. This can be an indicator of deception; including repeating what someone else told him yet attempting to “stich together” accounts to fit narrative.
- 4) “was forensically examined and contained blood of Jo Cox.”
 - a. Note the use of past tense with “was”
 - b. Note “*was forensically examined*” is passive voice and appropriate if the subject did not know who did the testing.

- c. Note “*and contained the blood of Jo Cox*” is reliably stated. He did not need to state it was not “basically the blood of Jo Cox” or “effectively the blood...” This is stated “reliably”, meaning the subject believes his own words here.
- d. This portion of reliable language should thus be compared to other statements.
- e. We can believe that the subject has no equivocation in reporting that the coat was examined professionally and that this professional examination (“forensic”) indicated the blood of the victim.

Yet in going back to his assertion, the shift of language is immediate. He returns to present tense language.

This is significant.

The past tense language indicates commitment, and allows us to see greater reliability.

We also note that it is not habitual to always speak in the present tense.

He knows how to commit to something and he knows how to avoid commitment to something else.

He discharges the spent cartridge in that garden and re-loads the firearm, placing that back in the bag with the safety catch off and effectively ready to fire again.

- 1) The subject returns to the present tense.
- 2) The subject returns to “effectively” to report what was in the mind of the accused.
- 3) The gun is a modified semi-automatic rifle. If he fired three times (we don’t know how many times he fire only that the report said Jo Cox was shot three times) then he would have discharged at least two shell casins at the scene. These are not mentioned.

Jo had sustained three gunshot wounds about the head, and thirteen stab wounds, many of which punctured her heart, her lungs, and her liver.

Note the return to commitment (past tense)

This is another statement of reliability.

The subject allows these words to stand o their own. He has no need of persuasion. He believes these words.

On her left hand there was a through and through injury, which is consistent with her hol- effectively holding her hand up to protect herself, basically an injury through her hand into her, into her head.

- 1) “consistent with her hol- effectively holding her hand up ...” The detective self-censors or needs time to choose his words. He does not report what happened but assigns meaning (“effectively holding up her hand to protect herself”).

We are able to see the subject’s baseline use of the word “effectively” which is to assign meaning, such as to know what is in the mind of the actor. It would not be unusual for a law enforcement professional to say “she was injured raising her hand to defend herself.”

His interview in total possibly six hours I think it was off top of my head.

Interviewer : What did he say at that time?

Absolutely nothing.

- 1) Did the accused not speak for 6 hours?
- 2) “Absolutely nothing.” “nothing” would be a strong answer, “absolutely” weakens it.
- 3) It would have been highly unusual for a person to not speak for 6 hours. The response “absolutely nothing” may have been further explained (its warranted due to the length of time) yet edited out.

[Describing items allegedly found at Thomas Mairs house]

A Third Reich eagle, mail order catalogues and brochures. A lot of that material goes back as far as the early nineties. Lever arch folder and within that there were news clippings of Anders Breivik and other terrorist atrocities. Also wikipedia pages of Jo Cox.

- 1) The subject uses passive language.
- 2) Would a “third Reich eagle” be better stated as “Nazi” material by a law enforcement professional?
- 3) “*Also wikipedia pages of Jo Cox.*” Again there is no context given for these “pages”.

He’s never been linked to any other far right organizations in this country. There’s no evidence at all to support the fact that he’s been on any marches, part of the EDL, part of the National Front, part of Britain First, so his own views and his own beliefs have been kept private.

- 1) Note the incongruence of attempting to build a position. Here the subject uses “any other far right...” the inclusion of the word “other” is incongruent as he has not been linked to “any” group. This is a strong example of presenting a narrative that must be fulfilled rather than reporting facts.

- 2) That the subject is a law enforcement professional, the lost expectation of “fact” is heightened.
- 3) In these two sentences we have two negations (statements in the negative which indicate sensitivity to the topic on the part of the speaker). “*He’s never*” and “*there’s no evidence*”. To the second negation is added “*at all*” which highlights the sensitivity (indicates increased sensitivity).
- 4) “*far right*” is not defined but by inclusion the detective links “*far right*” to “*the EDL*” “*the National Front*” and “*Britain First*”. “*far right*” has been treated as *subversive and quasi-criminal* by many elites and government officials and official law enforcement leaders yet it has never been defined by these aforementioned groups.
- 5) The detective repeats the word, “*part*” three times preceding each group mentioned. Repeated words show sensitivity. Why is it sensitive to the detective? Is it because there is “*no evidence*”?
- 6) “*so his own views and his own beliefs have been kept private.*” Here we have the word “*own*” repeated twice showing sensitivity. This sentence also contradicts the narrative that the same detective has been building on. If Mair has kept his views and beliefs private how can the detective imply his views and beliefs are “*far right*”?

...

Looking at Thomas Mair, the minute he stepped into the box, it was evident that he had something on his mind.

- 1) “*Looking at Thomas Mair, the minute he stepped into the box, it was evident that he had something on his mind.*”. The detective is inferring he knows Mair’s mind by looking at him. This is not an expected statement from a law enforcement person describing a crime. This narrative is consistent with his need to persuade cited previously.

He was asked to give his name, the magistrate was shocked about she’d heard or clearly couldn’t understand exactly what he’d said, so he repeated it.

- 1) Here the subject not only knows the mind of Mair but also that of the magistrate. Again unexpected in this context.

[The man before the magistrate is alleged to have said. “My name is Death to traitors, freedom for Britain” Note : I do not believe this was the real Thomas Mair.]

Analysis Conclusion:

The subject shows weakness of commitment in many portions of the statement. He is only reliable in three portions:

1. The actor (alleged to be Mair) activities with a candy bar
2. The injuries to the victim
3. The evidence of blood

By “reliable” it is meant that the subject believes his own words. He addresses these issues in a way that reveals confidence.

When he describes surveillance, including video, he indicates sensitivity and anticipates a need to justify and defend; rather than allow evidence to stand upon its own. It is his “need to persuade” that raises more questions for the audience than answers.

Contamination Concerns

The statement has or could have been edited and we have no information on how or why. It is edited at a minimum as the speaking parts of the two detectives is cut and added interspersed with others (witnesses or BBC employees).

The detective’s language is similar to the first detective, Nick Wallen in that there is sensitivity, passivity, self-censoring, missing information and speculation. This is not expected in a case that has been investigated and successfully adjudicated.

The language also suggests that it does not proceed from experiential memory.

Experiential memory includes the actual investigation, actual interviewing and the actual viewing of surveillance video.

It is consistent with narrative

Narrative means a stated conclusion or understanding that must then be supported by detail. When the detail does not support the conclusion, it must be either discarded (missing information) or artificially engendered. The latter is seen in unnecessary qualification in a sentence, such as “basically” and “effectively.”

The entrance of a psychological profile is expected. The offering of Mair’s background, beginning at age 8, did not support a profile. This was offered in weak language consistent with building a case against Mair rather than the expected underpinning of one who would commit such a murder. Here the statement indicates “narrative” rather than a form of criminal profile expected from an investigator.

Need to Persuade belies weakness.

In seeing the statement on forensic examination, we are given insight into the subject's thinking. He is capable of communicating a past event in proper grammatical form indicating his own confidence in the topic. What he knows (blood on the coat) is reported by him with no need to persuade his audience of it as fact.

This is in stark comparison to the "need to persuade" in narrative building

We also find this in the need to tell the audience what the actor (accused) was thinking, including where this may not be known.

The narrative is given in the present tense.

The reliable detail of the forensic testing and of the victim's injuries are in the past tense.

Expected:

What is expected is a direct description of events as they are known, not speculation or commentary offered as fact.

With the passing of time, such speculation will enter, but it is introduced as such. See the example of the victim's hand injury.

Ingratiation

The political points made by the subject is consistent with a satisfaction of narrative that is popular among media, many in positions of authority, and in policing administrators. The wording is such that it may seek to appeal or "ingratiate" itself with those not associated with "the right" or conservatism.

The subject does not reliably report Mair's political views nor the childhood setting that would lead to such views.

The intimation of creative intelligent loner is not reported as fact; he intimates instead. This is including the weak language regarding handwashing and the convoluted attempt to portray Mair as non-working.

This language of weakness is compared to the statement of strength regarding evidence.

The weakness is an attempt to persuade.

The strength is a reporting of fact he does not doubt.

Regarding Mair, the subject does not believe many of his own words.

This may be due to:

- a. Ignorance
- b. Willful deception

Ignorance could be the repeating of things told him to present, that did not come from experiential memory, but have become part of a forced narrative for him to put together;

Deception: the wording is heavily qualified because the subject is using language he himself does not believe.