



An example of how Forensic Statement Analysis can be used to attribute authorship:

Important Note: *The following example is designed to illustrate how similarities in linguistic style can identify authorship. The formal examination of any document would involve an in-depth analysis accompanied by a detailed report.*

The following examples were written by the same person 14 years apart. The highlighted similarities in just a small section of the two texts identify the habitual use of words and phrases, such as *more or less*, *in practice*, *moreover*, *argue*, and the root word *clear**

Although these words are commonly used by many people, it is their collective use over and over again in different texts written over a very long time that provides a powerful example of the personal linguistic (idiolectal) habit of co-selection.

'UNABOMBER' Manifesto (1995)

Thus, what we mean by "leftism" will emerge more clearly in the course of our discussion of leftist psychology...We argue that modern leftists tend to have such feelings (possibly more or less repressed) and that these feelings are decisive in determining the direction of modern leftism... Moreover the thought and the behavior of the oversocialized person are more restricted by society's expectations than are those of the lightly socialized person... "Mental health" programs, "intervention" techniques, psychotherapy and so forth are ostensibly designed to benefit individuals, but in practice they usually serve as methods for inducing individuals to think and behave as the system requires...In practice, the word "abuse" tends to be interpreted to include any method of child-rearing that produces behavior inconvenient for the system.....No doubt the majority of scientists, like the majority of the general population, are more or less susceptible to advertising and marketing techniques and need money to satisfy their craving for goods and services...We are going to argue that industrial-technological society cannot be reformed in such a way as to prevent it from progressively narrowing the sphere of human freedom. But because "freedom" is a word that can be interpreted in many ways, we must first make clear what kind of freedom we are concerned with... One more point to be made in this section: It should not be assumed that a person has enough freedom just because he SAYS he has enough. Freedom is restricted in part by psychological control of which people are unconscious, and moreover many people's ideas of what constitutes freedom are governed more by social convention than by their real needs... Moreover, since society would be altered in a way that could not be predicted in advance (third principle) there would be great risk... They just work themselves out through a process in which various competing groups pursuing their own usually short-term) self-interest arrive (mainly by luck) at some more or less stable modus vivendi... Thus it is clear that the human race has at best a very limited capacity for solving even relatively straightforward social problems.

QED

Untitled Essay Theodore Kaczynski (1971)

In these pages it is argued that continued scientific and technical progress will inevitably result in the extinction of individual liberty. I use the word "inevitably" in the following sense: One might—possibly—imagine certain conditions of society in which liberty could coexist with technology, but these conditions do not actually exist, and we know of no way to bring them about, so that, in practice, scientific progress will result in the extinction of individual liberty.... (The reader possibly assumes that items (5) and (6) present no danger to freedom because their use is supposed to be voluntary, but I will argue that point later. See page 1-15.)... Unlike the human brain, computers are more or less unrestricted as to size (and, more important, there is no restriction on the number of computers that can be linked together over a long distance to form a single brain)... it seems clear in view of the advantages listed above that no human brain could possibly compete with such a computer in any field of endeavour... (Indeed, it is impossible to argue against an end to television violence.) ... Moreover, many devices of functional importance (e.g. electronic computers, television broadcasting equipment, jet planes) cannot be owned by the average person because of their size and costliness... Consider: Today, how can one argue against sex education... And who can argue against that?... Now, there is a more or less unlimited number of value-judgments that lie before us... This becomes even clearer when we consider London's willingness to use psychological engineering to stop businessmen from destroying forests... It seems clear that here, again, London is attracted to psychological engineering simply because he would like to see the general public share certain of his values.