

Chapter II

THE HUMAN BRAIN DOES NOT CONTAIN ANY REPTILIAN COMPLEX!

If one looks in the *ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA*, Vol. 4, under "Brain" you are led from the reptilian to shrew to lemur to ape to human development of the brain. The writers of this source book are of course adherents and followers of Darwin. Without allowing any scientific evidence on this point to the contrary many readers will thus be convinced that humans possibly do have a reptilian remnant vestigial complex as part of the human brain. Paul MacLean, chief of the Laboratory of Brain Evolution and Behavior of the National Institute of Mental Health works closely with lizards, reptiles and monkeys in research. Speaking of what he refers to the ancient part of the human brain he states: "We share it with the other mammals and the reptiles. It probably evolved several hundred million years ago." He calls it the reptilian or R-complex. Many others like Carl Sagan agrees with MacLean notions. Sagan notes that the emergence of humans was accompanied by major bursts in brain evolution. He somehow equates the human brain development with the much discredited recapitulation theory of Ernst Haeckel. See, *The Dragons of Eden, Speculations on the Evolution of Human Intelligence*. Sagan's best seller is based from beginning to end on evolutionary fundamentalism. Without any proof or evidence he literally believes and has stated on T-V: "The cosmos is all that is or ever was or ever will be." The media and press has built him up as one of the great scientists of our time.

Jan Cox is the author of "**Magnus Machina**". In his book he observes: "The less knowledge a man has about his animal side, the more vehemently will he deny this idea...Since man's lower story is as much a natural beast as any in the jungle, all that has been said directly applies to his own feral nature...But if man were still a primate without a cortex, we would find no more difference between individual men that we would find between individual hyenas...the animal is born completely programmed...There is only the savage cravings of

the mute animal, and the intellect's evolutionary need for order...He is somewhere between the savage and pristine beast of yesterday, and the intellectual, civilized superman of tomorrow." President Jimmy Carter has publicly noted that macro-evolution (humans having shared a common ancestor with apes and monkeys) is not incompatible with his religion. In writing the "introduction" to Cox's book he said in part: "I have grown to appreciate his wit, his intelligence, and his brutal honesty."

Anthony Storr wrote "**Human Aggression**". Konrad Lorenz, author of "**On Aggression**", states that Storr's book is the "best existing statement on the role of aggression and hostility in human life." The title to chapter 2 of the latter book is: "Is Aggression an Instinct?" He then answers the question, "aggression is necessary, are as much human needs as sexuality or hunger." His speculations and guesses are all projected on: "aggression, even between members of the same species, has evolved in accordance with the great Darwinian principle of natural selection...that the natural world was indeed 'red in tooth and claw.'" There are thousands of Phd. Scientists that reject the notion of Mega-Evolution because of a total lack of any persuasive evidence. Many, as this writer, have studied this issue for years, and believe it to be a false and untrue concept. It follows that if evolution is untrue there is no Reptilian Cortex in the human brain.

The reason for the importance of this question is that many alleged experts and treatment centers deny that the acts of many are those of the free will of a person; they consistently point to causations of environment and heredity or genetics, suggesting that the actor is blameless and is in no way responsible. That "The chemically dependent person undergoes molecular depletion of the endorphin-enkephalin metabolism within the ancient, reptilian-derived survival hypothalamic brain." See, "Alcoholism And Other Drug Additions: A Primary Disease Entity" by G. Douglas Talbott, M.D., pp 490-494 of the August 1986, "**Journal of the Medical Association of Georgia**". This article seems to convey the message that the "Reptilian" remnant of our animal ancestry brain causes and provides the genetic disposition for a chemical imbalance; and,

that "the species will die if the molecular balance cannot be restored. Compulsive drug taking and intake serves this purpose. that is, the compulsivity to continue to use the drug". This has far reaching implications as to the commission of acts which are illegal under the criminal laws. The idea seems to be projected that the compulsivity to overindulge drugs as an addict is not an act of free will but is a disease not the fault of the actor; that it is part of the survival of the fittest or species and a part of the alleged great Darwinian reptilian remnant of the human brain.

"If chronic alcoholism or dipsomania is to be accepted as a defense to a charge of drunkenness, would it also not be logical to accept it as a defense to a charge of driving while drunk? If so, how are we to eliminate or slow down the greatest cause of death on the highways? And why not accept a plea of pyromania by an arsonist, of kleptomania by a thief, of nymphomania by a prostitute, or a similar plea of impulse and non-volitional action by the child molester?" *BURGER v THE STATE*, 118 Ga. App. 328, 332, (1968).

At page 330 of the cited decision it is observed: "The over-indulgent drinker should not be encouraged in thinking that he is a sick person, University of Georgia sociologist Dr. Paul Roman declared Wednesday. This tends to bring on a truly alcoholic condition by giving the over-indulgent drinker to feel that he is not responsible for his actions, Roman said. 'I see a tendency towards defining behavior that does not constitute true addiction, and then defining alcoholism as a disease...' This "sick concept" shouldn't be swallowed whole."

"Eight judges on this court rejected alcoholism as a disease or type of defense to a charge of drunkenness. (If a disease, it is the only disease that can be legally bottled and sold over the counter.)" *DAN RIVER, INC. v. SHINALL*, 186 Ga. App. 572, 576, (1988)." The law presumes that a party intends whatever acts he commits. All persons are presumed sane and are responsible for civil and criminal acts done. All this adds up to the incipency of the will meaning that the origin of the acts of a person is the commencement by and through the incipency of one's will. In the case of *GRIMES, Sheriff v. BURCH, alias Jones*, 223 Ga. 856, 858 and 860, (1968), it was held: "It is contended that the appellee had chronic alcoholism, a disease, at the time of her escape, and was therefore not guilty of a

crime...that neither moral nor legal responsibility can be avoided in this way. This is a new principle sought to be engrafted upon criminal jurisprudence. It is neither more nor less than this, that a want of will and conscience to do right, will constitute an excuse for the commission of a crime...the fact is, responsibility depends upon possession of will-not the power over it. Nor does the most desperate drunkard lose the power to control his will, but he loses the desire to control it.

No matter how deep his degradation, the drunkard uses his will whenever he takes his cup. It is for the pleasure of the relief of the draught, that he takes it. His intellect, his appetite, and his will, all work rationally, if not wisely, in his guilty indulgence. And were you to exonerate the inebriate from responsibility, you would do violence both to his consciousness and to his conscience; for he not only feels the self-prompted use of every rational power involved in accountability, but he feels, also, precisely what this new philosophy denies-his solemn and actual wrongdoing, in the very act of indulgence."

Justice Joseph Henry Lumpkin, speaking for a unanimous court goes on to conclude in this case: "Converse seriously with the greatest drunkard this side of actual insanity-just compose him, so as to reach his clear, constant experience, and he will confess that he realizes his guilt, and therefore the responsibility of his conduct. A creature made responsible by God, never loses his responsibility, save by some sort of insanity. There have always existed amongst men a variety of cases, wherein the will of the transgressor is universally admitted to have little or no power to dictate a return to virtue. But mankind have never, in any age of the world, exonerated the party from responsibility, except where they were considered to have lost rectitude of intellect by direct mental alienation." The latter would amount to insanity. Mental alienation would not include any alleged imaginary aggression impulse of a non-existent reptilian complex. Albert H. Hobbs who wrote "**Man Is Moral Choice**", Arlington House Publishers, New Rochelle, New York, 1979, states that his interpretation is: "Chronic alcoholism exists when the essentially social nature of drinking is subordinated to the consumption of alcohol as an excuse to evade social responsibilities."

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn believes that man has the capacity to choose the direction he will take. "The most important part of our freedom, inner freedom, is always subject to our will. If we surrender it to corruption, we do not deserve to be called human." Plato has said that man has a positive ability to make moral choices. Dante has said that man's capacity to will is God's greatest gift; that man's will is free and we can exercise choice. When one acts, they must consider the consequences, and assume the responsibilities for what they do.

*"There was a lady from kent,
who said she knew what it meant,
When men took her to dine,
Gave her cocktails and wine;
She knew what it meant--but, she went!"*

In "CRIME Times," Vol. 3, No. 1 1997, Alcohol Addiction is blamed on genetics. "*Alcoholism: can your genes drive you to drink?*" The same arguments can be made for other actions. Can your genes drive you toward Bestiality, Incest, Rape, Theft, Oral Sex, Arson, Murder or any other acts one can imagine? These are precisely the arguments made by noted lawyer Clarence Darrow when he states man doesn't possess a will and whatever one does is already programmed so no one is ever at fault. He advocated closing all the prisons and jails.

Ph.D., Robert Karp observes: "Predisposition to alcoholism is genetic. It's a well established fact, and it's non-controversial. People who think alcoholism is not genetic are mistaken." The fact he is so sure of is his literal faith and belief in ape ancestry evolutionary reptilian remnant. He is simply mistaken on both counts.

Senator George McGovern has noted: "There must be something in our genetic makeup that has made so many McGovern's on both sides of the ocean susceptible to this terrible disease." He seeks to escape any fault by incorrectly categorizing his dipsomania desire with cancer, diabetes and arthritis. "The Johns Hopkins Medical Letter" of June 1997, page 6, has an excellent article on Alcohol. Never once is over-indulgence equated with disease. Suggestions are made that persons may decide or choose to utilize moderate intake and

consumption. Recently, a mother killed several of her children. The headlines of one newspaper asked "What caused her to do it? She decided to do it and must be held responsible. Trying to shift the blame to society, the environment, others, genetics, some monkey mythology of reptilian complex which is only an assumption of Darwinian Dogma is the wrong concept. As Harry Conn has noted our greatest problem is not ignorance but in believing things and concepts that are simply not true. Indubitably, the human brain does not contain any reptilian complex! Beyond question, humans have never in the past, nor in the present, been genetically linked or kin to apes, monkeys or reptiles. It is clear to most all, that unless one is insane, that he possesses a free will and is responsible for acts, actions, conduct and choices made.