

And That's all the Murder she Wrote
a salacious story of sex, drugs, money, and murder

By Katherine Grace Gomulkiewicz

Characters:

Joe Darwin: the beat cop

Electra James: the detective

Velma Stroop: the police chief

Ron: the dead man

The Suspects: people suspected of committing the crime

Setting: Chicago 2018

“On my honor I have neither given nor received unauthorized information regarding this work, I have followed and will continue to observe all regulations regarding it, and I am unaware of any violation of the Honor Code by others.” KGG

ACT I

Scene I

A dingy side street behind Al's Pizza and Pasta in Chicago. There are old tomatoes and banana peels rotting around a dumpster. An arm hangs over the edge of the dumpster. Joe Darwin and Electra James stand huddled together as a light snow falls around them.

Joe Darwin: Another murder in Chicago, what a typical night.

Electra James: Mhm, nothing new here. *she leans down and picks up a snakeskin wallet and flips it open* Looks like the man's name is Ron.

Joe Darwin: *snorts then slowly touches the arm hanging out of the dumpster* He's cold.

Electra James: *rolls her eyes* Darwin, it's snowing, of course he's cold!

Scene II

Three hours later inside a police station in Chicago. There are glazed donuts and fresh herbal tea on the table. Darwin has his feet up and Electra is scribbling notes onto a small pad of paper.

Electra James: So tell me Darwin, what do you think happened to Mr. Ron?

Joe Darwin: *mutters* I'd say the butler with the candlestick in the parlor.

Electra James: What?

Joe Darwin: Never mind...I'd say he died.

Electra James: *pauses* You're such a genius Darwin. I really gotta hand it to you on that one. Some real clear deductive reasoning you got going on there.

Joe Darwin: *picks up a donut and slowly takes a bite a few crumbs bounce off his chin and onto his uniform* Well, Electra James not only do I know that frozen Ron died I also know that he was murdered. *pauses and takes another bite of the donut* and I know who did it.

Electra James: Yeah, how's that?

Joe Darwin: Well, it's clearly the obvious suspects.

Electra James: What?

Joe Darwin: The suspects.

Electra James: Who are the suspects?

Joe Darwin: The people who I think committed this crime.

Electra James: You make no sense.

Joe Darwin: This crime is so easy to solve! *pauses* Let me explain—have you ever heard of the Savanna Principle?

Electra James: The what?

Joe Darwin: The Savanna Principle.... *abruptly puts the donut down and stops talking*
Velma Stroop enters the break room

Electra James and Joe Darwin: Good evening, Chief Stroop.

Velma Stroop: Good evening. What are you both up to?

Joe Darwin: I'm solving the murder of Ron in the dumpster.

Electra James: WE were working on figuring out who the suspects should be and Darwin was about to explain to me the Savanna Principle.

Velma Stroop: *bends down and picks up a powdered sugar donut* Well, Darwin I'm curious to hear this. Please, explain.

Joe Darwin: Well, the Savanna Principle is how I know who the suspects are in this case. It's the idea that different types of people commit different types of crimes. Well, hm, I guess it's a little more complicated than that.

Electra James: *mockingly* Is it too hard for you to explain Darwin? After all, you aren't Einstein or anything.

Joe Darwin: *glares at Electra* Shut up and give me a minute. Okay, how much do you ladies know about evolutionary psychology? *both shake their heads* Well then, I guess I'll start there. The two main tenants of evolution are survival and reproduction (Ozkan, 2017). Everything that we humans do derives from those two basic drives. Even now as evolved beings the "human brain is still...shaped by the past primitiveness" (Ozkan, 2017, p. 1).

Velma Stroop: So, you are saying we have a primate brain still even after all of these years of evolutionary change?

Joe Darwin: Well, sort of. I'm saying that the same things that drove our hunter-gather ancestors still motivate humans today (Ozkan, 2017). Now, all of us know that the FBI reports that 77% of homicides were male victims and also that more men perpetrate homicides than women (Ozkan, 2017). So, that gives us clue number one about the suspects: they are male.

Electra James: You don't know that for sure—what about the other 23% of homicides!

Joe Darwin: I'm just playing the odds, baby.

Electra James: *mutters* What a man...

Joe Darwin: *condescendingly* Sorry, what did you say? I couldn't hear you over the sound of that penis envy.

Velma Stroop: Darwin, how does this relate to the theory you have about evolution?

Joe Darwin: Well, I was getting there if someone hadn't so rudely interrupted me. The reason more men commit murder and also are the victims of murder is because of evolution. Think of it this way: homicide is just the current "intrasexual competition over resources and over reputation" (Ozkan, 2017, p. 2). We are Scar and Mufasa battling over Pride Rock.

Electra James: Um, was that a *Lion King* reference?

Joe Darwin: Hey, don't hate the player. What I mean is that on the hunter-gather phase of existence when humans lived in the savanna it was advantageous for men to be violent with one another. During that time, the more resources a man had such as shelter, weapons, food, etc. the more mating he would be able to do (Ozkan, 2017). I'm just saying, the concept of gold digging isn't new (Fernald, 2008).

Electra James: You are so rude.

Velma Stroop: *exasperated* Come on! Darwin, please continue without the side comments.

Joe Darwin: Okay, okay. So anyway, in this hunter-gather phase of existence it was adaptive to assert dominance by accumulating resources since this allowed a man to mate with the most women possible. But, this same type of violence didn't make sense for the female caretakers. What did they have to gain from such violent episodes? Since violence and aggression was adaptive in men and maladaptive in women, that's why there is the disparity in the murder rates today. Basically, men had paternal uncertainty and that caused them to assert dominance over other men (Fernald, 2008).

Velma Stroop: Can you give me a modern example of what you mean, Darwin?

Joe Darwin: uhhhhhh

Electra James: *interrupts* Things like men getting into stupid bar fights (Ozkan, 2017) or arguing over the weight rack at the gym.

Joe Darwin: Yes—thank you, Electra.

Electra James: I can keep going...

Joe Darwin: I think that's quite enough.

Velma Stroop: Hm, so what you are saying is that violence is an adaptive male trait?

Joe Darwin: Exactly! Which is why I know the suspects are male oh, and it's women's fault.

Electra James: Here we go...

Joe Darwin: All I'm saying is that because of the burden of pregnancy women are forced to select a man who can invest resources (Buss, 1995). This is the most adaptive behavior for survival so then the men have to become violent to compete for resources (Buss, 1995).

Velma Stroop: So the Savanna Principle is that men are more violence than women?

Joe Darwin: Well, sorta. I actually wasn't done explaining. That's just more the evolutionary explanation for male violence. The Savanna Principle is more specific than that. It's not just about adaptive traits. It's also about level of intelligence (Ozkan, 2017).

Electra James: Here we go again...

Joe Darwin: As I was saying...this brilliant man, Kanazawa, came up with the Savanna Principle. Essentially here's what you ladies need to know: Kanazawa believes that many human behaviors such as criminality and religiosity are related to intelligence (Ozkan, 2017). Since we are dealing with the murder suspects at the moment, I'll focus on the criminal. Kanazawa suggests that there are evolutionary novel and evolutionary familiar cues and that people with higher intelligence deals more effectively with novel input (Ozkan, 2017). So that tells me that the suspects are men with lower IQs.

Velma Stroop: I have no idea how you arrived at that conclusion.

Electra James: Yeah, come on Mr. Genius—explain yourself.

Joe Darwin: Okay let me give you an example. Violent crimes in Chicago such as physical assault, rape, and murder are considered to be evolutionarily familiar behaviors (Ozkan, 2017). Therefore, they require lower intelligence to commit. Crimes we see in Chicago today such as computer hacking represent evolutionarily novel crimes and require higher intelligence to commit (Ozkan, 2017). *slaps his hands on the table* and that is the Savanna Principle.

Velma Stroop: Well, you know Darwin, there is more than one mildly intelligent man in the city of Chicago.

Electra James: *snorts* Yeah, You don't want me to bring in all of my ex boyfriends for questioning, do you? I'd say it'd be harder to find one intelligent man in the city of Chicago. Also, do you have anything to back up this theory because it sounds like a load of...well you know what...to me.

Joe Darwin: *groans* Of course I have data to back up the Savanna Principle. Well, sorta.

Velma Stroop: Please, explain.

Joe Darwin: Well, last year I read an article written by some guy in Texas. He was testing the Savanna Principle using the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (the Add Health), which was administered nationally in high school from grades 7-12 (Ozkan, 2017). The researcher also used an at home interview component of the Add Health (Ozkan, 2017). In the end, there were over 1,000 male and female participant responses used to test evolutionarily familiar violent tendencies, evolutionarily familiar property crimes, and evolutionarily novel behaviors (Ozkan, 2017).

Velma Stroop: *shudders* That's a lot of kids.

Joe Darwin: Yep. That's nice because this was really the first time the Savanna Principle was empirically tests so it was important to have a large sample size.

Electra James: Always focused on size aren't you Darwin.

Joe Darwin: *coughs* Yeah I'd say that's you not me....Anyway, as I was saying...The experiment had a three dependent variables: violent and property crimes which related to evolutionarily familiar crimes such as stealing of tools, food, and shelter, and evolutionarily novel crimes (Ozkan, 2017). In reality, the researches asked a few different questions about illegal drugs which they then clumped together to be novel crimes (how often do you smoke weed, do cocaine, heroin, or meth etc.) (Ozkan, 2017).

Velma Stroop: Wait, they clumped all of those drugs together?

Joe Darwin: Yeah, why?

Velma Stroop: Well, it just seems to me from twenty years in law enforcement that the types of people smoking weed aren't the same people shooting heroin.

Electra James: Not to mention everyone knows that cocaine is a rich kid drug whereas meth is seen more in rural communities. I'm really questioning those methods.

Joe Darwin: Hey, don't shoot the messenger. Also, it doesn't matter because they are all evolutionarily novel behaviors and that's what matters. Anyway, there were also a bunch of independent variables in the experiment too: intelligence, physical attractiveness, social class, puberty, height, self-control, victimization, delinquent peers, *breathes and keeps going* race, age, school attitude, and school performance (Ozkan, 2017).

Velma Stroop: Oh wow. Why so many independent variables?

Joe Darwin: Well, some things such as delinquent peers and social class are potential other predictors of violence so the researcher wanted to control for these variables to make sure the results were due to intelligence (Ozkan, 2017).

Electra James: That actually makes a lot of sense.

Joe Darwin: *laughs* Yeah, I agree. The researcher saw some of the other variables such as self-control and school performance and attitudes as potential components of intelligence outside of IQ (Ozkan, 2017). Essentially, he wanted to test for them as well.

Velma Stroop: Well, what did he find? You said this backs up the Savanna Principle, right?

Joe Darwin: *hesitates* Well, sorta. He found that there was a "negative bivariate relationship between violence and intelligence for each gender" (Ozkan, 2017, p. 9).

Velma Stroop: Come again?

Electra James: *giggles* That's what she said.

Joe Darwin: Ugh. Let me try to explain more clearly. After including all of the variables in

different models, the data showed that significantly more intelligent females are more likely to avoid violence than less intelligent females (Ozkan, 2017). However, the effect of intelligence was minor. That said, this result supports the Savanna Principle because it shows that women don't have an evolutionary propensity for violence.

Electra James: Yeah, yeah. *punches Darwin in the arm* Can we get to the part where you are wrong about this whole silly model?

Joe Darwin: Fine. The experiment found no significant results for violence related to physical attractiveness or social class across all models for both genders (Ozkan, 2017). In this ways the results did not support the Savanna Principle's idea that males who are less intelligent are more likely to resort to illegal income-generating activities (Ozkan, 2017).

Electra James: Ha-Ha!

Joe Darwin: Not so fast! It does still support an evolutionary framework just not the specific Savanna Principle (Ozkan, 2017).

Velma Stroop: Hmmm I'm not sure about that.

Joe Darwin: I swear—it does!

Velma Stroop: Explain how it does then.

Joe Darwin: Well, the data showed that intelligence and drug use are positively associated which does fit the Savanna Principle since drug use in a novel crime (Ozkan, 2017). The effect is minor, but still it exists! Another strange finding, in my opinion, was that social class is associated with increased substance use in both males and females (Ozkan, 2017). I mean, the experiment did not reveal “a robust relationship between IQ and delinquency” (Ozkan, 2017, p. 16) but that doesn't mean it's not there. I still believe there's enough evidence to suggest that the suspects are lower-IQ males from Chicago.

Electra James: *pours herself a cup of tea* Literally none of that is supported by the evidence you just gave.

Velma Stroop: *nods* I'd have to agree with Electra on this one, Darwin.

Electra James: *takes a sip of tea* Honestly, with those results you'd be better off telling us the suspects are mostly likely not smart women.

Velma Stroop: *turn to look at Electra* I guess that rules us out! *both laugh*

Joe Darwin: *glares at both of them* Okay, well who do you think the suspects are then and how the hell do you explain the cool experiment if you don't believe it has to do with evolutionary adaptations?

Electra James: Calm down, cowboy. I didn't say I disagreed with everything that you just said.

Joe Darwin: Really?

Electra James: Yeah, we can agree on one thing for sure.

Joe Darwin: What's that?

Electra James: Well, humans are driven by sex and aggression (Nye, 2000).

Joe Darwin: Amen to that! Clearly violence is adaptive for men but maladaptive for women.

Electra James: Uh no. The results of the experiment don't fully back that up, remember? Plus, I'd argue that we are all governed by impulses and try to fight the moral constraints of society (Nye, 2000).

Velma Stroop: So Electra, are you saying the suspects could be anyone?

Electra James: Yes, pretty much.*pPauses* Well, I do have a way to narrow down the suspects.

Velma Stroop: How's that?

Electra James: Based on what Darwin just told us and on my own theoretical framework, I'd look for people in Chicago who have an overactive id and a diminished superego.

Velma Stroop: Ummmm come again?

Electra James: *mutters* That's what she said.

Velma Stroop: What?

Electra James: Never mind. What I mean is that all people are born as babies completely id (Nye, 2000).

Joe Darwin: Completely what?

Electra James: Id.

Velma Stroop: What does that mean?

Electra James: How do I explain this? Okay, people are composed of three different parts: id, ego, and super-ego. The id represents our basic human impulses (Nye, 2000).

Joe Darwin: *interrupts* Sex and aggression!

Electra James: Yep! Now, when babies come into the world they are little blubbering ids. Then slowly they develop and ego as they start to distinguish themselves from other people. Then over time they develop a super-ego which is the society norms and constraints put on the id. The ego balances the id impulses and the societal super-ego (Nye, 2000).

Joe Darwin: *grumbles* I still like my theory better.

Electra James: Actually Darwin, I was thinking about that evolutionary approach you applied to the data and I wanted to say I think my theory fits the data better.

Joe Darwin: What!? Are you crazy?!

Electra James: Nope. First of all, I have some modifications to the methods of the study. I feel like instead of using a survey like the Add Health, a psychotherapist should have worked with each of the teenagers individually using something like hypnosis to draw out their unconscious thoughts.

Joe Darwin: *looks irritated* Um, okay.

Electra James: I'm not done yet. I also feel like clumping all of these teenagers together probably isn't wise. Each of them has a unique conscious experience and childhood history, which would effect their relationship with criminality far more than IQ. Honestly, this is why I don't think the experiment had large significant effects.

Velma Stroop: What do you mean?

Electra James: Well, I agree that clearly the increase in criminality correlates to a person with a strong id not being regulated by the ego. However, each person has a unique history. It would be hard to find a strong commonality. I would rather conduct a few specific case studies on high profile criminals. If I had my way, I'd use dream analysis and hypnosis to draw thoughts and desires into their consciousness. Then I suppose you could compare if there were similar trends among their responses.

Joe Darwin: Well, I disagree. However, I respect the emphasis you place on childhood history. I guess we both agree that environment plays a large role in peoples behaviors.

Electra James: Yeah that's true.

Joe Darwin: I just think of it on a macro evolutionary level and you think of it on a micro person specific level.

Velma Stroop: Aren't you both so cute. Finally finding some common ground.

Joe Darwin: Hey, I bet we could agree on other things if we tried.

Velma Stroop: I dare you, try.

Joe Darwin: Well, *long pause* we both used inductive reasoning.

Electra James: *rolls her eyes* That is the stupidest thing you've ever said, Darwin.

Joe Darwin: Whatever, you can't deny that it's true.

Electra James: I'll be honest, I have been thinking about some of the results from the experiment. Criminal activities like murder and drugs as manifestations of the id. I find it interesting then that people with higher social status used more drugs. I wonder if this means the more enforced the super-ego is by increased social standing, the more the instinctual id

fighters against the moral norms.

Velma Stroop: That's interesting Electra but cut to the chase. Who would you say the suspects are and why. After all, we have a dead man in a dumpster and we're just sitting here.

Joe Darwin: *puts down is donut* Wow, I thought you of all people Chief Stroop would agree that this is the correct way to identify the suspects.

Velma Stroop: What do you mean by that?

Joe Darwin: *makes knowing eye contact with Electra* It's just....well...um...

Electra James: well...Chief Stroop...you are always talking about the importance of memory and perception as tools for solving crimes.

Velma Stroop: *chuckles* Well, you aren't wrong about that. But before I tell you how I identified the suspects, I want to finish hearing your theory, Electra.

Electra James: I guess I would reiterate this is a crime about id.

Joe Darwin: No, this is all about the Savanna Principle.

Electra James: *sighs* About the data you presented, Darwin, I dissent from your conclusions. First of all, it is impossible to surmise the way you have about life in the hunter-gather society. I think the relationship between criminality and people is simple. The data from the study does not support your theory. I'd suggest that the correct interpretation of the results would be that females with a higher intelligence have a more developed super-ego. It is the development of the super-ego that allows them to regulate their id impulses and therefore not commit crimes in the community.

Joe Darwin: *shakes his head* I'm still putting my eggs in the maternal instinct basket.

Velma Stroop: Says the only man in the room.

Joe Darwin: *shrugs* Just saying, it makes the most sense to me.

Electra James: Chief Stroop please be the judge. Which theory about the suspects as informed by the evidence do you believe?

Velma Stroop: Actually, I have my own theory about the suspects if you must know.

Electra James: Is that so? Please tell us!

Velma Stroop: *smiles widely* Well, if you insist. As you were talking, Darwin, I got to thinking about something you mentioned with how humans change over time. I think it had something to do with the cognition.

Electra James: Bless you! What is cog...

Velma Stroop: Cognition? Well, it relates to cognitive processes in the brain which is just an

“abstract specification of the events taking place at the neural level” of the brain (Best, 1999 p. 1).

Joe Darwin: I honestly still have no idea what that means.

Velma Stroop: I would say a good definition of cognition is the “acquisition, storage, transformation, and use of knowledge” (Matlin, 1998 p. 2). I’m talking about how the brain works. I think figuring out the mindset of the suspects will reveal who they are.

Electra James: Okay, so you are talking about the brain but how does that relate to the study or even to the suspects?

Velma Stroop: I was getting there! Darwin, I think that the results from the study you told us about in Texas have to do with cognition. The reason that some females showed less of a proclivity towards violence didn’t have to do strictly with IQ, but rather with their level of cognitive functioning (Ozkan, 2017).

Joe Darwin: Okay.

Velma Stroop: Now, consider school performance and IQ test results to be components of cognitive functioning and not of intelligence. In that case, there would be a significant negative relationship between cognitive skills and violence related behaviors among the female participants (Ozkan, 2017).

Joe Darwin: Wow, Chief Stroop, I never thought of the results like that before.

Velma Stroop: Well, there you go. Although I must admit that I would’ve conducted the experiment completely differently.

Electra James: *perks up* I agree! Chief Stroop, you agree with me don’t you that focused case studies would be more beneficial than a large surveyed sample population?

Velma Stroop: *shakes her head* Not at all Electra! I would suggest that instead of just collecting data from participants that the researcher should use a strong experimental design.

Joe Darwin: What do you mean by that?

Velma Stroop: Well, I always believe that experiments are the stronger route towards verifiable evidence. In an experiment a researcher can control for all the confounding variables that may be present. *pauses* That could be one of the issues with the study, Darwin.

Joe Darwin: I don’t see any issues. *pauses* Well, what do you mean?

Velma Stroop: There could be some confounding variables that the researcher didn’t identify which may be effecting the results. That’s why I am in favor of experimentation, because it controls for those variables. I like the high internal validity it offers.

Joe Darwin: I disagree with you on that one, Chief Stroop. What good does internal validity offer? I mean, it’s not bad but I would rather a study have high external validity.

Electra James: *interjects* I mean, I still think we should be delving deeper into each person's unique life story.

Joe Darwin: *rolls his eyes* Yeah, yeah Electra we know.

Velma Stroop: Well, I stand firmly behind the value of experimental design. I think it's a very important part of research. My guess for why the results of this study were not significant and also why known effect sizes were small has to do with the premise of the research. What I mean is, I reject the Savanna Principle.

Joe Darwin: *eyes widen* Why, Chief Stroop? We spent many years and hunter-gather people and that evolutionarily shaped us today.

Velma Stroop: I agree with what you said earlier, Darwin, about the importance of brain circuitry, however this has nothing to do with evolution. It has to do with attention, perception, and memory. First of all, humans are domain specific processors and this relates to how people see the world and process information (Fernald, 2008). In the case of the study you brought up Darwin, I think perception is a good place to start.

Electra James: What do you mean by perception?

Velma Stroop: Well, perception is how humans process our environment drawing on present environment and past experience (Fernald, 2008).

Joe Darwin: So the formation of adaptive versus maladaptive behaviors?

Electra James: No—the unconscious versus conscious thoughts humans have based on their ego, id, and super-ego.

Velma Stroop: *laughs* Nope, more like this is how the brain utilizes information. *pauses* Have you heard of Gestalt psychology?

Electra James: No...

Velma Stroop: Gestalt Psychology is the idea that the sum is greater than the parts (Fernald, 2008). Like, the brain processes information but that it's more complicated than that. I like studying the isolated parts of the cognitive process but can never forget the whole system is more complex and must also be studied (Fernald, 2008).

Electra James: That makes sense to me. I think that the different parts of a person work together like id, ego, super-ego.

Joe Darwin: Electra, if you say those terms one more time I swear to you...

Velma Stroop: *cuts him off* So, as I was saying, I would interpret the results based on perception and motivated forgetting, which is the idea that sometimes humans forget things because they don't want to remember them (Fernald, 2008). It would be my prediction that the people with lower cognitive functioning were using motivated forgetting to reject the negative effects of criminality and drug use.

Electra James: *interjects* It almost sounds like you are talking about repression. I could see the results of this experiment aligning with the defense mechanism of sublimation (Fernald, 2008). What I mean by that is that instead of killing a person (which is highly socially unacceptable) the people are diverting their base desires into the more socially acceptable usage of drugs.

Velma Stroop: I'm not sure that's exactly the same as what I'm saying, but I agree with the premise that people may intentionally ignore or forget information.

Electra James: *laughs* Fair enough, Chief Stroop. So, who do you think the suspects are?

Velma Stroop: I believe, based on the evidence and my knowledge of cognition, that the suspects are people who have altered perceptions about their surroundings and may be intentionally forgetting the murder of Ron.

Joe Darwin: Well, I disagree.

Electra James: Clearly...

Velma Stroop: *pauses* Hey, I have an idea. Let's all lay of our case for the suspects based on the evidence and provide the strengths and weaknesses of our argument. Reinforcing points where we agree with each other would be helpful too. Darwin, why don't you go first, since you started this whole discussion?

Joe Darwin: *puffs out chest* Sure. Well, based on the evidence I would say the Savanna Principle has only been somewhat verified. However, it is true that the basic evolutionary tendency of violence between men remains a solid strength. The murder rate given by the FBI backs up this suggestion, since men commit more murders and more men are the victims of murder. A strength to my approach is that these trends have been verified. A weakness of my argument is that the Savanna Principle may not be the best-fit model. Additionally, there may be some speculation involved in figuring out how people lived as hunter-gathers since there is limited empirical evidence, if any, from that time. I would say another strength of my idea is that it views human existence on a micro level: how we have evolved over time versus looking at an isolated person on a micro level. That said, this leads to little human interaction via therapy and focuses much for on studies to back up evolutionary theories. As far as how my theory relates to you all? I'd say I agree with you, Chief Stroop, that the adaptive circuitry in the brain plays a large role in human decision-making. I think we all agree to some extent that past experience has an effect on present behavior. Electra, we clearly both agree that the most basic human drives are sex and aggression. Anything else you can think of?

Electra James: *nods* Yes to sex and aggression. Chief Stroop, I also think we both would agree that not all levels of this processing are conscious. I guess, in some ways, Darwin you would agree with this as well. I think the strength of my theory lies in the fact that it takes into account a specific person's life experience while still working in a larger framework for human existence. Everyone has an ego, id, and super-ego...

Joe Darwin: *mutters* Those terms again...

Electra James: *interjects* ...however a person's specific impulses and repressions are based on his or her own experiences. Additionally, my theory places emphasis on the tension

between society and base impulses, which is a tension we might all frame differently but would agree upon. I would say a weakness of my approach would be that it relies so heavily on an individual. It becomes hard to make predictions about human behavior because it is isolated to a person's lived experience. Also, I would say we also agree, Chief Stroop, that often the sum of the parts are greater than the parts put together, yes? For me that is the ego, id, super-ego and consciousness levels but for you it's that Gestalt thing.

Velma Stroop: Yes, that is true. A strength of my perspective is the idea of Gestalt Psychology. I guess a strength and weakness of the cognitive perspective would be I support experiments with high internal but low external validity. This sometimes makes it hard to assert how lab results would be applicable in the real world but means the results will be verifiable. In this way, my work is more on a micro level. That said, I'm the only one of the three of us actually testing specifics in the brain processes like memory and perception. This is clearly a strength of my approach particularly because it examines people's actions and decisions in the present moment more than just speculating about past actions. *claps her hands together* Okay, moment of truth: describe the suspects.

Joe Darwin: The suspects are clearly male and would have exhibited aggressive acts in the past such as getting in to bar fights. They were mostly likely in an argument with Ron over resources of some type and they killed him to assert adaptive dominance.

Electra James: The suspects are people who have let their id rule their actions. They may be in the process of using the defense mechanism of repression so they are in denial about the murder they have just committed.

Velma Stroop: The suspects are people with impaired cognitive functioning who have a distorted perception of the events surrounding the murder of Ron. They may be intentionally forgetting the violence so that they fail to recall the memory. Also, I would guess that the suspects... *at this moment something catches Stroop's eye and she abruptly stops talking. There is a scuffle outside and suddenly the door to the break room flings open. Darwin puts down his donut and Electra swallows the rest of her tea. Stroop stands up.*

The Suspects: We would like to confess to the murder of Ron in the dumpster... *the lights immediately cut to darkness*

References

- Best, J. B. (1999). *Cognitive psychology*. Belmont (California): ITP.
- Buss, D. M. (1995). Psychological sex differences: Origins through sexual selection. *American Psychologist*, 50, 164-168. doi:10.1037//0003-066x.50.3.164
- Fernald, L. D. (2008). *Psychology: six perspectives*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Matlin, M. W. (1998). *Cognition*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Nye, R. D. (2000). *Three psychologies: perspectives from Freud, Skinner, and Rogers*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Ozkan, T. (2017). Delinquency and Evolution: A Test of the Savanna Principle. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, 1-20. doi:10.1037/ebs0000095