

Chapter Two

- Chapter 1: The Emotional Intelligence Movement.
- Chapter 2: The Successes and Failures of the EQ Movement
- Chapter 3: Egopathy: what is it and how does it work?
- Chapter 4: Big Bad Bullies (BBBs) and PCDs (Power, Control, and Direction.)
- Chapter 5: Narcissistic Personality, Sadistic Personality Disorder, Psychopathy, Anti-Social Personality Disorder, Bipolar Disorder and their Relation to Egopathy
- Chapter 6: Egopathic Defenses/ Ego Expressiveness, Schemas and Hidden Agendas
- Chapter 7: The Roots of Disempathy and Cruelty: The Developmental Personology of Egopathy
- Chapter 8: Families Behaving Badly
- Chapter 9: Doctors and Professors Behaving Badly
- Chapter 10: Workplace Incivility, Egopathic Bosses, and Healthy Workplaces
- Chapter 11: Personality and EQ Assessment: Which one reveals Egopathy Best?
- Chapter 12: Egopathic Characters in books, on TV, and in the movies.
- Chapter 13: Egopaths in Academic Literature, the Popular Press, and Other Media
- Chapter 14: Public and Private Figures Behaving Badly in the News
- Chapter 15: Happiness, Health, and Positive Psychology
- Chapter 16: So what can I do about it? Remonstrating and High Character Communication; A class in Parenting/Relationships in High School; a class in Developmental Personology in graduate schools.
- Chapter 17: The Vocabulary of Egopathy and High Character Communication
- Chapter 18: The Structure of Emotional Intelligence and Egopathy: The Diagrams, Figures, and Lists
References

Chapter 2: The Successes and Failures of the *Emotional Intelligence* movement

The success of emotional intelligence has been an unparalleled phenomenon here in America and around the world. It can only be surmised that around the world millions of men and women are controlling themselves and exhibiting more emotionally intelligent behavior every day. And that's very good for the planet. Amen. God Bless Peter, John, Dan, and Reuven and all the rest who have poured so much energy and intelligence into the dissemination of these great ideas.

We need to keep pushing, however, and make this grand technology the best it can be. "Empathy" was one of the traits that was examined in Daniel Goleman's book *Emotional Intelligence*. When you speak of empathy you naturally speak of psychological health. A person who has developed psychological health will be able to feel and to show empathy towards others when they are suffering.

Empathy

Now that premise begs the questions, "What is psychological health?" In a way "psychological health" equals "emotional intelligence." Each of the traits that are presented in the emotional intelligence literature is tantamount to being a psychologically healthy person. One trait of a child who grew up with a healthy mind is the ability to feel empathy. In Chapter 7, "The Roots of Empathy," Goleman makes it very clear where the ability to feel empathy comes from. It comes from parents who know how to give of themselves emotionally year after year to the child as he or she goes through a myriad ordeals and triumphs. If you include "empathy" as a major component of emotional intelligence, then you could say this child is "emotionally intelligent" when he or she feels and shows empathy for another child.

Why am I belaboring this point? Because so many children and adults do *not* show empathy in day to day situations because they have issues of all kinds. These issues have not been addressed in the emotional intelligence literature. It is not just the "absence" of emotional intelligence that causes a person

to be callous and cruel to another human being, but the *presence* of something as well. That something is a host of long forgotten, repressed, or ignored issues that must be deal with in order to behave with emotional intelligence.

Donna is the head of marketing department. She had feelings which swirl around inside of her. She is aware of these feelings at times but mostly she pushes them out of her consciousness or deals with them obliquely.

The literature on emotional intelligence concerns many aspects of EQ. But right here I would like to bifurcate the entire field into two sections: All the pages, chapters and articles having to do with knowing, managing, using, and expressing emotions and the ability to feel concern and empathy for another person who is in pain. The reason I want to bifurcate the field of emotional intelligence is to make it more understandable to the newby who is trying to get a grasp on what it is. I am also doing this simplification because there are so many articles which clearly are equating EQ with high character concern for another person's needs, concerns, and feelings. Then when you pick up another article or quickie assessment of EQ, there is nothing in there about being altruistic or other-directed behavior.

This lack of a focus on a limited set of constructs throws the field of emotional intelligence into disarray and it has been noticed by more than one psychologist.

Let's Get Psychological

The creators of emotional intelligence seem to have overlooked the feelings of guilt, remorse, compunction, and regret. Each of the major theorists of emotional intelligence includes a component of "knowing" what you feel. These feelings can be "jealousy," "sadness," "disappointment," "frustration" or any other feelings that are not necessarily indicative of being an unkind or uncaring person. Salovey and Mayor say we can utilize these emotions to make good decisions, thereby showing we have "good emotional intelligence." Utilizing these "non-moral" emotions is all fine and good. But when people get into conflict, when parties don't agree, when factions become aggressive, it's time to get into the psyche in such a way that understanding stems the tide of violence and aggression.

Ethical includes not doing something which will put you at an unfair advantage over others or in a position where your are "taking advantage" of informed others which then leaves them feeling hurt, betrayed, mislead, and/or abused. "Moral" behavior tends to be more focused on religious or existential themes. In the extreme, these behaviors have only to do with breaking God's laws. It would be considered "immoral" to have sex outside of marriage, to eat meat on Fridays, to eat pork on any day of the week, or to fail to comply with the rules concerning daily prayers. This heavy emphasis on the religious aspects of the word "moral" makes the word difficult to use when speaking about treating each other well. John Bradshaw seems to do just fine using the phrase "moral intelligence" in his new book *Reclaiming Virtue*. That's okay.

However, in the daily use of the word "moral" and "ethical" it seems pompous and hyperbolic to say that our supervisor was being unethical or behaving "immorally" when he withheld information from us. (where is the story of the woman who was targeted and fired because of having information withheld?) We really need a word that simply means "unkind," "uncaring," and "inconsiderate." What the person did hurt the target's feelings. Their behavior robbed the "target" of her or his needs in the relationship. (see the chapter that lists our "basic human needs.")

The person "needed" to have a boss that filled her in on all pertinent information. The boss did not do that because he had developed a "psychodynamic psychosocialism" about her. He was in the middle of "acting out" his unresolved issue from his past "onto" his targeted person. This is egopathic behavior.

If we call this behavior "egopathic," now we have a word to use to describe the "unkind," "uncaring," "inconsiderate," behavior we were just talking about. But we still don't have a word that sounds like we

are not slinging “psychobabble mud” at the other person. “He’s being so egopathic,” just makes the person using the term sound a little “psycho” him or herself. So we are still left without a word that gently and yet firmly describes the actor’s behavior as inconsiderate and, therefore, inappropriate.

“There,” you might say. “There’s the word: inappropriate.” Yes, I have used that word as well, but the other person is just left feeling like you are being “defensive” and utilizing a very common word, “just to get back at the accuser or punisher.” It is never impressive when a person is “getting back” at someone. We need a word that describes the “unkind” behaviors in such a way that the listener thinks, “Oh, really? They acting in *that* way? Wow. That’s not good. We’ll have to look into that.” In my years of working, I have seldom gotten the sense that the descriptions I used elicited that response from my “person-in-whom-I-had-invested-hope.” The person almost always came back with a response that revealed they were unmoved by my complaint about my boss’s/coworker’s behavior.

Emotional Intelligence and “Knowing” Your “Unkind” Tendencies

A person with emotional intelligence is expected to “know” his or her feelings about the “unkind” behavior they exhibit. Having those feelings buried or repressed should be considered a sign of low emotional intelligence. This way of thinking has been expounded by Sigmund Freud and Carl Rogers and many others for many years. Why are the EQ gurus ignoring them? As I was writing this book Daniel Goleman published yet another book entitled, Social Intelligence: The New Science of Human Relationships. (Bantam). This is interesting that he would now go back to the origins of emotional intelligence, that of Thorndike who in 1927 named an important intelligence: social intelligence. Most of the stories of emotional intelligence in the literature are actually stories of “social intelligence.” The originators of emotional intelligence, Mayer and Salovey, are the theorists who initiated the focus on using one’s emotions to make good decisions and knowing, managing, and expressing emotions. Neither focus (emotional vs. social) is “wrong” nor “right,” they are both of equal importance and are complementary.

The books about EQ have begun to win converts by the thousands. Industry is beginning to take notice. Hundreds of consultants are being hired by companies to teach their employees better interpersonal skills and other traits of the emotionally intelligent. Is it improving the skills of employees? There is much debate but the training does seem to help. The presidents and CEO’s are finally able to see where the problems of low motivation or conflict lie. They are embedded in the employees’ low emotional intelligence.

In a Newsweek article it was pointed out that some people with “an EQ of a toad” were becoming successful. If it takes high emotional intelligence to succeed, how were corporate reptiles with low EQ succeeding with promotions and productivity? The answer is very clear. They are succeeding because their attractive traits coexist with their unattractive traits and no one knows what to do about them. The disruptive, unhealthy traits have a nasty habit of trailing along hidden behind the dynamic, impressive traits. The executives who score high on Holland’s test on the “Enterprising” tend to also score high on the “reptile” scale, as well. In the MBTI handbook called “Gifts Differing” there is a page devoted to the “shadow side” of personality. This needs to be explored further.

Social Intelligence

Is it fair to compare one's emotions to one's underlying issues? I wrote to Mayer and Salovey and asked this question but they have not responded to my inquiry. When people exhibit the kind of behavior Goleman shows in his book Emotional Intelligence, the astute reader can see this person is suffering from what Jeanne Segal called “unfelt feelings.” (Raising Your Emotional Intelligence) What does she mean by “unfelt feelings?” This phrase has a long history in psychology which dates at least as far back as Sigmund Freud. He began to speculate that his patients' current symptoms of hysteria were related to their early childhood experiences. He surmised that these early experiences created too much anxiety to be dealt with at the time so they were pushed underground into the “unconscious.” This process was called “repression” and is considered one of the “ego defenses”. This submerging of these memories may

have gone unnoticed for these victims of childhood abuse had it not been for the phenomenon of “symptom displacement.” These memories from childhood may have been forgotten consciously but they retained the ability to generate psychological symptoms, nonetheless.

What is Emotional Intelligence?

Emotional Intelligence is 1. Knowing what you feel; 2. Understanding what you feel; 3. Being able to manage those feelings and emotions; 4. Being able to communicate what you feel; and 5. Being able to care about others’ feelings, heartaches, and disappointments.

Five Basic Emotional Intelligence Feelings. Can you feel them? If you feel these too strongly, that’s not emotional intelligence. If you feel them, understand them, and manage them well, that’s emotional intelligence.

1. Anger
2. Happy (High happiness is not “EQ”)
3. Anxious, Fear
4. Sad, Depressed
5. Empathy and Recognition (for when others feel the above feelings)

In Chapter Four of Raising Your Emotional Intelligence, Jeanne Segal asks, “What do you do with a feeling you’d like to give away? (p. 78). Segal answers the question by saying that if you get rid of the emotion before you fully process and/or embrace it, 9 times out of 10 it will lead to shaming behavior or blaming behavior, “twin bogeymen of a low EQ.” I would like to say here they are twin bogeymen of egopathy as well (see Ch. 3).

Being very angry, even rageful, and expressing it in a way that is very annoying and abusive to those you love or work with certainly would be a sign of emotional disinhibition and indicative of poor management of emotions which is antithetical to emotional intelligence. Goleman goes on to give the management of our emotions a name: the Greeks called it *sophrosyne*. This was translated by Page DuBois to mean “care and intelligence in conducting one’s life.” I wonder if that is a good word to adopt to capture the opposite of low emotional intelligence. Used in a sentence it would be, “I could tell by his denial of having been hurt that he was not a *sophrosyne*.” I would like to suggest the word “altrucharacteristic”* as an adjective to describe the personality style and behavior which is indicative of emotional intelligence.

*Altruistic and high character is combined to form a new word.

Chapter Five of *Emotional Intelligence* Goleman says that we *should* be able to balance our good and bad emotional experiences. But here’s the 64,000 dollar question. How can some people balance these emotions without much trouble and others have such a difficult time?

Again, Goleman reminds of the Plato’s words

In that answer lies the roots of animosity, enmity, and emotional disempathy. Yes, Goleman called his Chapter 7 “Roots of empathy.” But in the chapter he focuses on those who have empathy and a few people who do not have empathy. What’s the bridge here?

Everything that is said about emotional intelligence is true. It is what is NOT said that creates a problem. The *real* day to day problem is not just low emotional intelligence. The real problem is the lack of people’s ability to know, understand, manage, and express their ego defensive behavior and ego expressive impulses. This way of thinking is called “psychodynamic” which borrows heavily from Freud’s understanding of the human mind.

EI Abilities of Knowing, Understanding, Expressing, Managing, Empathy

As the five abilities go up in Emotional Intelligence so go up certain interpersonal ABILITIES (that's the hypothesis)

The ability to care (not just being empathic)
 caring about the others' point of view
 caring about the others' explanation
 caring about the others' needs
 and not assuming negative traits in the other person (attributional errors).

Able to calm the self enough to
 not have anxiety about the situation
 not control the conversation
 not control the situation
 not control the outcome to meet your own agenda

These are half social skills and half emotional intelligence

The Moral Element

For thousands of years men and women have been trying to understand how to describe a man of good character or "virtue." Society has come down to three ways of describing a person who is impressive, trustworthy, and good. The list starts off with the most easy to see indicators of personality: physical size and appearance, in other words, presentation. But these indicators have the lowest validity. As you move down the list they get more difficult to see. The first one, Presentation/Appearance, you can size up in five minutes. The second indicator, traditional lifestyle, might take you an hour to discover. The third one, Conscientiousness (Holland), would take a month or more of working with the person to get a feel for his or her tendency to be late or on time, to be diligent or avoidant, to be persistent or given to faltering at a task. The last category, Conscientiousness (according to Jane Loevinger) indicates that a person is willing to make the tough decision to "do the right thing" (like Huck Finn in the Mark Twain classic.)

Four Levels of Indicators of "Maturity"	In Maturity	In Character	In Emotional Intelligence
Presentation/appearance	Gravitas/looks/SE	Seems strong	Calm emotions
Traditional lifestyle	Spouse/house/kids	Sound money attitudes	Control of emotions
Conscientiousness (Holland)	Gets work done well Follows through on promises	Is serious about work to be done, tasks to be completed, not a slacker.	Able to Motivate Oneself (Bar-On)
Moral Conscientiousness (Jane Loevinger)	Conscientiousness means having a conscience.	Moral behavior	Moral (empathy)

Moral behavior means truly caring about the welfare of others. It means putting oneself second when someone else is in dire need, as far as one is able. Behaving in a generally moral manner means that you do not have (or at least have controlled) any personality traits that might be found in Axis II in the Cluster B set of Personality Disorders found in the DSM. Moral behavior is the opposite of egocentrism.

Issues vs. Feelings

When a person displays emotional intelligence, it means two things: It means they behave in a moral

fashion and, two, it means they do not have many unresolved issues from childhood or early adulthood. “Issues” are unresolved psychical strains, misgivings, misunderstandings, and just plain neural misalignments. These issues can color, contaminate, or otherwise influence their interpersonal decisions.

In determining cause and effect, one’s issues are more important than feelings because when someone is in conflict they are almost always acting out hidden and/or unresolved issues. What does that mean “unresolved issues?” We are all at a different stage of “resolvement,” if I’m allowed to invent a word here. Let’s look at the two extremes. On the one hand you have someone who has no issues (this probably only exists in theory) and then you have someone who has many “issues” meaning many instances of great pain leftover from childhood. (see trauncil.) These experiences caused poor development of the healthy emotions and clear thinking.

Then on the other extreme there are people who had happy childhoods who take the world pretty much as it comes and does not “find fault” with people and situations so much. This benign attitude comes from having had one’s needs met as a child. But that doesn’t mean they won’t get into conflict. In fact, being happy and self-confident can cause an egopath to be triggered into “picking a fight” or “copping and attitude” with the happy person. In any unhappy situation there are feelings that are being triggered, it’s true, but there are also “issues” stemming from childhood that must be addressed to solve the problem.

The Transition between Emotional Intelligence and Egopathy

The notion of Emotional Intelligence is a great concept. But it is not clear yet to the general public exactly what it is and how it is to be used.

Can the person with emotional intelligence hold down those feelings
 Ninety-nine percent of our hassles and hurts in life has to do with being hurt and thinking “Wow, that was really rude, inconsiderate, unkind,
 They lack consideration,
 We don’t have the words that mean
 It’s hard for good people to admit that in 1 out of 10 situations they behave badly.
 Egopaths frame themselves as the A person. “I’m just reacting to you because I’m the A person.”
 “You’re the B Person, right?” No, they aren’t. You’re the B Person.
 A big erroneous “since ...then “I have a right to come back
 I didn’t say “you” were rotten, I said the banana was rotten.”
 They construe what you are doing is being a big jerk!
 The egopaths would say “You’re the one who was inconsiderate.”