

Chapter 4: Bullies Behaving Badly; PCDs and PCDAs.

There are five types of egopaths. There are the Bilious Bullies (BB), the Egocentric Narcissists (EN), the Obsessive-Compulsive, (O-C) and the Dependent-Borderline-Paranoid Egopaths (DBPs), and the creepiest of all, the Subthreshold Psychopaths (SPs.)

“Man...is apt to see in himself only what he wants to see and (will) ignore and repress what he considers as bad and unacceptable” (p. 46). Alexander and Selesnick; *The History of Psychiatry* (1966)

Type 5: Subthreshold Psychopaths (SPs.)

Article: The Neurobiology of Evil: Psychiatric Perspectives on Perpetrators. Dan J. Stein.

Banal evil may involve a dissociation of cortico-striatal processing from limbic input (reason without passion), sadistic evil may involve a dissociation of limbic processing from frontal controls (passion without reason).

At what point does “not doing” become “aggressiveness?” We usually think of “aggressiveness” as “moving against” someone in such a way as to cause physical harm such as hitting or shoving. We also use the term “aggressive” when we refer to people who are giving us a tongue lashing or advice-giving in such a vociferous form that it begins to feel like trauma to our feelings and mental well-being. But if we use the level of “trauma” and “mental well-being” as a rule of thumb, we can also suffer a great deal of anguish and trauma when someone actively rejects us, moves quickly away from us or goes to great lengths to avoid us, and disregards our need for due consideration. We expect to be treated as a normal, attractive human being and when a boss or coworker fires us, tries to get us fired, or doesn’t schedule or include us in a meeting, it is very traumatic. It strikes at our very soul and being. When this happens to us, it feels very aggressive on their part. At what point does “moving away from” or “disincluding” someone become “aggression”?

I had a client who came to therapy for the first time. In our very first session he described how he had been treated at his job. He was an accountant whose principal job was to support a certain vice-president. He heard through the grapevine his VP was on the way out. This meant that he would not have a job and yet no one had informed him formally of this dreadful situation. He had not been given the courtesy of a phone call so he could make plans for a new job. Had he not been picked up by another VP he would have been given his pink slip, not because he was doing a poor job, but because his boss’s job had been eliminated. This is an example of “aggressive disinclusion.” Egopaths are inclined to engage in “aggressive disinclusion” since there are few rules regarding this behavior. It takes a man or woman of character to say, “We need to inform VP Smith’s accountant what we have decided here today so he can make other plans. Who wants to volunteer to do that? Will you do it in 48 hours? Thank you.” This kind of competent coordination of relationships is a sign of high functioning leadership. Many managers don’t have it. “Relationships” are not what they do well. Yet, most companies do not provide a competent human relations specialist (HRS) to do the job in order to aid the reluctant, beleaguered or egopathic manager and avoid mistreatment of the worker.

The Schemer or OC manager

They may not explode with irritable anger but they also don’t seem to be in a very good mood a lot of the time. They are likely to have a demeaning, condescending tone when they go about their business of bossing, supervising, or advising others. The more sensitive schemers will have moments when they let their egopathic guard down and admit that they are very stressed or even unhappy at the company.

But beware. There is always more there than first meets the eye. Schemers are very game to set up a

ruse, a double back, or a “screw-you-over.” They have an agenda to protect their territory or to get ahead. They are the ultimate political animals. They feel no compunction about disregarding your needs or feelings in their drive toward their goal.

Bilious bullies are at least genuine. You know where they stand on the issues. They are not happy and they’ll let you know that as soon as you decide to breath a word that opposes them. They will find fault with whatever you do and no amount of reasoning and explaining will let you off the hook. Bullies have a corn cob up their arses that no amount of “Adult-Adult” exchanges coming from you will mitigate. A big part of the problem is that their unrelenting criticism starts to push your buttons and you become a bit of a BBB yourself.

I call these people “BBB” because of the numerous phrases that can be coined using these three letters. Big, Bad, Bully is the first one that comes to mind. But you could also call them Bilious, Bitchy Bulldogs. Or you could refer to them as Bloated, Bulldozing Bastards. Come up with your own combination of “B” words to describe your favorite overweight, underweight, inconsiderate, self-absorbed master of disaster. Would it be “Borderline, Bipolar Bitch?” (See chapter XX for the double wife murderer’s big, bad momma)

In the book “Letters from Jenny” by the grandfather of modern personality assessment, Gordon Allport, there is a young man’s mother who is described by Allport as being “anal.” It seems in the past the word meant “mean, judgmental, and ill-tempered.” It is usually used these days to mean “obsessive and compulsive.” Read the last chapter of Letters from Jenny book for an assessment of her personality.

Egopathic Sentences

All egopaths, and psychopaths as far as that goes, have one thing in common. They have a core which is wounded and incomplete. Another way to say that is to say they have a core of pain from an early wound. (See the "9 Steps of Egopathic Process" at the end of the last chapter.) The later the wound, the less psychopathic they are and the more they are only egopathic. (see page XX for the bad behavior “bell curve.”) Most egopaths do not understand this psychological phenomenon at all. Egopaths tend to take the stand that psychology is full of nonsense and that they don’t need psychotherapy. Some of the egopathic sentences you’ll hear are:

“Psychiatrists (or any mental health professional) are some of the sickest dudes around. Those people are sicker than I am!”

“I wouldn’t go to see one of those quacks (shrinks, cuckoo birds) if you paid me.”

“There nothing wrong with me. I don’t need counseling. I can take care of my problems. If anyone needs counseling it’s you. If you would straighten up and do as I tell you everything would be okay.”

“I’m not interested in counseling” (followed by a big laugh).

Most egopaths would have had a very good life if they had not been “traunciled” at an early stage in their lives. Most are tall, handsome, charming, intelligent, quick-witted and capable. But that’s part of the problem. Most of them got whatever they wanted when they were young people which fueled the egopathic pump and doubled the likelihood that they would grow up egopathic.

A man or woman’s character is shaped by the love, limits and consequences that they experience as children. When a child is treated with favoritism because of his/her position in the family, gender, personal attractiveness, or intelligence they learn that they can get away with a lot. And it is hellaciously difficult to get them to unlearn that expectation when they are grown. It can drive a spouse into an early grave and no one is the wiser for it. Egopaths just don’t get it. They don’t understand that they are not the center of the universe. They have never had to develop a sense of “otherness” which is the high-character person’s stock in trade. Caring about other’s feelings and needs just doesn’t compute in an egopathic brain. “Altrucharacteristic” is my word for this giving, sharing, deferring style of interaction. Can you learn to be “altrucharacteristic?”

High emotional intelligence and ego defenses combined:

1. Able to know one's use of ego defenses and ego expressions
 2. Able to understand one's use of ego defenses and ego expressions
 3. Able to manage (or control) one's ego defenses and ego expressions
 4. Able to reveal and discuss one's ego defenses and ego expressions.
 5. Able to have empathy for those who have been hurt by one's use of ego defenses and ego expressions.
- If you can do 4 out of these 5, then you can be considered "altrucharacteristic."

Momentary Psychopaths

How do you categorize the young man, Charles Roberts, who was stable and raising a family in small town Pennsylvania and who then, one day, lined up some little girls and executed them in cold blood? How do we diagnose him? We need a name other than psychopath. I believe he was an unusual type of egopath who got pushed over the edge into brutal psychopathy. Shall we call these types "momentary psychopaths?"

Of course, the purpose of this book is to help mental health professionals become aware of this dangerous personality style. If an egopath were to be granted the right to carry a gun, he could misuse that privilege far sooner than a non-egopath. That is why we need to further Robert Hare's work on the Psychopathic Checklist (PCL) so that it reflects the traits of an egopath instead of a psychopath. For instance, on the P-Scan it says, "There are givers and there are takers." I presume the psychopath would be considered a "taker." But an egopath would say, "I'm such a giver. I give and give and no one appreciates me." And it may be true. She's not lying. But she or he would be encapsulating (compartmentalizing) the times when she or he was aggressive and mean-spirited to the point of cruelty. Egopaths vary in their ability to remember and be honest about their moments of biting, sharp-tongued sarcasm or incisive cutting remarks. Sometimes they admit they do it and say, "He deserved it." Other times they will flat out deny that they ever said such a thing. They will be indignant at your accusation.

I wonder if there is research that describes this personality style of denial and how it predisposes a person to old-age cantankerousness and even early dementia. This leaves an adult child who has begun therapy to be bewildered when they finally confront their parent(s) about their childhood involvement in the developmental trauncil. If the parent denies such a thing ever happened, the adult child feels abused and invalidated all over again.

The Scheming Predatory Retributive Egopath

The Gang of Five: There were a group of five therapists once who worked well together. But two of the three male therapists left the worksite. That left one male therapist, Jamal, and five women. There is something dangerous about one man being left to the devices of five women. There is a phenomenon that might be called "gang mass aggression toward a target" which should be researched in social psychology. It is an expression of childhood abuse transpositioned from the original abuser to an innocent, scapegoat surrogate. This has been seen throughout history in thousands of situations yet seldom described for what it really is.

These five women each who had to have been abused (or traunciled in some way) as children, ganged up on this fellow employee to censure him and utilizing trumped-up charges and misappropriation of the facts to get him fired. No real misbehavior was cited, just mass judgmentalness and trumped up charges. Their boss was a fair woman but one who did not understand egopathy. She did not know how to recognize it, confront it and control it. Eventually, Jamal was terminated, wreaking havoc and pain in his life.

Research has just been completed and reported showing that bigger mice will bully smaller ones in a

cage. The changes in the small mice seem to be permanent if the abuse or trauma continues long enough. The address to the information online is <http://usatoday.printthis.clickability.com/pt/cpt?action>

The PBS Special about Elia Kazan and Arthur Miller.

I remember in film school studying the great brilliant director named Elia Kazan. He made the great films “Streetcar Named Desire” and “On the Waterfront.” He had decided to name Communist Party members in the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the early 1950’s. He had weighed the pros and cons of naming names and had decided that his career was too important not to cooperate with the committee. After all, he had been one who had actually been a member of the Communist Party.

Kazan’s reasoning did make sense. He obtained permission from some of the people he would name and, he reasoned, he would not be giving the committee anything they did not already have. But the outcome was devastating. He lost his best friend, Arthur Miller, and other friends shunned him. Arthur Miller went on to write a play called “The Crucible.” The play was analogous to the “witch hunt” which had transpired during the McCarthy hearings.

When the play was presented, the reviewers were afraid that if they gave it a positive review they would be treated badly by the media industry. They would be considered leftist just for writing a positive review of a play that showed sympathies toward exposing egopathically judgmental cruelties. How the long arm of egopathy spreads and contaminates life! One of the actresses was targeted for simply acting in the play. She had to pay \$500 to a “fixer” to get her name off the blacklist. Unbelievable.

If we go back to the very beginning of the House Committee in 1946 we could find a useful set of endeavors that were designed to root out the worst of the Communist leaning operatives here in America. That was well and good. But somewhere along the way the subtle psychodynamics of egopathy took over the mind of Senator Joseph McCarthy. His psychological self began to say, “Hey, this feels good. I have the power to search people out and call them before the Committee and grill them about their behavior. This is like an aphrodisiac or an anti-depressant. I don’t feel like a loser anymore. I feel like I’m somebody important. I think I’ll do more of this. I’ll broaden my range and get tougher on those who are named.” No one, least of all Senator McCarthy, was able to stand up to this powerful inner voice and say, “Don’t let this voice, this prurient neediness, take you too far. This is a psychological voice of unhealed woundedness and if you don’t be careful it could grow into egopathy. If it grows into egopathy a lot of innocent people could get hurt and have their careers ruined.” No one was able to have the psychological insight to remonstrate with Senator McCarthy. Psychology was too much in its adolescence in those days. But how far have we come since the 1950’s? How well can we confront a current senator or president about his or her egopathic leanings? Or even confront ourselves, those of us who are parents, supervisors, managers, or professors? Generally, we don’t do this very well.

My hope and prayer is that this book will begin to help people take a long look at themselves and realize when they are leaning toward making themselves feel good by attacking, fault-finding, censoring, rejecting, and disregarding. I would like the world to become a better place in which to live.

In the Andrea Yates story, Yates says she “knew it was wrong and that she would be punished.” This is fodder for the prosecution to prove that she knew what she was doing was wrong and, therefore, is punishable as “not insane.” Although trying to decide if a person knew that “what they were doing was wrong” has been deemed a test for “insanity,” most mental health professionals do not think in terms of “insanity” since that is such an archaic concept. We have much more specific diagnoses now and more sophisticated ways of assessing the level of the person’s mental health.

For instance, one way of assessing a person’s mental health is to ask if they suffer from “compulsions.” A compulsion is an overwhelming drive to do something. The person may know it’s “wrong” and yet still do it. Millions of people know smoking is wrong and yet they feel compelled to do it anyway. Millions of people know it’s “wrong” to overeat or pig out on junk food, but they do it anyway. In Andrea Yates’ case, the question is not “did she know it was wrong” but “how overwhelming

was the compulsion?”

“If there is a concern about this person for some reason, then I need to talk to him and ask him what he thinks of my concern and see if it’s legitimate. If someone else is complaining about him from another department, I feel sorry for the employee. I wonder if anything is going on with him that is upsetting. If so... Then, I need to speak to him and listen to his story and see if A. it’s something I’m doing/not doing, B. See if it’s an interpersonal (with staff) problem; and C. See if I can be supportive; and D. see if the problem is currently or going to affect his job performance. If this is a personal problem that may aversively affect his performance or even the safety of the other employees...

Then I need to interact with the employee in such a way as to minimize the threat to the safety or productivity of the department/company/unit.”

Egopathic Style of Communication

An egopath will tend to reach out to a third entity to add weight to what they say or need. For instance, if an egopath is annoyed with you or wants something from you, they will say, “You know, in West Virginia there is a law that says a husband HAS to carry his wife if she has an injury of *any* kind.” They feel a sense of strength as they throw this concept at you. It proves that you are really screwing up and need to get with the program (of satisfying them.) They usually do not have the skill set to simply ask for their needs, to explain why it means so much to them, and then listen for any inconvenience the target may want to share.

For the complete list of “PCD” behaviors look at the “PCD Handout” file that is on my website at www.cedricwood.net or www.dreedwood.com.

In the next chapter I will talk about the personality disorders and compare and contrast them with my concept of “egopathy.”