

Albert fish and psychopathy

Psychology



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Albert Fish and Psychopathy Question Psycopathy is a term drawn from Greek, composed of two words, “psyche,” meaning the mind, and “pathos,” meaning suffering or disease. The term refers to a personality disorder, which is portrayed through the characteristics of shallowness of emotions, especially, those characterized by reduced fear, lowered empathy levels, stress tolerance, lack of guilt feelings, cold heartedness, egocentricity, and antisocial behaviors, including criminality and a parasitic lifestyle. According to the scientific American, psychopathy is related to criminality, violence, and conduct problems, although many psychopaths are not known to be violent; psychopaths can mask their identity tactfully (Patrick & Lilienfeld, 2011, pp. 95-162). On the other hand, the evil perspective is more of a situationist approach to the way that anti-social deeds committed by individuals can be explained, sanctioned, prevented or treated where necessary. The approach is informed and influenced by social research inquiries and theory. In explaining the reasons for evil behavior, individual dispositions are traced. Also considered, are genetic factors, pathological risk factors, personality traits, and other areas of organismic variables. The approach is informed by the principles of Lewinian theory, to explain the relative case through which an ordinarily good person is converted into evildoing, which is caused by the process of turning off on one or more of the situational variables explained before (Watson, 1973, pp. 342-345). The connection between psycopathy and the evil perspective, is that they both accommodate and try to explain the sources of behaviors like egocentricity, impulsivity, irresponsibility and callousness among other indicators examined, to provide the two explanations of anti-social behavior. This shows that a psychopath will appear similar to an evil person, as explained <https://assignbuster.com/albert-fish-and-psychopathy/>

by the evil perspective; they will be characteristic with the same inclinations. There is also a connection in the likely causes of the two conditions, as explained under the evil perspective and the justification for psychopathy, that the common measurement model on the PCL-R model relates such conditions with antisocial personality disorders and criminal thinking. Other variables incorporated include reactive anger, increased risk of suicide, impulsive violence and criminality, which are all triggers to such behaviors. There is another connection that both areas of explaining wrong behavior, trace the incidence of such behaviors to the under-explored force of social situations, which alter the mental programming and the behavior models of individuals. The two areas of knowledge can also be used to explain extreme instances of evil behavior, based on situational bases or dispositional inclinations. These include the acts of groups like torturers, terrorist suicide bombers, and death squad violence perpetrators (Patrick & Lilienfeld, 2011, pp. 95-162; Watson, 1973, pp. 342-345). The differences depicted through a review of these two areas viewing and explaining antisocial behavior, include that psychopathy is greatly associated to mental impairment or disorders, while the evil approach relies on the social actors and the forces that cause the shift from good to evil behaviors. Further, the evil perspective seeks to explore the areas that trigger evil behavior and how they can be manipulated to revert the situation, while psychopathy centers around explaining the indicators and the causes of evil behavior, as it notes that it is a condition that is disguised very well. Psychopathy, especially among children from good homes, is explained on the basis of biological causes, as opposed to the evil perspective of explaining evil behavior, which explores the social factors that are likely to have caused the incidence of such

behaviors. However, the end result of both is greatly similar, in that they both seek to explain the epicenter of evil behaviors (Patrick & Lilienfeld, 2011, pp. 95-162; Watson, 1973, pp. 342-345). Question 2 First, it should be noted that Fish was a good example of a serial killer, as explained through his case and the kind of criminal acts he could engage in, as well as the anti-social tags placed on him. An example includes the Boogeyman and the Brooklyn Vampire. He also had a history of child molesting and cannibalism, which led him to the molestation and the possibility of eating children. The case of Fish's acts of pushing needles into his groin was a perfect example of deliberate self-harm (DSH) or self-harm (SH) in general, which is the intentional injuring of one's own body, often, without suicidal intentions. These acts are directly associated to the explanations of the " diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders," as a symptom of borderline personality turmoil (Klonsky, 2007, pp. 226-239). In the case of Fish, his self harming behavior may be explained as a coping mechanism, which he thought to offer temporary satisfaction to his conditions of depression, anxiety, emotional numbness, stress and the sense of failure. These feelings could be associated to his rejection by the wife and the expectations from his arrest. The link between the self-harming behavior and his lust for killing, may be traced to the belief that he had a mission and a responsibility to torture and harm others. However, after he was rejected by the wife and arrested, which may have led to his detainment; he may have felt not capable of doing what he felt was his mission. As a result, he resulted into self harm as a coping mechanism, to allow him feel better, in response to his sense of failure, anxiety, and maybe depression among other related feelings (Meltzer et al., 2000). References Klonsky, D. (2007). The functions <https://assignbuster.com/albert-fish-and-psychopathy/>

of deliberate self-injury: A review of the evidence. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 27 (2), 226–239. Meltzer, H et al. (2000). *Non Fatal Suicidal Behavior among Adults aged 16 to 74*. London: The Stationary office. Patrick, C., and Lilienfeld, S. (2011). *Psychopathic Personality: Bridging the Gap between Scientific Evidence and Public Policy*. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 12 (3), 95–162. Watson, J. (1973). Investigation into deindividuation using a cross-cultural survey technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 25 (4), 342-345.