

TABLE OF CONTEXTS

TABLE OF CONTEXTS

PROLOGUE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

PART I – INDIVIDUAL EVIL

I. DEFINITION OF EVIL

1. Introduction

2. Mental Models

3. The Myth of Evil

A. *Evil involves the intentional infliction of harm on people.*

B. *Evil is driven primarily by the wish to inflict harm merely for the pleasure of doing so.*

C. *The victim is innocent and good.*

D. *Evil is the other, the enemy, the outsider, the out-group.*

E. *Evil has been that way since time immemorial.*

F. *Evil represents the antithesis of order, peace, and stability.*

G. *Evil characters are often marked by egotism.*

H. *Evil figures have difficulty maintaining control over their feelings, especially rage and anger.*

I. *Synthesis*

4. Definition of Evil

II. HUMAN PARADIGM

1. Historical Context

2. Thought Streams

3. New Paradigm

III. AGGRESSION

1. Models

A. *Psychoanalytic Theory (1903,1929)*

B. *Frustration-Aggression Theory (1939)*

C. *Ethological Theory (1966)*

D. *Social Learning Theory of Aggression (1973)*

E. *Excitation Transfer Theory (1979)*

F. *Hostile Attribution Model (1980)*

G. *Cognitive Scripts Model (1988)*

H. *Cognitive-Neo Association Model (1990)*

I. *Displaced Aggression Theory (2005)*

J. *General Aggression Model (2017)*

2. Definition

A. *Anger*

B. *Wrath, hate, annoying, anger, fury, rage*

C. *Hostility*

D. *Violence*

1. *Expressive variability of Anger*

2. *Conclusion*

IV. PERSONALITY

1. Classical Personality Model

2. Modern Conception of Personality

3. Actual Personality Model

A. *Definition*

B. *Composition*

C. *Dynamics*

D. *Model*

E. *Function*

F. *Strategy*

4. New Personality Classification System

B. *Characteristics of Predatory Personalities*

V. PREDATORY PERSONALITY

1. Reactive and Predatory Aggression

2. Dimensions of Predatory Personality

A. *Traits*

B. *Mixed Model of Predatory Adaptation Style*

a). *Problematic sense of regard for self and others.*

b). *Impaired capacity for Empathy and Constriction*

c). *Impaired Conscience.*

d). *Actively seek superior or dominant position in any relationship or interpersonal encounter.*

e). *Lack of Adaptive Fearfulness*

f). *A pathological disdain and disregard for truth.*

g). *Defective internal “brakes” (lack of inhibitory controls)*

h). *Irascible Temperament*

i). *What they say is very different from what they think*

j). *Difficulties in establishing intimate interpersonal relationships*

k). *Responsibility-Resistance Behaviors and Manipulation Tactics.*

l). *Impression Management*

C. *Resume*

3. Different Prototypes in Predatory Adaptation Style

A. *Transgressor Prototype (Antisocial Personality Disorder)*

- B. *Egocentric Prototype (Narcissistic Personality Disorder)*
- C. *Ruthless Prototype (Psychopath)*
- D. *Channeled Prototype (Sociopath)*
- E. *Morbid Prototype (Sadistic Personality Disorder)*
- F. *Covert Prototype*

4. Conclusion

VI. DELIBERATE COGNITIVE DOMINANCE STRATEGIES

- 1. Rationalization (making excuses)
- 2. Externalizing the Blame (Blaming others or scapegoating)
- 3. Denial
- 4. Minimizing
- 5. Bullying
- 6. Covert Intimidation
- 7. Evasion
- 8. Diversion (deflecting or shifting focus)
- 9. Giving Assent
- 10. Posturing
- 11. Playing the Victim
- 12. Feigning Ignorance or Confusion (Playing “Dumb”)
- 13. Feigning Innocence
- 14. Playing the Servant
- 15. Seduction
- 16. Shaming
- 17. Guilt-Tripping
- 18. Vilifying the Victim
- 19. Selective Attention
- 20. Hypervigilance
- 21. Conning and Contracting
- 22. Trying to escape guilt or shame on a “technicality.”
- 23. False Concessioning
- 24. Leveling
- 25. Insinuation

VII. OTHER DELIBERATE COGNITIVE DOMINANCE STRATEGIES

- 1. Straw Man Fallacy
- 2. Flattery
- 3. Silence Treatment
- 4. Nonsense
- 5. Disqualification
- 6. Destructive Criticism
- 7. Triangulation
- 8. Smokescreen
- 9. Discarding the positive

10. Pathologizing

VIII. LIE

1. Conceal
2. Falsify

IX. MORAL DISENGAGEMENT STRATEGIES

1. Introduction
2. Moral Agency
3. Moral Disengagement Positioning:
 - A. Behavioral Locus
 - A1. Moral Justification
 - A2. Euphemistic Language
 - A3. Advantageous Comparison
 - B. Agency Locus
 - B1. Displacement of Responsibility
 - B2. Diffusion of Responsibility
 - C. Effects Locus
 - C1. Ignorance or Distortion of Consequences
 - D. Victim Locus
 - D1. Dehumanization
 - D2. Attribution of Blame
4. Resume

PART II – SITUATIONAL EVIL

X. SITUATIONAL EVIL

XI. OBEDIENCE TO AUTHORITY

1. The Experiment
2. Experiment Results
3. Formation of the Behavior of Obedience
 - A. Hierarchical structures
 - B. Antecedent Conditions for Obedience
 - C. Construction of Obedience
 - D. Behavior within a Hierarchical Organization
 - E. Inhibition Systems
1. Conclusion

XII. STANFORD PRISON EXPERIMENT

1. The Experiment
2. Results of the Experiment
3. Analysis of the Experiment
 - A. Character Transformation
 - a. The Prisoners
 - b. The Jailers
 - c. The Importance of Situations
 - The power of Norms

Person's Roles

Anonymity and de-individualization

The power of social approval

d. The Power of Systems

B. Group Power, Compliance or Obedience, and Authority Systems

a. Research on Group Power

Inflated Self-Attribution Bias

Compliance with group standards

Group Pressure

Changes in perception due to peer pressure

The Influence of Minorities on Majorities

Belonging to the Inner Circle

b. Blind obedience to authority

Obedience in the Milgram experiment

Obedience to authority in health professionals

Obedience to authority in airlines

Obedience to authority in companies

Obedience to authority in a sex scam

Obedience to authority leads to mass suicide

c. Creation of Authority Systems

Authority system in a high school class

Authority System in elementary school children

Authority System at the University

Authority System in Mobile Brigades

System of Authority and "The Banality of Evil"

C. The Dynamics of Anonymity and Human Inaction

a. Anonymity as a process of deindividuation

Anonymity in University Students

Anonymity on Halloween

Anonymity in Wars

Anonymity at Mardi Gras

The process of deindividuation

b. Evil caused by Human Inaction

Spectator's Inaction

Inaction and compromise

The inaction of the Good Samaritan

The Institutionalization of Inaction

Inaction in tolerance and acceptance

4. Conclusions

XIII. FINAL WORDS

XIV. REFERENCES