Manipulation

By Harvey R. St. Clair

In the behavioral sciences we sometimes use the term "manipulation" to describe certain behavior. Everyone seems to know what is meant by manipulation, yet the term is omitted in the psychiatric dictionary. The verb, manipulate, and the noun, manipulation, have come to have psychiatric connotations which are worthy of a more detailed study. The regular dictionary definition of manipulate is: (1) to operate on, or work with the hands; especially to handle something dexterously or skillfully; (2) to influence the action or result artfully; arrange deceptively; tamper with. The word is derived from the Latin, manipulus, meaning handful.

In psychiatric usage manipulation is a psychosocial maneuver which uses aggressiveness, cleverness and deception to influence others so that they will give gratification to the aggressor. It should include the concept that the responder is assumed to be reluctant, or even unwilling, to contribute such satisfactions and must in some way be maneuvered by the aggressor into activity which gives the desired effect.

The behavior is generally conscious and planned, even though much of its motivation is usually unconscious. Its purpose is to change a frustrating object into a gratifying object. The instigator seeks to force his environment into compliance with his desires.

Perhaps this is too broad a definition. Perhaps no behavior is devoid of at least the unconscious intent to influence the environment for personal satisfaction, and could therefore be termed, in a broad sense, "manipulation." Even a person in a depressive stupor still has an impact on others.

The mechanics of how manipulation is accomplished are infinite. The subtleties of the manipulator are quite complex and involve many factors which are difficult to dissect. Many methods and mechanisms can be called into play in varying combinations. Each individual uses his own repertoire and unique variations. Manipulation is not a homogeneous phenomenon. Sometimes the skill and the complexities of these operations command the respect and admiration of observers.

Let us look further into what happens in the transaction. For purposes of discussion, the maneuver can be broken down into five phases, or steps. The first is the selection, consciously or unconsciously of the object which ultimately is supposed to give gratification. The second is capturing the attention of the object. The third is the work of overcoming the objections and resistances of the object. The fourth is the presentation of the demand. The fifth is actual gratification. Each of these will be briefly discussed.
1. *Selection of the Object*

Before an object is selected there must be present in the manipulator some need which desires satisfaction to such an extent that action is sought to achieve this. The need may be quite sharp and clear or may be hazy and ill-defined. It may be single or multiple, strong or not so strong, chronic or just brief and on the spur of the moment, but at least the intensity of the urge to achieve satisfaction is sufficient to motivate the person into aggressive behavior. The needs may be to give it satisfactions, or to strengthen some crumbling ego defenses, or to live up to some ego ideal, or to ease a disturbed superego. Once the need becomes strong enough to insist on gratification, the person is then compelled into seeking an object. Sometimes the whole maneuver itself is highly cathexed and the individual derives considerable pleasure out of “operating.” More will be mentioned later regarding types of needs.

The selection of the object is determined by a number of factors such as the type of need to be met, the availability of the object, and the qualities of the object. Again there can be much variation in all of these respects, and it is the combination of these variables which determine such things as whether the selection is done with lengthy, careful, thoughtful planning, or is unplanned, immediate and indiscriminate; whether the maneuver requires a certain setting or not; whether timing is of importance or not; and similar qualifying aspects. Quantitative requirements for the object are largely dependent upon the degree of the need in the manipulator. The qualitative requirements for the object seem (1) to be the assumed potential to gratify the need of the manipulator, (2) to be human and therefore to have frailties and imperfections which can be exploited to advantage if need be, (3) to be ambivalent enough so that there is at least hope for resistances to be surmountable, and (4) to be identified either consciously or unconsciously as being in a subservient position.

2. *Capturing Attention*

The methods for capturing attention can be most varied and scarcely require study. Their purpose is to serve as an admission ticket to the relationship and to assist in setting the stage. They may or may not be an introduction and opening move of the next step in the transaction. Announcing some topic, changing a topic into another one, introducing a stimulating question, arousing another’s curiosity, saying or doing something which has a startling effect; assuming control of the setting and using it as a stage for a solo performance, doing something for the other person, and being conspicuous in any way are but a few examples. Whatever the method used, the intent is there to make the introductory moves toward the chosen object and bring the object into active range.

3. *The Work of Overcoming Resistances of the Object*

The next step of the maneuver consists in the actual work of the manipulation. How this functions is again quite individualistic. Whether the objections of the object against giving in to the manipulator are strong or weak, real or just assumed, at least this aspect of resistance of the object is probed, assessed
and dealt with by the manipulator. Much of this goes on at intuitive or nonverbal or oblique and indirect levels. The probing and assessing of the object's resistance can be lengthy or so cursory as to be negligible and can be, and usually is, more unconscious than conscious. The length of time consumed and the amount of effort put forth by the manipulator to deal with these resistances is roughly proportionate to the degrees of resistance sensed, or met, in the object.

Overcoming the object's resistances usually consists of two aspects: (1) the work of concealment of true purpose of the manipulation, and (2) the active approaches toward the object's resistances.

Concealment of true intent is not an absolute essential, but it is usually present to some degree. Even the person who seemingly makes no attempt whatsoever to conceal his real motive, and who makes his demands on the object with directness and frankness, may still be using the subtle camouflage value of candor to disarm his object of any objections. Concealment of motive can be achieved by many means. Not divulging the true intent, denying the true intent, appearing to be altruistic, doing the other person a favor in order to disarm, focusing on some other topic, using flattery, and promising or alluding to some personal gain for the object in order to throw them off the track are but a few examples. The man who deliberately uses his pet dog to secure an introduction to an attractive woman is at least attempting to conceal.

Another aspect of concealment is the fact that not infrequently the real motives for the maneuver are not conscious to the manipulator himself. Aichhorn pointed out that manipulative, acting-out behavior gives no clue in itself as to the nature of the underlying motives for which it is an expression.

This does not necessarily imply that what is unconscious in the manipulator is concealed from others. Situations may exist where the concealment of motive is unconscious on the part of the manipulator; in this instance he succeeds in fooling no one but himself.

How the manipulator behaves in an effective way is also important in assisting the work of concealment. Throughout the transaction the manipulator usually behaves in an innocent, disarming, and so-called "normal" way, or he reacts with spurious affect that is appropriate with whatever substitute gambit he is employing. The more convincing the front or the "act" the manipulator uses the better the concealment. In either event he must consciously suppress the affect associated with his real motive lest it risk betraying him. Mechanisms other than suppression can also assist in concealment of this affect.

The work of actively overcoming the real or possible objections of the object can be viewed in two major ways: (1) exploiting the personality of the person, and (2) aggressiveness on the part of the manipulator.

The capacity of the object to give can be used to advantage. Many people are sufficiently mature, generous, and good-natured so as to respond favorably with giving as soon as they are requested to do so. All the manipulator need do to take advantage of their good nature is simply to present his demand in a reasonable fashion and the request is honored. Judging this quality of the object is done before the request is presented, and the manipulator hopes then
that this quality of generosity is strong enough by itself to override any possible resistances to the manipulator's request. Persons who dominate a conversation in order to have a captive audience are an example here.

Along the same lines of this is the taking advantage of the other person's capacity to be forgiving. Even if the concealment fails and the manipulator's true intent is discovered, a candid confession of guilt may be utilized to use forgiveness as a device to remain on the accepting of the other person. The manipulator assumed that confession automatically assures forgiveness and pardon.

Courting the positive side of the other person is another variant. This could go under the label of "pump priming." Various means can be used to achieve this. Doing something either generous or at least positive in quality to impress others favorably, doing actual favors for others, whether with genuine or with tongue-in-cheek motives, or any kind of ingratiating behavior are a few examples. Give in order to get is the method used here. There is a tendency of others to return a favor when they have been given to first. Some of this return is based on gratitude, some on genuine capacities to give, some on avoidance of guilt feelings, and some on the cultural tradition that it is polite to return a favor. The man who goes to great lengths to be nice to an unattractive but wealthy girl in the hopes of marrying her for her money, and who succeeds in having her fall in love with him, is a case in point.

Taking advantage of the object by focusing on the immature, neurotic and sensitive aspects of his personality is another method of overcoming resistances. Everyone has some areas of sensitivity and neuroticism, and these can be discovered by the manipulator and then exploited. There seem to be four common areas for targets: (1) narcissism and greed, (2) guilt, (3) the allure of the forbidden, and (4) the universal capacity to have anxiety.

Appealing to the narcissistic side of the object doesn't require too much skill. Holding out promise of satisfying some greed on the part of the object is also easy to do.

Exploiting guilt feelings in the subject can be viewed in two ways. First, the manipulator can focus on general, nonspecific guilt feelings. The psychology here is, "You're a bum if you don't come across with what is requested, and if you should refuse, shame on you." The success of innumerable charity fund drives can be attributed in part to this maneuver. People will sometimes feel guilty if they don't contribute to the charity. Second, a manipulator can take advantage of specific neurotic areas of guilt in the other person's personality. The object is tricked into surfacing neurotic guilt feelings in some area, and then to save face he is offered the solution of contributing whatever the manipulator wishes. It is as if the object does penance for guilt feelings by making a gift to the manipulator. This could be labeled emotional blackmail. Salesmen who use snob appeal in their approach are inferring that the customer is inferior if he doesn't react favorably.

The third of the common methods of exploiting the personality of the object is that of using the allure of the forbidden. A variant of this is to use the allure of satisfying the object's curiosity. Sometimes a combination of these two is
seen in using the mysterious as bait. The mysterious hints at both the allure of the forbidden and the satisfying of curiosity. The object here is tempted to satisfy his own craving for the forbidden, to solve the mystery, or to satisfy his curiosity, but at the price of granting the manipulator whatever he wishes. This capacity to be tempted quite probably has its roots in unconscious oedipal strivings, which are common to all of us. The circus sideshow Barker takes advantage of this personality trait in others to lure customers.

The fourth common characteristic of the object's personality on which the manipulator can capitalize is the universal capacity for anxiety. Since people vary in when, where, why, and how they become anxious, it takes some skill in probing by the manipulator to expose these areas. Once they are discovered, the manipulator pricks this area and watches his victim squirm; then he offers to let his victim off the hook if the demand of the manipulator is gratified. This, too, is emotional blackmail. An example of this maneuver would be the teenager who repeatedly badgers his parents about some request until he makes a pest of himself and so irritates his parents that they finally capitulate just to get the youngster to stop bothering them.

Another way of viewing the mechanics of the work of overcoming the resistances of the object is to see the power of aggressiveness on the part of the manipulator. Aggressiveness in this context should include superior logic, persistence, argumentativeness, and so on. By aggressive attack on the object an outright power struggle ensues and the manipulator hopes to win by the use of superior power.

There seem to be several variations of this technique. One method is for the manipulator to always keep the initiative and to continue with unrelenting rationalizations and argument to present his demands so that there can be no logical refusal, and to attack all objections as they are raised by the object with such superior logic that the object ultimately has to surrender. We often see this technique used in debate. We also see this in the teenager who convincingly argues his parents into letting him stay out later than customary.

Another method is to present the demands originally to such a grossly exaggerated degree that by comparison the weaker version, which is just the desired degree in the first place, doesn't sound so bad after all and thus stands a better chance of being accepted. A wife uses this method on her husband when she calmly states that she needs $100.00 for a dress and then cheerfully settles for $20.00.

Still another method could be aptly called the "bulldog" technique. In this instance the manipulator simply uses every aggressive tactic that he can devise until he wins. Some door-to-door salesmen will use this method. Harassment sometimes can be most effective.

Another approach is to put the object completely on the defensive. The manipulator tries to make the object prove why he can't grant the manipulator's request and then attacks each one of these defenses until the object can't think of any further reason for not granting the request, and then more or less has to give in because he hasn't a sufficiently strong reason for refusal.

There are also other methods of using aggressiveness to overcome resistances
of the object. To some extent an element of aggressiveness is essential to the successful operation of all the maneuvers discussed. It is necessary for the manipulator to have the initiative and to be in control. Even if the attempt fails, the manipulator can still have the satisfaction of having tried.

4. Presentation of the Demand

The need of the manipulator can be of many types and degrees. The needs and demands can be single or multiple. They can be mature, appropriate and reasonable, or they can be neurotic, inappropriate and unreasonable. The mature need can be to please the manipulator, or it can be sublimated and give satisfactions to the object. We see an example of the latter in the process of psychotherapy. The neurotic needs can cover the gamut of needs. Neurotic needs can be either erotic, hostile, or mixed. They can involve any fixation point, any defense, and any facet which demands attention.

How the demand for satisfaction of needs is presented to the object may vary from being overt to covert, spoken to unspoken, intellectual to emotional, once to repetitious, admitted to denied, direct to camouflaged, blunt to subtle, etc. There is always the element of timing present. This may or may not be very important in the transaction. Timing may be poorly and carelessly handled, or it may be skillfully and adroitly handled. At any rate there is a point in the transaction when the demand is in focus and the object is then asked to react favorably. At this point the object may raise additional objections and resistances. If so, these too will require further work on the part of the manipulator if they are to be successfully surmounted.

5. Gratification

Once the manipulator has reached the end point of his presentation, he then, hopefully, expects gratification. At this point he ceases his position of being the aggressor and assumes the role of the receptor. Frustration hopefully gives way to satisfaction.

Note, however, that if the manipulation fails to achieve its aims, there is then some degree of frustration. Even the masochist who has frustration itself as his goal can be thwarted to some extent. Once the manipulator commits himself to action, there is the gamble as to whether it will or will not be successful. Admittedly, the degree of risk may be so small that it exists only in token form, but nonetheless it is present or else there would be no necessity to manipulate. This being the case, the manipulator runs the risk of failing to achieve his purpose. This risk is always accepted and the manipulator is willing to accept the possibility of frustration as a requirement of the transaction. The expectation of success usually offsets the possibility of defeat.

In some instances the risk of defeat is much greater than the chance of success; yet the manipulator still goes ahead with the attempt, despite the fact that it runs into almost certain failure. In these instances the manipulator denies the possibility of defeat. He neurotically weaves the possibility of defeat into unconscious punishment for his "crime," or into masochistic patterns, or into some other neurotic system; or he has such an immature ego that he is
willing to take such foolish risks because of being obsessed with the intensity of his craving to the exclusion of all else.

**Internal Dynamics**

To give a mere description of a process is no substitute for understanding it. We can turn our attention now to some of the internal dynamics involved.

Manipulation always serves the pleasure principle and is therefore ego-syntonic. There must be at the moment of manipulation a somewhat lower level of the reality principle in comparison with the pleasure principle. It is always an ego maneuver which involves acting-out of needs. This acting-out can be both conscious and unconscious. In fact, manipulation can be considered as a form of acting-out.

The motives behind such behavior can be, and usually are, multiple. We need to remind ourselves here of what Freud termed "overdetermination," which means multiplicity of motives. Essentially there are always id satisfactions being served, and at the same time anxiety from threatened ego defenses desired relief.

Unconscious desires to satisfy erotic drives at any level are often present. The person may be orally sadistic and be therefore cannibalistic toward others. Such a person has the concept that the world exists purely to be eaten whenever one is hungry. The person may have fears of oral passive-dependent cravings and become aggressive toward others as a way of defensively seizing the initiative and thus avoiding the panic of exposure of a passive position. There may be oedipal fixations and the person may be attracted to act out because the object is a symbol of "forbidden fruit." To outwit others can be an extension of this stealing of the forbidden. The acting-out can, in this instance, represent a seduction and erotic conquest of the object. The person may be analy sadistic and be defiant and rebellious; he may harbor a grudge and have a motive therefore of using the object as something to sadistically control, or to wreak revenge on, or to engage in a hostile power struggle in order to defeat, or to just prove that he has "worked" the other person. Fears of insecurity may compel the person into doing something to regain a sense of security. Fear of losing a love-object, so-called "separation anxiety," and smoldering depression may direct a need to manipulate someone else to prove that they are there and that they can be provoked into some response which alleviates the inner suffering. Paranoid patterns can direct that the person has an extra need for fancied omnipotence, superiority, prestige and power and that he needs to maneuver others to prove this. We should also include here the self-righteous, pious paranoid who feels that since he has been persecuted he now has a "right" to play God and manipulate others. The person may be essentially hostile and project his hostilities by picturing all others as opponents. He then makes "survival of the fittest" his philosophy, and in that tenor he feels justified in manipulating. The schizophrenic may need to act out a fantasy and will attempt to manipulate others into role-playing whatever identities his fantasies require. This is by no means an encyclopedia of the motives which can be involved, but it should suffice to give a few examples.
Whatever the needs and motives may be, there is an internal crisis occurring within the manipulator. There is at the time of these maneuvers an amount of endopsychic tension which cannot be handled by the usual methods and defenses. Either the quantitative urgency of the motives or the inadequacy of ego capacities to deal with anxiety, or both, gives such an intolerable threshold of tension that something needs to be done in connection with the external environment. This then sets the stage for acting-out, which in turn requires an external object. At this point the ego grants the id permission to have gratification at the expense of others, and manipulation occurs. It is as if the ego then regresses to primary process functioning and sanctions both the concept of immediate id gratifications and the symbolic usage of any handy, available, substitute object. This is the essence of the maneuver. Even if the manipulation is altruistic and is actually more for the benefit of the object then the manipulator (such as we see, for example, in directive psychotherapy and structured counseling), there is still the usage of the object by the manipulator for both id satisfactions and ego defenses against anxiety. It is thus always essentially both parasitic and predatory, and it always unconsciously views the object as performing maternal functions. It is unconsciously a child-mother relationship by proxy, with the manipulator being the child and the object the mother.

This makes the relationship between the manipulator and object incapable of equality. The object resents being manipulated. This occurs even if the manipulation is for the object’s own benefit. The bargain of the transaction does not allow the object to have the same opportunity to be the manipulator. It cannot be a mutually satisfying exchange on a mature level. The resentment of the object at being manipulated is inevitable, and it occurs whether the manipulation is successful or unsuccessful, immediate or delayed, altruistic or openly selfish. All of us resent having been “worked.” Our resentment is always there, even if only unconsciously so. Manipulation is both an insult to the equality of give-and-take on healthy, mature levels, and a threat to that aspect of all of us which likes to assume that we can reasonably cope with the demands of others. It is also a threat to our own repressed id impulses. If any manipulation is to be done, we’d like to do it ourselves. Manipulation thus provokes both hostility and envy in the object. Because of these factors the maneuver of manipulation tends to be destructive of a permanent, equal relationship between the two parties. This tends, in turn, to make the maneuver self-defeating and self-destructive. The manipulator, by the maneuver of manipulating, tends to destroy that very essential ingredient for lasting and mature relationships—namely, mutual respect and interpersonal equality. Manipulation precludes equality.

This actually becomes part of the equation. This ultimate destruction of the relationship is either by conscious design (for example, in the swindler who, when once he has achieved his purposes, moves on) or it is for unconscious purpose (for example, in the masochist who has a fate neurosis and is forever punishing himself by ultimately wrecking all relationships he forms). Since the maneuver itself is a regression to primary process functioning, it tends to
neglect secondary process concepts of relationships. This makes the maneuver basically an immature one. Since it always exploits and since it always tends to be destructive to permanent relationships, it is also always essentially sadomasochistic.

It seems likely that we would find two groups of people who tend to utilize manipulation to an excess. The first group are those who, because of conflict, have failed to find adequate satisfactions in healthy, mature, equal, interpersonal relationships and thus resort to manipulation as a substitute method of achieving satisfactions. They have never learned the pleasures of loving in equal interactions. This group would include the neurotics and the psychotics. The second group are those who have relatively little superego conflict and who use manipulation as a preferred way of living. This group consists of the psychopaths. Manipulation becomes an accepted method of functioning for them. Manipulation as such, however, is not especially diagnostic of any clinical group, and can be found in the healthy as well as in the clinically ill. In those who use it to any excessive degree manipulation has a tendency to come gradually more severe and repetitious as time goes on. In these people, whom we could perhaps designate by the phrase “chronic manipulators,” it becomes more entrenched as a personality feature. This seems to be because repeated use polishes and refines the person’s skills and therefore success in using it, and because the maneuver destroys existing relationships, thus requiring the manipulator to seek new worlds to conquer. It is somewhat, therefore, a self-perpetuating character trait in these people.

**Superego**

So far, the superego has been omitted in this discussion. Needless to say, the superego must be dealt with by the ego in ways that will permit acting out with a minimum of guilt feelings, or else the superego will prohibit the action. We see here six frequently found conditions which will permit this.

The first condition is an immature or corrupt (or both) superego. In these instances the superego either approves of the intended action by offering no opposition, and thus gives tacit consent, or else it actually approves of the manipulation and its motives because of having warped and so-called “corrupt” values. These immaturities and warped values give a freedom from guilt feelings and, in the instance of a corrupt superego, give ego sanction and encouragement. We usually find these superego patterns arising (1) from an environment that was too rigid and harsh with which to indentify, and thus had to be rebelled against, (2) from an environment that gave neglect, and thus erred by omission, or (3) from an environment that had warped and corrupt superego values itself, and thus afforded antisocial identifications. These immature and corrupt superego patterns are more frequent in the psychopath, the schizophrenic, the paranoid and the compulsive.

The second condition is one in which the superego itself is sadistic and the manipulator has a masochistic ego. In these instances the manipulator knows ahead of time that he feels guilty, but the guilt feelings themselves are unconsciously turned into tension-relieving, masochistic channels. There is secret
enjoyment from the self-punishment of feeling guilty. This, then, not only permits the ego to go ahead with its manipulative acting-out intentions, but encourages it as well. In this instance the superego will even taunt the ego into going ahead so that the perverted satisfactions of feeling guilty can be achieved.

The third condition is one in which the ego strikes a “Devil and Daniel Webster” bargain with the superego. There are guilt feelings, but the ego requests a delay in punishment and says to the superego in effect, “If you will let me go ahead now with what I want and will let me enjoy it with a minimum of guilt feelings, I will, in exchange for this permission, be glad afterwards to feel guilty and pay proper penance.” This is a bargaining by postponement, and at the same time the ego hopes by a confession of intent to soften the superego guilt.

The fourth condition is an actual bribery of the superego. This is similar to gaining an indulgence. In this situation the ego actually does something good or something which fulfills an ideal; having done this, it then requests the superego to give an indulgence. Here the ego says to the superego, “I’ve now earned some time off for good behavior, and therefore I’m now entitled to do this other which you don’t approve of.” This performing of the good deed can be done before, or at the same time, the request for the indulgence is made, a variant is where the ego can present a list of basic virtues of self and offer these as a bribe to the superego. If the superego accepts the bribe, then the manipulation can proceed with less guilt feelings.

The fifth condition is by placating the superego guilt by rationalization of the manipulation. Rationalization can focus on either the methods of the manipulation or the motives, or both. If successful in this rationalization, the ego may persuade the superego to lessen the guilt feelings, or even remove the guilt feelings altogether, for the time being at least. It says in effect, “What I’m about to do isn’t really so bad after all. It’s for a good cause; others do it too. My needs are so great and are really just human, etc.”

The sixth condition is outright denial of the guilt feelings. Here the superego is blocked out of awareness by repression, or suppression, or flat denial, or by isolation. Needless to say, this occurs chiefly in those people who have rather grossly immature personalities and who can ignore significant parts of reality.

Once one has successfully manipulated and tolerated whatever guilt feelings that have been present, there is a mild shift in the internal relationships between the ego and the superego. To some extent the superego also approves of success in and of itself. The ego ideal can’t help but have a bit of pride in a successful maneuver. Therefore, there is a modification in the superego after the maneuver. This tends to mollify the superego guilt. The amount of lessening of guilt may be, and usually is, rather small but nonetheless occurs. From the viewpoint of the ego, the successful maneuver is looked back upon as having had narcissistic value. Sometimes this manipulating characteristic, if used to any frequent extent, can become an identity itself for the ego. The person says in effect, “Now that I am a successful manipulator, I am allowed to manipulate.”
Psychogenesis

There is no single specific psychogenesis. We find manipulation in a heterogeneous group of people. All of us use it at times. It is not especially characteristic of any type of personality or any type of illness. It is, however, more frequent in delinquents and psychopaths. There is no specific psychogenesis and no specific fixation point. It is difficult to judge whether manipulation is normal or pathological. Each instance must be evaluated on its own merits. Diagnostically it indicates nothing specific, except in general to say that it is less than mature. We do see it as the ego not being able to give up the pleasure principle.

Summary

Manipulation is seen as a psychosocial maneuver in which the aggressor seeks to maneuver resistive objects into granting satisfactions to the aggressor according to the pleasure principle. An object is selected, his attention is captured, the real motives of the manipulator are somewhat concealed, the object’s resistances to granting satisfactions are dealt with, the manipulator’s needs are presented, gratification is obtained, and whatever superego guilt feelings may be involved are dealt with. It always represents taking some risks of failure, and even when successful it tends to be somewhat disruptive of permanent relationships of an equal nature. It is to some extent immature and can be considered a form of acting-out of needs when endopsychic tensions demand an external object. It is not specific to any single diagnostic classification and it is seen in all people at times. The motives are usually multiple and usually unconscious as well as conscious. It unconsciously views the object as performing maternal functions, and it tends to be both parasitic and predatory. This holds true even if the motives are seemingly altruistic. To some inescapable degree the maneuver becomes sadomasochistic.

Abraham Lincoln said: “As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy—whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy.”
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