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Gary Watson’s area of specialization is moral, political philosophy and legal philosophy, with a special concentration on the theory of agency and responsibility. More recently, his research investigates the question of whether criminal law has a coherent normative underpinning.
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1. Psychopathy comes to our attention primarily by alarming displays of moral indifference. That indifference is so thoroughgoing that it raises the question of whether psychopaths lack the capacity for morally responsible agency. My concern in this paper, though, is not responsibility to others but rather the less explored topic of psychopaths’ peculiarly limited regard for themselves, going forward and backward. What interests me is the question of how these prudential peculiarities, as I call them, might be linked to the deficiencies of moral concern.

The story of “Howard Dever”, reported in McCord and McCord (1964), gives a good sense of the phenomenon. Dever’s young life of petty crime and hustling in NYC was interrupted in the 1940’s by his conscription into the US Army. After 14 AWOLs, ensuing incarcerations and related psychiatric hospitalizations, the Army shipped Dever to England, where he continued his mischief. During this time he married an English...
woman. He was injured during a German bombing attack on London, for which he was
given a medical discharge, whereupon he abandoned his wife and newborn child to return
to the US.

After his wife tracked him down in New York City, the family moved into an
apartment together. “A week later he left for Florida without notifying his wife: ‘I met a
guy in a bar, and he said he wanted to pull some jobs in Florida; would I go along? I said
‘O.K.,’ but I forgot to tell my wife. She didn’t know where I was, but she took me back
when I came home. It wasn’t that I didn’t like her—we got along O.K. I just had other
things to do’” (19). By the time he was 35, Dever faced a 15 count indictment for
burglary, forgery, and impersonation in Massachusetts and was wanted for similar
offenses in a number of other states. Looking back, he remarked: “Hell, I didn’t need the
money. I would just get an idea and I’d go out and do it. Maybe I hurt somebody doing it,
but I’ve had fun” (19).

2. This sort of thoughtless misbehavior causes, of course, enormous grief, but what
makes psychopaths so chilling, in contrast to other anti-social types, is their blank
incomprehension of the moral responses which their inconsiderate and sometimes
malicious behavior elicits. They will often try to talk the talk, but for the most part lamely
and in any case, with no insight whatever into why people bother with what we call
morality. This so-called “ego-centricity” strikes many observers as “pathological” rather
than as a moral fault because its possessors seem incapable of seeing and taking seriously
the reasons we take ourselves to have for attending to one another’s liberty and well-
being.
The root of this moral deficit is subject of much research and controversy. One leading view, advanced by James Blair et al., is that psychopathy manifests emotional learning deficits having to do with the normal internalization of interpersonal norms, deficits rooted in amygdala abnormalities. It is crucial, in Blair’s view, not to equate, as many have done, psychopathy with the category of “Anti-Social Personality Disorder” as that is specified in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual IV of the American Psychiatric Association. “The advantage of the concept of psychopathy [over the DSM-IV classifications],” Blair insists, “is that it identifies a population who share a common etiology, a dysfunction in specific forms of emotional processing…” (Blair et al. 2005: 12).

3. Right alongside “egocentricity” or self-centeredness in the psychopathic profile, however, sits a striking deficiency in “prudential” concern. This trait figures prominently in the most influential clinical descriptions, those of Cleckley and Hare. Psychopathy characteristically involves “Poor judgment and failure to learn by experience”; “Failure to follow any life plan”; and lack of “remorse or shame” (as Cleckley puts it). Hare’s influential Checklist includes “lack of realistic, long-term goals,” “failure to accept responsibility for one’s actions,” “impulsivity”; “poor behavioral controls”; and “lack of remorse or guilt” (Hare). Psychopaths are apt to get themselves into easily foreseen and avoidable trouble and are notoriously inconstant in their stated plans and projects. Yet, these prudential misadventures are no more occasions for genuine regret or self-rebuke

---

4 Amygdala dysfunctions result in impairments in socialization in such a way that “the individual does not learn to avoid actions that cause harm to other individuals”. (Blair, 2006, 139)

5 ‘Ego-centricity’ is one of Cleckley’s terms; Hare speaks of ‘callousness’ and ‘lack of empathy’.
than are their moral failings. They are, in this respect, as careless of themselves as they are of others.

4. An initially plausible hypothesis is that the co-occurrence of moral and prudential deficits in psychopathy is no accident. Call this the linkage thesis. The main question of this lecture is how such a linkage might be explained.

The thesis requires clarification, of course, and defense. For one thing, it might be thought that the trouble psychopaths create for themselves can be attributed to a special taste for excitement and risk-taking, rather than to prudential deficiencies. In these cases—in which the risk is precisely what is sought—the absence of self-criticism makes sense. For example, one woman whom Robert Hare diagnosed as psychopathic reported that what she found most exciting was “walking through airports with drugs. Christ! What a high!” These thrill-seekers might be likened to extreme sports enthusiasts, who rate risk-taking differently from most of us.

A telling point, however, is that the risk-taking of such “adrenaline junkies”, and of those devoted to doing whatever feels good, need not be either impulsive or undisciplined in the way at issue here, nor, importantly, need these adventurers lack self-

---

6 Caution is required here, since these characters often adopt a self-chiding posture as a strategy to impress their interlocutors.

7 The idea that prudential and moral concerns are intertwined is not unfamiliar in philosophy, and we find in philosophical moral psychology and current theory of agency in particular a cluster of ideas that might help to understand the connection. Suppose, for example, we accepted some form of the familiar idea that moral normativity can only be grounded in long-term rational self-interest. Then a being who—for whatever reason—were incapable of prudential reason could not make sense of morality either. The consideration that conformity to moral norms served long-term self-interest could have no grip on such agents. One might instead think that the capacity to care about the interests of others, with whom one has no special connection, is the same capacity that carries one beyond the horizons of one’s present self. Prudence as an interest in one’s future self thus falls out of the capacity for disinterested benevolence. For this suggestion, see Hazlitt (1930). However the explanation that I shall entertain below is not that the incapacity for imprudence is explanatory prior to the incapacity for morality, or the other way around, but that these incapacities have a common root.

8 Quoted in Hare 1999, 61. Here the “high” in question is not (just) a product of consuming the drugs but of the dare of getting caught with them.
critical reactions to the mistakes they do make.⁹ They may in fact chide themselves for timidity, loss of nerve, or negligence. Such reactions are outside the repertoire of psychopaths, however.¹⁰

Further, psychopaths’ prudential failings show up even when nothing especially thrilling or tempting is in the offing. Cleckley elaborates on this point in his description of his patient “Tom”, who resented and seemed eager to avoid punishment, but no modification in his behavior resulted from it. He did not seem wild or particularly impulsive, a victim of high temper or uncontrollable drives. There was nothing to indicate that he was lured by strong temptations, lured by definite plans for high adventure and exciting revolt.¹¹

5. Let me call attention to some grounds for skepticism about the linkage thesis.

The correlation of moral and prudential deficits is arguably an artifact of the subpopulations on which research on psychopathy has been very largely based, namely those who have come under the purview, for one reason or another, of criminal or psychiatric institutions. Prudent psychopaths, if there are any, are by nature more likely to avoid the clutches of such authorities. So the high incidence of prudentially impaired psychopaths in the prison population, for example, doesn’t tell us much about the incidence in general.

---

⁹ For all I know, a sizable percentage of professional daredevils are psychopaths. I’ve seen no educated estimates of this.

¹⁰ Suppose both that Blair et. al. are right about psychopathy having its neurophysiological roots in amygdala disfunction and that the linkage thesis is correct. This conjunction would predict that either this brain disfunction affects prudential monitoring in some way or that it is correlated with something that does so. Note that it would not be enough for the disfunction to explain an impairment in “aversive learning”. For an agent might be impaired in this way and (for this very reason) be wracked with regret. (“Damn, I keep doing this!”) What is wanted is an explanation of the absence of regret.

Now the clinical criteria of psychopathy do imply a strong likelihood that psychopaths will run afoul of the law, but there appear to be “successful,” non-criminal, or as Hare prefers to say, “subcriminal” psychopaths. HANDOUT

Hare claims that many psychopaths never go to prison or any other facility. They appear to function reasonably well—as lawyers, doctors, academics, mercenaries, police officers, cult leaders, military personnel, business people, writers, artists, entertainers, and so forth—without breaking the law, or at least without being caught and convicted. These individuals are every bit as egocentric, callous, and manipulative as the average criminal psychopath…. (Hare 1999: 113 ff.)

Does the apparent existence of successful psychopaths tell against the linkage of moral and prudential deficits?

In the nature of things, data on subcriminal psychopaths are more difficult to obtain, but to my knowledge, what studies there are do not decisively settle the matter.12 Two main differences are said to distinguish this population from the prison population. In Schopp and Slain’s words, “First, the successful psychopaths report a higher level of education, which is relatively unsurprising in that level of education is often correlated with intelligence and effective social skills. Second, the successful psychopaths reported lower frequency of convictions, although they do not report a lower frequency of arrest” (Schopp and Slain 2000, p?). This suggests again that factors other than caution keep

---

12The question is discussed among other places in: Schopp and Slain 2000, upon whom I rely here, and Benning, (2006). Schopp and Slain themselves rely primarily on Widom 1977 and on Widom and Newman 1985. One technique for identifying the target population is to advertise in newspapers for certain “character” types. An advertisement might read, for example, “Psychologist studying adventurous carefree people who’ve led exciting impulsive lives. If you’re the kind of person who’d do almost anything for a dare, call . . .”. Alternatively: “Wanted: charming, aggressive, carefree people who are impulsively irresponsible but are good at handling people and at looking out for number one.” Schopp and Slain, 257
some psychopaths out of the clutches of the authorities. The successful psychopath is not necessarily more prudentially competent.

Hare goes on to say that the “intelligence, family background, social skills, and circumstances [of subcriminal or successful psychopaths] permit them to construct a facade of normalcy and to get what they want with relative impunity.” These factors can explain how some psychopaths manage to remain at large despite prudential shortcomings. A combination of special talents and supportive environments can compensate for these shortcomings. Hence the linkage thesis is compatible with the existence of psychopaths with little or no legal entanglement.

Still, it seems doubtful that anyone one could master a complex subject matter, as some psychopaths have reportedly done, if she were so very impulsive or inconstant as the psychopath is depicted to be. Those achievements seem to require a dedication and planfulness that is at odds with our hypothesis. But note, too, that the achievements are at odds with a tendency that Hare himself takes to be characteristic, namely, that “Psychopaths are easily bored. You are not likely to find them engaged in activities that are dull, repetitive, or that require intense concentration over long periods” (Hare, 62). (I return to the significance of boredom later.)

This objection brings out an important distinction between prudential guidance and the persistence of plans and goals. For persistence may result from a fortuitous absence of competing distractions, rather than from prudential concern. The endurance and

---

13 For example, Cleckley’s patient, Joe, “entered law school at the state university and after three years graduated with high distinction, being named valedictorian for his class” (Cleckley: 1976: 152.) Subsequently, “Joe became interested in running for city council, threw himself with great energy into the race, and after a shrewd and active campaign was elected.”(152) Cleckley adds, pointedly, that Joe soon neglected his duties of his office: “According to the opinion of those who know him, he was not interested in the position itself, that is to say, in anything he might accomplish thereby but only in the petty fame it might bring him. He enjoyed stepping into various roles in which he played the big shot” (153).

14 I’m grateful to Piers Rawlings for discussion of this point.
consistency of these endeavors may well depend on how continuously the individual’s present aims are rewarded. For instance, an individual might find a steady source of enjoyment in winning chess contests, in fixing automobiles, or in competitive sports. A regular stream of stimulating experiences might sustain him or her through some otherwise rigorous programs.

The final source of doubt that I’ll mention comes from some researchers who, on experimental grounds, explicitly challenge what I’m calling the linkage thesis. Their claim, as I understand it, is that what is measured by Hare’s checklist is in fact a union of deficits with distinct etiologies.\textsuperscript{15} The idea is that impulsivity, tendency to boredom, and so on (Factor 2) can come apart from the disorders identified under Factor 1 (grandiose sense of worth, absence of guilt and remorse.)

6. Despite these challenges and reservations, which I take seriously, I shall proceed, for the rest of this talk, on the assumption that the linkage thesis is at least still empirically alive; that, as far as we know, what success and persistence we do find in psychopaths can be explained in ways that are consistent with lack of prudence. Besides, the interest in the type of agent that I am here supposing the psychopath to be seems to me not entirely hostage to the empirical question. We can think of the project along the lines of Michael Bratman’s creature construction,\textsuperscript{16} except with a perverse twist. Instead of asking what we could add to simpler agents to get the kind of creatures we take ourselves to be, we ask what we would have to destroy or disturb in creatures such as us to get disordered agents of the kind psychopaths are alleged to be. (Call this creature corruption

\textsuperscript{15} R. Hall and S.D. Benning suggest that findings in support of the dual deficit theory tend “to indicate that an individual high in the interpersonal–affective facet of psychopathy but not the antisocial facet might have the potential to function adaptively in the community without experiencing significant legal problems.” “The Successful Psychopath”, Psychopathy Handbook [cite].

\textsuperscript{16} The idea is adapted from Paul Grice. See “Valuing and the Will”, in Bratman 2007.
or deconstruction.) As in creature construction, we are not to imagine the changes in terms of the agents’ hardware but in terms of the moral/philosophical psychology (or refinements thereof) by which we understand ourselves. The thought is that we can learn from this exercise, even if it turns out that the linkage thesis is not true of actual creatures.

The idea that prudential and moral concerns are bound up with one another is not unfamiliar in philosophy, and we find in philosophical moral psychology and current theory of agency in particular a cluster of ideas that might help us capture what is amiss with psychopathic agency: that psychopaths are deficient as valuing agents, or as planning agents, or as caring agents, that they are wantons or incapable of achieving practical identities. These idioms are by no means equivalent, nor are they entirely rivals, and I have my favorites, but in what follows, I’ll not put too fine a point on it. For the ideas converge, roughly, on a generic explanation of the linkage thesis: that the common ground of the prudential and moral failures of is the incapacity for reflective normative orientation. This is not a surprising conclusion, but it needs working out.

7. Consider Cleckley’s patient “Chester”:

“Whatever strange goals or pseudo-goals there may be to prompt and shape his reactions as a member of the community, these too…fail to motivate him sufficiently, fail to induce decisions and acts that would give him the freedom to pursue them. It has been demonstrated to Chester repeatedly…that his

---

17 Suppose we accepted some form of the familiar idea that moral normativity can only be grounded in long-term rational self-interest. Then a being who—for whatever reason—were incapable of prudential reason could not make sense of morality either. The consideration that conformity to moral norms served long-term self-interest could have no grip on such agents. The explanation that I shall entertain here is not that the incapacity for imprudence is explanatorily prior to the incapacity for morality but that these incapacities have a common root.
characteristic acts put him in a situation [of confinement] he finds particularly disagreeable. This does not produce the slightest modification of his behavior.”

Cleckley 1975: 134.

As Cleckey observes, it is tempting to interpret the behavior of Chester and his ilk “as a rebellious manifestation, a symbolic protest against customs, principles, people and institutions that he will not accept.” (134). But Cleckley regards these interpretations as implausible. “If loitering, theft, swindling, ‘disgracing himself’, running up debts, and social sabotage in general are his goals, the pursuit of these he must give up when he comes under close supervision on the closed ward.” What strikes Cleckley as “an important clinical feature of the disorder” exhibited by his patients is precisely “the specific and obdurate difficulty in finding out anything at all about less superficial attitudes or real inner purposes or meanings” (134).

Tellingly, Cleckley speaks in the above passage of Chester’s ‘pseudo-goals’. Means-end normativity presumes a commitment to aims that, unlike mere desire, are regulative or normative for one’s choices. As a concern to properly manage one’s life, prudence is not confined to merely future desires. To focus on the future in this way would suggest that nothing is amiss with psychopaths’ relation to their actual present aims. Remarkably often, those ongoing concerns fail to inhibit shoplifting sprees or gambling-binges that imperil their liberty and livelihood. Put another way, psychopaths’ deficiencies of self-regard pertain to her present as much as to her future self. So the

---

18 “[E]verything about [Chester] suggests a drifting approach, a casual and weak impulse, a half-hearted whim rather than an explosive release of passion in the forbidden deed. Instead of a pathologic intensity of drive, there seems to be a pathologic general devaluation of life, a complex deficiency, confusion or malfunction in what chooses aims or directs impulse” (135).

19 Thanks to Agnieszka Jaworska for pressing me on this point.
problem is not merely that psychopaths are, so to speak, “present aim” agents. Although one cannot “manage” the past, prudential concern is nonetheless evinced in past regarding attitudes such as regret and remorse. (As Tom Nagel remarks, “Regret is to the past what prudence is to the future.”)  

The absence of ends in the sense indicated by Cleckley means that the so-called “egocentricity” of Tom, Chester, and their ilk is fundamentally different from genuine self-regard. In failing to take their ends seriously, these subjects do not, after all, treat themselves as worth much. An individual’s controlling sense of the importance of how his or her life goes supplies a critical standpoint from which one might find reasons for persisting in the face of distractions, for achieving coherence of aims, and for regretting how one has conducted oneself, as well as for a commitment to self-correction.

Just as psychopaths are blind to the claims of the moral life, they have no grip on the larger ethical question of “how we ought to live”. Despite Socrates, that question is to them a trivial or perhaps senseless matter. Of course, not all creatures who lack this capacity (or in whom it is unrealized) are psychopaths—brute animals and infants for example. Psychopathy is a disorder of rationally reflective social beings—beings for whom it is characteristic to have a life to lead.

---

20 There are of course asymmetries, but it would be peculiar for someone who cares about her future to be altogether indifferent to how her life has gone or will have gone.  
21 As Carl Elliot observes, “[W]ile the psychopath seems pathologically egocentric, he is nothing like an enlightened egoist. His life is frequently distinguished by failed opportunities, wasted chances and behaviour which is astonishingly self-destructive” (Elliot 1992, 210).  
22 This is closely related to a remark of Carl Elliot’s: “This poor [prudential] judgment seems to stem not so much from the psychopaths inadequate conception of how to reach his ends, but from an inadequate conception of what his ends are.” “Diagnosing Blame, Responsibility and the psychopath”, Journal of Medicine and Philosophy 17, 1992, 200-214.  
23 The absence of these critical reactions is indeed just an instance of a general trait on the PCL: “failure to accept responsibility for actions” (Hare and Neumann 2009: 623).
8. The idea that psychopaths lack practical normative orientation is basically the conclusion to which Cleckley is led by his extensive case studies of the phenomenon. “In contrast with all the various diversities of viewpoint and degrees of conviction found among ordinary people, the so-called psychopath holds no real viewpoint at all and is free of any sincere conviction in what might be called either good or evil” (Cleckley 1976, 371, footnote). He puts this conclusion in terms of an inability to experience anything as meaningful. Psychopathy consists in “a disorder at deep levels of personality integration [that] prevents experience from becoming adequately meaningful to the [psychopathic] subject” (my emphasis, Cleckley, 1976, 374).

Cleckley attributes this lack of meaningful experience to his subjects’ incapacity for “true and abiding loyalty to any principle or any person” (Cleckley 1976: 375). They consequently have no practical orientation other than that provided by the impulses that present themselves for satisfaction, which provides no basis for commitment. This detachment is registered in psychopaths’ limited emotional repertoire.

In considering the general shallowness of affect common to all members of this series in connection with their incapacity for object love, there is temptation to wonder about the possible interdependence of these faculties. Is it possible for tragic or transforming emotion to arise in any person without that peculiar and indescribable personal commitment to another? Or, if not to another personality, at least to some abstraction well outside the self? (Cleckley 1976: 350)

Consider another of Cleckley’s patients, ‘Max’:

---

24 This is not to say that psychopaths are at all despondent or depressed—on the contrary, they are remarkably immune to those maladies. This immunity does not mean that they are at ease. One of the notable characteristics of psychopaths, as Cleckley himself observes, is that they are easily bored and restless. I return to this point at the end.
[Max] is unfamiliar with the primary facts or data of what might be called personal values and is altogether incapable of understanding such matters. It is impossible for him to take even a slight interest in the tragedy or joy or the striving of humanity as presented in serious literature or art. He is also indifferent to all these matters in life itself. Beauty and ugliness, except in a very superficial sense, goodness, evil, love, horror, and humor have no actual meaning, no power to move him. He is, furthermore, lacking in the ability to see that others are moved. It is as though he were colorblind, despite his sharp intelligence, to this aspect of human existence. It cannot be explained to him because there is nothing in his orbit of awareness that can bridge the gap with comparison. He can repeat the words and say glibly that he understands, and there is no way for him to realize that he does not understand. (1976:40)

Here Cleckley sticks his neck out considerably farther than I have done in my statement of the common-ground claim. The moral and prudential deficiencies we have been considering are deficiencies in regard for persons, and therefore for respect and for human well-being, and this implied a poverty of corresponding emotional and sentimental responses. Cleckley’s conjecture implies that the emotional and conative deprivations will be rather more wide spread. These creatures will, on this conjecture, be not only deaf to the appeals of the moral law within and the claims of prudence, but also unmoved by the starry skies above, or the novels of Dostoevsky or old growth forests or the preservation of historic urban districts or folk music. On this account, the apparent absence of psychopaths from the ranks of accomplished artists, intellectuals, scientists, or devoted preservationists is not due solely to their characteristic impulsiveness. (Indeed, the explanatory connection might go in the other way round; they have no authoritative standpoint by which to monitor the impulses of the moment.) If Cleckley is right, psychopaths are bereft of any sense of the point of these disciplines.
But properly understood, this claim is not as far-fetched as it may seem. At any rate, it may not go significantly beyond the common-ground claim as I initially stated it. It would be one thing to claim, quite implausibly, that psychopaths cannot be good at math, or physics or tennis, and another thing to say that they love these as disciplines or practices. Since what we call disciplines are inherently interpersonal, even when practiced in isolation from others, devotion to them brings with it a sense of participating in the values of these enterprises with others. (That is one respect in which these devotions lead disciples to “transcend themselves,” submitting to “a higher calling”.)

What T.M. Scanlon insightfully observes about science could be said about art, or baseball: “those who take up science as a career have reason to try to be good scientists: to work hard, to choose lines of inquiry that are significant rather than those that are easiest or will get the most attention, to report their results accurately and in a way that will be helpful to other inquirers, and to treat the results of others fairly, recognizing their merits rather than simply emphasizing their weaknesses and deficiencies. Someone who failed to see strong reason to do these things could be said not to understand or not to care about the value of science, and to be in it just for the sake of money or fame or the thrill of competition.” Scanlon, 1998: 90-91. In the case of literature, which deals so much with moral and ethical issues, issues about meaning, it is even more plausible to think that psychopathy unsuits one for it.

Nevertheless, it is harder to see how the argument for Cleckley’s case is supposed to go in the case of the appreciation of many aesthetic qualities of music and nature with, for example, the capacity to bring tears to ours eyes. It would be quite remarkable if these were experiences unavailable to the psychopaths. If so, what would that teach us about
both these experiences and psychopathy? The splendid, the sublime, the wonderous: Are these aesthetic experiences in some sense ethical? Here I don’t know what to say. This is a question that as far as I know has not been pursued.

In sum, on Cleckley’s account, a common ground of psychopaths’ prudential and moral shortcomings is the incapacity to value anything whatever (where valuing, as before, entails at a minimum devotion to ends as standards of self-correction). This explains the sense in which psychopaths are bound within the horizon of their present inclinations: their practical perspective is exhausted by the imperatives of the impulses with which they happen to find themselves.

9. Christine Korsgaard, Normativity and Practical Identity

10. Practical Fragmentation and Discursive incoherence

11. Kennett on Psychopathy as Anormative Agency

12. Psychopaths as rational wantons

13. In conclusion
APPENDIX

Clinical diagnoses of, and psychological and neurophysiological research on, psychopathy are based largely on the characteristics originally set out by Hervey Cleckley, beginning in the 1940’s, and refined and “factored” in Robert Hare’s “checklist”.

Cleckley’s List of Chief Characteristics of Psychopathy (1964)

1. Superficial charm and good “intelligence”
2. Absence of delusions and other signs of irrational thinking
3. Absence of “nervousness” or psychoneurosis
4. Unreliability
5. Untruthfulness and insincerity
6. Lack of remorse or shame
7. Inadequately motivated antisocial behavior
8. Poor judgment and failure to learn by experience.
9. Pathologic egocentricity and incapacity for love
10. General poverty in major affective reactions
11. Specific loss of insight [inability to see himself as others see him, to “size up” what he has done and been]
12. Unresponsiveness in general interpersonal relations
13. Fantastic and uninviting behavior with drink and sometimes w/o
14. Suicide rarely carried out
15. Sex life impersonal, trivial, and poorly integrated
16. Failure to follow any life plan

(The Mask of Sanity, 4th edition, 362-3)

Robert Hare’s Psychopathy Checklist—Revised (PCL-R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1: Interpersonal/affective</th>
<th>Factor 2: impulsive/antisocial</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glib/superficial charm</td>
<td>Need for stimulation/proneness to boredom</td>
<td>Promiscuous sexual behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandiose sense of self-worth</td>
<td>Parasitic lifestyle</td>
<td>Many short term marital affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathological lying</td>
<td>Poor behavioral controls</td>
<td>Criminal versatility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conning/manipulative</td>
<td>Early behavioral problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of remorse or guilt</td>
<td>Lack of realistic, long-term goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow affect</td>
<td>Impulsivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callous/lack of empathy</td>
<td>Irresponsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to accept responsibility for own actions</td>
<td>Juvenile delinquency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revocation of conditional release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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