

Stanisław Siek

The appliance of the knowledge of psychology of personality in the study of the functioning of a state

Collectanea Theologica 58/Fasciculus specialis, 203-217

1988

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

STANISŁAW SIEK, WARSZAWA

**THE APPLIANCE OF THE KNOWLEDGE
OF PSYCHOLOGY OF PERSONALITY
IN THE STUDY OF THE FUNCTIONING OF A STATE**

The psychology of personality, shortly speaking, deals with three main problems: the structure of personality, its origin and development and the methods of inquiry.

Generally speaking the problem of the structure of personality seeks the explanation of the texture, organisation of the psychological life as a whole; it gives a description of the independent or more important elements of this texture and relations between them. Psychologists solve these questions differently, therefore we have different "conceptions", "theories" or models of personality.

When dealing with the problem of origin and the development of a personality we try to give an answer to the questions: what factors condition the development of personality and its particular elements; what sort of regularities are there and what kind of processes take part in it. The problem of methods of searching is similar. Some trends and schools of thinking prefer different methods of inquiry, but there are more and more of the methods and they become more and more reliable and accurate.

In spite of the lack of a homogeneous theory of personality accepted by most of the psychologists and in spite of various opinions about the origin and development of personality, our knowledge becomes richer and more integrated so it can be used for the study of art, culture and perhaps even in the analysis of the functioning of state. In this paper I would like to pay attention to some of the possibilities in this field.

The purpose of this report is to present a certain way of dealing with the analysis of the functioning of a state taken as a structure **ANALOGOUS** to the structure of mental life as a an entity called personality.

The base of this analysis is an **ASSUMPTION** claiming that a state as an entity functions analogously to a personality. Approving this assumption we have to point out some elements in the structure of state which are analogous to elements of the structure of personality. Having these elements we can put the question: how do the analogous elements of the structure of personality function and what kind of regularities are involved? Having the information about the functioning of separate elements of personality we are

able to ATTRIBUTE by analogy similar functions and "behaviours" to the body of state.

What sort of results can be obtained by this approach?

1. Firstly, this approach gives us a certain MODEL of the functioning of state as a whole.

2. Secondly, having the model of the functioning of the "normal" state like the models of functioning of the "normal" personality we can evaluate the QUALITY OF FUNCTIONING of a certain state in question by comparing it to analogous models of PERSONALITY WELL ADAPTED, MATURE, HEALTHY and to models of UNADAPTED, IMMATURE PERSONALITY.

What are the weak points of this approach of analysis of the functioning of state?

There can be some doubts about the basic assumption that the structure of state is analogous to the structure of personality and that the functioning of personality is analogous to the functioning of state.

But in science we can accept certain assumptions if they are potentially fruitful, i.e. allow us to make up a certain model of functioning of something, a model which is logical and coherent, which can deliver some information about a certain field of reality.

Another weak point of this approach is that opinions about a personality, its structure and its functioning are not univocally determined. There exist a dozen or so of different conceptions of personality which point out different elements of personality structure and different forces determining its functioning.

Personality Structure and State Structure

There are more than 50 definitions of personality. This expression usually means the STRUCTURED ENTIRETY of one's mental life.

The simplest definitions describe personality as a whole, a sum of different traits and qualities. Prince, for example, describes personality as the sum-total of all biological innate dispositions, impulses, tendencies, desires and instincts of an individual and dispositions and tendencies acquired by experience.

There are groups of definitions emphasizing the uniqueness of this structure in particular persons. According to Shoen personality is a structured system, a functioning unit of habits, dispositions, emotional attitudes which markedly distinguish one person from another.

One of the most oftenly cited descriptions is Allport's definition saying personality is a dynamic organisation of those psychophysical systems of the individual which determine his unique way of adjusting to the environment (Allport, 1949, p 43—48).

There are different opinions in modern psychology on WHAT SORT of ELEMENTS the mental life of an individual, called personality, organised of. Different authors specify various elements and forms of this organisation. These opinions are called personality theories, or more adequately — conceptions of personality structures. There are more than ten conceptions of personality structures and they are usually divided into conceptions of TRAITS, TYPES, FACTORS, PSYCHOANALYTICAL concepts and the so-called traditional concepts. These divisions are not separate and very often they overlap each other.

According to adherents of concept of traits, for example Allport's or Guiford's, the basic element of the organization called personality is the trait of personality. Groups of traits most often accounted as personality structure elements are: psychical needs, drives, capacities, emotions, attitudes.

The conceptions of types are based on the notion of type. Adherents of this concepts — for example Kretschmer, Sheldon, Heymans, Pawłow account the personality structure as an organization of types of temperament, character, temperament and character, attitudes — distinguish from 2 up to 8 types of personality.

Conceptions of factors are based on the notion of factor or dimension of personality. For example Eysenck distinguishes two reverse dimensions of personality: extraversion-introversion, emotional stabilization-neuroticism, and Cattell distinguishes 16 reverse dimensions (Cattell, 1957).

Psychoanalytical concepts of personality distinguish 3 fields of traits and reactions of personality in the personality structure: Id, Ego, Superego. In the scope of Id two groups of instincts or drives are pointed out: Eros and Thanatos and in the scope of Ego more than ten traits called the defense mechanisms and 4 characters: oral, anal, phallic, genital (Blum, 1964).

"Traditional" concepts of personality structure use the notion of type and traits as elements of personality structure. According to Remplein, who could be accounted as an adherent of this concept, the personality structure is an organization of drives, temperament, character, will, emotions and abilities (Remplein, 1970).

From the analysis of different concepts follows that most of psychologists distinguish similar basic elements of the personality structure but they call them differently and sometimes attribute them a little different scope of functions. As basic elements most of the psychologists distinguish:

1. The forces involved in the personality determining energy and direction to one's behaviour.
2. The center guiding one's behaviour. Exponents of different lines of thinking call this center: will, Ego, Self, self concept.
3. The element of personality structure containing one's ideals,

patterns of acting, a set of moral injunctions and commands. This element of personality structure is sometimes called the ideal of self, Superego, conscience, predominant values.

4. The forces involved in the personality, the task of which is to protect the individual against fear and minimization, feeling of guilt, negative self-concept.

5. Abilities, emotions, attitudes.

Approving the assumption that a state is an analogous structure to the structure called personality, we can try to distinguish the elements of state which are analogous to the elements of personality structure.

One of the oldest and the simplest definitions of state, Aristotle's definition, describes it as a union of people, tribes and families in certain places to protect them against harm and with the purpose of gaining perfect and self-sufficient life (Aristotel, *Politics* III, p. 117).

Modern definitions of state describe it as complex organization of people on certain territory. Ehrlich speaks about state as a global organization uniting all classes of society, strata and social groups.

In another place he describes the state as a hierarchical and territorial organization of coercion which fulfills the economical, political, ideological interests of the class in possession of the sources of production (Ehrlich, 1979, p. 39—40).

In plain words we can say the state is a global organization of people on a certain territory where one group in power exerts from other people certain obligated behaviours for the sake of their own interest or of the majority.

In the state structure, like in the personality structure, we can distinguish certain elements fulfilling different functions. Usually we distinguish:

I. Systems of organization of power (ruling decisive organs).

II. Systems of organization of coercion (administration, courts, public prosecutor's office).

III. Systems of control.

IV. Systems of economical, cultural and other organizations (Ehrlich, 1979, p. 73—74).

Looking at the structure of any state we notice some elements of POLARIZATION, Center of power guide the citizens' behaviour or extort obligatory behaviour from them imposed by law and norms of social coexistence, or a behaviour serving the interests of the state as a whole. There is in this organization a struggle of more or less antagonistic forces.

Let us try to confront now the more important analogies between state and personality.

In both of them a struggle of antagonistic forces takes place. The struggle of these forces was emphasised even in the simplest

models of mental life. So reason and will were opposed to emotions, drives and passions. The soul opposed to body. Reason to emotions. Freud and psychoanalitics were those who in particular paid attention to the struggle of antagonistic forces acting within the personality. The polarization of personality and the struggle of antagonistic forces appeared on different levels of personality. It is expressed in the opposition between consciousness and unconsciousness, infantilism and maturity, behaviour improperly and properly adjusted, tendencies towards egoistic and pro-social behaviours. The struggle of antagonistic forces within personality is to be found in the relation between self-concept and ideal of self, the level of aspirations and psychophysical predispositions, the tension of psychical needs and the possibilities of relieving them in acting of the will and character.

The second analogous element of the state and personality is the ruling center, the center of power. I mentioned that the psychology of personality describes it as a self, Ego, self-concept, will.

The guiding center of personality like the center of state power has its "superstructure". Those are: one's ideals, patterns of acting, scales of values, philosophy of life and what psychoanalitics call the Superego. The ruling center of the state also has its superstructure in the form of a certain philosophy, outlook on life and ideology.

The third analogous element of personality and state is the system of control and coercion. In a state this function is carried out by a specialized institution and also by what is called "public opinion". In a personality the control systems are described as conscience, ideals and norms, Superego, moral norms, norms of philosophy of life. There are also some more or less unconscious structures of control of personality.

These are dispositions which are the effect of experienced rancours, acquired complexes, properties of self-concept formed in early childhood.

Some of the "means of coercion" used by the guiding center of personality are: fear, anxiety, feeling of guilt, depreciation of one's self-concept, loss of euphoria, worsening of frame of mind, mental discomfort, remorse, macabre dreams, feeling of loneliness, feeling of senselessness of life. There are also "positive" means, for example: self-respect, complacency, joy of life, inner restfulness, signs of approbation from others, increase of inner prestige, feeling of power.

Having stated the important analogies between the personality structure and state structure we can make further steps in our analysis. Now there arises the question of choosing a conception of personality as the basis of this analysis. As it was stated there are more than ten significant personality conceptions. Not all can be

useful to the same degree. For this kind of analysis are useful theories which have the analogous elements mentioned above well described. For example, the psychoanalytic conception, theory of Allport, Murray, Lewin, Lersch.

Since particular conceptions of personality contain some elements described better than other, the eclectic-analytical attitude could be more useful.

It would be based on the description of particular SETS of personality structure on the base of the models which contain these elements well defined and on the base of experimental inquiry and clinical observations of these elements. In this way we could get as a base of the state analysis a conception of personality structure which allows, for example, to analyse the psychic needs according to Murray's conception, self-concept according to Allport's conception and the defense mechanisms according to psychoanalytics and modern clinical studies.

Of course, such an attitude is theoretically cohesive, but it allows to describe many "reactions and behaviours" of state, what is the most important for this kind of analysis.

Following this way we would obtain the THEORETICAL MODEL OF FUNCTIONING OF A STATE which would tell us how a state CAN work and function. This model would allow us to analyse the functioning of any chosen state.

It would be something of a theory of functioning of a state considered as an organization analogous to a personality.

Basing on such a scheme we would be able to make the analysis of state's needs, its self-concept, its defense mechanisms, attitudes or other elements of "personality of state".

Now arises a question about the way of doing it, about the proper method.

The Method of Analysis of Functioning of a State Taken as an Organization Analogous to Personality

Psychology of personality has at its disposal several methods of study. There are, for example, questionnaires, tests, interviews, inquiries, laboratory and natural experiments, special methods of creation analysis, for example analysis of works of art, systematic observations. Some of the methods can be useful for the analysis of functioning of a state.

In this report I shall deal with the possibility of using only one method — the simplest and used as one of the first in the study of mental life — the method of questioning. By this I mean analysis of the spontaneous or structured expressions of a person for the study of his personality.

Let us suppose the method is used by a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist. He speaks with the patient or investigates him and on the basis of the accepted model of functioning of personality, or on the base of the conception of illness and personality disturbances, he sets in order the information he got from the patient and he puts a definite "diagnosis". The quantity and quality of the patient's expressions and their content is an important information for the investigator.

Every practising psychologist knows how much information about the patient's personality he can get out of the analysis of his expression. We can get information about his emotions and feeling his psychical needs, his attitudes and anticipations, his self-concept, the struggle of the defense mechanisms, aspirations and rancours.

In a similar way we can study the functioning of state — by analysing "the expression of the state". There are many possibilities of studying the "state's language". The state speaks to us by settled rules and instructions, announcements and appeals, through radio and TV, through newspapers.

I think the most precise and objective study of the "state's language" is the analysis of the press. Usually every state has a certain newspaper which is an organ of a more or less official statement and this newspaper should be the subject of analysis.

The first step of such an analysis would be, as I mentioned before, accepting the assumption that the state functions analogously to a personality of a human being.

The second step is the description of the particular elements of personality structure on the base of conceptions described best. This description will be the theoretical base, the base for interpretation of "state's language".

The third step is the proper psychological analysis based on the analysis of the contents of press.

The analysis of the contents of press is commonly used nowadays by politologists, publicists, some sociologists. It is a pity that the keys used by them are not consent to psychological analysis, and because of this we should base on our own keys, i.e. the theories of personality structure and its particular elements.

Still many elements of modern methods of analysis of the content of press can be used in psychological inquiries.

For example, in Walery Pisarek's book "The analysis of the content of press" we can find some information on how to describe the intensity of statement; what units of measurement and estimation to use, how to study the relations between the contents and form of news, or the relations between contents of news and reality (Pisarek, 1983).

Let us show some theoretical possibilities of studying the self-concept of the state and the functioning of defense mechanisms.

The Self-Concept as a Guiding of Personality of a Human Being and the Self-Concept of a State

The centers and structures ruling a person's behaviour and integrating his actions have different names in different schools of thinking in psychology.

The majority of present-day psychologists, particularly those of the experimental attitude, use the expression self-concept for this center.

The self-concept acts in a person's personality as a factor which unites behaviour, endows behaviour with a homogenous mark, allows to prophet the future behaviour. It is said that the self-concept is kind of a map accordingly to which a person conducts his behaviour.

The modern psychologists describe very often self-concept as an organisation of psychical traits and properties of the organism recognized as one's own, specific for self of somebody.

Nuttin, according to Rogers and Sarbin, describes the self-concept as a consciousness of one's own being and acting, as a subject and a set of experiences recognized as one's own, what one can say about oneself when one says "I", "me". (Nuttin, 1968, p. 43).

Dana defines self-concept as a set of a different degree of awareness of ideas and feelings and expressions concerning oneself (Dana, 1966, p. 184).

According to Combs and Snygg self-concept is an organisation of all properties which an individual calls his own or self (Snygg, Combs, 1959, p. 12).

Self-concept is a more or less aware knowledge about one's own possibilities, psychophysical properties, needs, status among other people, one's own emotions, appearance, capabilities.

From experimental inquiries it follows that people are aware of some of their properties very well and are able to speak about them clearly but have vague feelings about other properties and there are probably some recognized as "one's own" a person is not at all aware of at present.

Self-concept is the basic element of a personality because the individual's behaviour depends upon what the self-concept is like. In most cases a person does not act according to his objectively described psychophysical properties and his psychophysical possibilities but according to „how he sees the real environment”.

The self-concept of a person may have different properties involving a person's behaviour and leaving a specific impress on him.

The self-concept can be:

global and differentiated,
overstated and lowered,
stabilized and unstabilized.

Approving the assumption that the state functions analogously to personality we assume that the managing center of the state also has a certain self-concept and that the properties of this image involve and leave an impress on the functioning of the state.

We can therefore assume that the ruling center of the state may have a global or differentiated self-concept, overstated or lowered, stabilized or unstabilized.

What kind of activities can be caused by these properties of self-concept?

The global and differentiated self-concept

The global self-concept is marked out by vague knowledge about one's possibilities and real environment, by not knowing one's wishes and attempts. There is an uncertain feeling about one's social role and about one's mission. The global self-concept is characteristic of an uncritical and undurable acceptance of opinions and suggestions of other people.

The differentiated self-concept means that the individual knows exactly what he wants, he knows and realistically describes his own possibilities, he sticks to a definite line of acting.

The ruling center of the state of a differentiated self-concept imposes clear and precise lines of action. It realistically describes its possibilities and knows exactly what aims it wants to achieve.

A state with the ruling center of a global self-concept has a dim undurable feeling of its role and mission. It estimates itself and its possibilities unrealistically. It takes up uncritically and not for long different ideas of action, it is susceptible to suggestions.

The overstated and lowered self-concept

The overstated self-concept would be expressed in over-estimation of one's possibilities, in the inclination for uncritical undertaking of various actions which are beyond one's actual possibilities. The overstated self-concept and the uncritical undertaking of too difficult actions cause frustration and this leads to accusing other people of one's own faults, falling into conflicts, demanding unjustified favours from others. The overstated self-concept usually comes together with low resistance to difficult situations, threat and stress.

The lowered self-concept, lower self-estimation, causes the state to limit, like a person, its activity, it does less than is able to, it obtains less than the objective possibilities allow. It is characteristic for the lowered self-concept to abandon some actions recognized as difficult or to give up such actions.

The stabilized and unstabilized self-concept

Self-concept can be stabilized or unstabilized independently of what type it is, i.e.: global, overstated, lowered or "normal" that means proportionally far-away from the ideal self.

The optimal functioning of the individual and state is conditioned by the stabilized, realistic and differentiated self-concept.

The stabilized self-concept leaves a homogenous impress on activity, it goes together with the feeling of self-value, it gives the stability of behaviour and it is accompanied by a small activity of the defense mechanisms.

The unstabilized self-concept merges and integrates actions badly, it causes the lack of a homogenous reference system for an estimation of one's own actions.

The self-concept conditions in a personality structure a stability of behaviour, keeping of a more or less fixed line of activity. The guiding center of the personality as well as of the state endeavour to some extent automatically after defending the stability of self-concept and therefore after defending its line of activity, no matter whether it is an efficient, mature or optimal activity or on the contrary — immature and non-functional.

There are a few ways of unconscious defense of the self-concept and the line of one's activity: negativism, shameful non-disclosure of one's activities, idealization of oneself, non-perception of what is incompatible with the self-concept and the present activity line, "patching up the self-concept" by rationalizations.

Negativism appears in stubborn hesitation in taking up new activities and looking for new solutions and also in using the attitude of "No" to all new enterprises. It is usually accompanied by the mechanism of defense of self-concept stability namely the excessive fixation of one's line of activity, restiveness, activity "just to spite", going all lengths.

Another way of defending one's self-concept is the idealization of oneself. The individual or the guiding center of state start to attribute to itself maximally good features, all what is best and in this way one puts himself beyond reach of criticism.

The knowledge of psychology of personality enables us to study the functioning of another aspect of state self-concept — its ESSENCE.

Self-concept is built of different sets of traits and properties which are recognized as one's own and specific for oneself. The self-concept of every human being can be recognized as a concept of one's own, private "personality structure".

Submitting the state self-concept to analysis we can put the

question: what kind of activity, what kind of policy could be expected of the state if the people in the ruling center represented a definite mental type of people. We know from somewhere else that we seldom deal with clear types of personality. It is also known that in the ruling centers of states there are people of different types of personality. But looking into this issue from the point of view of the theory of functioning of state we can ask such a question and try to answer it.

In modern psychology there are different typologies and such a theoretical analysis is possible. Using the terminology of psychoanalytics one can ask what kind of activity and what kind of policy can be expected of the ruling center of state if it was dominated by introvertic or extravertic people, by people with an oral, anal or phallic character? What if it was dominated by "subtle aristocrats" or "practical and full of energy people" — using the terminology of Kretschmer.

One could ask this question basing on the typology of Znaniecki. What kind of policy could be expected if it were the "people of work", "people of amusement" or "well-bred people" at power?

Limited by time I shall not continue this issue. I shall pass on to remarks about defense mechanisms of an individual and a state.

The defense mechanisms of personality and of state

Mechanisms of defense are a set of personality traits the task of which is to defend the individual against the feeling of fear, disquiet, against feeling of guiltiness, the perception of disadvantageous negative features of self-concept, against shame, against diminishing oneself and disapprobation from others.

Typical for the mechanism of defense is that they act unconsciously, that means the person does not realize he arouses the defense mechanisms.

Describing the mechanisms of defense Laughlin says they are specific processes working outside the conscience that a human being is not aware of. The mechanisms of defense are automatically and unconsciously working tendencies attempting to solve the emotional conflict safely and to diminish the emotional tension and fear (Laughlin, 1963, p. 10).

The majority of authors taking up these problems specify and describe the following mechanisms of defense:

Repression,	Compensation,
Suppression,	Reaction Formation,
Displacement,	Regression,
Rationalization,	Projection.

Accepting the assumption that the state functions analogously to personality we assume that the state, like the human being, arouses defense mechanisms and uses them.

The sense of the activity of the defense mechanisms of state and personality is similar: to defend oneself against degradation, negative self-concept, fear and public opinion.

The main structures "estimating" the functioning of state is the ruling center, the opinions of other countries, public opinion. Therefore the mechanisms of defense would have to defend a state from contradictory tendencies emerging simultaneously from the ruling center, from the pressure of other states and from the pressure of the society. Here are some examples of the functioning of the chosen defense mechanisms.

Repression and supression

Repression is an automatic blocking restraining the reactions of the organism or personality which cause a feeling of fear, shame, guiltiness, negative change of self-concept.

It is characteristic for the feature of repression that the restrained impulses, for example the impulse of aggression or domination cannot admittedly be disclosed but it does not loose its energy which still demands relieving of tension. So what is forced out is not revealed but still tends to disclose itself and there is still a need for certain energy to keep the forced out tendencies restrained.

The mechanism of supression works like the mechanism of repression with the exception that in supression the individual realizes he restrains some thoughts, impulses, tendencies, actions or stops some actions, whereas repression works automatically and without consciousness.

The simplest example of repression and supression acting in the state body is the so-called "taboo" theme, not speaking and writing about certain things that could be dangerous for the state and could spoil its positive image in the internal and external public opinion.

Displacement or transference

Displacement or transference is a mechanism of defense which is based on the fact that feeling or emotion is TRANSFERED from a primarily significant object to another.

A state manipulates emotions and lines of needs of citizens and makes such "substitutions". For example in the early ages often the person of the father of a young man was substituted by the person of the king. The young man transferred most of his emotions (love, respect, obedience, devotion) to his father.

Another example of displacement is transferring patriotic feelings for ancient personages to personages of today. One more example is directing and transferring hostile emotions to some definite objects and persons.

From psychological practice are known cases of displacement called substitution. Substitution often manifests itself in the development of some harmful habit or entanglement in some tiring activity as to avoid solving a serious conflict or prevent the disclosure of desires and needs not possible to be carried into effect at the present moment.

An example of the functioning of substitution mechanisms in any state can be the undertaking of senseless wars, the undertaking of irrelevant political actions, the entanglement in unnecessary economical investments surpassing possibilities.

C o m p e n s a t i o n

Compensation is a defense mechanism working without the participation of consciousness, that is an individual desires to EQUILIBRATE or REDEEM the defects and faults he possesses or THINKS he possesses in some other activity not connected with these real or imagined defects.

At the base of the process of compensation is usually the feeling of discredited value, uncertainty, diminished feeling of security. If an individual has this kind of conviction about himself or has feeling of defeat, unfulfillment, he tries to gain a vicarious satisfaction and increase his self-value.

Intensive diplomatic activities, exaggerated investment in, for example sport and pressing for results, mythologizing a country's history and presenting one's nation as strong, wise and noble serve as examples of the functioning of state compensation mechanism.

R a t i o n a l i z a t i o n

Rationalization is a mechanism of defense a person is not aware of and which consists of one's motives, emotions, desires which are unacceptable, seem bad, repulsive, unsuitable to one's dignity, to noble motives and emotions.

Rationalization is often manifested by exculpation of one's disapproved activities by giving them higher motivation and explaining them by ultimate necessity.

The same is the case with attributing one's fault for one's failures to another person; also exaggeration in stressing the soundness of one's action which is aimless, immature and ineffective.

Satisfying the strong needs of aggression, prestige, esteem, greed for power is masked by the people at power as service for

ideas or carrying out a historical mission and can serve as examples of the rationalization mechanism.

Rationalization can sometimes take the form of an unconscious deformation of the image of the work of an institution, a group of people, persons.

The processes of deformation — rationalization consist of exaggerated criticism, pointing out inefficiency, stupidity, negligence. In this kind of criticism an individual or institution disguises the feeling of its uselessness, ineffectiveness and in the criticism of others defends its own image.

Reaction formation

The defense mechanism of reaction formation lies in the fact that a person behaves in a manner CONTRARY to what strong impulses and tendencies impose on him and which are "unapprovable" and cause fear and condemnation.

So a restrained and suppressed aggression appears as a reaction formation in the form of an excessive kind heart, politeness and complaisance, ambition and pride as a humility and subservience, malevolence as excessive friendliness, desire for isolation as an exaggerated wish of being together.

In the activity of the state we can observe reaction formation in any excessive statements, assurances and promises. Analysing these exaggeratedly expressed emotions we can guess there exist within the state forces which act in the opposite direction.

We distinguish the functioning of reaction formation from "normal" behaviours by their form of exaggeration, excessive intensity and frequency of expression.

Regression

Regression is a defense mechanism which consists in attempting to solve situations of conflict by applying behaviours "below normal level", behaviours specific for the earlier stages of development described as immature, childish and infantile.

We could speak about regression in the functioning of a state if we had noticed in its activity less mature actions than usual. As examples can serve such behaviours like manifestation of excessive passivity, dependence, demand of care, support, exposure of egoism, narcissism (narcissism — an unjustified feeling of omnipotence plus self-love).

The introduction to regressive behaviours of states and individuals is stopping and fixation of the development at a certain stage and constant returning to these fixations in difficult and conflict situations. Symptoms of regression of adults experiencing diffi-

culties with adjustment are hypochondrical attitudes, demands for special privileges, care and forbearance. If a state excessively stresses symptoms of its "difficulties" or "illnesses" it demands special privileges so we can assume it applies the defense mechanism of regression as to increase its feeling of security or to improve its image in the external and internal public opinion.

I showed here only a part of the manifestation of some of the defense mechanisms in the functioning of state. Just as previously I pointed out some of the possibilities of analysing the self-concept of a state.

It is possible to study other elements of the functioning of "state personality" similarly to the way presented, like: psychical needs, dispositions and attitudes, rancours and complexes.

The report presented shows some theoretical possibilities psychology of personality gives us. The application of these possibilities in some concrete analysis is a question for a separate report.

Bibliography

- Allport, G. W. *Personality a Psychological Interpretation*, Constable and Comp., London, 1949, II ed.
- Arystoteles, *Polityka*, PWN, Warszawa, 1964.
- Blum, G. S.: *Psychoanalytic Theories of Personality*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1964.
- Cattell, R. B.: *Personality*, World Book Comp., New York, 1957.
- Dana, R. H.: *Foundations of Clinical Psychology*, D. Van Nostrand, Princeton, 1966.
- Ehrlich, S.: *Wstęp do nauki o państwie i prawie*, PWN, Warszawa 1979.
- Laughlin, H. P.: *Mental Mechanisms*, Butterworths, Washington, 1963.
- Lersch, P.: *Aufbau der Person*, Barth, Leipzig, 1970, XI ed.
- Lewin K.: *A Dynamic Theory of Personality*, McGraw-Hill Book Comp, New York, 1935.
- Murray, H. A.: *Explorations in Personality*, Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1953, V ed.
- Nuttin, J.: *Struktura osobowości*, PWN, Warszawa 1963.
- Pisarek, W.: *Analiza zawartości prasy*, Ośr. Bad. Prasoznawczych, Kraków, 1983.
- Remplein, H.: *Psychologie der Persönlichkeit*, Reinhard, München, 1963, IV ed.
- Siek, S.: *Osobowość*, ATK, Warszawa, 1982.
- Snygg, D.; Combs, A. W.: *Individual Behavior. A Perceptual Approach to Behavior*, Harper, London, II ed.