## On *Disorders of Personality*

I will now move to Millon’s 2011 *Disorders of Personality: Introducing a DSM/ICD Spectrum from Normal to Abnormal*. This book works from the personality disorders described by the various versions of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* and the *International Classification of Diseases*, proposes new models for understanding them in relation with one another and the person as a whole. It also helpfully fills in much of the spectrum from personality disorders to normal personality styles as well as blends between personalities. I will at times also find it useful to fill in details with *Personality Disorders in Modern Life*, Second Edition, by Theodore Millon and Seth Grossman, Carrie Millon, Sarah Meagher, and Rowena Ramnath (2004).

### Re-Introduction to Personality

As we’ve just jumped 20 years forward in Personology research, we ask again: What is personality? Theodore Millon defines one as a set of “styles of adaptive functioning”. At least, he defines the non-disordered kind of personality as such, but I’ll get into the concept of personality disorder later; indeed, further discourse on the meaning of the term “personality” will also wait until later. For now I will just discuss how Millon analyses the concept in its bio-evolutionary aspects. By this I mean this first section will instead move directly to break down a personality into functional parts, hypothesized for their functional role in a system driven by natural selection. I take this material from the first chapter of his 2011 textbook. Following this, I will return to the 2004 text for some further analysis of personality.

### Justification of a Taxonomy Based in Biology

Beginning with a taxonomy of the aims of personality’s functioning requires justification. My aim here is to extend the philosophical tradition while being informed by the psychological. By recommending Theodore Millon, I am also taking a side, advocating for a biological point of view in psychology and for the need for a good explanation of the psychological vehicles, as understood by the various‌ ‌schools‌ ‌of‌ ‌Psychology‌ ‌of‌ ‌Personality. In the dissertation, I will answer what arguments he is in and who disagrees with him. This text serves as evidence in favor of Millon's claim in Chapter 1 and its contextualization elsewhere.

Millon synthesizes many historical sources from a variety of perspectives. As such, I chose Millon's book, which I believe is critical for further synthesizing this theory and model‌ ‌with‌ ‌ other ‌ theories ‌ and ‌ ‌ models. I will later contrast my Millonian model with other models. My hypothesis is that they will generally be able to be incorporated or explained. This process of synthesis of psychological theories is illustrated below.

#### Illustration of Process of Synthesis of Psychological Theories



Who would disagree with basing a view of personality on natural selection? Disagreements may arise from the factual accuracy of Darwinian theories of evolution or from the purported relationship between personality and natural selection. Regarding the former, I think that there’s a strong enough consensus in the field of Biology for us to accept such theories despite some people having reasons to object. Regarding the latter, we should consider the ways the relationship might be different. According to Millon, we should expect this evolutionary model of personality to be accurate because each facet of personality developed through evolution.

Allow me to illustrate. For billions of years, the Earth had no life on it. Sometime in the very distant past, some molecular structures self-replicated in organized ways. There are arguments over whether to find the origin of life in the origin of encapsulation, metabolism, or RNA reproduction. Regardless, cells formed, and they reproduced. After some time, multicellular organisms began to form. These structures of many cells replicate themselves, i.e. they reproduce, and while at first reproduction was always a single organism produced by a single organism, later developments in biological life on Earth allowed for two organisms to input in the reproduction of many organisms, i.e. they later sexual reproduced. Some continue to reproduce asexually. How many times an organism reproduces varies based on the length, circumstances, and activities of its life. As time moves forward, organisms die. The circumstances and activities of each life determine the length of each life. Thus the circumstances and activities of each organism, as I’m using “organism” here to mean as I just used “life” to mean, determine when it lives, and how many it contributes to the reproduction of. Applied to each organism in the sequence of life, this becomes the principle of natural selection. As we are still humans generally in the process of sexual reproduction, the personalities we enact must have come from some combination of the human and her environment, and the human is the result of a process of biological evolution, and the humans have such a big influence on our environments and our perceptions of them that the human is a good place to look first.

Being requires distinction (from non-being). Life can be understood, then, as a process of moving an arrangement at time t(x) to an arrangement at time t(y). It gets more complicated from here. Though we can also consider sequences without necessarily getting time measurement involved. Life is seen from the point of view of personality as having length, circumstances, and activities. Yet there are other factors that create personality that can override‌ ‌the‌ ‌human‌ ‌element. Accordingly, you may think other factors ‌ ‌ should ‌ be ‌ ‌ the ‌ ‌ foundational ‌ ‌ components ‌ ‌ of ‌ ‌ our ‌ ‌ model. What are these other factors? The same question will open the chapter on the context of personality, that is, what other factors influence human behavior besides personality, and how are the parameters for‌ ‌defining‌ ‌personality‌ ‌determined?[[1]](#footnote-0) There are many possibilities to describe, including the physical, the chemical, the anthropological, the psychological, the sociological, the legal, and the clinical, but I can say with confidence that the biological and thus human is both accurate and encompassing of the other possibilities’ explanatory powers, while also being the most secure and salient. Millon’s justification for the model uses the relatively high level of unity and evidentiary support in Biology to justify its use in priority over psychological, sociological, and other possibilities that are not yet in a state of theoretical unity. It seems reasonable to expect that the biological study of humans would be far more important than Physical Science in this domain. One could start a model of personality with the Physics of Personality, but its benefits besides sparseness, when sparseness is a benefit, are also found in Biology. Although biological understanding is teleological, the end-seeking organisms it understands are mechanical and are therefore physical. Social, practical, and cultural understandings of personality are‌ ‌useful‌ ‌to‌ ‌understand‌ ‌personality, but they are multifarious and thus any Personology would have to choose between them, whereas Biologists have already come to something of a consensus that we can work from.

1. Chapter 3 [↑](#footnote-ref-0)