The Routledge Handbook on Deviance brings together original contributions on deviance, with a focus on new, emerging, and hidden forms of deviant behavior. The editors have curated a comprehensive collection highlighting the relativity of deviance, with chapters exploring the deviant behaviors related to sport, recreation, body modification, chronic health conditions, substance use, religion and cults, political extremism, sexuality, online interaction, mental and emotional disorders, elite societal status, workplace issues, and lifestyle. The selections review competing definitions and orientations and a wide range of theoretical premises while addressing methodological issues involved in the study of deviance. Each section begins with an introduction by the editors, anchoring the topics in relevant theoretical and methodological contexts and identifying common themes as well as divergence.

Providing state-of-the-art scholarship on deviance in modern society, this handbook is an invaluable resource for researchers and students engaged in the study of deviance across a range of disciplines including criminology, criminal justice, sociology, anthropology, and interdisciplinary departments, including justice studies, social transformation, and socio-legal studies.

Stephen E. Brown is a professor and head of the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Western Carolina University and Professor Emeritus at East Tennessee State University. He earned his Ph.D. at the University of Maryland. His interests are in criminological theory and deviance. His criminological theory book, with Finn Esbensen and the late Gilbert Geis, is currently in its ninth edition.

Ophir Sefiha is an assistant professor in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Western Carolina University. He earned his doctorate in justice studies from Arizona State University. His research centers on the interplay among deviance and social control, media, and crime. He has published articles on topics including sport regulation, media coverage of sport scandals, and performance-enhancing drug use.
“Deviance, one of the most interesting and vibrant areas of research, is presented richly and persuasively alive in this up-to-date, captivating book. In it, an esteemed group of first-rate scholars produce a remarkably broad contemporary and brilliant perspective on the various and intriguing manifestations of deviant behaviors. This is certainly a must-read for anyone interested not only in the study of deviance, but on how deviance affects culture and society.”

—Nachman Ben-Yehuda, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Hebrew University
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As scholars with criminological backgrounds, our studies and teaching have keenly impressed upon us both the breadth and ephemeral nature of deviance and social control. It was our goal to pull together a variety of topics, addressed by a wide range of deviance scholars, to underscore the relativity of deviance along with some critical threads running through the stigmatization and control of behaviors and conditions frequently identified as deviant. We could not have been more pleased with the willingness of a diverse range of accomplished scholars to contribute to the creation of the handbook you are reading. Working with them was a remarkably smooth and illuminating process. We learned much more about the diversity of deviance studies, the impact of stigmatization, and mechanisms for contending with deviant labels.

Inherent in our approach is a recognition of the lack of consensus and the socially constructed nature of deviance. Some of the behaviors in this book are criminal, but many are not. Our hope was that this handbook would provide a relatively brief, concise, and easily accessible collection of readings that focus on deviance as manifest in everyday settings. We were also interested in further exploring how new and emerging technologies function to rearticulate notions of deviance and deviant identities. While many chapters in this handbook examine often-overlooked and emerging sites for the contestation of deviance, the text does not neglect topics traditionally examined by deviance scholars, including drug use, white-collar crime, and sexuality. Taken as a whole, the text balances traditional topics with new and emerging topics in the study of deviance and in doing so provides readers with a general overview of the depth and breadth of the field of deviance studies. We hope this text also provides students and interested readers with an introduction to the diversity of deviance that exists in contemporary society. We are confident that the readings collected here will stimulate additional investigation into the study of deviance.

This text would not have reached fruition without the help of a number of people. Mickey Braswell with Anderson/Routledge originally approached us about the need for the project, while reviewers provided helpful feedback and contributing authors submitted timely, well-crafted chapters and responded positively to suggestions for revisions. Two graduate assistants, Sydney Hurt and Katherine Kulick, assisted with the quotidian yet necessary organizational work of collecting manuscripts, maintaining contact with authors, and consolidating information. Our gratitude is also extended to our editor Ellen Boyne and editorial assistant Eve Strillacci, without whom the project would not have been completed. Finally, we want to acknowledge the value of innumerable colleagues and students who fuel our research interest in deviance through stimulating and provocative discussion and debate. Diversity of thought and debate is, after all, the cornerstone of deviance studies.
SECTION I

Defining and Studying Deviance

Introduction

Outside of scholars of deviance, most construe the phenomenon as comprised of “bad” characteristics or behavior. Indeed, even among accomplished social science scholars, deviance is often envisioned within a narrow framework of purportedly harmful or undesirable characteristics that ascribe ill will to the “deviant.” Even informed reviewers of the original proposal for this *Handbook on Deviance* took umbrage at our inclusion of several illnesses and religious orientations. Yet as Pat Lauderdale outlines in the opening chapter, the concept of deviance may be extended well beyond negative behaviors and conditions alone.

Central to understanding deviance is its relativity (Curra, 2017). That is, what is successfully defined as deviant will vary across time and space. Using the deviant label of “terrorist” as an example, Lauderdale poses the question of who is successfully so labeled. The answer to such questions, it is asserted, goes beyond time and place. Citing Oliverio (1998: 5), it is offered that it is revealing “to examine the political processes and practices that maintain, create, and change the definitions of certain acts as terrorist.” Deviance, Lauderdale contends, can be viewed as reactions to diversity: how and why some behaviors and conditions across a continuum are successfully labeled deviant while others are not. In fact, there exists a plethora of examples of behaviors that threaten human life yet avoid state definition as deviant (criminalization), while other behaviors lacking evidence of harm to others are so criminalized (Brown et al., 2015). Central to accepting a diverse range of human behaviors and conditions versus their designation as deviant is a function of the distribution and role of power. Lauderdale cites Kai Erikson’s (1966/2004) classic analysis of New England Puritans’ creation of deviance and Thomas Horejes’s (2013) examination of the political defining of disabilism in making the case that hegemony, domination through cultural control, creates deviance from diversity.

Undoubtedly, societal reactions and the power marshaled behind them shape the deviance chronicle. Yet many theoretical frameworks seek to explain the origin and continuity of behaviors that ostensibly violate norms, perhaps bringing social harm. Defining deviance as norm violation, Soren Kristiansen reviews the historically preeminent efforts to explain deviance.

First reviewed is Edwin Sutherland’s differential association portraying deviance as entirely a function of the social process of learning, successfully casting criminology within the sociological domain in the mid-twentieth century. In quite a different vein, and echoing many of Lauderdale’s views of deviance, Kristiansen outlines the conflict perspective. In particular, summarized is the Marxian economic view that a ruling class creates a surplus population of deviants. Returning to a dominant
mainstream theory, Robert Merton’s (1938) landmark casting of anomie as a product of social structure is summarized. Finally, accentuating the diversity of explanations of deviance that have been proffered, Kristiansen’s theoretical discussion is closed with the labeling perspective that deviance is created by the response of others rather than the behavior of the actor who is dubbed “deviant.” This creation of deviance through social reaction echoes the relativity of deviance and is reflected in many of the chapters of this handbook.

Equally crucial to the study of deviance, along with a theoretical framework, are the methods of study. Kristiansen’s chapter summarizes and contrasts qualitative and quantitative approaches to the study of deviance. The chapter closes with an examination of longitudinal designs as a technique for attempting to sort out causal order in understanding deviance.

One of the goals of this volume was to construe deviance in the broadest sense. Nicole A. Shoenberger’s review of the concept of positive deviance provides a framework for analyzing the full range of human behavior and reactions to it. Normative behavior is distributed across a bell-shaped curve, with positive deviance representing the counterpart to the much more frequently examined negative deviance. Shoenberger makes the case that the extension to include positive deviance yields a more vibrant and complete deviance field.

The Shoenberger chapter reveals the lack of accord in defining and conceptualizing this emerging theoretical extension of deviance. Of particular interest are those who exceed normative expectations only to face negative sanctions. Examples include the A student being viewed as a “rate-buster,” the aging athlete who refuses to “age gracefully,” or the highly devout religious individual being labeled an extremist. This has important implications for understanding labeling and stigma. While some debate the value of recognizing positive deviance, it is surely of value in understanding the dynamics of stigmatization.

This opening collection of essays, setting the stage for the nine groupings to follow, concludes with a chapter examining the role of the media in defining deviance. Gray Cavender discusses media power in the context of “sport frames,” thus also providing a transition into the next set of chapters addressing “sport and deviance.”

If deviance is to be understood as norm violations, negative reactions to behavior, and/or stigmatizing selective behaviors or qualities, the shaping of both norms and reactions to behaviors/qualities is critical. Cavender’s widely shared contention is that the media play a major role in deviance construction. Investigating sports as an example, ample evidence of media glorification of athletes and athletics is unveiled, even while some coverage is allotted to both deviant behavior of athletes and institutional sports deviance.

References


I would like to thank Professor Ophir Sefiha for his helpful comments and long-standing friendship. I also appreciate the ideas from the Honorable Ugo Collela concerning cognitive schema, the academic support from Professor Karen Cook, Director of the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences, and Professor Morris Zelditch, Jr. at Stanford University. This chapter is an extension of the continual research on power and deviance with Randall Amster, who helped initiate the ideas.

Introduction

Why isn’t the study of deviance part of the study of diversity? When we inspect a normal bell curve, we see three standard deviations, which could be studied as diversity. Yet for the vast majority of social scientists, especially sociologists, the concept of deviance is usually perceived and treated as negative. Of course, part of the issue is the historical path of earlier sociologists in America, who viewed most of the growing urban cities as replete with dangerous deviants (Erikson, 1996/2004; Lauderdale, 2011). And now many university deviance courses turn students into voyeurs, with deviants portrayed via the “freak of the week” show. One week the subject is a prostitute, next a drug abuser, and then a transvestite and so forth down the hegemonic line. Currently, it’s back to the future in many current classes on deviance, except for the addition of a few more “freaks,” such as terrorists (cf. Liazos, 1972; Lauderdale, 2011).

In this context, an intractable question remains. Is the leader of loose-knit bands of hit-and-run killers of British soldiers a terrorist? Or is he a revolutionary hero or freedom fighter? What is the label or definition for George Washington? How does the definition change in comparative and historical contexts? Claiming that the definition of deviance is relative turns out to be only the beginning of the answer (cf. Curra, 2014). Now, how do we assess the difference in the reactions to Nelson Mandela? Ben-Yehuda (2006) notes that Nelson Mandela is only one example from the recent past, where he was a heroic figure for most nonwhites in South Africa while being defined as a terrorist by others in power. What conditions lead someone to be defined as a freedom fighter versus a terrorist (Toggia, Lauderdale and Zegeye, 2000; Beck and Miner, 2013; Tilly, 2005; Bergen, 2016)? How do we understand the actions of individuals such as Nidal Hasan, the Fort Hood shooter; Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, the “Underwear Bomber”; Faisal Shahzad, who tried to bomb Times Square; or the assassinator of Andrei Karlov? Time and place are relevant, but they are not sufficient paths to the answers.
Following the political examination of deviance, Oliverio (1998: 5) suggests that:

The task then becomes not to expose or define who the terrorist of the week is, whether it is the Unabomber threatening national security or the CIA conducting covert actions, but to examine the political processes and practices that maintain, create, and change the definitions of certain action as terrorist. Accordingly, we may be better able to understand the status of terrorism as either an act of deviance, social control, politics, and coercion or understand it in a particular time and place as a social problem.

We know that the intent of an individual or group and the consequences of action are important in understanding such processes and practices. The study of terrorists or terrorism, for example, can be one way of using the sociology of deviance to understand social benefit or harm (Altheide, 2006; Tilly, 2005; Hamm, 2007; Oliverio and Lauderdale, 2005). How is the moral boundary between benefit and harm or good and bad constructed, maintained, or changed?

**Power and Deviance**

Kai Erikson in *Wayward Puritans* (1966/2004), despite early erroneous interpretations, focuses upon central issues in politics, power, and who and what might account for the shift in the boundary between good and bad. His analysis of specific cases of intolerance by the Puritans when they encountered diversity and reacted to it as deviance is significant, especially in light of the Puritans’ desire to move away from the pomp and circumstance of what was no longer considered merry old England.

Erikson notes that in the 18th and early 19th centuries, England adopted a policy of removing serious deviants, including convicted felons, from the streets of cities such as Manchester and Liverpool. Then they sent them to penal camps in distant colonies, including Botany Bay in Australia. After the felons had served their time, they were many thousands of miles from England with meager resources, and many of them moved into the growing town of Sydney. If deviance is the result of bad seed, unhealthy associations, lack of opportunity, or anything similar, then Sydney would have been full of deviants, while Liverpool would have enjoyed several generations of calm.

What in fact happened? Erikson reminds us that the moral map of Sydney became very much like the moral map of Liverpool after a relatively short period of time. Individuals who had been removed as the bottom of the English moral order recreated that order half a world away with very few resources. Sydney began to enlist constables, merchants, and patrons of the arts from a populace that included large numbers of “deviants,” including debtors, idlers, and whores. Liverpool found (created) new deviants to fill the vacuum left in the wake of the former deviants, and relatively quickly, the Liverpool jails were as busy again. Erikson suggests the outcomes reflect the power of a social structure. His analysis of specific cases of deviance amplification or creation by the Puritans is critical, because the Puritans encountered diversity and reacted to it as deviance. The people who were designated as deviants, that is, the religious dissenters, the Quakers, and the witches, were caught in a set of larger crises (Inverarity, Lauderdale, and Feld, 1983).

Erikson (1966: 68) presents the conditions under which the boundary might shift, for example, by “a realignment of power within the group, or the appearance of new adversaries outside it.” Such conditions are particularly useful when we extend his suggestions by also focusing upon an emerging group or society and the emergence of “modern” society (Gusfield, 1963).

In the context of power relationships, when you see someone begging for help with their cap in their hand, do you view the individual as handicapped, disabled, deviant, or is the image of someone such as the theoretical physicist Stephen William Hawking? Thomas Horejes, a “deaf” scholar, shatters the hegemonic façade of deviance via the study of disabilism (see Horejes & C. J. Heuer, 2013). He reviews the widespread
historical and cultural analyses on racism, feminism, classism, Semitism, and “other”-isms; however, he found only a paucity on disabilism (cf. Fielding, 2015). As with many other –isms, an examination of the origins of disabilism is controversial because it presents a narrow legal analysis on the historical and cultural documentation on the notion of disability.

Disabilism has been misrepresented narrowly as a health, economic, technical, safety, or deviance issue rather than as discrimination. It has not been perceived as a political issue and process that would create a policy to end discrimination or the deviant label often attached to it. A spatial framework in which time and space are critical to the study of the processes reveals the emergence of disabilism and the processes by which the biological/confainment model has become ingrained in modern disability policy. Despite the fact that “handicapped” people typically are not executed or moved into ghettos as in the past, disability policy still is rooted in a hegemonic, narrow medical model related to deviance despite evidence of relevance of constructing a politics of diversity and self-definition (cf. Goode, 2015; Goode and Ben-Yehuda, 2009).

Hegemony and Deviance

Hegemony is not a simple synonym for domination (Lauderdale, 1976). The use of hegemony focuses upon the state’s “war of position” and those who control modes of production, that is, imposing and promoting crucial worldviews through cultural means (Mies, 1986; Chew and Lauderdale, 2010; Cruit and Lauderdale, 2016; Oliverio and Lauderdale, 2015). Such interpretations emerge from the control of central information sources, and ideas created by “objective” rule makers are presented as unbiased. The media provides an obvious example of this process, and as most of civil society assumes the dominant interpretive framework, individuals use the meanings and ostensible truths derived from their interpretations as standards by which to judge others. Alternative ideas suggested by scholars such as Horejes are often dismissed as “biased,” and in some instances individuals or groups in civil society are defined as deviants, for example, sometimes as leaders and other times as troublemakers (Horejes and Heuer, 2013). The concept of hegemony challenges the idea of common sense by asking if it is good sense.

The heuristic idea of hegemony was created by Antonio Gramsci. In prison for more than 10 years during the fascist regime of Mussolini, Gramsci conceived the concept of hegemony to explain the encompassing tactics of the fascists. Acknowledging the obvious role of political economy but wanting to transcend the idea of false consciousness, he stressed the importance of understanding the manipulation of culture as a form of domination (cf. Oliverio, 1998). It should be useful in this context to employ hegemony in its Gramscian sense as a cultural concept rather than the typical misuse of Gramsci’s concept as a solely political or economic idea. For Gramsci and now scholars such as Horejes (see Horejes & C. J. Heuer, 2013), hegemony is an order in which a certain way of life and thought is dominant, in which one worldview permeates customs and political and religious ideas, in particular their intellectual and moral connotations. In his conception of hegemony, Gramsci draws the distinction between civil and political society, with civil society being characterized by private relations within private organizations, whereas political society is characterized by the state’s use of coercive force. The war of position in terms of the role of the state in society usually is as a slow, protracted struggle that involves diverse means, which include “nonviolent” aspects of civil society and control of the definitions of deviance. Gandhi’s anti-colonialist resistances in India or the Occupy Wall Street social movement exemplify wars of position (cf. Cohen, 2004). Hegemony is a theoretical construct that can help us examine the various social control processes embedded in the cultural production of the everyday world in critical historical moments (Horejes and Lauderdale, 2014; Garland, 2002). In a Weberian sense, these processes make them appear to be efficient, predictable, and rational for public policy and, presented in their idealized form, ostensibly provide “equal opportunity” in education and the workplace, yet without appropriate sociocultural consideration (Sefiha and Lauderdale, 2008;
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Fielding, 2015). And most information and policy is explicated via a hegemonic legal concept as if people are universal, homogenous, and normalized without respect to diversity.

Information taken from our sensory experience is connected in a manner that simplifies understanding and recall. Schemes of interpretation via hegemony provide frameworks for structuring and interpreting our experience. Our world often is understood by assimilating interpretations to schemas while accommodating them to their constraints. Erving Goffman (1963) similarly notes that situations are defined “in accordance with principles of organization that govern events”; he calls these organizing structure “frames.” Most senses of the external world require scanning the environment, selecting features that appear important, and selecting information about those features and either storing it for future retrieval or using it as a basis for action. This cognitive schema serves as an interpretive mechanism that structures and assigns meaning to incoming information. Popular media, as one important organization, distributes much of the information. Yet the media often uses apt and isolated events to make their point. Popular media usually ignores the structure of harm and the longer, often hidden, protracted processes (Sefiha and Lauderdale, 2008). At the top of the news, we read a horrific story of the murder of two or three people by a very disturbed individual. Yet at almost the same time, a story of 40 people being killed on the highway in a “truck accident” is relegated to the sidelines after a brief mention, and no comment regarding how many other people were killed in automotive “accidents” during the same time period is made. The intention and behavior of a very disturbed individual was to blame in the first case; however, the automotive deaths are left in the tumble of consequences and the false necessity of the paramount value of automotive travel. Yet approximately 40,000 deaths occur yearly due to automotive accidents.

Hegemonic analysis notes that individuals organize information in a schematic manner, and we need to understand how individuals settle on a particular schema instead of another schema. Why are certain features important and acted upon while others are misinterpreted, ignored, or suppressed? This type of analysis requires us to examine the relationship between “schemes of interpretation,” social structures, and hegemony. Thomas Horejes (2013) illustrates in the study of disabilism how power is intimately connected with knowledge, and those who generate and control knowledge are often perceived to speak the truth. “Truth” becomes linked in a circular relationship with systems of power that produce and sustain it and to the impact of power, which induces and extends it—a “regime” of truth.” Stories of ostensible truth become deeply problematic.

Dominant perceptions of deafness create a one-sided framework that does not celebrate differences, diversity of language, culture, and positive constructions of deafness. An alternative perspective is possible, a perspective in which deafness can be seen as diversity in a different paradigm other than as deviant or deficient.

The study of the power of law and deviance is most clearly demonstrated when new categories of deviance are being created or old categories are being transformed (Pfohl, 1994; Lauderdale, 2011). Under the Fugitive Slave Laws of the 1850s, aiding and abetting an escaped slave was a crime, yet with the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment less than a decade later, the use of slavery itself was the crime. In 1800, the organization of a labor union was a crime, specifically conspiracy in restraint of trade, yet by 1940, unions were legal, and employers were required by law to engage in collective bargaining. And Socrates in his time was seen increasingly as a serious deviant under the law of Athens. His offense was his independent thought and his call to his students to think as independently as possible. Now Socrates is viewed as having acted for a higher moral good not only for his country but for most people. As we follow Gramsci’s framework, we can examine the political and legal processes of how an accepted and socialized form of activity can become delegitimized or vice versa (cf. Zelditch, 2006).

Moral entrepreneurs such as Ralph Nader, Caroline Myss, Leonard Peltier, Bobby Seale, Mother Teresa, Christiane Northrup, Edward Snowden, Bradley Manning, Julian Assange, Daniel Ellsberg, and Bright Simons fuel the debate on whether they are patriots or traitors (political deviants or
deviants) and reveal much about the state of hegemony in the United States. Yet many moral entre-
preneurs have been relegated to the sidelines of the news, and most are in the dustbin of history (cf.
Deloria, 1992; Cummins, 1994; Ferrell, 2002; Downes and Rock, 2007).

**Deviance and Protest**

The study of relevant events that become nonevents or important moral leaders that are ignored is
a complex research project, yet a crucial one for the study of power and deviance (Rodriguez and
Lauderdale, 2014). David Dellinger is one of many leaders who now is disappearing from the study
of leadership and diversity. Was Dellinger a moral entrepreneur or simply a deviant (Hunt, 2006)?
Active nonviolence and social protest were central to his life (Lauderdale, 2007). He was a student in
the 1930s, the son of an economically and socially prominent family, who became involved in politics
as he was studying economics at Yale University. Dellinger left Yale for a period of time during the
Great Depression. He decided to ride the freight trains, sleep at missions, and eat at the soup lines. He
spent a year working in a factory in Maine in 1936 after finally graduating from Yale.

Then Dellinger received a fellowship to Oxford University and became a supporter of the Popular
Front Government in Spain. Returning to the United States, he enrolled at the Union Theological
Seminary in New York. As a type of conscientious objector, Dellinger refused to register for the mili-
tary draft in 1940. He was arrested and sentenced to a year in prison, yet while in prison, he organized
protests against the segregated seating arrangements. His activism led to solitary confinement in the
prison. After being released, he was arrested again for refusing to join the armed forces when the
United States entered World War II. He was sentenced to another two years in prison.

After WWII, Dellinger helped create the Direct Action magazine in 1945 and criticized the use
of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki (Anderson and Herr, 2007). A short time later, he became
the editor of Liberation, a position he maintained for more than 20 years. He also was a prominent
activists in opposition to the Vietnam “War.” He helped organize the 1967 protest march on the Pen-
tagon. In 1968, he was one of the activists charged with conspiring to incite riots at the Democratic
Party Convention. His codefendants included Tom Hayden (Students for a Democratic Society),
Bobby Seale (Black Panther Party), Rennie Davis (National Mobilisation Committee), and Abbie
Hoffman and Jerry Rubin (Youth International Party). These activists, part of the famous Chicago
Eight, were eventually acquitted. Dellinger was painted as a stern, evangelical Christian socialist and
the chief architect of the conspiracy because of his position as the chairperson of the National Mobi-
lization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

Dellinger wrote a number of books, including Beyond Survival: New Directions for the Disarmament
Movement (1985), Vietnam Revisited: From Covert Action to Invasion to Reconstruction (1986), and From
Yale to Jail: The Life Story of a Moral Dissenter (1993) (Anderson and Herr, 2007). He continued to
be active in politics and, even into his eighties, continued to take part in protest marches. He was a
primary figure in the demonstration against the North American Free Trade Agreement in Quebec
City in 2001. He also held regular fasts in an effort to change the name of Columbus Day to Native
American Day. Traveling across every state, speaking at gatherings large and small, he was fond of
pointing out that efforts for peace and justice were larger and more substantive than at the height of
the 1970s. He noted that in the last 30 years protest, efforts were simply more locally based and cov-
ered a wider range of issues. Political work such as his can help expose the cracks in the hegemonic
façade.

Dellinger helped expose the problematic relationship between the U.S. military and private cor-
porations (Dellinger, 1993). The research, development, and procurement of military equipment and
weapons systems, for example, are rarely exposed to public view or even congressional scrutiny. The
Pentagon’s budget requests routinely contain undisclosed allotments to private corporations. Large
corporations give “grants” or “endowments” to universities in exchange for special privileges—such
as “locking in” licensing and patent agreements and the right to name buildings or professorships, participate in basic research, and turn lab innovations into commercial applications.

The dangers of this relationship were recognized and described by President Dwight Eisenhower in his farewell address to America after two terms as president:

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together . . . The prospect of domination of the nation’s scholars by Federal employment, project allocation, and the power of money is ever present and is gravely to be regarded.

(1961)

In Retrospect

In conjunction with an analysis of hegemony, we suggest that where power is increasingly concentrated or consolidated, the hegemonic forces that prescribe rules and laws and proscribe certain conduct as deviant play a concomitantly greater role in the promotion, revision, and maintenance of demonizing categories and labels. As a corollary, where power is more diffuse, deviance may still persist yet be more likely to be construed positively, as with the work of certain geniuses, artists, musicians, scientists, or leaders. Wherever power approaches complete diffusion, deviance often comes to be seen as “diversity” and not as abnormal, immoral, or unlawful. Thus, the consolidation of power and the persistence of categories of deviance correspond in a manner that highlights the relevance of an approach that incorporates analyses of the contours of both power and deviance (Lauderdale and Amster, 2008). Through a variety of social mechanisms, most human diversity is categorized as normal variation and a varying fraction as deviance. This area of research asks how the moral boundaries of these categories are drawn, that is, normal versus deviant, and what determines the placement of specific actors and acts within the categories (Mills, 1943; Lauderdale, 1976; Ben-Yehuda, 1985). Therefore, deviance is defined as bad from specific social reactions, and the creation of moral boundaries separates the varying definitions of normal from deviant ones. The creation of the boundaries and the placement of individuals as either normal or deviant are viewed as basic processes of social definition that often are found to be outcomes of political variables (Lauderdale, 2015).

The study of deviance in retrospect might be heuristic, and some of the classical work on deviance remains important from a historical perspective (Durkheim, 1982; Lauderdale and Amster, 2008). The foundations such as differential association by Sutherland, subculture by Cohen, conflict by Quinney, and their derivatives contain three basic assumptions (Sutherland, 1939; Cohen, 1955; Quinney, 1970). They all assume the preexistence of a deviant category or definition; the individual deviant is viewed by the rest of society as violating an established norm or value, and specific state actors within society will react to the perceived violator by negatively sanctioning the “deviant” behavior. These last two assumptions are theoretically and empirically informed—for example, by Durkheim (1973 [1899]) via the functional theory of social control and by Becker on labeling—yet assuming the pre-existence of a deviant category is highly problematic. “Deviance” is treated as a fixed category with unchanging parameters throughout history and across different cultures, with little if any attention to state power relationships (Fielding, 2015; Raymen and Smith, 2015).

The parameters of deviance and power, however, were clear in other research. In the earlier part of the last century, the Chicago school of sociology examined the relevance of the power to define
via W.I. Thomas’s observation that if people define situations as real, then they are real in their consequences. The Chicago school documented the transition zone in which more recent immigrant groups would find themselves more likely to be defined as deviant as they struggled to become more integrated into mainstream society. The research noted explicitly the conflict of power for immigrants and revealed implicitly the roles of the market economy, which often restricted access to the mainstream, and the clash of social classes. Sutherland explored the relationship between deviance and social class (Sutherland, 1939). The emerging theory of differential association assumed that deviance is common among all social classes and that the process of differential association leads to a bias against those members of society with little power. For example, becoming a corporate price fixer involved the same basic learning and social support processes that led to becoming a burglar. Their theory raised serious questions about the political issues of definition. Why are offenses committed by higher-status members of society typically lightly sanctioned and usually adjudicated under civil rather than criminal law? On the other hand, why do offenses committed by lower-class individuals typically receive a harsher negative sanction and, in many instances, a sanction vastly disproportionate to the relative harm of the offense?

This concern with explaining the reaction to deviance rather than only the motivation of the actor was addressed by the labeling theory of the 1960s. This reorientation, in turn, resulted in a partial rebirth of the sociology of law. Labeling theorists remained partially tied to the traditional concern with motivation despite their new perspective. Most of these researchers attempted to demonstrate how sanctioning and the associated stigma serve to reinforce and amplify the deviant behavior of the individual. These theorists tended to focus upon the exorcism of explanations of deviance in terms of individual characteristics. They maintained that deviance is a property conferred on rather than inherent in the actor (Becker, 1963). Many of the variables that could contribute to changes in the definition of acts or actors have been touched upon by a variety of labeling theorists. They discuss the methods used by the deviants and the status of the definers (labelers) and the defined. The focus of the labeling approach, however, has been largely misdirected. In fighting this theoretical struggle with their predecessors and focusing on the consequences of stigma, labeling theorists typically overlooked the sources of the deviant definitions being imposed by powerful agencies, the ways in which such definitions changed, and especially the explicit processes of power underlying the development and imposition of definitions of deviance. Ironically, the research in stratification has taken the direction of emphasizing individual motivational issues at the expense of political and structural questions. The research became focused upon the process of status attainment by individuals, tracing out the career trajectories of individuals in the occupational structure, typically with rather precise estimations of the role of actual performance versus unearned progress in an individual’s career development. However, the research usually fails to account for barriers to the attainment of status as a result of inequities in power.

The history of the sociology of deviance is also dominated by debates concerning the relative importance of legal and extralegal factors in society’s reaction to deviancy. Societal reaction, the most fundamental process of deviance, is an established observation (Grattet, 2011). The research maintains that society nearly always reacts to deviancy; therefore, continued efforts to estimate the relative impact of legal and extralegal factors are not particularly heuristic. The related body of knowledge currently consists of a number of competing and divergent arguments, yet all of them are incapable of being reconciled with one another, and they critically fail to address the role of power by which behavior comes to be defined as deviant (Sumner, 1994)

**Conclusion**

A power-and-deviance approach to the definitions specifies and then seeks to explicate the conditions under which amorphous behavior becomes defined as deviant, or behavior that was once characterized as deviant becomes redefined as some kind of nondeviant conduct or attribute. One obvious
example is when the medical or psychiatric communities redefine a deviant behavior as a physiological malady or cognitive abnormality (i.e., “sickness”).

Future research on deviance and moral boundaries can focus upon (1) the processes by which moral boundaries are initially created, (2) the actors intimately involved with the creation of the boundaries, (3) how the boundaries are maintained or shifted over time, and (4) the impact of boundary changes. By explicating and integrating this research, we can gain a more significant perspective on how definitions of deviance or normalcy are created and applied and on the importance of moral boundary research. At more specific levels of analysis, researchers can continue to examine how the moral boundaries have changed via the actions of moral entrepreneurs, social movements, organizations, the state, and global institutions (Goode and Ben-Yehuda, 1994; Farrell and Case, 1995; Oliverio, 1998; Ben-Yehuda, 2001; McAdam and Su, 2002; Chew and Lauderdale, 2010; Curra, 2014; Cruit and Lauderdale, 2016).

In concert with an analysis of hegemony, we suggest that, where power is increasingly concentrated or consolidated, the hegemonic forces that prescribe rules and laws and proscribe certain conduct as deviant play a concomitantly greater role in the promotion, revision, and maintenance of demonizing categories and labels (cf. Cooney and Burt, 2008). As a hypothesis, where power is more diffuse, deviance may still persist but is more likely to be construed positively, as with the work of certain geniuses, artists, musicians, scientists, or leaders. If power approaches complete diffusion, deviance often comes to be seen as “diversity” and not as abnormal, immoral, or unlawful (Sternin and Choo, 2000; Lauderdale, 2011). The variations of power and the persistence of categories of deviance correspond in a manner that highlights the relevance of an approach that incorporates analyses of the contours of both power and deviance (Lauderdale and Amster, 2008; Sefiha and Lauderdale, 2008). In essence, most new books and research articles remain stuck mainly in the old perspective about deviance as bad or behavior that is labeled as bad. With a number of global shifts and clearly the “new” wars, the call to celebrate diversity more than 25 years ago has faded, since even the moment of major acceptance of diversity typically is when it can be normalized or assimilated (Cruit and Lauderdale, 2016). Future research into the analysis of deviance as diversity and the sociology of law would be a very heuristic research agenda.
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