**SOC 3290 Deviance**

 **Overheads Lecture 6: The Pathological Perspective 1:**

\* Introduction:

- Many previously immoral/sinful behaviors now

 “medicalized” as diseases of body/mind

 - Excludes other interpretations/explanations

 - May act as a means of control

\* Transformed classical perspective’s focus on free choice into causation

\* Legitimized by rhetoric of science/ provided simple answers

 **Theoretical Images:**

\* Popularized by Lombroso’s Criminal Man (1876):

 - “Born criminals” are evolutionary throwbacks (“atavists”)

 - identified by physical anomalies (e.g. receding forehead)

 - compared prisoners/soldiers to back this up

- earlier writers had similar ideas (e.g. Hippocrates, Della Porter,

 Lavater, Rush, Gall and Spurzheim).

\* Three essential components of pathological theorizing:

 (1) Determinism (deviance is caused, not chosen)

 (2) Positivism (faith in the scientific method)

 (3) Organic image (society like a large organism)

 **History of Pathological Theorizing: Cycles of Optimism + Failure**:

\* Pathological perspective runs in historical cycles:

 (1) Optimism; (2) Failure; & (3) Renewed faith

\* We will detail this history in two parts:

 (1) Theories related to “sick” bodies;

 (2) Theories related to “sick” minds

  **(1) From Body Types to Chromosomes:**

\* Lombroso’s ideas refuted by Goring (1913)

\* Hooton (1939) resurrected Lombroso in The American Criminal

 Problems:

 (1) Prisoners can’t be equated with deviants (not all caught)

 (2) Control groups unrepresentative

 (3) “Physical inferiorities” = value judgements

 (4) Traits may be socially derived

 (5) previous incarceration for other crimes

\* Sheldon: Body types predispose to types of deviance:

 (1) Endomorphs (fat, round, crave luxury)

 (2) Ectomorphs (frail, skinny, plagued by physical problems)

 (3) Mesomorphs (robust, strong, assertive= more delinquent)

\* Methodological problems: -vague definitions & measurements;

 - social influences in classification

\* Charles Goring: Focus on Heredity. Compared criminality of:

 - brothers

 - fathers and sons

 - distinguished (1) living together/apart

 (2) visible vs. invisible crimes

 - correlation in levels of criminality high: mental ability?

 - problems: (1) inadequate controls

 (2) visible/invisible distinction

 (3) No evidence intelligence inherited

\* Sensationalistic studies of family genealogy:

 - Dugdales’ The Jukes

 - Goddard’s study of Kalliak family

 - suggestion that deviance runs in families

 - Refuted: (1) studies of “respectable families” comparable

 (2) biased sources

 (3) subjective IQ measures

\* IQ studies: - Goddard: 70% of prisoners have IQ (rated below age 13)

 - Murchison: not if most other do too

 - IQ scores fluctuate with education, linguistic and

 socioeconomic background

\* Genetic studies: Identical vs. Fraternal twins (NOT 100%)

 Adoption studies (small differences)

 XYY males: research very limited

 Generally many methodological problems

 **Psychological Pathology: The Abnormal Mind:**

\* Deviance considered the result of a sick mind

\* Three variations: (1) Psychoanalytic theory

 (2) Psychometric assessments

 (3) Focus on psychopathy

\* Psychoanalytic theory:

 - Deviance caused by unconscious forces/repressed sexuality

 - Id: made up of libido and thanatos (“death instinct”)

 - lack of balance between id, superego and ego= deviance

 - problematic stages of personality development (oral, anal,

 and phallic)

\* Problems:

 - unconscious motives can be found for anything

 - circular reasoning

 - unquestioned acceptance of modern male heterosexuality

 - exaggeration of importance of early childhood experience

\* Psychometric assessments:

 - assume certain personality traits associated with deviance

 - little evidence backs this up

 - MMPI and CPI scales after the fact/ not predictive

- Eyesenck: genetic personality deficiency: neurobiological assumptions problematic

 - Yochelson & Samenow: circular reasoning

\* Psychopathy Research: The search for people devoid of conscience

 - List of symptoms vague/ some even “normal”

 - Disease not distinguished from behaviors

 - Circular reasoning

 - Biological measurements: (1) problem of subject selection

 (2) behavior itself may cause

 **Identifying Pathological Deviance:**

\* Search for causes/cures based in faith in:

 (1) science/scientific method

 (2) ability to predict/control

\* Ultimate goal: rational mastery over nature/deviance

\* Yet many problems with research/methodology:

 (1) Physiological studies: (2) Psychological studies:

 - imprecise definitions - professional socialization

 - poor sampling - contextual variation in diagnosis

 - inadequate control groups - class/cultural stereotyping

 - definitional ambiguity

 - circular reasoning

\* Why has this perspective remained respectable?

 **Historical considerations**:

\* Pathological theorizing/positivism linked to capitalism:

 - efficient control of labor = profit maximization

 - “technology of inner discipline” most efficient

 - material science promises technical control

 - “treatment” and “rehabilitation” into useful laborers

\* Prisons:

 - constant surveillance/control

 - classify individuals into types

 - facilitate causal theorizing/molding useful workers

 - similar dynamics in other institutions

 - common now/ radical in early 19th century

\* Instrumental nature of positivism:

 (1) Gender-specific hierarchies:

 -advocacy of contextless, emotionless objectivity (male)

 -parallels distancing/projection in pornography (“virtual

 reality of mastery”)

 -sadism = bridge between classical/positivist thought

-pornography put into practice: powerful/positivist medicine making over the mind/body of alleged deviant

 (2) Non-white/non-Eurocentric hierarchies:

 - “neutrality” and emotional disengagement dismisses

 other traditions/epistemologies (e.g. African tradition of

 “ecstatic knowledge”).

 - pathological characterizations of racial inferiority

 - exclusive standard of truth denies other viewpoints

\* Next Class: (1) Pathological social control

 (2) Assessment of the perspective