CONCLUSIONS

Richard A. Brymer
McMaster University

Abstract: Anthropological literature on small-scale societies, including some of the ethnographic material in this volume, suggests that the five organizational settings which form the conceptual setting for sociological theories of deviance are not universally present. Small-scale societies are devoid of large, competing pressure groups with different values, differentiated regulatory organizations, distinct sub-cultures and a concept of the individual separate from the group. Consequently, many of the statuses and roles beloved of labelling theorists, e.g., moral entrepreneurs, generic labelling, deviant subcultures and deviant identities are absent. The development of a scalar model is the first step toward an understanding of deviance in cross-cultural terms. The emergence of deviant identity and deviant sub-cultures may perhaps be seen in some of the "middle-scale" ethnographic cases discussed in this volume, e.g., the self-confessed sorcery specialist. The scalar model assumes that large-scale societies are often composed of small-scale subunits, and both dominate and interact with small-scale folk societies which they partially absorb. A clash of values may occur. Thus spirit possession, which is not deviant in a small-scale unit, is viewed as deviant when that unit is absorbed within a larger group. Poaching and treasure-hunting, not necessarily regarded as deviant in small-scale rural groups, fall foul of the new industrial culture. The new scalar model will be of value not only to sociologists but also to anthropologists who have paid so little attention to deviance.

Résumé: La littérature anthropologique portant sur les sociétés à petite échelle, y compris quelques-unes des études ethnographiques du présent volume, constate que les cinq paradigmes organisateurs de différents concepts sociologiques de la déviance ne sont pas toujours présents. Les sociétés à petite échelle manquent non seulement de grands groupes de pression rivalisants à cause de leurs différentes valeurs et de différentes organisations régulatrices, mais aussi de sous-cultures distinctes et d'un concept de l'individu à part. Par conséquent, beaucoup d'états et de rôles favoris des théoriciens de l'étiquettage, comme par exemple les entrepreneurs moraux, l'étiquettage générique, les sous-cultures et les identités déviantes, sont ab-

Anthropologica XXXIII (1991) 195-213

sents. Quant à une meilleure connaissance de la déviance transculturelle, le développement d'une échelle modèle s'impose. Il se peut que la naissance d'une identité ainsi que de sous-cultures déviantes se dégage dans certains cas ethnographiques «à moyenne échelle» étudiés dans le présent volume, comme par exemple la spécialiste sorcière déclarée. L'échelle proposée présuppose que les sociétés à grande échelle soient souvent composées de sous-unités à petite échelle; toutes les deux dominent et influencent d'une manière réciproque les communautés traditionnelles à petite échelle qu'elles absorbent en partie. Par conséquent, les valeurs des différentes sociétés peuvent entrer en conflit les unes avec les autres. Ainsi la possession d'alcool, qui n'est pas déviante dans une unité à petite échelle, est censée être déviante lorsque cette unité est absorbée par une unité plus grande. Le braconnage de même que la quête de trésors qui ne sont nécessairement pas considérés comme déviants dans une société rurale à petite échelle, deviennent inacceptables pour la nouvelle culture industrielle. La nouvelle échelle sera donc utile non seulement aux sociologues mais aussi aux anthropologues qui n'ont pas encore eu grand égard à la déviance.

In the introduction to this collection, I was critical of both sociology and anthropology. The purpose of my critique is to inform sociology's focus (or mis-focus) by relying upon anthropologists' ethnographies that are sensitive to labelling theory. My fundamental conclusions are that modern sociological views of deviance as a highly differentiated and organizationally complex entity are inappropriate when smaller-scale societies are examined. Anthropology is in equal difficulty, though, for it has no systematic view of deviance, despite the fact that, when pressed, anthropologists can provide materials on deviance. I have used the concept of societal scale primarily for its heuristic value, because sociology—while paying attention to socio-economic development—does not focus on the full range of scalar forms.

In the light of our anthropological evidence, I first reconsider in this conclusion the utility in cross-cultural terms of the five major "arenas" which sociology uses as concepts to organize the study of deviance in large-scale societies. Material from the smallest-scale societies is of particular importance in this section. Secondly, I reorganize these materials in order of societal scale, and attempt to make sense of the gradual emergence and differentiation of the sociological arenas. In both sections, I use the same material, but reorder it in terms of different logics. Finally, I offer some suggestions as to the possible future for an integrated sociology *and* anthropology of deviance.

The Five Major Arenas

1. Society-at-Large

The smallest-scale societies lack the political heterogeneity which is the basis for competition between groups seeking societal acceptance for their own definitions of moral behaviour and its obverse, deviance. Deviance is then *not* the outcome of a shifting political process. Generic and institutional labels are either completely absent, or, where found, appear to be derived from a very conservative (and consensual) tradition of morality. Particularly apposite here are Preston's cases of Margaret and Helen from Cree society, where possible conjuring and sorcery were involved. *Any* person can be a sorcerer or conjurer, but no separate class of persons is created by the label and the label, if used, is not generic. Labels are more likely to be negotiable, highly particularistic and applicable to one and only one person, although they may indeed be highly pejorative. Savishinsky's chapter indicates that the imported generic label of "alcoholic"—along with the alcohol—has little if any impact on the Hare, even though drinking behaviour itself may include or come to be the source of episodic and staged deviance.

The Counts' chapter dealing with Lusi-Kaliai, although it does not deal with a very small-scale society, again indicates the rarity of generic labels, and the prevalence of particularistic labels or "nicknames." Somewhat further along a scale of complexity, McLellan's material from Malaysia indicates that "possession" behaviours that are normative in a village become the subject of generic labelling when translocated into a larger-scale industrial society. Thus the "moral entrepreneurial process," one of the bases of labelling theory, simply does not exist in smaller-scale societies. What may take its place is a micro-level analogue of the process at an interpersonal level. That is to say, the micro-politics of a small group can give rise to pejorative nicknames that are applied to one particular invididual and, as such, establish that person as deviant, at least while the behaviour persists.

2. Regulatory Organizations

Small-scale societies lack the formal regulatory institutions that serve as loci of definition and control of deviance in complex societies: there is no separation of legislative, policing, judicial, penal or rehabilitative functions such as are to be found in large-scale societies. Furthermore, deviant individuals are not set aside as a separate category of persons. One implication of this is that there is no possibility of a deviant *career* without such a network of institutions. McPherson's Kabana chapter indicates that cases of sorcery may ultimately be mooted ultimately by entire villages or sets of villages with all concerned present. There are no separate institutional bod-

ies or specialized roles to deal with what is regarded as a clearly deviant act. In his review of the ethnographic literature, Raybeck suggests that Mbuti acephalous groups make collective decisions, including what to do about recalcitrant individuals. In these small societies, every attempt is made to reintegrate individuals into their groups, but, where this is not possible, as in Raybeck's reporting of !Kung deviance, executions also appear to be collective, although this is not entirely clear from Lee's original data.

3. Sub-cultures

In the small-scale societies treated in this work, there appear to be no subunits which might qualify as deviant sub-cultures. The societies are relatively homogeneous, and have no mechanisms for setting people aside, nor is there evidence that categories of people set themselves aside for reasons of stigma. There are "symbiotic" or trade relations between different cultural groups such as between the !Kung and the Herero and Tswana (Lee 1984), and between the Mbuti and their Bantu neighbours (Turnbull 1976; Raybeck). Occasionally these groups use each other as foils for deviance (see especially Ben-Ari 1987), but they remain separate societies and, as such, they are not usually considered to be part of a larger integrating unit.

4. Small, Informal Groups

There are, of course, small informal groups in the small societies that are reported by our contributors. In fact, such groups sometimes constitute the largest possible social unit in a small-scale culture. Thus these groups *are* society. Johnson and Earle (1987:27, 29, 214) characterize such societies as having a low population density and small absolute size (around 30 persons), with cyclical aggregations into larger temporary groups. Both Savishinsky and Preston note these characteristics in their papers. Daily life is carried out, for the most part, in extremely small groups built on kin ties and long-term personal relations.

Deviance in this context is both constructed and controlled at a very informal, face-to-face level, with rare permanent stigmatization of an individual as deviant. Levels of control seem to have two extremes: gossip and nicknaming, or permanent exile, flight or execution.

5. The Individual

In large-scale societies, where the stigmata of deviance are so pervasive, deviant individuals constitute a special unit of analysis because they carry a special "master status" that "straights" do not possess. In small-scale societies where such master statuses do not exist, the individual *as a special unit of analysis* is clearly inappropriate. Any particular person is simply an-

other player in the never-ending interaction between all persons in the group.

Preston describes cases of deviance (or, more appropriately, reactions to trouble) among the Cree which led to the offenders' reintegration in the community with no accompanying deviant identity. Interestingly enough, the only suggestion of a long-term deviant identity arose from threats imposed by representatives of the larger-scale society, the police in the case of Peter (#5) and Ella (#4), and mental health authorities in the case of Louise (#3). In the cases of Peter and Ella, the local community actually intervened to move the threatened individuals away from contact with the larger society, and back into the protection of the smaller society.

Similarly, the Rodmans note, that while anyone in Longanan society can be a rainmaker, it is very difficult for the community to assign this identity to a given individual. In the case of Henderson, even when it is voluntarily adopted, it does not appear to have acted as a "master status." This stands in sharp contrast to industrial societies in which deviance is often involuntary, and where even mistakes ("erroneous" assignment of a deviant identity, for example) have serious consequences for the individuals so assigned (Schwartz and Skolnick 1962; Rosenhan 1973).

To summarize this section, I note that sociology, in general, and labelling theory, in particular, present a very incomplete theory of deviance. While sociology's theory may be appropriate in analyzing deviance as it exists in large-scale industrial society, it obscures the character of deviance in smaller-scale societies. I now turn to anthropology and the possibility of a complementary Anthropology of Deviance, and a potential hybrid.

The Anthropology of Deviance

Anthropologists in general have not paid much attention to deviance. The contributors to this collection have done so systematically, and this material can be used to suggest the emergence of the complicated kind of deviance that is characteristic of complex societies. While anthropology has long been concerned with the perplexing problem of cultural evolution, not even the most fervent of evolution's defenders (Johnson and Earle 1987) pays attention to deviance as an evolving phenomenon. The examination of materials in the chapters of this collection suggests that if anthropologists begin to pay systematic attention to deviance, using and refining the concept of societal scale as a gradient for comparison of cross-cultural materials, they may be able to remedy some of the lacunae in sociologists' explanations of deviance.

To raise the issue of evolution in this context should not be taken to mean that I am arguing for "survivals": it is beyond argument that each human society has its own history, and that none can be taken to represent a stage

of some other society's past. I do not wish to reiterate the ontological and epistemological debate about the concept of cultural evolution. I do wish to argue for the heuristic value of the notion of scale and evolution in that it helps us to understand the differences between complex and simple deviance, the reactions to it, and how these change and emerge. So as not to get caught in the evolution debate, I use the term "scalar type." Such usage is partially outlined in Raybeck's initial survey of small, middle and peasant societies in this collection. In this concluding chapter, I suggest extending Raybeck's model on three fronts.

First, I suggest extending the notion of societal scale to allow us to explore both the implications of the primate material discussed by Zeller and others, and to re-examine the industrial and post-industrial societies suggested by sociology.

Secondly, I examine the effect that a large-scale society has on the smaller units that constitute it or become embedded in it through historical events – families, peer groups, sub-cultures, ethnic groups, regional groups, encapsulated aboriginal societies and so on. In all these kinds of aggregations, the nature of deviance and its regulation is altered by the presence of the larger-scale unit. Embedded units are not autonomous but must take into account the larger unit, and, conversely, must themselves be taken into account by it. In either case, the relation of each to the other modifies the structure of both and alters what constitutes deviance and its regulation.

Finally, I reconsider sociology's arenas for the analysis of deviance in the light of enlarged scalar comparison and the problem of embeddedness. I offer some tentative speculation about the emergence of these arenas.

Primates

Primates have social – if not cultural – organization. Zeller is creative in discussing primate deviance as it is labelled by occupational groups having varying interests in primate behaviour. Laboratory scientists, with the most narrow functional interests, see the most deviance; "free range" researchers (with the broadest social interests) see the least deviance. Zeller, a primatologist herself, defines non-human primate behaviour apparently unconducive to evolutionary fitness as "abnormality." She then conceives of deviance as statistically modelled, with the positive and negative behavioural extremes constituting deviance, and the modal ranges representing normal behaviour. This is similar to Raybeck's distinction between hard and soft deviance, with hard representing the extreme, and soft falling within the range of modal behaviour. In both cases, extreme behaviour is that which threatens, or, in the case of primates, appears to observers to threaten, the survival of social order.

I suggest another perspective from which to view primate behaviour as either deviant or normal. If one takes *reaction to behaviour*, as observed among the primates themselves, rather than statistically abnormal behaviour as a criteria for alleging deviance, then different data become crucial. This becomes especially important in examining studies of free-ranging primate groups, particularly if the reactions form a chain or involve more than one individual. Raybeck's and Zeller's chapters focus on the effect of deviance in the maintenance of social order. I am interested in the emergence of deviance at different levels of organizational complexity.

Zeller refers to a statistically normative situation in which alpha males copulate with all females; and if alphas perceive a non-alpha male copulating, the alpha male reacts by interrupting or stopping the copulation. She then goes on to describe cases where such non-patterned copulation occurs. In such cases, the couple may move out of the alpha males' perceptual field (hiding? a recognition of the abnormality of their own behaviour?) and the female inhibits her usual copulatory call, although she expresses the standard facial responses (a reaction to "self"?). A second-level scenario then can occur when a non-alpha male observes such a non-standard copulation, and then drags an alpha male into the presence of the copulating couple. (A third party reaction to others' "deviant" copulation?) The alpha male then attacks, restoring the *status quo ante* of social order.

There are also other cases where immediate statistical normality is *not* restored, and bands fission and establish separate statistical modalities. In the discussion of possible reasons for the contentious problem of infanticide, at least one hypothesis advanced is that of male competition for scarce females. In addition to infanticide, Zeller notes that male gorillas attempt to steal females from other groups, and that female gorillas may leave their groups. In each of these outcomes, the structure of the group is altered.

While few sociological theorists would be interested in such a scenario, the material that Zeller reports does, in my terms, exhibit monadic, dyadic, triadic and quadratic coordinated reaction to behaviours. These behaviours also appear to be closely analogous to human deviance, in that there are collective attempts to avoid sanctions, and coordinated efforts to control such behaviours and restore normative order. Although such behaviours are neither a random nor representative sample of *all* behaviours, they are strategic behaviours from the point of view of deviance. They are also similar to the collective behaviours observed by McPhail (1991). McPhail's observations of crowds, riots, football games and other performances focus on formal properties of behaviour without respect to meaning, intent or symbolism. It is interesting to note that other social scientists have also recently developed an interest in the analysis of primate behavioural analogues of human behaviour, particularly the political scientists, G. Schubert and R.D. Masters (1991).

While our closest primate relatives may lack symbolic culture, they do make trouble to which others react in socially organized and innovative ways. However such behaviours are learned, they are organized and may constitute a pre-human analogue of trouble as it is discussed in the next section.

Band-Scale Societies

Discussions of band-level social organization have had a long history in anthropology, beginning with Morgan, Weber and Durkheim, and continuing into the present in the work of Steward, Turnbull, Lee and others. All characterize social relations in such societies as egalitarian, leaderless and highly interpersonal. Such social relations have been described as primitive, organic, multiplex, dense, information-rich (Raybeck), etc. Few ethnographic or theoretical accounts of band-level society attempt to explain deviance, because, as I argued earlier, *sociological varieties of deviance* simply do not exist in such societies.

Trouble and problems, however, *do* exist. As an example, consider the introduction to Leacock and Lee's 1982 summary of the politics and history of band societies. Following their listing of the "core" traits of band society, they say that:

> The foregoing does not mean that foraging societies are without problems or contradictions. All social life is fraught with contradictions and foraging life is no exception. . . . Contradictions [problems] arise when individuals desire to hoard rather than share, to marry in, to be lazy and freeload, to try and lord it over others, to be sullen and isolate themselves, or to be quick to argue and fight. The ridicule, misfortune, or social isolation brought on a person habitually indulging in such behaviour are widespread themes in gather-hunter belief, mythology, ritual and child-rearing practice and daily life. The social life of foragers is in good measure the continual prevention or working out of potentially disruptive conflicts in accord with the particular cultural ways of each society. (Leacock and Lee 1982:9)

This quotation, and other accounts of band-level difficulties, suggests that trouble begins at either intra-personal or inter-personal levels. In other words, one person may feel that something is "wrong" with him- or herself, or that someone else has in some way slighted them. This is reminiscent of Emerson and Messinger's work (1977) which uses data from large-scale society in a critique of "official labelling" theory. They suggest that many forms of official deviance may, in fact, begin in informal groups with informal definitions of trouble and informal remedies for it. This kind of trouble may, if formal agencies become involved, result in the designation of the original trouble as official deviance. Informal trouble, thus, may be

the precursor of official deviance, given the existence of a set of specified and escalating conditions. While Emerson and Messinger developed their views in large-scale society, and intended them to apply to sub-units embedded in a large-scale society, these views may also help us to understand the emergent character of deviance in a scalar order.

In band-level societies,there are only internal troubles and remedies, and no external agencies available to remedy or classify the trouble as deviance. Trouble is inevitably intra-and inter-personal, as is its resolution. Although individual, family and band levels exist, and the family does mediate between the individual and the band, the extremely small, close and public nature of trouble makes its resolution available to all. This perhaps accounts for the continuing observation that band-level troubles are not often connected with the quality of a particular act, but with the quality of that act in relation to the history of the persons involved. One metaphor that both Preston and Savishinsky use is the notion of the "personal file" that each member keeps on all other members of the band. Such a file is updated daily, and each update modifies all previous entries. Thus, any given daily update, considered in the light of the total file, may be grounds for the continuation or the withdrawal of trust. This is in contrast with the middle scale, where more levels are found, and with industrial societies, where each differentiated institution keeps files on its members, but only for highly specialized and narrow reasons. Any given individual may have many files, but they are all more or less isolated from each other and, as yet, no single institution keeps *all* files on each individual. (More of this later in the post-industrial scalar analysis.)

Band-level societies, like primate groups, have systemic trouble, and their troubles are resolved internally or the groups fission. Unlike primate groups, the normative structures of bands that give rise to such troubles are not statistical or species wide, but culturally variant, although Leacock and Lee do infer a common set of core traits (Leacock and Lee 1982:8).

Middle-Scale Societies

Middle scale societies are difficult to "bound." In this work, I treat them as belonging to a residual category and argue that "middle" constitutes any scalar type more complex than band level, but simpler and smaller in scale than a pre-industrial, urban societal scale. This latter boundary has some importance for deviance.

Compared to band-scale societies, middle-scale societies exhibit a gradual increase in the levels of complexity of interpersonal affiliation. While middle-scale societies are also characterized by strong interpersonal bonds and their members operate on the basis of the personal file, there are more

constituent groups and personal arenas – at differing levels of oganizational complexity – within which deviance or control can be created, discussed and remedied.

In the scheme that I am using, each newly emerging level incorporates the prior levels and alters their relations with each other and with itself. Note also that these new levels in middle-scale societies are not differentiated by function, such as occurs later in industrial and post-industrial scale units, and all persons in the unit have some personal "stake" in the matter.

This is most clear in the cases presented by McPherson and the Counts. McPherson, in Jean's sorcery case, notes at least five levels in the construction and adjudication of behaviour as deviant or normative: the individual, the family, the men's house, the village and, finally, inter-village moots. As each level comes into play, the "deviance" itself becomes more and more complex, involving individuals with diverse and shifting interests. Band-scale societies simply have fewer levels.

The Counts' paper indicates the development of both particularist labels or nicknames, and generic nicknames as well as the appropriate social control associated with each sort. Nicknames are used in gossip, ridicule, shaming and teasing. The Countses show how adultery can be treated particularistically and joked about, or generically, as in "people who act like dogs," with different control mechanisms. In this latter case, suicide, sorcery and compensation payments as well as inter-village mooting occur as a means of control and to bring about the restoration of traditional order. But, as in the case presented by McPherson, such procedures often fail to reach a consensus, even though the higher levels of organization exist.

The Rodmans' material from Longana indicates similar levels of organization, but we also get a hint of the development of specialized regulatory roles. Rainmaking per se may or may not be deviant, and it is adjudicated in a manner similar to that discussed by Counts and McPherson. The use of Anglican lay persons and of the Bible as a set of diagnostic rules and roles may be an importation of colonialism, but it combines with traditional procedures to produce limited specialization in the allegation of deviance. McLellan's chapter on material from Malaysia, too, is similar. In the traditional village context (pre-industrial agrarian?), a *bomoh* is the specialized personage to involve in order to alleviate spirit possession. In its new industrial context, spirit possession is deviant because it disrupts industrial efficiency and because industrial specialists, such as human resource managers and union representatives, have little effect on it. Whether the use of traditional *bomohs* in these new circumstances will spread is not as yet known.

The materials in this volume suggest, too, that some codification of law begins to develop in this "middle" level, at least in terms of a rhetoric of sorcery that is understood by all, and used by some, on occasions when sor-

cery is suspected. If so, then the idea of deviance has become concrete at a level over and above the intimate negotiations of concerned persons. Donald Black is working in this area in his attempt to create a sociology of law, and more importantly, a theory of social control, in his *Towards a General Theory of Social Control* (1984). His approach is best summed up in a brief selection from a footnote in his introduction (Black 1984:15):

> The theory of social control provides a radical alternative to theories of deviant behavior of every kind. Given that deviant behavior is conduct that is subject to social control, every instance of deviant behavior is also an instance of social control. Thus to say that poor people are more likely to commit crime is also to say, simultaneously, that poor people are more likely to be defined as criminals. Variation in the nature and rate of deviant behavior—across a population, across time, or whatever—necessarily reflects variation in the nature and rate of social control. It is therefore possible to explain deviant behavior with the theory of social control. (Original citation in Black 1976:9-10)

Black seems to have created a chicken-and-egg problem; valuable, but nonetheless a problem, and his choice is to begin with a study of social control and law. His work is admirable and is one of the few sociological studies that uses anthropological and cross-cultural materials. His focus, however, is always on the differential distribution of social control. I prefer to accept the co-constitutive nature of social control and deviance, *and* to organize our materials in a scalar order as a corrective to labelling theory, in particular, and sociological theories, in general.

This examination in terms of scalar types allows us to see the emergence of social trouble in non-human primate groups, the presence of culturally organized intra- and inter-personal trouble in band societies, and trouble organized and remedied in levels of increasing complexity in middle scalar types.

Pre-Industrial Urban Societies

I have chosen this as a boundary in our discussion of scale because it seems to make sense in explaining the emergence of the various arenas of deviance. Pre-industrial urban societies—unrepresented in the case studies in this collection—are characterized by social stratification and functionally differentiated political, economic and ecclesiastical institutional organization. In addition, the élite members of political/ecclestical/economic institutions are to be found in distant centralized urban locations rather than, as in middle-scale societies, close at home in face-to-face relations with other members of their society. The urban location serves as "headquarters" for administering the various "middle-"scale units that continue to exist in tra-

ditional areas. I rely on the classic work of Sjoberg (1960) in summarizing the major characteristics of such a scalar type. For the study of deviance this scalar type is a watershed. It allows us to differentiate an anthropological focus on "folk" deviance from a sociological focus on "urban" deviance. A pre-industrial society contains *both* the forms of folk society that exist in the hinterland and the complex organization of urban deviance. Furthermore, all five arenas appear to be present in the urban sphere of pre-industrial, urban society. Sjoberg's original comparison was with the industrial city. My comparisons run both ways, with what is structurally earlier, and with that which comes later.

In his discussion of the government functions of political structure, Sjoberg (1960:244ff.) first discusses the maintenance of social control and order. Generally, law is highly codified and in the hands of ecclesiastical or moral experts. Although a full fledged moral entrepreneurial process may not be present in society at large, there are competing moralities, especially in times of inter-city war and conquest. The existence of folk law and urban law means that all are subject to at least two sets of laws. Furthermore:

> Turning to the local scene, often urban officials have a small police force to search out law breakers. In addition, the wards, the guild, and various ethnic groups, religious organizations, and extended families all assist the governmental apparatus in maintaining order on the local level. (Sjoberg 1960:246)

While the governmental control structure is highly and formally organized into multiple levels and backed by codified law, it is not *bureaucratic* in the sense that it is impersonally administered. Rather, adjudication and punishment are often Draconian and based upon a plaintiff's interpersonal, political and social standing. Punishments are extreme and public, and often permanently physically stigmatizing, such as branding or mutilation. Thus deviants are not reintegrated, but given a permanent master status which sets them apart from all others. And,

> despite the strong sanctions against lawbreakers, these seem to thrive, and criminals have organized themselves into guilds in cities from Timbuctoo to Seoul. . . . Evidently, crime will persist as long as there are laws to be broken; norms take on meaning because of their violation and the subsequent punishment of offenders. Moreover, in feudal cities, petty criminals, so long as they do not directly challenge the authority of political and religious leaders, come to be viewed as part of the natural order of things. A modus vivendi is . . . achieved between the criminal guilds and the broader society. (Sjoberg 1960:249)

From Sjoberg's reference to criminal guilds, it is fairly obvious that the pre-industrial world develops sub-cultures which are organized along so-

phisticated lines. Equally, he notes the presence of an aggregate of persons who might, in turn, be available for membership in such a sub-culture: outcasts. Outcasts are those people who are included in neither the class structure of the city nor the interpersonal network of the folk hinterland. They are literally displaced persons who perform whatever work is left over. Many are slaves, but others are wandering ethnic groups. Some labour in ethically enjoined occupations, e.g., leather workers in India and prostitutes in many locales, along with dancers, actors and other entertainers.

Deviant sub-cultures seem to have been in full bloom in the pre-industrial city and, with them as a referent, it is possible to see some "buds" of embryonic sub-cultures in middle-level scalar societies, although the evidence is sketchy. In both Kabana and Kaliai society, there is a suggestion that while all males can be sorcerers, *some* are better at it than others and "advertise" themselves as such. Insofar as specialized knowledge may be required, and *if* this knowledge is passed down through generations, we may indeed see the glimmerings of sub-cultures. Levy's discussion of the concentration of deviance in certain Hopi clans and lineages may also indicate a peculiar kind of sub-cultural differentiation of a sub-set of the community as "more trouble" than other sub-sets (Levy 1984).

Some deviant sub-cultures generated in the pre-industrial urban era have continued to exist to the present (Inciardi 1974). Equally, the pre-industrial, urban scalar type may also generate sub-cultures which are normative in their original setting but, when translocated and embedded in a later industrial urban type, become deviant. The papers by Migliore and Brymer contain materials of this order. Both treasure hunters and hunter/poachers began their traditional sub-cultures when hunting (for either treasure *or* game) was a legal and a traditional activity. With the advent of the industrial era and the construction of bureaucratic regulatory laws, both sets of activities became illegal except under very narrowly specified conditions. Participants have, as a result become self-conscious about their activities. Both sub-cultures now have problems that they didn't have in the prior era. Both must respond to the state and its concerns but, beyond that, they must also be cognizant of their neighbours' concerns about illegal activity that could endanger all residents of the neighbourhood.

With respect to deviance then, the pre-industrial, urban scalar type seems to be a watershed in that it exhibits institutional differentiation, codification and control of deviant behaviour along very complex lines. The five basic organizational settings discussed in the Introduction are fully emergent, including the stigmatized deviant individual. Having seen the emergence of the five arenas, we can now begin to take a retrospective look at middle scalar types as being strategic in the emergence of these arenas. I have speculated about sub-cultures; my final conclusions will suggest a wider focus.

In spite of the emergence of the crucial arenas, the vast majority of the population of a pre-industrial society lived in the hinterland and was not continually subject to the state's laws. Sjoberg's rough estimates are that no more than 10 percent, and probably less than 5 percent, of the population lived in urban areas (Sjoberg 1960:83). People in Raybeck's study of swidden and peasant societies, those in isolated areas in industrial societies, as well as those studied by Migliore and Brymer seem to be as concerned with the informal control of deviance as they are with the centralized formal controls. Yet, I argue that such societies are of critical significance because the basic patterns for the organization of deviance in industrial society are already set.

Industrial Societies

What follows from the foregoing discussion is an argument that in industrial society we are concerned primarily with the elaboration of previously set patterns of deviance. The most fundmental difference seems to be one of quantity. The consequence of very large numbers of people is what is at issue. With the development of industrialization, massive migration from rural to urban areas began to occur, such that informal deviance and social control increasingly came under the scrutiny and jurisdiction of urban authorities. Formal methods of control take precedence over the informal ones in such conditions. In early industrial society however—and perhaps even into the early part of the twentieth century—policing and ecclesiastical control personnel were still in short supply. The work force may have been moving from farm to factory, but it was not involved in service-related organizations as indicated in Table 1.[1] In the newly burgeoning metropolises, deviance grew at a rapid rate. It is during this era that modern sociology began its concern with deviance as a systematic focus of attention and its description of deviance discussed in the Introduction, beginning with its view of ghettos as pathological, then as disorganized, or as the loci for cultural conflict between the newly arrived folk-ethnic groups and the "modern" city.

A second theme in industrialization that has implications for deviance was the growth of "bureaucracy" as an organizational ideal. It began in industry as the social organization of mass production, which focussed on impersonality, hierarchy, equal work for equal pay, etc. (Sjoberg, Brymer and Farris 1967). Its value seemed to be its emphasis on "fairness" and, when coupled with the growth of liberal democracy, it led to a push for equal law enforcement for equal crime. While this theme led to the proliferation of moral entrepreneurial processes, the actual construction of institutions using such a theme lagged far behind. There were few client-oriented institutions

Table 1
Canada's Occupational Structure, 1880-1987

Year	Primary (%)	Secondary (%)	Tertiary (%)
1881	51	29	19
1901	44	28	28
1921	37	27	37
1941	31	28	41
1961	14	32	54
1987	7	23	70

Primary = Basic extraction; farming, fishing, mining.
Secondary = Manufacturing and construction.
Tertiary = Transportation, communication, trade, finance and other services.

(including law enforcement, penology, social work, etc.), and most were essentially non-bureaucratic and thus ideologically and inter-personally oriented (Gilbert and Specht 1976).

The industrial scalar type has provided the majority of sociology's views of deviance. In the last few decades, however, some have begun to refer to contemporary society as "post-industrial," although implications for the nature of deviant behaviour are as yet unclear.

Post-Industrial Society

Post-industrial society seems to be characterized in the first place by the rapid move of the labour force from secondary production into client-oriented tertiary organizations, leaving very few workers engaged in primary resource extraction (see Table 1). Secondly, post-industrial society exhibits the perfection of bureaucratization in a process sometimes referred to as technological rationalization. This latter process began during the Second World War and continued, more systematically, with McNamara's reorganization of the U.S. Department of Defence in the 1960s (Sjoberg, Brymer and Farris 1966:325-326).

The first of these trends has led to a geometric increase in the number of organizations that deal with one form of deviance or another. Table 2 below illustrates such trends.

The data in Table 2 are drawn from various annual directories of the Human Service Organizations in Hamilton, a medium-sized Canadian city usually characterized in terms of its reliance on heavy industry, especially steel production. The data were made available to various agencies for referrals, information, etc. The data do not reflect the number of workers or clients involved, nor do all of the agencies process deviants. The agencies

Table 2
Growth of Human Service Organizations in Hamilton, Ontario, 1950-1983

Year	Population	# of Orgs.	# Orgs./1000	# of persons/Org.
1950	196 245	82	4.18	2393
1955	225 638	109	4.83	2070
1961	263 750	113	4.28	2334
1965	277 847	147	5.29	1890
1970	296 826	212	7.14	1400
1975	310 595	312	10.05	996
1980	306 538	329	10.73	932
1983	310 000	350	11.29	886

Source: T. Scandlan, "The Bureaucratization of Client-Oriented Organizations," Senior B.A. Honours Thesis, Department of Sociology, McMaster University, 1985.

are available to handle trouble as it may be periodically defined and redefined by moral entrepreneurs, and thus some agencies appear and disappear from the directories. There is not only an absolute increase in the number of agencies, but the ratios in the last two columns also exhibit rapid growth. The highest period of growth was between 1965 and 1975, when the rates were 26 percent and 32 percent above the previous year.

Thus, growth has not only been continuous, it seems to have undergone periodic geometric increases. One outcome of this proliferation of processing agencies is that the possibility of secondary deviance is increasing as the number and ratio of organizations reacting to new forms of deviance increases. More and more people have more and more organizations interested in them, and keeping official files on their involvement in various organizations. While such agencies are intended to help their clients, it is still possible to conclude that what is defined as "deviant" is increasing and becoming more complex.

The second of these trends has perhaps led to a qualitative change in the nature of deviance in post-industrial settings. Service or "client-oriented" groups bureaucratized their organizations much later than did production organizations. Their increased concern with efficiency and technological rationalization led to some unanticipated consequences. Sjoberg, Brymer and Farris (1967) have argued that it is the nature of bureaucratization itself that maintains the post-industrial class structure.

If the argument above is extended to the relationship between deviants and non-deviants, there is a suggestion that social service agencies are becoming less able to cope with deviance. The implication of this would lead one to expect an increase in the number of deviants and kinds of devi-

ance. Previews of this future may already be indicated in the work of W.J. Wilson and his focus on the "truly disadvantaged" (Wilson 1987 1991).

Summary

My critique of anthropology and sociology suggests a new approach to deviance. Such an approach should rely on anthropology's sensitivity to cross-cultural and cross-scalar materials, and sociology's sensitivity to deviance and the generic processes whereby it is created and maintained. This broader study of deviance must take account, too, of social reactions to deviant behaviour and the construction of various levels of both control *and* deviance.

What is needed are careful ethnographies, focussed explicitly on deviance and its organization, at *all* scalar levels between primate and industrial. Of particular interest would be a further attempt to characterize deviance in terms of the presence—or absence—of the five arenas of deviance. With such data and with attention to comparative analysis, detailed study of the emergence of deviance and its parallel relation to order could begin. It would then be possible to flesh out the skeletal outline that we have presented in this volume.

Note

1. This table was adapted from R. Hedley, "Industrialization and Work," in Hagedorn 1990. Hagedorn in turn adapted it from Smucker 1990 and Statistics Canada *The Labour Force*, October, 1987, p. 20.

References Cited

Ben-Ari, Eyal
1987 Pygmies and Villagers, Ritual or Play? On the Place of Contrasting Modes of Metacommunication in Social Systems. Symbolic Interaction 10(2):167-185.

Black, Donald
1984 Towards a General Theory of Social Control. Vols. 1 and 2. Orlando: Academic Press.
1976 The Behavior of Law. New York: Academic Press.

Emerson, Robert, and Sheldon Messinger
1977 The Micro-Politics of Trouble. Social Problems 25(2):121-134.

Gilbert, Neil, and Harry Specht
1976 The Emergence of Social Welfare and Social Work. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers.

Hedley, R. Allen
1990 Industrialization and Work. *In* Sociology, 4th ed., edited by Robert Hagedorn, pp. 437-462. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada.

Inciardi, James A.
1974 Vocational Crime. Handbook of Criminology, edited by Daniel Glaser, pp. 299-401. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing.
Johnson, Allen W., and Timothy Earle
1987 The Evolution of Human Societies From Foraging Group to Agrarian State. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
Leacock, Eleanor, and Richard Lee
1982 Politics and History in Band Societies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lee, Richard B.
1984 The Dobe !Kung. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Levy, Jerrold
1984 The Sins of the Fathers: The Creation of Deviant Families Among the Hopi Indians of Arizona. Unpublished paper presented at the Conference on Deviance in a Cross-Cultural Context, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.
McPhail, Clark
1991 The Myth of the Madding Crowd. Hawthorne, New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
Rosenhan, D.L.
1973 Being Sane in Insane Places. Science 179:250-258.
Scandlan, T.
1985 The Bureaucratization of Client-Oriented Organizations. Senior Honours Thesis, Department of Sociology, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario.
Schubert, G., and R.D. Masters
1991 Primate Politics. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.
Schwartz, Richard D., and Jerome H. Skolnick
1962 Two Studies of Legal Stigma. Social Problems 10:133-138.
Sjoberg, Gideon
1960 The Preindustrial City: Past and Present. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.
Sjoberg, Gideon, Richard A. Brymer and Buford Farris
1966 Bureaucracy and the Lower Class. Sociology and Social Research 50(3):325-337.
Smucker, J.
1980 Industrialization in Canada. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall.
Statistics Canada
1987 The Labour Force. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.
Turnbull, Colin
1962 The Forest People. New York: Simon and Schuster.
1976 Wayward Servants: The Two Worlds of the African Pygmy. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Wilson, William J.
1987 The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, The Underclass and Public Policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1991 Presidential Address. Studying Inner City Social Dislocatees: The Challenge of Public Agenda Research. American Sociological Review 56:1-14.