

INTEGRALISM AND THE SOCIOLOGY OF DEVIANCE

TOWARD A NEW PARADIGM

Lawrence T. Nichols

The purpose of this article is to sketch out a new approach to the sociology of deviance, by examining the field in the light of Pitirim A. Sorokin's philosophy of Integralism. As other scholars (Jeffries 1987, 1998, 1999, 2001; Johnston 1991, 1995, 1998) have noted, and as I have also pointed out (Nichols 2001), Sorokin's Integralism has many affinities with traditional Catholic perspectives. Indeed, Sorokin frequently cited the works of Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great, Nicholas of Cusa and their contemporaries as epitomes of a medieval variant of Integralist ontology and epistemology. Recent papal teachings on faith and science, such as the encyclical, *The Splendor of Truth* (1993), are likewise in accord with this perspective. Sorokin's writings on Integralism, however, also had a strong futurist orientation, consistent with his thesis that modern secularist culture in Europe and America was declining and about to give way to another worldview. The question of how Integralism might reorient disciplines such as sociology, and specialized subfields such as deviance, is thus closely related to the broader issue of the church in the contemporary world and the possibility of Christian and Catholic social science.

As necessary prolegomena, I shall now offer an historical sketch of the sociology of deviance, followed by a condensed statement of the philosophy of Integralism. I will then articulate several propositions defining a proposed new sociology of deviance in which spirituality and creativity are central themes.

The Sociology of Deviance

Let us begin with a simple question: If we were college undergraduates who had enrolled in a course on deviance, what topics would we cover? A concise answer can be gotten by

examining the chapter headings of three recently published textbooks. Alex Thio (1995) focuses on the following issues: physical violence, sexual violence, property crime, prostitution, suicide, mental illness, organized crime, white collar crime, illegal drug use, alcohol use and abuse, homosexuality, heterosexual deviance, power abuse. Erich Goode (2001) offers a similar inventory: criminal behavior, drug use, heterosexual deviance, homosexuality, physical characteristics, cognitive deviance (belief systems), mental illness. Patricia and Peter Adler (2003) also deal with many of the same issues, while adding a few others: drug scares, moral panics, homophobia, fat identity, anorexia nervosa and bulimia, stigma management, child abuse reporting, youth gangs, police racism, bisexuality, rape, cheating. Let us now consider how the field arrived at the present set of focal concerns.

The special field of the sociology of deviance in the United States emerged gradually over the course of some seventy years, ranging from the 1890s to the 1960s. Defined in terms of widely influential writings, this period might be referred to as the time between the publication of Emile Durkheim's *The Division of Labor in Society* (1893) and Howard S. Becker's *Outsiders* (1963) and *The Other Side* (1964). Durkheim's work is foundational in its characterization of societies as moral orders based on "solidarity" that is defended through the rule of law. The works of Becker and other "labeling" scholars, by contrast, focus on the arbitrariness of practices through which societies distinguish "deviants" from "normals" and thereby create deviance.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in American sociology, much of what is now examined as deviance was studied within several related frameworks: social ethics, social problems, and social control. At Harvard University, for instance, economist-sociologist Edward Cummings¹ taught courses on labor conflicts and social welfare policy, while his colleague

Francis Greenwood Peabody addressed “the ethics of the social question” with an emphasis on family life, temperance, and public health.² Peabody published books on *Jesus Christ and the Social Question* (1915) and *Reminiscences of Present-Day Saints* (1927)—titles that would seem shocking in today’s more scientific climate. At the University of Chicago, established in 1892, the Christian ethical approach to social problems was championed by Charles Henderson, while Marion Talbot (one of the first women on the faculty) specialized in sanitation issues.

Meanwhile, sociologist-economist Edward A. Ross (at the Universities of Nebraska and Wisconsin) wrote influential works on the process of social control, through which individual motives and conduct were directed toward societal ends. In his influential book, *Sin and Society* (1907), Ross raised an alarm about a new breed of outwardly respectable deviant that he called “the criminaloid” (the prototype of what would later be called the white-collar criminal). Thus, among both traditional moralists (Peabody) and more scientifically oriented investigators (Cummings, Henderson, Talbot, Ross), discourse about deviance manifested a Judeo-Christian rhetoric that included allusions to Biblical teachings. This approach thereafter diminished and had largely disappeared by the 1920s, except within some Christian and Catholic schools, especially those that included departments of social ethics (e.g., Boston College). At Harvard, the last influential social ethicist was the physician Richard Clarke Cabot, who asserted in a 1938 book that honesty would cure many social problems, and who maintained till the end that “charity is the greatest word in our language.”³

In the decades following World War I, discourse about deviance moved strongly in the direction of naturalistic science that withheld moral judgment. A vocabulary of impersonal, large-scale processes emerged: urbanization, immigration, the cycle of race relations,

accommodation, assimilation, ecology, deviant professions. The dominant metaphor for deviance was “social disorganization,” a concept closely associated with “Chicago sociology” and expressed in the monumental work, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (1918) by W. I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, as well as in Thomas’s *The Unadjusted Girl* (1923) and W. I. and Dorothy Swaine Thomas’s *The Child in America: Behavior Problems and Programs* (1928). The morally neutral tone of this discourse was popularized in Anderson’s *The Hobo: Sociology of the Homeless Man* (1923) and Sutherland’s *The Professional Thief* (1937). The field also moved beyond traditional concerns with crime, vice and dependency to consider such issues as violations of norms in the workplace, most famously in research at a Western Electric plant in Chicago. At Harvard, psychiatrist and industrial sociologist Elton Mayo wrote of “the social problems of industrial civilization” that were engulfing humanity.

A further indicator of the shift in discourse was the idea of “natural histories” or invariant stages of a process that also became influential during the period between World Wars. One variant of this approach was the framework of deviant careers that was popularized through the studies of Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, especially their *500 Criminal Careers* (1930) and *One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents* (1934). Such deviant careers were sometimes linked to “natural areas” of cities, as in the ecological studies of Clifford R. Shaw, who wrote of both “delinquency areas” (1929) and “the natural history of a delinquent career” (1931). Natural areas could also be sites of nonconformist cultures, especially those of recent immigrant groups that led to “culture conflict and crime” (Sellin 1938).

As the victorious United States moved into the era of Cold War with the Soviet Union, a new metaphor of “systems” and “system needs” began to dominate discourse on deviance. Thus,

returning to Durkheim's emphasis on moral order and solidarity, Talcott Parsons in his major work, *The Social System* (1951), approached deviance as a threat to the integration of groups that was ordinarily counteracted by "mechanisms of control." At Columbia, Robert K. Merton (1957) added nuance to this "functionalist" or "structural-functionalist" model by examining how deviance such as political corruption supported existing social orders.

The systems emphasis dovetailed with the analysis of "subcultures" that generated and sustained deviance. Thus, Albert K. Cohen, in *Delinquent Boys* (1956) examined "the culture of the gang." In the same vein, Walter Miller (1958) investigated "lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency." Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin (1960) combined the subculture frame with the idea of opportunity, in an effort to explain contrasting patterns of crime and deviance in urban neighborhoods.

As the 1950s drew to a close, dissident voices challenged the framework of self-regulating systems and subcultures. C. Wright Mills in *The Power Elite* (1957) and Pitirim A. Sorokin and Walter Lunden in *Power and Morality* castigated the crimes of high officials. These critics asserted that the deviance of political and economic elites was neither automatically counteracted (as in Parson's model) nor functional for exploited groups like immigrants (as in Merton's analysis of urban political machines). In these works, a moralistic discourse reappeared, along with a prophetic stance reminiscent of Biblical warnings to monarchs and oracles against the nations. Within sociology, although they inspired a younger generation, these works were widely attacked as unscientific exercises in political ideology and social ethics.

During the 1960s, the sociology of deviance emerged as a highly popular and influential field. Scholarly discourse was dominated by the "labeling" or "social reaction" approach that

viewed deviance as a quality conferred upon behavior by those in positions of power. Consistent with the themes of the contemporary Civil Rights movement, sociologists described deviants as victims of arbitrary definitional processes that imposed enduring “stigmas” upon them, while hypocritically sparing privileged groups (e.g., middle class teenagers). Influential sociologists such as Howard S. Becker urged colleagues to adopt the nontraditional posture of identification with such victims of normative enforcement. Meanwhile, scholars such as Edwin Schur (1965) raised the issue of “crimes without victims” (e.g, prostitution, drug use, homosexuality) and called for “radical nonintervention” in the lives of nonconformists. This was the beginning of the stance of “the insurgent sociologist” militantly committed to reform and radical social change, which a traditionalist Catholic observer such as G. K. Chesterton would likely have seen as part of the “topsy-turveydom” of the twentieth century.⁴ As an amalgam of American pragmatism (a la William James, John Dewey and George Herbert Mead) and conflict theory, the “labeling” approach questioned authority and denied moral absolutes (while simultaneously tending to absolutize humanistic self-determination and egalitarianism).

As New Left political movements proliferated in the U.S. and Europe, discourse on deviance acquired a strong neo-Marxist tone and a vocabulary of class conflict. A rubric of “political economy” emerged as the major frame for understanding conformity and nonconformity. Influential writers such as Richard Quinney characterized the oppressive capitalist system as a primary cause of street crime, as well as the reason why more serious white collar offenses went unpunished. Revisionist historian Anthony Platt (1969) examined the juvenile justice (“child saving”) movement as a means for controlling the lower class, while David Rothman (1971) critiqued the institutionalization of deviants in prisons and mental

institutions as cruel and ineffective. Stephen Pfohl (1978) criticized attempts by psychiatrists to predict which individuals would become “dangerous” to society. Meanwhile the translated writings of French social critic Michel Foucault (1977, 1980) on punishment and surveillance, as well as his history of sexuality, became very popular among sociologists in the U.S.

From the final two decades of the twentieth century into the early years of the twenty-first, the themes of moral relativism, of deviance as victimization of nonconformists through official repression, and of scholarly insurgency (e.g., Gamson 1998) have remained prominent in published discourse. Earlier emphases on labeling and political economy have blended with emergent issues of identity politics (e.g., Hendershott 2002), especially feminism and gay liberation, as well as “postmodern” epistemology (e.g., deconstruction, semantics and semiotics, textuality and narrative analysis).⁵ The perspective of individual subjectivity has acquired widespread legitimacy, while the “voyeuristic gaze” of repressive officialdom has come under condemnation (e.g., Pfohl 1992). A theme of victims talking back to their oppressors, and defiantly speaking their own reality, has emerged and crystallized in movements such as “queer sociology” (e.g., Seidman 1996).

Ironically, the increasing acceptance of nonconformity by sociologists blunted the earlier critical thrust of the sociology of deviance and contributed to its decline. Indeed, shortly before the millennium a book-length “obituary” of the field appeared (Sumner 1994), whose diagnosis has been affirmed in more recent research (Miller, Wright and Dannels 2001).⁶ Some scholars, especially Erich Goode, have dissented. Even while denying the death of the field, however, Goode (2002:116) conceded its general malaise: “The field lacks a central theoretical core, there are no intellectual assumptions that tie its practitioners into a coherent community, and the

disagreements among researchers concerning its legitimate subject matter are profound.” Thus, a good case can be made that if the sociology of deviance is to be revitalized, some new paradigm is needed.

Sorokin’s Integralism

The philosophy of Integralism originates as epistemology, in the sense that it attempts to overcome an apparent dualism concerning the nature of reality, truth and value. As Sorokin notes, both individuals and organized groups have perceived two radically different aspects of reality: a spiritual eternalistic dimension and a physical temporal dimension. These contrasting dimensions compete for attention and allegiance, and the choice of which to accept and emphasize has profound consequences for persons and societies. Indeed, the selection of either as the dominant premise determines one’s lifeworld and meaningful experiences. People dwell in either a realm of the sacred, or a realm of the secular, in their culture and relationships. The ancient Incas, Mayas, Egyptians, Israelites, and Hindus, as well as medieval Europeans and members of contemporary Islamic republics, have inhabited a spiritualized sociocultural order. By contrast, the ancient Greeks and Romans in the later phases of both empires, as well as post-Enlightenment Europeans and citizens of officially atheistic societies such as the former Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China, have experienced life within domains of secularism.

Sorokin referred to the sacred cultural mentality as “Ideational.” Within such sociocultural orders, various kinds of “scripture” are the main form of literature; art tends to be nonrepresentational; there is a theocratic government featuring priestly, prophetic or clerical groups; law codes are based upon the principle of expiation; there is an ethics of absolute principles (Sorokin 1957: 15). The opposed mentality is called “Sensate.”⁷ In such sociocultural

orders there is realistic and naturalistic literature and representational art; government makes no claim of spiritual authority; law codes emphasize re-education and rehabilitation of offenders; there is an ethics of personal happiness (hedonism, utilitarianism, eudaemonism).

These ontological and epistemological choices result in interpersonal and intergroup conflicts that are often severe and may lead to violence. Members of Ideational cultures tend to regard Sensate orders as ungodly, heretical or blasphemous. In the same way, partisans of Sensate cultures are inclined to view Ideational systems as unenlightened, superstitious and unscientific. Each is threatened by its counterpart and sees it as error and insult.

There are, however, mitigating factors that promote peaceful coexistence and understanding. First, as Sorokin notes, neither Ideational or Sensate orders are ever found in completely pure form. There is always some admixture of the elements of each within a population and a culture area, as well as within the minds of individuals. In most cases, such mixtures are eclectic and somewhat contradictory, as when people are pious in church and yet ruthless in marketplace transactions. But there is also one harmonious combination that affirms the truth and value of both the Ideational and the Sensate premises.

In his major work, *Social and Cultural Dynamics* (1937), Sorokin referred to this perfectly balanced culture mentality as “Idealistic.” As exemplars of Idealistic culture Sorokin cited the classical period of ancient Greece (the time of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle) and medieval Europe. In both cultures, according to his analysis, there was a slight dominance of the sacred or spiritual premise in the harmonious sacred-secular hybrid. Sorokin also argued that the perfect blending found in Idealistic cultures could be understood in terms of phase movements, in the sense that Idealistic sociocultural orders tend to appear when Ideational systems are

declining and Sensate replacements are beginning to emerge.⁸

At the time of the publication of the first three volumes of *Dynamics* in 1937, Sorokin embraced the Idealistic stance, telling readers in a preface:

The standpoint assumed is Idealistic in the specific sense of the term as used in this work. It is the only point of view that permits us to see without serious distortion both extreme types of integrated culture—the Ideational and the Sensate (Sorokin 1937, Vol. I: x).

The privileged status of the Idealistic perspective was also evidenced by numerous statements in the three volumes about its special, rare, even “miraculous” qualities.

In 1941, however, when the fourth volume of *Dynamics* appeared, Sorokin moved away from the posture of Idealism toward an even broader synthetic stance called Integralism. He began by stating that, “The integral truth is not identical with any of the three forms of truth, but embraces all of them” (Sorokin 1941: 762). Elaborating on the idea that Integralism is the broadest possible perspective, Sorokin (1941: 763) asserted:

The reality given by the integral three-dimensional truth, with its sources of intuition, reason and the senses, is a nearer approach to the infinite metalogical reality of the *coincidentia oppositorum* than the purely sensory, or purely rational, or purely intuitional reality, given by one of the systems of truth and reality.

The emphasis here was on what Sorokin would later (1956b) call “epistemic correlation,” that is, the principle that each type of knowledge corrects and balances its two counterparts. Genuine knowledge, in other words, always occurs within an intuitional-rational-sensory matrix, a unified totality of perception. Truth is always dialectical or dialogical.

Sorokin developed this principle in both non-temporal and temporal applications. The non-temporal refer to operations of the mind considered by themselves (as in Kant's critiques of reason). Thus, sensory perceptions not checked by careful logical reasoning would be misleading, as when one concludes that the earth is flat or the sun is small. In the same way, rational deductions not systematically checked against empirical evidence would be prone to error, as in the theories of alchemy. Intuitions by themselves might also prove false, as the historical record shows, as in prophecies of the date of the second coming of Christ.

The temporal application of the principle of epistemic correlation deals with culture. Here Sorokin theorized the rise and fall of Ideational and Sensate "supersystems" (i.e., art, literature, law, religion, etc.) in terms of their relationship to the total matrix of truth. In particular, the decline and demise of each type of integrated system was explained as a departure from the totality, that is, a kind of schism, secession or separatism. Here, for instance, is Sorokin's (1941: 764) summary description of the genesis of cultural crises, such as that of Western Sensate culture in the mid-twentieth century:

Suppressing the other systems of truth, and the aspects of reality they give, the dominant system of partial truth begins, under the disguise of truth, to lead the society more and more toward ignorance, error, hollowness of values, aridity in creativeness and discovery of the aspects of reality, and poverty of social and cultural life. Adaptation becomes less and less possible. And life becomes less and less rich in real values and creative experience.

A full-scale analysis of the complexities of Integralism lies beyond the scope of this paper. As Barry Johnston (2001: 41) has noted, Integralism is “simultaneously an epistemology, psychology, sociology of change, and theory of history.” There is, however, one issue that needs to be addressed because of its ramifications for an alternative sociology of deviance: the special status of intuition.

As I argued in an earlier article in this journal (2001), Sorokin’s approach to knowledge strongly resembles the Russian religious tradition of Intuitionism, rooted in the writings of the Eastern Church Fathers. Indeed, Sorokin’s own term “integral” has a central place in Intuitionism, especially in the works of two major figures, Ivan Vasilyevich Kireyevsky (1806-1864) and Vladimir Solovyov (1853-1900). The most striking similarity appears in Solovyov’s unfinished 1877 work, *The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge*. As historian V. V. Zenkovsky (1953: 482) observes, Solovyov (like Sorokin) seeks a “total-unity,” that is

a synthesis of religion, philosophy, and science—of faith, thought, and experience—which is to answer the question: “What is the purpose of human existence in general? For what does mankind finally exist?” Solovyov is here speaking of mankind as a “single being.” ... “The culminating phase of historical development finds expression in the formation of a total life-organization, “ an “integral life,” which will satisfy the needs of feeling, thought and will.

In the same way that Solovyov emphasizes “faith” and “feeling,” Sorokin treats intuition as “*primus inter pares*” within the trinity of intuition-reason-sense.⁹

The “crisis of our age,” the disintegration of modern Sensate culture, is seen by Sorokin as rooted in the increasing neglect of intuition (truth of faith), or, conversely, the increasing

separation of the truth of senses from the total matrix of truth. The solution to the crisis is therefore the reintegration of intuition in a new culture where it enjoys a place of privilege (i.e., either an Ideational or an Idealistic supersystem). Sorokin's proposed first step, again rooted in intuition, is the altruization of individuals, groups and societies. In this way, as Johnston (1995: 146, 168) notes, Integralism moves from epistemology to program of practical action.

From Sorokin's perspective it is through intuition that we recognize the truth of the Christian Golden Rule, and thus it is through intuition that we know ourselves as members of a global human family. In moving from cognition to the logically implied loving action, we also integrate what is intellectually true with what is morally good.¹⁰ For Sorokin (as for Leo Tolstoy who greatly influenced him), this involves a further transformation toward the radical non-violence of the Sermon on the Mount. In Sorokin's ultimately optimistic vision, human beings will turn away from exploitation and warfare to build a new soul-filled social order. The following passage, from *S.O.S.: The Meaning of Our Crisis* (1951: 72) speaks of the possibility of a new heaven and a new earth:

Looked at through the eyes of the soul, the whole meaning of life and the mission of human beings on this planet are also radically transformed in this new cosmos.

Life is transformed from the soulless "struggle for existence" into the creative adventure, animated by love, helped by mutual aid, and striving to be radiantly creative and the supreme mission of humanity on this planet becomes the creative building of a great human universe of the True-Good-Beautiful Trinity.

As soulfulness is reclaimed and an Integral culture develops, human beings will also gain a new self-image. Rejecting the id-ego-superego model, as well as other forms of biological reductionism popularized by social science, people will recognize a four-componential nature: biological unconscious, biological conscious, sociocultural conscious, and supraconscious (Sorokin 1954b). In this way, Integralism moves from theory of cognition and historical cultures to a theory of personality that asserts not only the existence of the spiritual but also its primacy. Most heretically, Integralism claims that recognition of universal human spirituality will henceforth become axiomatic for genuine social science. Consequently, denials of spirituality and agnostic stances toward the spiritual that have been so characteristic of modern Western science, will be seen in the future reintegrated culture as incompetent science.

An Integral Paradigm of Deviance

On the basis of the preceding discussion, it is possible to sketch out several major features of a sociology of deviance informed by Integralism. Such a paradigm would include: (1) a balanced emphasis on positive and negative deviance; (2) a balanced view of freedom and determinism; (3) explicit recognition of spiritual aspects of deviance and its control; (4) stable reference points defining morality and its violations; and (5) an integral methodology including contextual and historical analysis.

1. Positive and Negative Deviance. In Sorokin's view, the nearly exclusive emphasis in sociology on negative deviance is a symptom of the malaise of the times. This is not to say, however, that Sorokin himself ignored negative deviance. Indeed, such deviance is a major focus in quite a few of his works, from his early study, *Crime and Punishment, Heroism and*

Reward (1913), through *Hunger as a Factor in Human Affairs* (1922), *The Sociology of Revolution* (1925), *Social and Cultural Dynamics* (1937-1941), *Man and Society in Calamity* (1942), *S.O.S.: The Meaning of Our Crisis* (1951), *The American Sex Revolution* (1956a), and *Power and Morality* (1959). These studies address a wide range of negative deviance, especially violence, criminality, and sexual licentiousness.

As he discovered his own distinctive theoretical and prophetic voice in *Dynamics* and its sequels, Sorokin began to emphasize positive deviance more and more. This involved two foci: exceptionally creative individuals, including geniuses; and moral exemplars. Thus, outstanding creative persons occupied a central place in his study of the fluctuations of Western cultures over twenty-five centuries, because their works revealed the specific character of individual periods. Sorokin's treatment of geniuses was more limited, but of great significance as part of his attempt to demonstrate the power of intuition, as in his mature system of sociology, *Society, Culture and Personality* (1947) and his critique of *Fads and Foibles in Modern Sociology* (1956b).

Sorokin's work on the positive deviance of altruists, by contrast, absorbed his energies for more than a decade, from *The Reconstruction of Humanity* (1948), through *Power and Morality* (1959). Three works in particular made lasting contributions to the understanding of this topic: *Altruistic Love* (1950a), *Explorations in Altruism* (1950b), and *The Ways and Power of Love* (1954b). Working largely with biographical and interview data, Sorokin created a threefold typology of altruists, while also reaching the startling conclusion that altruists live longer than egoists. He also identified techniques for the production and application of love energy.

The emphasis on positive deviance accords with Sorokin's view that Integral culture

should be ennobling in all its specialized components such as science. Here one can recognize a Tolstoyan echo. In an early essay on Leo Tolstoy as a philosopher (1914), Sorokin discussed Tolstoy's belief that good literature has a quality of "moral contagion," in the sense of spreading true ethics among readers.

2. Freedom and Determinism. As was noted in the historical sketch of the sociology of deviance, the professional literature has tended to emphasize environmental causes of the origin and persistence of deviance. Several factors in particular have been stressed in innumerable writings: biology (including physiology and genetics), racial identity, social class, residence in impoverished urban areas, and official oppression and repression. The vast majority of studies in the ecological, subcultural, opportunity, labeling, and political economy schools have followed this logic of external causation of violations of social norms.

There has also been some consideration of deviance as free choice, but this approach tends to be regarded as a throwback to the social ethics period. Indeed, for the past several decades it has been politically incorrect to explain deviance in terms of free will, and many sociologists would view this as "blaming the victim" (Ryan 1971).

The situation seems to be changing, however, and two exceptions to the above generalization should be noted. The first is the literature on identity politics that approaches deviant lifestyles as political empowerment. The second consists of studies of the "seductions" of crime and deviance (Katz 1990) that focus on attractions, rather than coercion.

In Sorokin's work, outstanding creativity and altruism represent types of positive deviance based on free choice. Sorokin underscores the role of freedom by examining how

exceptionally creative persons and altruists overcome severe obstacles. This includes his treatment of processes of conversion from egoism to altruism.

3. Spiritual Dimensions of Deviance. Within the professional sociological literature, deviance is understood as violations of technical (performance), legal and ethical norms, but not as a spiritual phenomenon. From an Integral perspective, however, deviance also involves a transcendent interior dimension. In deviant behavior, the deepest potential in human beings is either realized or else rejected. In either event, something of great value is at stake.

The positive deviance of exceptionally creative persons expresses human potential in one of its highest forms. For Sorokin, this manifestation of spirituality bears a special resemblance to the divine. In his view (as is the opening chapter of the Book of Genesis), God is above all else a creative power and thus to be made in the divine image is to be also a creator. Conversely, Sorokin's obvious disdain, even contempt, for periods of cultural stagnation, and especially for the "passive sensate" attitude, is rooted in a perception of unfulfilled creativity. Violence, especially the irrational brutality of revolutions and world wars, is also the antithesis of creativity and a rebellion against mankind's creative vocation.

Deviance can also be spiritual by being redemptive, as in the selfless love of altruists, especially martyrs. Sorokin's writings on the crisis of our age and the reconstruction of humanity are suffused with the theme of "purification through suffering" made famous through the works of Dostoyevsky. Such positive deviance also bears a resemblance to the divine as manifested in the suffering servanthood of Christ, which reveals the triumph of sacrificial non-violence.

4. Stable Reference Points for Deviance. In place of the extreme moral relativism of much recent work in the sociology of deviance, an Integral paradigm would assert universal standards of conduct. Sorokin believed that there were fundamental ethical principles shared by major cultures and world religions, especially honesty, compassion, non-violence and love. Without such stable points of reference, as noted in the historical sketch above, the very concept of deviance becomes increasingly vague and meaningless.

Within sociology, Vincent Jeffries has made the most serious effort to articulate moral universals consistent with Integralism. In his view, the best starting point is provided by the Biblical Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule, in combination with the ideas of virtue and vice. These are not merely theological constructs, for as Jeffries (2001: 32) argues, “The truth of faith identifies and establishes the virtues and vices as fundamental typologies of attitudes and behaviors.”

The virtues are most useful for examining positive deviance, since they constitute “a common standard of goodness and morality that transcends different historical eras and cultures” (Jeffries 1999: 43). Especially virtuous individuals and groups are deviant in the positive sense of over-fulfilling norms of goodness and serving as models for others. Jeffries suggests that social scientists apply the typology of five primary virtues presented by Aquinas: temperance, fortitude, justice, charity and prudence. The corresponding vices are attitudes and patterns of behavior that are harmful to oneself and to others, and are therefore useful in analyzing negative deviance. Jeffries also argues that sociologists might build upon the traditional idea of the

“seven deadly sins”: pride, envy, anger, lust, gluttony, greed and sloth.

5. Integral Methodology. As is true of many broad-gauge paradigms, Integralism is simultaneously a theoretical model and a methodological strategy (Ford 1996). Beginning with *Dynamics*, Sorokin developed an unorthodox approach that he called “logico-meaningful” and “meaningful-causal” analysis.¹¹ The principle underlying this approach is that behavior is only comprehensible in terms of the significance attached to it by participants. Sociologists seeking to understand behavior (in this case, positive or negative deviance) must therefore base their analysis on subjective data and on the intersubjective systems of meaning (cultures) of participants. For instance, behavior that may be defined by a totalitarian regime as negative deviance (e.g., preaching a religious dogma) may simultaneously be seen by believers around the world as heroic positive deviance (i.e., martyrdom).

The importance of culture points also to the centrality of context, since culture is one type of context. But for Sorokin culture is also situated in the broader context of human history. Particular acts are conformist or deviant according to the historical setting in which they occur. Furthermore, Sorokin’s model of historical phases and crises illumines both the quality and quantity of deviance in particular periods. For instance, according to Sorokin’s theory, periods of cultural disintegration produce crises that breed totalitarian governments. This means that an atrocity such as the anti-Jewish genocide of the Nazi regime in the 1940s cannot be adequately explained in terms of psychology (e.g., the personality of Adolph Hitler) or political systems (e.g., as a feature of fascism), but must be seen also as negative deviance typical of a period of final crisis for Sensate culture.¹²

A particular challenge for analysts here is sensitivity to the significance of multiple contexts, including not only the dominant culture type and the historical period but also such factors as political mood (liberal or conservative), economic conditions (prosperity, recession, depression), religious mood (e.g., times of declining faith or times of revival), population dynamics (e.g., large families may be seen as deviant in periods of rapid population growth) and international relations (e.g., persecution of dissidents may be more likely in times of ideological Cold War). The fact of multiple contexts of action means that numerous readings of deviance are always possible.

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to envision a new paradigm for the sociology of deviance on the basis of Sorokin's philosophy of Integralism. From the perspective of many, perhaps most sociologists, this effort itself is deviant in the sense that it mixes science with religion and asserts the central importance of human spirituality. On the other hand, the moment may be favorable for such a reconsideration, for there are widespread signs of a resurgent spirituality and a renewed interest in transcendental issues. Recent cosmologies in physics (especially the "Big Bang" theory), the ageing of the "baby boom" generation, the holistic health movement, research on death and dying (including reported "near death" and "out of body" experiences), psychologies of personal growth (e.g., Thomas Moore's "care of the soul" and "the soul's religion"), renewed interest in mythology (including the works of Joseph Campbell and the Christian allegories of C. S. Lewis and J. R. R. Tolkien), efforts to create alternative corporations (e.g., Tom Chappell's "soul of a business"), the decline of atheistic Communist systems, and the Islamic challenge to the West have all placed spiritual questions on center stage. There is no

logical reason to expect that sociology will remain untouched by these developments.

Sociology, in its modern phase, began with Auguste Comte's "religion of humanity," and was largely shaped by major thinkers who either denied transcendent reality (Marx, Durkheim, Herbert Spencer, Pareto) or who understood the spiritual as ethical action in the world (Max Weber, Edward A. Ross, Jane Addams, Robert MacIver, Parsons, Merton). Against this backdrop, Sorokin, with his explicitly mystical emphasis, was widely regarded as an unscientific negative deviant who longed to return to the Middle Ages. Now as the twenty-first century unfolds, Sorokin's works may appear in a very different light—even as vindicated signs of a return to the attitude of thankful faith that Chesterton called "orthodoxy."

1. Cummings is best known as the father of the famous poet, e. e. cummings, whose works include a moving tribute to his father.

2. In the irreverent parlance of Harvard undergraduates, Peabody's courses in social ethics were known as "Peabo's drinking, drainage and divorce."

3. Harvard still maintains a Richard Clarke Cabot Professorship in Social Ethics, despite the abolition of its Department of Social Ethics in 1931, when it was replaced by the new Department of Sociology chaired by Sorokin.

4. A journal entitled *The Insurgent Sociologist* was established during the period.

5. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, and the end of the Cold War, tended to discredit the 1970s view that "capitalism is the problem and socialism is the solution."

6. There had been earlier critiques from within. Of these, the most frequently cited was an article by Alex Liazos complaining that students referred to the field as "nuts, sluts and preverts."

7. The late Robert K. Merton has reported that Sorokin initially employed the term "Sensual culture," but eventually adopted the term "Sensate" suggested by Merton.

8. One problem in Sorokin's theory is why the Idealistic or Integral type, which is the most adequate approach to truth, is relatively short-lived vis-a-vis its Ideational and Sensate counterparts. Sorokin's response, according to Professor Joseph Ford, was to compare the Idealistic culture mentality to a delicate hybrid plant that is more difficult to cultivate than the plants from which it is bred.

Sorokin might also have pointed to the dominance of right-handedness and left-handedness in people, and the relative rarity of ambidexterity.

9. There is even an interesting etymological similarity between the two thinkers. The name Solovyov means "nightingale," and the name Sorokin means, approximately, "blackbird."

10. The link between scientific inquiry and practical reform was a lifelong concern of Sorokin's, dating back to his early career in Russia. For more on this topic, see my article, "Science, Politics and Moral Activism: Sorokin's Integralism Reconsidered."

11. The term "logico-meaningful" stands in sharp contrast to the "logico-experimental" method advocated by economist-sociologist Vilfredo Pareto that was modeled on natural science.

12. Although most sociological research in the U.S. lacks an historical dimension, there have been some good studies of deviance that are informed by historical scholarship. An enduring minor classic in this respect is Kai Erikson's *Wayward Puritans*, which analyzes three crises in the history of Massachusetts Bay Colony, including the Salem witchcraft hysteria of 1692.