

Part 1: Deviant aggressive behavior

The set of theories provide a broad -though not necessarily mutually exclusive- overview of possible mechanisms driving deviant aggressive behaviour. In itself, the presentation of these terms together- 'deviant' and 'aggressive'- implies that there are certain behaviours that are 'deviant', but not 'aggressive' (such as artistic subcultures) and 'aggressive' but non-deviant, such as the 'aggression' expected in the training of the military and sports professionals. This dimension of socially and culturally acceptable limits of these terms helps frame our discussion of policy in a more comprehensive and responsible manner.

Theory 1: If deviant behaviour is simply a result of reinforcement based on reward or punishment, then social policy ought to choose its reinforcements accordingly. Non-deviant or 'acceptable' behaviour can be provided positive extrinsic incentives. However, this action may result in a situation where behaviours undertaken by individuals based on implicit social or ethical norms would now be tied to the incentive, and may cease to do so on withdrawal of the incentive. For this reason, not engaging in deviant or aggressive behaviour may continue without any particular reward.

Instead, the deviant behaviour and its unacceptability may be firmly emphasized through legal mechanisms or public censure. For example, strikes by religious groups on the release of movies containing controversial or sensitive content has frequently been allowed or given passive acceptance by law-enforcement officers or politicians who themselves hold vested interests in the appeasement of or patronage to such interest groups. A firmer government policy would ensure that such aggression is declared as illegal on mass media, and ensure that the vandals involved are prosecuted as per law.

Theory 2: This theory zooms in from groups to the lens of individual behaviour. Authority figures who may or may not directly be the cause of an individual's personal frustrations then become the target for their expression. A possible example would be several noted instances of gun violence in schools, such as that in Parkland, Florida at the hands of a teenager already diagnosed with deep emotional problems (Kennedy, 2018). In such cases, there needs to exist greater coordination between psychiatric associations and legal bodies permitting the acquisition of weapons or firearms. For example, an individual procuring a gun would need to provide evidence of no psychological issues by registered psychiatrist/

Theory 3:

This makes stronger claims as it makes two claims within it. The first is that social rules systematically oppress or discriminate against certain sub-sections or specific individuals. The source of these rules are not clearly defined, but can be assumed to be placed by implicit social norms (most likely defined by the segments of society that benefit from this arrangement)/

Given these circumstances, deviant behaviour is seen as rational. The caste system in Indian society may provide an example- where lower castes were assigned menial and often inhuman tasks, such as manual scavenging. Many of these, called 'Mahadalit' communities have been subjected to intense discrimination as far as being denied access to public areas and temples, equal opportunity for education, etc (UN India, 2018). The large number of instances of counter-violence towards and

by these communities could be construed as 'rational'. There may exist an underlying sense of sympathy with the oppressed, and this may require policy that takes away the systemic element of oppression of individuals. For example, again in the Indian context, the Union and State governments provide legislation for 'reservations' in political and educational institutions for lower castes and untouchables, so that they may gain social mobility that would not have ordinarily been available to them. With higher social and economic security, these individuals would be expected to not continue to engage in deviant aggressive behaviour.

Theory 4: This final policy speaks of how deviance is a set of behaviours in society that may be classified as a 'role'. Individuals' assumption of this role depends on their exposure thereto, and is not necessarily expected of all individuals. In such cases, social policy would need to be aimed at limiting such exposure to deviant subcultures, or targeting the subculture itself. For example, the Ku Klux Klan's acts of violence against African Americans in the United States have continued for 150 years, in spite of repeated attempts to end their activities (Charleston, (2018)). In such cases, governments need to undertake stronger action against such denominations, and develop stronger mechanisms to understand and prevent the typical patterns in indoctrination of new members.

We now explore and test the applications/predictions of these theories in the context of a specific 'experiment' in the last 10 years in America- that of the #MeToo movement. Coined in 2006 by Taraka Burke, has allowed for the surfacing of cases of sexual harassment and exploitation of women, frequently relying on disclosure over traditional and new-age social media (Centre for American Progress, 2018). The act of 'deviant aggression' here is the acts of violence- either psychological or physical- against women, by men- frequently in positions of power (ibid).

Theory 1 would seem plausible on two fronts- that acts of violence were in some sense being condoned, if not rewarded. The reward could be linked with communications among men about their 'successes' with women, and a culture of validation of such actions by other men through cultures like 'locker room' talk., etc. Furthermore, it has not been punished to the required extent due to non-reporting, possibly by fears of counter-measures by the men involved.

Theory 2 speaks of acts of violence driven by frustration. Some incidents of school violence- such as Santa Fe have been linked to rejections of male perpetrators' sexual overtures to women. But further investigation is required to explore whether the women served as a conduit for frustration against authority figures more generally

Theory 3 would not hold valid at all in this context, since the men in question were frequently in power, and not oppressed by the women they enacted violence against.

Theory 4 may apply partially, as certain deviant and misogynistic cultures may advocate for greater power over women, and initiating some forms of violence against them. However, whether these traits can be considered an organized 'culture' akin to the Ku Klux Klan or religious and casteist groups in India is highly questionable.

Thus we find that for the #MeToo movement, Theory 1 seems most plausible, though further research may reveal links with Theory 2.

PROCRASTINATION

Bibliography

- Kennedy, Kelli (February 14, 2018). "Here's what we know about Nikolas Cruz, the Florida school shooting suspect". *The Boston Globe*. Associated Press
- UN India, 'Breaking Free: Rehabilitating Manual Scavengers'. Retrieved from: <http://in.one.un.org/page/breaking-free-rehabilitating-manual-scavengers/>
- BBC, May 2018. 'Sante Fe school shooting: Suspect 'was rejected' by victim Shana Fisher' Retrieved from: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-44194074>
- Center for American Progress. January 31, 2018. Retrieved from: <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/women/news/2018/01/31/445669/politics-policy-turning-corner-sexual-harassment/>
- Charleston, LJ, 'How the Ku Klux Klan began its reign of terror on Christmas Eve', *News.au.com*. Retrieved from: <https://www.news.com.au/lifestyle/real-life/true-stories/how-the-ku-klux-klan-began-its-reign-of-terror-on-christmas-eve/news-story/55da9fe804021f84f2839670b1faa8ee>