

Unpublished paper under
editorial review. Do not quote.

Copyright © 2012 by
David Horton Smith

Studying the ‘Dark Side’ of the Civil Society/Nonprofit Sector: Progress Toward a Round-Earth Paradigm (V#3 Final)

David Horton Smith, Ph. D.

Research and Emeritus Professor, Boston College

Chestnut Hill, MA, USA

<dhortonsmith@hotmail.com>

Abstract

Scholars of Civil Society/Nonprofit Sector (CS/NPS) Research currently use many Flat-Earth Paradigms that limit full understanding. Interdisciplinary CS/NPS scholars consistently ignore direct study of the "Dark Side" of the CS/NPS. Dark Side phenomena include deviance and misconduct in all kinds of organized and non-organized (informal) CS/NPS contexts both by individuals and whole groups. This article discusses the 'Relativity of Deviance' and the roots of CS/NPS Dark Side phenomena generally. Dark Side research-neglect by CS/NPS researchers in the published literature, including *NVSQ*, is documented. Deviant Nonprofit Groups (DNGs), especially Dissenting DNGs, are identified as the “Dark Energy” of the CS/NPS. They usually stir up negative societal reactions, but often lead to long-term, positive, social changes in their

societies. A paradigm shift is needed in CSNPS Research to focus more on Dark Side phenomena.

Keywords: Deviance, Deviant Nonprofit Groups, Paradigm Shift, Dark Side of Nonprofit Sector, Dark Energy of Nonprofit Sector, Misconduct

Introduction

An objective, scientific field or discipline of Civil Society/Nonprofit Sector (CS/NPS) Research can only be built wisely with full understanding of the objective realities of all its phenomena. We must study and understand all kinds and aspects of CS/NPS groups, both informal and formal, as well as all individuals involved in the CS/NPS, such as paid-staff and volunteers of different kinds, including informal volunteers acting outside organized contexts. Thus, we must include study of and theory about both the potentially or actually positive/beneficial AND the potentially or actually negative/harmful aspects of these CS/NPS phenomena.

These potentially or actually negative/harmful aspects have been termed recently the "Dark Side" of the CS/NPS [author reference] or, earlier, "the dark side of voluntarism" [author reference]. This Dark Side refers to all kinds of perceived deviance and misconduct by CS/NPS individual participants (e.g., formal and informal volunteers---both regular and episodic, paid staff, officers/board members) as well as by CS/NPS groups at every territorial level, from International NGOs (INGOs) down to block and building associations, throughout human history

and all over the world.

Using the term “Dark Side” does NOT imply condemnation of all Dark Side CS/NPS phenomena by those who make an objective examination of them. *Potential* harmful or negative effects are not *actual* harm or negative effects, but it is wise to know about such potentials. Moreover, there are virtually no human activities, including human activities as group members or participants, which do not have their negative aspects, however positive their main effects may be in the long term. Some Dark Side phenomena that seem to have immediately harmful or negative effects on participants or the larger society may have very beneficial or positive longer-term effects, either for the individuals or the group involved or for the larger community, society, and world, or both. Successful social movement organizations are but one example here (e.g., Gamson 1990: 53).

When we encourage more frequent, and especially more reliable, valid, comprehensive and comparative, study of the Dark Side of the CS/NPS, we are not implying that we support or approve of such deviance and misconduct being studied. Far less are we declaring approval or support of any specific deviance or misconduct, let alone approval of all such Dark Side activities by individuals or groups.

Emphasizing the Dark Side of CS/NPS phenomena is ultimately a metaphor and overgeneralization for purposes of communication and emphasis. There is clearly a spectrum of shades of "brightness to darkness" of CS/NPS phenomena. This spectrum ranges from the almost totally good, beneficial, and benevolent (e.g., the charitable volunteer work of Mother Theresa and her Roman Catholic religious order [Spink 1998]), through a neutral ("gray") phase of the harmless, inoffensive, and innocuous (e.g., a grassroots association of model train enthusiasts [Olmsted 1993] or of quilt-makers [King 1997]), to the almost totally evil, harmful, and

detrimental (e.g., the German Nazi Party and its affiliates under Adolf Hitler [Hohne 1979; Kershaw 2000; Rummel 1994]).

SPECIFIC REASONS FOR STUDYING THE DARK SIDE OF THE CS/NPS

Some important reasons why more empirical study of the CS/NPS Dark Side and more related theory are needed are the following:

(1) Dark Side study can provide a more objective and balanced approach to CS/NPS scholarship, helping to overcome the present widespread “boosterism” among scholars and especially practitioners. Too many researchers, observers, and leaders in this field talk and act as if the sector were indeed “Angelic” [author reference] or “Saintly”/“Sanctified” (e.g., Wagner 2000: Chapter 5), with only positive/beneficial activities and outcomes.

(2) Dark Side study can connect the CS/NPS Research field more clearly and effectively to the general study of crime, deviance, law and regulation (e.g., criminology, penology, deviance studies, criminal justice studies, police science). This linkage very much needs to be developed and strengthened.

(3) Dark Side study can better provide useful, practical advice to policy-makers and leaders in all sectors of society regarding the prevention, monitoring, and appropriate sanctioning of deviance and misconduct in and by CS/NPS groups, paid staff, and individual volunteers, both formally organized and informal.

(4) Dark Side study can potentially increase the future viability and survival of specific nonprofit organizations valuable to society in the longer term. Recent events in the USA show that even a very large and well-known nonprofit (e.g., ACORN ; Atlas 2010) can have a misconduct/Dark Side scandal that leads to its demise within a single year. This could potentially happen to *any* nonprofit anywhere.

(5) Dark Side study could help to increase societal support (e.g., greater donated time, money, and objects, including human blood and organs) for the CS/NPS as a whole. This could result partly from reducing the number of high profile CS/NPS misconduct/deviance scandals, which tend to have a negative effect on general public attitudes toward the sector and its groups/activities.

(6) Dark Side study can increase the overall positive effectiveness, impact, and efficacy of the CS/NPS and its participant groups and individuals by pointing out the preventable causes of deviance/misconduct and the problems of regulation and mis-regulation of the CS/NPS.

AN ANALYTICAL TYPOLOGY OF DEVIANT NONPROFIT GROUPS/DNGs

This article identifies and defines Deviant Nonprofit Groups (DNGs) as an important, new, analytical category of Nonprofit/Civil Society Organizations (NP/CSOs).

DNGs are nonprofit groups with one or more major goals or accepted means of achieving major goals that deviate from the accepted moral norms of the surrounding society at the time [author reference]. Accepted moral norms are taken to mean definitions of right and wrong activities (including speech or other communication) held by a substantial plurality (30% or 40%) of normally socialized adults in the society. A more stringent definition of accepted moral norms could insist on a 51% majority of normally socialized adults.

DNGs, thus defined, can be usefully categorized into three main types, according to their degree and duration of perceived deviance. This typology is described and discussed more extensively elsewhere [author reference].

The vast majority of DNGs seem to fall into the category of *Innocuous DNGs*. Innocuous DNGs are usually stigmatized and derided initially by many people in their societies of origin. However, these DNGs are innocuous in actually causing little objective harm. Any

actual harm present tends to affect the DNG members mainly or solely, and they usually endure this harm voluntarily. Further, this supposed harm is mainly in the eyes of non-members or disgruntled former members, not the active members themselves as self-perceived “victims.” Some examples would be “strange” new religions (“cults”) and “odd” left or right wing political parties. Innocuous DNGs represent the broad middle ground or “gray area” of the Dark Side of the CS/NPS spectrum.

By contrast, *Noxious DNGs* represent “the Darkest of the Dark Side” of the CS/NPS spectrum. Such DNGs are objectively and significantly, often substantially, harmful in an enduring way to their members, to the targets of their activity, to the larger community or society, or to some combination of these. Their harmful effects often go far beyond their effects on their members. Some examples here would be certain terrorist organizations and violent hate groups. Some examples would be the German Nazi Party from 1921 to 1933 (Hohne 1979; Kershaw 2000; Rummel 1994), when it was still essentially a nonprofit not an arm of government, and the Ku Klux Klan in America in the 1920s and later in the 1950s-1960s (Sims 1996; Tucker 1991).

The most beneficial and positive part of the Dark Side are *Dissenting DNGs*, which in some way are trying to change or improve the status quo from their own perspective and also from the longer term perspective of later history. Such DNGs are routinely stigmatized and criticized by nonmembers and especially by the government of their society when they first mount their challenges. However, many Dissenting DNGs are also recognized later as contributors to positive social change and innovation in their societies over the longer term. Some examples are new religions (e.g., Christianity and Islam when new), social movement organizations (anti-slavery and woman’s suffrage), and underground resistance organizations

during World War II in Nazi-occupied nations.

Dissenting DNGs can be seen particularly as the “Dark Energy” of the CS/NPS. This view builds on the conception of volunteerism as a form of potentially renewable, natural energy that was invented by Brudney and Meijs (2009). Dissenting DNGs are *Dark Energy* because the volunteerism they generate or mobilize deviates in major goals or means from existing moral norms of their society. Dissenting DNGs, and perhaps other DNGs, also deserve to be seen as a special kind of “energy” because they often cause (energize) major societal reactions, including eventually mass mobilization for their goals and often pervasive and significant societal change (Gamson 1990: 53).

More broadly, there is a Dark Side to ALL individual and group behavior in any institutional area or sector of society. For instance, there are deviant groups in such institutional areas as the family (Barnett et al. 2005; Cleveland 1986; Pagelow and Pagelow 1984;), education (Ezell and Bear 2005; Stewart and Spille 1988), religion (Berry 2000; Bushart et al. 1999; Monter 1990; Snow 2003), politics (Blackstock 1976; Boatner 1966; Rummel 1994; Sussman 1992), and the economy---both conventional and "underground" (Barth 1991; Davis 1993; Ermann and Lundman 2000; Frantz 1987; Jamieson 1994; Sterling 1990).

THE ROOTS OF CS/NPS DARK SIDE PHENOMENA

Psychologists have shown clearly that this Dark Side is not solely or even necessarily an individual (e.g., personality) trait, but often also, or even mainly, the result of certain kinds of situational influences and group dynamics. Nonprofit groups, especially Deviant Nonprofit Groups (DNGs), often foster or continue the individual deviance of their members or staff. Zimbardo (2007: inside dust jacket, front cover) terms this *The Lucifer Effect*. He argues that, "we are all susceptible to the lure of 'the dark side'" (ibid.). Instead of the very common "bad

apple" theory, especially in religious and criminological thinking, he argues for the "bad barrel" theory (ibid.). Actually, both approaches have merit and contribute to a more complete understanding of the complex Dark Side of human character and human behavior, both individual and collective, in the CS/NPS and other sectors of society. It is always an empirical question regarding the specific mix of "bad apple" vs. "bad barrel" causation.

Staub (1992) has shown how personality, attitudes, situation, and group context over time can in combination lead to Dark Side behavior by individuals and groups. He pays particular attention to the Nazi genocide/Holocaust (ibid., Part II) and other examples of genocide and mass killing of unarmed people (ibid., Part III). He uses this psycho-social, interdisciplinary mix of concepts, supported by the results of much behavioral science experimentation and research, to attempt to explain *The Roots of Evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence*---his book's title. His conceptual approach takes account of the role of group leaders, followers, and even bystanders to violence as contributing to the Dark Side of certain groups, especially sovereign governments and government agencies. He shows how both (a) difficult individual life conditions as well as (b) broader cultural values and norms both can contribute to the development of individual and group violence perpetrators (ibid., Chaps. 3, 4).

Individual violence perpetrators acting in groups, especially in extreme cases, tend to have a "potentially antisocial personality" and to be strongly "authority oriented" in terms of their characters (Staub 1992: 68-75). But extreme destructiveness by individuals (and groups) is usually developed gradually through time (ibid., Chap 6). People gradually learn by doing and change in the process. People engaged in violent and/or harmful behavior tend over time to harden themselves psychologically (in their "hearts" or feelings) to the harm they do.

Violence perpetrators often use various kinds of self-justification. Such "excuses" for

violence in perpetrators' minds especially include the following thought patterns: (1) devaluing the humanity of their victims, for instance, by claiming they are "sub-human" or an "inferior race;" (2) blaming the victims, for instance, by claiming that if "they" had not done X, "we" would not have had to kill, injure, imprison, or otherwise harm them; and (3) "neutralizing" the violent or harmful behavior, for instance, by doing it secretly or in isolation, by making the deviance a routine bureaucratic procedure, by giving the deviance euphemistic labels, etc. The German Nazi Party used all three of these approaches effectively in performing the Holocaust. Many but not all such people lack empathy for others. This is especially true for violence perpetrators at the extreme of the antisocial personality dimension (e.g., "psychopaths"/"sociopaths"), such as many top Nazi leaders.

This same kind of analysis of violence done by governmental organizations could also be usefully applied to violence by economic groups (e.g., Mafia crime families--- Balsamo and Carpozi 1991; Davis 1993), violence in families/households (e.g., child or spousal abuse--- Barnett et al. 2005), and violence by or in nonprofit groups (e.g., new religion/religious cult violence---Hubner and Gruson 1990; white supremacist hate-group violence---Bushart et al. 1999). Similar complex analysis applies well to lesser forms of group deviance, where physical violence or abuse is not the central issue, but sexual, emotional, or cognitive abuse is more prominent.

In trying to understand all forms of deviance, we must also apply the lessons of extensive research on the psychology of obedience to authorities/leaders (e.g., Kelman and Hamilton 1989). In all kinds of groups or interpersonal contexts, most people tend to obey authority figures even in causing (what they believe to be) pain or harm to others, especially to strangers (Milgram 1974). Further, we must note that sometimes the authority in a

group is diffused, so that all (or most) group participants are cooperating in fooling themselves by "groupthink" (Janis 1972). In such situations, groups make faulty decisions and do the wrong things while convincing themselves they are making good decisions and doing the right things.

THE RELATIVITY OF DEVIANCE IN THE CS/NPS

CS/NPS Dark Side phenomena (as in other sectors of society) vary greatly in their shades of brightness to darkness according to the eyes of the beholders. "Deviance" is extremely relative: One person's or group's "deviance" is another person's or group's principled "virtue" or "benevolence toward society or all mankind." Hitler and his Nazi Party firmly believed that they were helping all mankind by killing all Jews, Slavs, gypsies, and homosexuals so as to "purify the Aryan race." One person's "terrorist" or "revolutionary" is another person's "freedom fighter" or "hero." For "political liberation" struggles, which label ends up being applied by history to the challenging group or movement often depends upon who wins the struggle, rebellion, or war (whether a conventional war or guerrilla war).

During the guerrilla war 1966-1979 by political liberation groups in Southern Rhodesia/Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe, the dominant, white, racist, minority-rule, "colonial" government under Ian Smith and its similar elite constituency labeled the insurgents as "terrorists" and themselves as "patriots" (Kriger 1992). By contrast, the vast majority of the population (about 95%) consisted of disenfranchised, uneducated, very poor, nearly powerless, black Africans, who viewed the white colonial government and settlers from European roots to be evil, racist, long-time tyrants/oppressors and thieves of their land and resources. Black African voters in British-supervised elections in 1980 established African majority rule in Zimbabwe for the first time since British conquest and colonization in 1889.

After this election and ascension to (eventually) dictatorial power of Robert Mugabe, the

new government leaders and most Zimbabwe citizens stigmatized the formerly dominant, white, colonial settlers as the "deviants." The native, black, African guerrilla groups and their leaders, particularly African President Mugabe, became prestigious "heroes and liberators" (Martin and Johnson 1981). If the black guerrilla insurgency had failed, and if the white, racist, colonial regime were still in place, the black majority's insurgent groups would probably still be labeled and stigmatized as "evil terrorists."

Revolutionary socio-political movements and groups have overthrown absolute monarchs, colonial "governors," and all manner of other autocrats while seeking self-government and, sometimes, representative democracy in the past 200 years of human history around the globe. These movements and their component (deviant, usually nonprofit) groups have nearly always been labeled by dominant elites, and many times by the general public, as dangerous, even depraved, terrorists, traitors, rebels, seditionists, fanatics, madmen (mad-people), revolutionaries, etc. Such was the case in terms of labeling by the British monarchy, British leaders in the American colonies, and even British-sympathizer colonists when many American colonists rose up against their British rulers and started the successful American Revolution (e.g., Gross 2001; Jenson 1968).

These examples show clearly that the identification and labeling of "deviance" are complex and multi-faceted, often disputed by conflicting stakeholders in a situation. So, too, are the labels used to stigmatize political opponents, especially in struggles for the liberation/freedom of nations or ethno-religious groups/categories in a given nation. There are at least four key facets of the relativity of the label and concept of "deviant" (also "deviance") and all of the more specific labels used to characterize people with different values and norms, let alone races and ethno-religious traditions:

(1) The Relativity of Group Perspectives on Deviance

One facet of this broader relativity is that deviance can and often is defined in opposite or very different ways by any given in-group vs. out-group (that is, depending on the specific group perspective used). William Shakespeare wrote the truth when he had one of his characters say, "There is nothing either good or bad but thinking makes it so." Members of, or participants in, a "deviant" group often see themselves as "good people doing the right things." However, their larger society may often see them as "bad people doing the wrong things." The larger global society may generally side with one or the other of these two alternative perspectives, or may have a still different perspective, perhaps more mixed and doubtlessly variable among nations, among ethno-religious categories of people, and through time/history.

Among members of deviant new religions, such as the Hare Krishna (technically, the International Society for Krishna Consciousness/"ISKCON") beginning in America and spreading elsewhere, *nonmembers* in the 1970s and 1980s were usually seen as extremely evil (e.g., "devils"; Rochford 1985). By contrast, for many years after ISKCON's founding in 1965, most Americans' attitudes towards the Hare Krishnas were that they were weird but harmless (Innocuous DNGs in present terminology). When the Hare Krishnas started bothering people systematically at airports, "giving" flowers or their religious books then demanding "donations," attitudes probably shifted toward their being a genuine nuisance, but still harmless.

Later, more extreme and illegal deviance by some Hare Krishnas led to sensational exposés in the mass media and books like that of Hubner and Gruson (1990) and Kahaner (1988). These deviant acts by some Hare Krishnas and sensationalizing of such events in the mass media helped shift public attitudes toward the extreme negative end of the spectrum. Such shocking events by Hare Krishnas occurring in the 1980s on the heels of the Jonestown mass

suicide/massacre in 1978 (Weightman 1983) and with a growing anti-cult movement in America and elsewhere (Shupe and Bromley 1994) led to increasing stigmatization and more negative labeling of ALL new religions/religious cults and their participants, not only ISKCON.

(2) The Relativity of Degree of Societal Consensus on Norms

A second facet of this relativity of deviance is that broad, let alone virtually total, societal consensus on values and norms is rare and usually nonexistent in modern nations. In preliterate societies, reaching back from more than two hundred thousand years down to the present, high consensus on values-norms was usually present (based on more recent, anthropological studies of "pre-contact" tribes). As ancient civilizations, monarchies, and empires began to arise roughly 5,000 years ago in Egypt and later elsewhere, smaller high-consensus societies were assimilated into larger agglomerations, where overall consensus was weaker. We lack information on most of the population's values and normative attitudes for most or all pre-industrial societies, because representative sample surveys of the population were rarely or never done until the mid-20th century.

The European Values Survey and more recent World Values Survey (WVS) in the past two decades have begun to remedy this huge gap in our knowledge of contemporary societies. Historians have, though the ages, customarily written only or mainly about the national elites and government matters, with little if any about the lives or attitudes of the general population until quite recently (the past 30+ years). But such larger, conglomerate, pre-industrial societies probably lacked broad consensus on anything more than a small number of values and norms. The WVS data show clearly the current lack of consensus on values in societies (Meijs et al. 2003).

In modern nation-states, we now have the powerful, nation-wide, more-consistently-

socializing influences of mass formal education and widespread exposure to the mass media (including now the Internet and its wide variety of content). As a result, the breadth of consensus on certain key values and norms in such nations is probably much greater in degree than in the intervening period between the dominance of preliterate society on our planet (roughly until two or three millennia ago) down to industrial and post-industrial society dominance (roughly from the mid-1800s on to the present). Even in the most educated contemporary societies with high mass media exposure, recent national surveys show wide internal variations in many values and norms, let alone across nations (Esmer and Pettersson 2007).

(3) The Relativity of Changing Deviance Attitudes/Perceptions Over Time

What is perceived by many or even most people in a given society as "deviant" at any given time in its history may not have been perceived as "deviant" earlier in that society's history or be seen as "deviant" later in its history. In fact, public attitudes toward a person, organization, or nation can change overnight (e.g., the galvanizing effect on the US population of the Japanese sneak attack on Pearl harbor in 1941, or the effect of the 9/11/01 Al Qaeda terrorist plane crashes into the New York World Trade Center). The general long-term trend in global society is for fewer and fewer types of behavior and beliefs to be seen as fundamentally or intolerably deviant. People worldwide are gradually, if only very slowly, becoming more tolerant of differences in values, norms, beliefs and behavior by those in other nations and ethno-religious groups. The Internet, increasing formal education, and ever more widespread globalization through the mass media support this trend.

This is especially true where some socio-political movement in a given society or elsewhere in the world has worked hard to gain more public tolerance of and understanding for a

particular type of behavior, belief, value, norm, or other characteristic that was previously stigmatized (e.g., the gay and lesbian rights movement in Western societies--Adam 1995; the movement for rights of the disabled---Shapiro 1993).

One major part of this global trend toward more tolerance is termed "multiculturalism"---the tolerance and acceptance of the validity or "rightness" of various ethnic, racial, and cultural differences within and among different nations (cf., Kivisto 2002).

(4) The Relativity of Net, Long-Term Contributions to Positive Social Change

Many DNGs and their larger social movements, if present, seem initially very harmful and dangerous, especially to governments and to the categories of people the DNGs are attempting to change. But many of these DNGs and their larger socio-political movements turn out in the long run to have great benefits for the general population of their nations or even of the whole world (e.g., abolition of slavery, equal rights for women, environmental conservation and ecological balance, civil rights for people of color, tolerance and rights for homosexuals, fair labor practices by employers, equal rights for the disabled, etc.).

Among other aspects, the Dark Side thus also includes significant social system-challenge attempts that are based on very positive, humane, social values. These high-principled system-challenge DNGs have sought, often successfully, socio-cultural change and innovation in pursuit of human rights, civil liberties, social justice, security, peace, tolerance, poverty alleviation, ecological balance, and optimal human individual and societal development. Some socio-political movement and one or more of its component groups has initiated nearly every important, positive form of socio-cultural change in societies all over the world and throughout human history, ranging from the abolition of slavery to the creation of

public zoos (A to Z).

Gamson's (1990: 53) path-breaking study of a random sample of American social movement organizations from 1800-1945 shows that *about half (49%) of such "challenging groups" studied achieved some significant "new advantages."* This is an astounding track record of success in changing American society for the better. The new advantages resulted for the "targets of benefit," which might have been the challenging group members and/or some non-member category or group of people, sometimes most or all of American society. Gamson carefully did random sampling (p. 287) of social movement groups in America for this 145-year period (with an 83% completion rate in finding relevant data on sampled groups; p. 289). Thus, these results can properly be generalized to the more than five hundred national, socio-political movement-linked, challenging groups that existed in this period in America but that were not studied in Gamson's actual sample.

Similar results are likely for other currently industrial or post-industrial nations of the world that have democratic governance structures to a significant degree. Tilly's (2004: 140-143) analysis of social movement organizations from 1768 to 2004 in Western Europe and North America suggests that social movements sometimes cause more general democratization in nations, but can also have the reverse effect or no effect.

Dalton's (1994: 187) study of 64 Western European national or trans-national environmental social movement organizations indicated that the social movement leaders saw protest by itself as relatively ineffective. Protest and related ("challenging") direct political activities were used sometimes or often by 48% of the environmental groups studied (p. 183). But leaders viewed such actions as most effective when backed up and followed through by more conventional group political activities (pp. 195-198). In general, the environmental social

movement and its major social movement organizations have had substantial positive impact in Western Europe in the past few decades. This has been more clear for the conservation social movement groups than for the ecological balance social movement groups (pp. 256-259).

DARK SIDE NEGLECT BY RESEARCHERS IN OUR INTERDISCIPLINARY CS/NPS STUDIES FIELD

The "Dark Side" of the CS/NPS clearly exists objectively, as evidenced by recurring, credible reports in most of the news media, especially newspapers. A few well-known examples involving CS/NPS deviance in or affecting the United States would include the on-going current scandal of child molestation by Roman Catholic priests in America (Berry 2000; Fortune and Longwood 2003) and in other nations, the William Aramony financial abuse scandal at the United Way of America in the early 1990s (Glaser 1994), the mass suicides by cult members such as Heaven's Gate in America and earlier the Peoples Temple at Jonestown in Guyana (Weightman 1983; Wessinger 2000), and terrorist activities like the 9/11/2001 intentional, multiple plane crashes by Al Qaeda into the New York World Trade Center Towers (Wright 2007).

The Dark Side has indeed already been studied and described extensively by many books and articles on deviance and misconduct in the CS/NPS (e.g., Covey et al., 1997; George and Wilcox, 1996; Levitas, 2002; Zack, 2003). However, *the main point here is that interdisciplinary CS/NPS researchers have essentially ignored Dark Side study.*

Some of this CS/NPS deviance studied has occurred in *conventional, mainstream nonprofit organizations* in addition to the examples given above (e.g., Bakal 1979; Chap. 17; Bennett and DiLorenzo 1989, 1994; Gaede and Benyei 2006; Gaul and Borowski 1993; Monter 1990; Simon and Eitzen 1990: 56-57; Van Til 2000: 94-95, 117; Wagner 2000: 173), as in the

other sectors of society and their conventional groups.

Yet there are also more *fundamentally Deviant Nonprofit Groups ("DNGs")*, only a few of whose types were just noted above. [Author reference] presents 24 common sense categories of DNGs. Three main “purposive type” (non-analytical) categories that capture the nature of these 24 different DNG types are (1) political influence/liberation groups, (2) religious/salvation/occult groups, and (3) hedonic satisfaction groups (including two sub-types: aggression/anger expression groups and sensual/sexual expression groups).

The striking thing about prior research is that VIRTUALLY NONE OF THIS PRIOR CS/NPS DARK SIDE RESEARCH HAS BEEN DONE OR REPORTED BY PARTICIPANTS IN OUR INTERDISCIPLINARY CS/NPS STUDIES COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS [author reference]. One looks in vain in major, recent, research-based overviews of the nature of the Nonprofit Sector (in America or around the world) for significant, if any, attention to the Dark Side phenomena (e.g., Heinrich, 2007; Heinrich & Fioramonti, 2008 [except Chap. 19]; O'Neill, 2002; Salamon et al., 1999, 2004). Even Powell and Steinberg's (2006) Second Edition of the research handbook entitled *The Non-Profit Sector* almost completely ignores the Dark Side. Only Chapter 13 by Jenkins (2006) is substantially relevant to the CS/NPS Dark Side, with attention there only to socio-political movements and their constituent nonprofit organizations as ONE of 24 purposive types of DNGs.

Examining past issues of the *NONPROFIT AND VOLUNTARY SECTOR QUARTERLY (NVSQ)* for research studies of the Dark Side also leads to the conclusion that DNGs and the rest of the Dark Side of the CS/NPS are seriously---and perhaps dangerously---neglected in our interdisciplinary field, both in empirical research and in theory [author reference]. Similar neglect of the Dark Side has been documented by [author reference] for the journal *VOLUNTAS*,

published by the International Society for Third Sector Research.

To take a single example regarding *NVSQ*, the term "crime" occurs in over 100 *NVSQ* articles since 1972 (keyword search of all article text performed in May 2008). But nearly all of these mentions have to do with crime in the community or society in general, NOT CRIME IN OR BY NONPROFIT GROUPS. One of the very rare exceptions is the fairly recent article by Greenlee et al. (2007) on fraud in nonprofit organizations. There has also been, over the years, some significant but still relatively very minor attention in *NVSQ* articles to socio-political movement groups as ONE of many types of DNGs. And there has been some minor attention in *NVSQ* articles, especially in the past decade or so, to the two interrelated issues of accountability and accreditation (Bekkers 2003; Irvin 2005).

Approaching milder aspects of the study of the "Dark Side" of the CS/NPS by way of studying accountability in nonprofit organizations has been growing in favor recently in the broader research and practice literature relevant to CS/NPS groups. The practical issue of accountability (potential or actual deviance, in present terms) in charitable and other nonprofit organizations is a very old one, tracing back at least 800 years (Fishman, 2007). But increasing numbers of people in the nonprofit management/administration and foundation governance fields are getting interested in the subject. They approach this topic of accountability mostly from the standpoint of practical steps that need to be taken to avoid deviance (often referred to more euphemistically as "non-accountability," "norm-breaking", etc.). They very rarely focus on doing empirical research about the nature and causes of deviance in and by nonprofit organizations. The work of Brown and Moore (2001), Corbett (2007), Cutt and Murray (2000), Jordan and van Tuijl (2007), and Mulgan (2000) are examples of this growing interest in the accountability of nonprofit organizations.

CONCLUSION

Reducing neglect of the Dark Side of the CS/NPS in our interdisciplinary field of CS/NPS Research will contribute to building a healthier CS/NPS in the future. It will also contribute to a more comprehensive, less positively biased, interdisciplinary field of CS/NPS Research. If biologists and physiologists studied only healthy organisms, they would never know how to identify, ameliorate, or cure, let alone prevent, diseases and disorders in living organisms, including human beings. We must have the scientific curiosity and practical values of applied altruism to do the same in our field of CS/NPS Research.

Van Til (1988: 9) wrote incisively more than two decades ago about the tendency for there to be a "normative component" in much of what we talk about and study in the CS/NPS field. In particular, volunteerism is "a concept that lends moral or ideological support to the phenomenon." But he also cites (p. 17) Cornuelle (1983), the inventor of the concept of the independent (nonprofit/third) sector (Cornuelle 1965: Chap. 6), who wrote 45 years ago about the Dark Side of the CS/NPS without using this terminology.

The CS/NPS image as the "Sanctified Sector" (Wagner 2000: Chap. 5) or the "Angelic Sector" [author reference] that can do little or no wrong is obsolete, just as the "Lady Bountiful" stereotype of volunteers is also obsolete. Such a traditional, "flat-earth" paradigm is very narrow, non-objective, self-serving, and simply false, given the abundant evidence of deviance and misconduct in the CS/NPS both by individuals and by whole groups as DNGs.

In place of this "flat-earth Angelic CS/NPS" paradigm, a "round-earth," more objective paradigm for CS/NPS research and theory is needed. The author [reference] has sketched the outlines of the new paradigm needed. Such a "round-earth paradigm" involves

looking in a more balanced, thorough, comprehensive, and open-minded way at many phenomena of the CS/NPS where "flat-earth paradigms" still dominate in most prior and current research and theory in our interdisciplinary CS/NPS field. This suggested paradigm shift regarding the Dark Side of the CS/NPS may be properly seen as one of several needed paradigm shifts if we are to fully understand the CS/NPS and its varied phenomena objectively [author reference].

In addition, viewing DNGs generally and Dissenting DNGs in particular as the "*Dark Energy*" of the CS/NPS further elaborates on the recently proposed concept of volunteerism as energy" (Brudney and Meijs 2009). Not all such natural and potentially renewable volunteer energy has positive intent or outcomes for society, however attractive it may seem to certain volunteers involved. The Dark Energy of DNGs manifests volunteerism for goals and activities that most or many in society would consider to be deviance or misconduct.

Increased CS/NPS research and theoretical attention to Dark Side phenomena can probably best be achieved by a fundamental paradigm shift in our field. The prevailing, positively biased, "boosterism" that relentlessly views the CS/NPS through "rose-colored glasses" does not serve either our interdisciplinary research field or the CS/NPS itself in the long run. The time has come for most CS/NPS researchers to recognize the need for a paradigm shift in this area. The result will likely be many new hypotheses and much new research that illuminates all aspects of the CS/NPS, as with major paradigm shifts in other fields of science (Kuhn 1962).

REFERENCES

- Adam, B. D. (1995). *The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement*. Rev. ed. New York: Twayne.
- Allen, W. S. (1984). *The Nazi Seizure of Power*. Revised ed. New York: Franklin Watts.
- Anheier, H. (2005). *Nonprofit Organizations: Theory, Management, Policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Atlas, J. (2010). *Seeds of Change: The Story of ACORN*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Bakal, C. (1979). *Charity U.S.A.* New York: Time Books.
- Balsamo, W. & Carpozi, Jr., G. (1991). *Crime Incorporated*. Far Hills, N.J: New Horizon Press.
- Barnett, O. W., Miller-Perrin, C. L., & Perrin, R. D. (2005). *Family Violence Across the Lifespan*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Barth, J. R. (1991). *The Great Savings and Loan Debacle*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.
- Bekkers, R. (2003). Trust, Accreditation, and Philanthropy in the Netherlands. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32 (4): 596-615.
- Bennett, J. T., & DiLorenzo, T. J. (1989). *Unfair Competition: The Profits of Nonprofits*. New York: Hamilton Press.
- Bennett, J. T., & DiLorenzo, T. J. (1994). *Unhealthy Charities: Hazardous to Your Health and Wealth*. New York: Basic Books.
- Berry, J. (2000). *Lead Us Not into Temptation: Catholic Priests and the Sexual Abuse of Children*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

- Blackstock, N. (1976). *COINTELPRO: The FBI's Secret War on Political Freedom*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Boatner, M. M. (1966). *Encyclopedia of the American Revolution*. New York: David McKay.
- Brown, L. D., & Moore, M. H. (2001). Accountability, Strategy, and International Nongovernmental Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30, 569-587.
- Brudney, J. L., & Meijjs. L. C. P. M. (2009). It Ain't Natural: Toward a New (Natural) Resource Conceptualization for Volunteer Management. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38, 564-581.
- Bushart, H. L., Craig, J. R., & Barnes, M. (1999). *Soldiers of God: White Supremacists and their Holy War for America*. New York: Pinnacle.
- Charles, J. A. (1993). *Service Clubs in American Society: Rotary, Kiwanis, and Lions*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Cleveland, D. (1986). *Incest*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S95-S120.
- Coleman, James S. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Connors, T. D., ed. (1988). *The Nonprofit Organization Handbook*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Corbett, C. (2007). *Advancing Nonprofit Stewardship Through Self-Regulation: Translating Principles into Practice*. Paper presented at ARNOVA Conference, Atlanta, Georgia, Nov. 15-17.

- Cornuelle, R. (1965). *Reclaiming the American Dream*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Covey, H. C., Menard, S., & Franzese, R. J. (1997). *Juvenile Gangs*. 2nd ed. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas.
- Cutt, J., & Murray, V. (2000). *Accountability and Effectiveness Evaluation in Non-Profit Organizations*. New York: Routledge.
- Dalton, R. J. (1994). *The Green Rainbow: Environmental Groups in Western Europe*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Davis, J. H. (1993). *Mafia Dynasty: The Rise and Fall of the Gambino Crime Family*. New York: HarperPaperbacks.
- Dekker, P., & Halman, L. (2003). *The Values of Volunteering: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. New York: Springer.
- Drucker, P. F. (1992). *Managing the Non-Profit Organization*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- Ermann, M. D., & Lundman, R. J. (2001). *Corporate and Governmental Deviance*. 6th ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Esmer, Y., & Pettersson, T. (Eds.). (2007). *Measuring and Mapping Cultures: 25 Years of Comparative Values Surveys*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.
- Ezell, A., & Bear, J. (2005). *Degree Mills: The Billion-dollar Industry That Has Sold Over A Million Fake Diplomas*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Fishman, J. J. (2007). *The Faithless Fiduciary and the Quest for Charitable Accountability 1200-2005*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Fortune, M. M., & Longwood, W. M. (2003). *Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: Trusting the Clergy?* Binghamton, New York: Haworth Pastoral Press.
- Frantz, D. (1987). *Levine & Co.: Wall Street's Insider Trading Scandal*. New York: Holt.

- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *TRUST: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gaede, B. A., & Benyei, C. R. (2006). *When a Congregation Is Betrayed: Responding to Clergy Misconduct*. Herndon, VA.: Alban Institute.
- Gamson, W. (1990). *The Strategy of Social Protest*. 2nd. ed. Belmont, Calif.; Wadsworth Publishing.
- Gaul, G. M., & Borowski, N. A. (1993). *Free Ride: The Tax Exempt Economy*. Kansas City, Mo.: Andrews and McMeel.
- George, J., & Wilcox, L. (1996). *American Extremists*. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books.
- Glaser, J. S. (1994). *The United Way Scandal: An Insider's Account of What Went Wrong and Why*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Greenlee, J., Fischer, M., Gordon, T., & Keating, E. (2007). An Investigation of Fraud in Nonprofit Organizations: Occurrences and Deterrents. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36,676-694.
- Gross, R. A. (2001)(1976). *The Minutemen and Their World*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Heinrich, V. F. (2007). *CIVICUS global survey of the state of civil society, Vol. 1: Country profiles*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Heinrich, V. F., & Fioramonti, L. (2008). *CIVICUS global survey of the state of civil society, Vol.2: Comparative Perspectives*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Herman, R. D. and Associates. (2005). *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership and Management*. 2nd. ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Höhne, H. (1970). *The Order of the Death's Head*. New York: Coward-McCann.
- Hubner, J., & Gruson, L.. (1990). *Monkey on a Stick: Murder, Madness, and the Hare Krishnas*.

- New York: Onyx.
- Irvin, R. (2005). State Regulation of Nonprofits: Accountability Regardless of Outcome. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 34, 161-178.
- Jamieson, K. M. (1994). *The Organization of Corporate Crime: Dynamics of Antitrust Violation*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Janis, I. L. (1982). *Groupthink: Psychological Research of Policy Decisions and Fiascoes*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Jenkins, J. C. (2006). "Nonprofit organizations and political advocacy." In W. Powell & R. Steinberg (Eds.), *The Non-Profit Sector*. 2nd ed. (pp. 307-332). New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press.
- Jenson, M. (1968). *The Founding of a Nation: A History of the American Revolution 1763-1776*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jordan, L., & van Tuijl, P. (Eds.). 2007. *NGO Accountability: Politics, Principles and Innovations*. London, UK: Earthscan.
- Kahaner, L. (1988). *Cults That Kill*. New York: Warner Books.
- Kelman, H. C., & Hamilton, V. L. (1979). *Crimes of Obedience*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Kershaw, I. (2000). *The Nazi Dictatorship*. 4th ed. London: Edward Arnold.
- King, F. L. (1997). *Why Contemporary Texas Women Quilt: A Link to the Sociology of Leisure*. Arlington, TX: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas, Arlington.
- Kivisto, P. (2002). *Multiculturalism in Global Society*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Klonglan, G., Yep, B., Mulford, C. I., & Dillman, D. (1973). The Nature and Impact of Interorganizational Relations. Pp. 331-362 in D. H. Smith, (Ed.), *Voluntary*

- Action Research: 1973*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath.
- Knoke, D. (1990). *Organizing for collective action*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Kriger, N. J. (1992). *Zimbabwe's Guerrilla War: Peasant Voices*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levitas, D. (2002). *The Terrorist Next Door: The Militia Movement and The Radical Right*. New York: Thomas Dunne Books/ St. Martin's Press.
- Martin, D., & Johnson, P. (1981). *The Struggles for Zimbabwe: The Chimurenga War*. London, UK: Faber and Faber.
- McDonough, F. (2003). *Hitler and the Rise of the Nazi Party*. New York: Pearson Longman.
- Meijs, L. C. P. M, Handy, F., Cnaan, R. A., et al. (2003). In the Eyes of the Beholder? Pp.19-34, in P. Dekker and L. Halman, *Values and Volunteering*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Monter, E. W. (1990). *Frontiers of Heresy: The Spanish Inquisition from the Basque Lands to Sicily*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Moreno, J. L. (1993) (1953). *Who Shall Survive? Foundations of Sociometry, Group Psychotherapy and Sociodrama*. Beacon House.
- Mulgan, R. (2000). Accountability: An Ever-Expanding Concept? *Public Administration*, 78, 555-573.
- Olmsted, A. D. (1993). Hobbies and Serious Leisure. *World Leisure and Recreation*, 35, 27-32.
- O'Neill, M. (2002). *The Third America*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pagelow, M. (1981). *Woman-Battering*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Pagelow, M., & Pagelow, L. W. (1984). *Family Violence*. New York: Praeger.
- Powell, W. W., & Steinberg, R., (Eds.). (2006). *The Non-Profit Sector*. 2nd. ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993a). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993b). The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life, *American Prospect* 13, 35-42.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rochford, E. B., Jr. (1985). *Hare Krishna in America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Rotberg, R. I., (Ed.). (2001). *Patterns of Social Capital: Stability and Change in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rummel, R.J. (1994). *Death by Government*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Salamon, L. M., Anheier, H. K., List, R., Toepler, S., Sokolowski, S. W. & Associates. (1999). *Global Civil Society: Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Research.
- Salamon, L. M., Sokolowski, S. W., & Associates. (2004). *Global Civil Society, Vol. 2, Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Saris, W. E., & Gallhofer, I. N.. (1988). *Sociometric Research: Data Analysis*.
- Shapiro, J. P. (1993.) *NO PITY: People with Disabilities Forging a New Civil Rights Movement*. New York: Times Books/Random House.

- Shupe, A. and Bromley, D. G. (Eds.). (1994). *Anti-Cult Movements in Cross-cultural Perspective*. New York: Garland..
- Silber, N. I. (2001). *A Corporate Form of Freedom: The Emergence of the Modern Nonprofit Sector*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Snow, R. L. (2003). *Deadly Cults: The Crimes of True Believers*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger.
- Spink, K. (1998). *Mother Teresa: a Complete Authorized Biography*. New York: HarperOne.
- Staub, E. (1992). *The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sterling, C. (1990). *Octopus: The Long Reach of the International Sicilian Mafia*. New York: Norton.
- Stewart, D. W., & Spille, H. A. (1988). *Diploma Mills: Degrees of Fraud*. New York: American Council of Education.
- Sussman, B. (1992). *The Great Coverup: Nixon and the Scandal of Watergate*. Arlington, VA: Seven Locks Press.
- Tilly, C. (2004). *Social Movements, 1768-2004*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Van Til, J. (1988). *Mapping the Third Sector*. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Van Til, J. (2000). *Growing Civil Society*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Wagner, D. (2000). *What's Love Got to Do with It? A Critical Look at American Charity*. New York: New Press.
- Wasserman, S., & Faust, K. (1994). *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Weightman, J. (1983). *Making Sense of the Jonestown Suicides*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.

- Wessinger, C. (2000). *How the Millennium Comes Violently: From Jonestown to Heaven's Gate*. Chatham House Publishers.
- Wilbur, R. H., (Ed.). (2000). *The Complete Guide to Nonprofit Management*. 2nd ed. New York: Wiley.
- Wolf, T. (1999). *Managing a Nonprofit Organization in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Fireside/Simon & Schuster.
- Wright, L. (2007). *The Looming Tower: Al-Qaeda and the Road to 9/11*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Zack, G. M. (2003). *Fraud and Abuse in Nonprofit Organizations*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Zimbardo, P. (2007). *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil*. New York: Random House.