

Hobsbawm's problem of the "social bandit," indeed of banditry in general, demands a much more sophisticated response. And that reply, if it is ever to be made in a sense more satisfactory than that posed by the historian himself, will have to seek frameworks beyond those already offered. If Hobsbawm's typology of brigand violence is proving to be problematic, it is unlikely that merely serving up more varieties of brigandage and complaining that Hobsbawm's model cannot account for them (p. 2; not true, in any event) will further our understanding of this peculiar form of violence. Nor will any abysmal retreat into "criminological theory" help, as the hand-wringing desperation of Dretha Phillips attests. If the term *banditry* is justified as a social-scientific category, then it must be possible to provide some sort of generative model for its existence: its genesis growth, decline and extinction as a form of violence. The studies by Lewin by Pérez (including all those not in the present collection) and the larger book-length studies by Chandler and Sánchez-Meertens that underpin their contributions to this volume all point the way. Pérez has demonstrated a possible connection, in certain historical conditions, with wider forms of political and social violence that constitute resistance to the "present order." Chandler and Lewin, however, have demonstrated how highly localized, parasitic, and manipulated the form can be. And, finally, Sánchez and Meertens have given one of the better accounts of how banditry coexists and interlocks with other types of violence (criminality, feud, civil-war, the politically organized violence of the centralized absolute state) in complex ways. What is needed, then, is an attempt to put realities and perceptions of the banditry together into a coherent theory that will enable the researcher to put better questions to the case studies. This is a goal that this compilation does not achieve, perhaps because of too much myopic concern with Latin American brigands.

Be that as it may, this is a worthwhile collection, perhaps especially for those who are not *aficionados* of Latin American banditry. Each of the pieces offers a useful synopsis, a window through which, it is to be hoped, the reader will be encouraged to look for the more complete studies that lie beyond.

Brent D. Shaw
Department of History
University of Lethbridge
Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada T1K 3M4

HOMICIDE, by M. Daly and M. Wilson. New York: Aldine De Gruyter, 1988, 328 pp.

Martin Daly and Margot Wilson are two of the leading exponents of the emerging paradigm of "evolutionary psychology": the application of evolutionary thinking to questions of human social motivation. In their excellent textbook *Sex, Evolution and Behavior* (1978, 1st edition; 1983, 2nd edition) they had ordered an immense amount of disparate data on the nature of sexuality and offered important insights into the human condition. Their current book breaks new ground, reporting on an eight year project

funded by the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation analyzing homicides from the point of view of evolutionary theories of interpersonal conflict.

The book contains 12 chapters. The first introduces the basics of evolutionary thinking, particularly the notion that behavior is “adaptive,” that is, that it confers “fitness” in the sense of helping to replicate genes more effectively. Thus, it dawns on the reader that the startlingly novel hypothesis will be presented that people kill one another partly because it is in their genetic interest to do so. This argument is not developed in a crass way. “Adaptive” thinking is much more sophisticated than the ideologically biased lampooning so often presented by critics of human sociobiology. As Daly and Wilson discuss, almost all the major advances in biological research have been predicated on the assumption of adaptive function, and when the complexity and organization of strategic behavior are considered, along with the mechanisms underlying their occurrence, refreshing but sophisticated insights are generated.

Chapter 2, cheerfully entitled “Killing Kinfolks,” presents the first sets of data. Analyzing information garnered from thirteenth-century agricultural England through the aboriginal India of the 1920s to the urban Detroit of the 1970s, the authors make the point that in homicide, as in human affairs generally, kinship provides a tempering influence on interpersonal conflict. Thus among cohabitants of the killer, those who are not blood relatives are far more likely to be murdered than kin. While spouses are the principal victims, the relationship remains when spouses are removed from the analysis.

Chapters 3 and 4 consider “killing children,” using data from both the ethnographic record and the modern West. Children who are least likely to reproduce their parents genes are most at risk. Thus stepparents abuse and kill children more than biological parents; defective children are abused and killed more than healthy children; younger parents kill more than older parents, especially when conditions are unfavorable for child rearing (presumably because such parents will have a better opportunity to replicate in the future); and female children are killed more than male children, especially in the upper classes of stratified societies. This latter finding is not immediately explainable by sociobiological reasoning but probably relates to the greater potential reproductive capacity of males (who can theoretically impregnate many women) and the tendency of women to “marry up” (a pattern that in the upper classes results in there being fewer mates available).

A welter of additional fascinating arguments and data are presented in the remaining chapters, concerned with parricide, the killing of parents (Chapter 5); the killing of acquaintances by young men preoccupied with status and honor (Chapter 6); why men are the more violent sex (Chapters 7 and 8); spousal killings and sexual jealousy (Chapter 9); blood revenge and the nature of justice (Chapters 10 and 11); and the role cultural factors play in influencing homicide (Chapter 12). Two examples will give some of the flavor. In Chapter 7 Daly and Wilson introduce the notion of “biophobia,” which they see as permeating current thinking about human behavior. In discussing this problem they outline, with punchy little quotes and citation counts, the enormous impact of the now discredited work of Margaret Mead. Mead, it may be recalled, had purported to find numerous counterexamples of biological universals, such as three separate cultures in New Guinea demonstrating all possible variations (except the Western one) of differences between the sexes. In this section, Daly and Wilson also confront the widespread but false belief system that since social natures are due to cultural factors, we

can create any world we want to simply by altering the way people are brought up. An example of how novel sociobiological analyses can be is found in Chapter 11, where Daly and Wilson discuss their view that biological dispositions for vengeance become elaborated into judicial systems of deterrence. In support, they cite the case of how exceptions are made for those not perceived as deterrable. Thus "insanity" is attributed to those unable to pursue their self-interest as an evolutionary psychologist would define it!

Criticisms can, of course, be made. One question that emerges, ironically because Daly and Wilson are so convincing about the strategic nature of human beings, is Why do people not kill each other more frequently than they do? While the authors do point out that their research is just a beginning and that many questions need to be addressed from the perspective of the new paradigm, it did strike this reviewer that a greater acknowledgment of genetic diversity could have been made. Not every husband when faced with his wife's infidelity becomes angry enough to murder her. Not all young men suffering relative deprivation are equally primed to perceive altercations as reflecting on their honor. Not all people have the traits to become a Yanomamo headman. The authors even suggest that homicide is what "normal" people do and that to attribute a propensity to violence to certain types of individual differences (such as immaturity or a primitiveness of nature) is not a theory but a "facile disparagement (revealing) more about the prejudices of their proponents than about the causes of violence" (p. 1). Too many studies of twins and adoptees have now been conducted, however, for the genetic contribution to individual differences in aggressiveness, intelligence, law abidingness, and other relevant attributes to be legitimately ignored. After all, the first postulate of evolutionary theory is the existence of genetic variance both within and between populations. Yet at several points Daly and Wilson merge the social influences that affect people into the biological, as though any attempt to partition these sources of variance is wrongheaded.

In spite of the disregard of the psychological literature, the book is very highly recommended. It is written in an engaging and ebullient manner with numerous pithy asides and editorial flourishes. Anyone interested in the study of human aggression will find something of interest. More important, they will find an approach to human behavior with breathtaking implications that they cannot afford to remain knowledgeable about.

J. Philippe Rushton
Department of Psychology
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario N6A 5C2

VIOLENCE IN INTIMATE RELATIONSHIPS, edited by Gordon W. Russell. New York: PMA Publishing Corp., 1988, xv + 294 pp.

In the past decade, the literature on family violence has grown substantially. In terms of its research, the complexity of its theories, and the utility of its efforts to stem the