

Criminology

[Sociology](#), [Violence](#)



1. What data does Barash present concerning a gender imbalance in violent behavior?

By a male to female ratio of three or four to one, men statistically record more violent rate. Barash presented cases of “killing establishment” involving the dominance of male over female statistically. Analysis of executioners, deadly hunters, armed robbers, men of arm forces implicate male dominance over female counterparts. He submitted that men are easily provoked and are more involved in an open shooting, be it in residence or workplaces. The culprits in cases of violent occurrences are predominantly men both in the United States and some other parts of the globe such as the Middles East and Rwanda among others.

The suicide bombers of the Al Qaeda networks records more masculine operatives. On the feminine end, Barash presented a report on how Susan Smith (1994) gained more attention on a similar brutality and killing that are often perpetrated by men. This laid emphasis on the fact that the findings of men in such cases is becoming usual and commoner. It is therefore, a gender imbalance in criminal behavior. Furthermore, Barash demonstrated a consistency in men-to-men as violent target as oppose to female-to-female with a less frequent recorded scenario. 20% of a man is at risk of dropping death by another man. Homicides among men range from 0. 5 to 100 murders per million victims in Iceland and U. S. respectively (Daly & Wilson, n. d.).

2. What does Barash consider the basis of maleness and femaleness?

While Barash condemn the idea of peculiar sex organs as being a major determinant of maleness and femaleness, he however summarized that the microscopic gamete is the key feature for such gender categorization. The productive efficiency of fertile eggs is a foundation on which femaleness stands and, the quantitative potential of viable sperm cells laid basis for maleness. The difference in gamete possession points to the maleness as a competitive ability to produce large offspring, and the femaleness' noncompetitive increase in fertile eggs productivity.

3. How does he believe evolution can explain male violence?

Barash's reports on some basic activities that took place prior to birth gave a hint, reflecting how evolution contributes to a pending future violence characterized of manhood. Firstly, a successful birth must have won in a rigor to gain dominance over millions of competing spermatozoa for fertilization with just a single egg. Secondly, the theory of adaptation particularly explained the endowment of natural fitness for male, equipping them with the physiological and anatomical tools (larger in size and stronger). This is a reflection of male characterized violent propensities. Moreover, the genealogical history of man reveals Homo sapiens descendant in the likes of a polygyny elephant seals. This explains an inherent aggressiveness, a sense to dominate and a resulting use of violence to satisfy and win in a competitive bid for survival.

4. What social conditions does he suggest may play a role?

An eminent sociologist, Marvin Wolfgang, in his report on the classic study of American homicide showed that cultural orientation of the people is one of

the social conditions that deposit an expectation of male violent while female are more expected to protect their calmness irrespective of stimulant. Surprisingly, a society learns its norms faster. Male to female violence differences is popped up from dissimilarity in “ primary upbringing and social expectation” (Barash, n. d.).