entrapment in the contemporary "carceral continuum." Instead, Beckett and Herbert advocate for policies and programs that use a harm-reduction approach such as needle exchanges, legalizing prostitution, and providing public housing that allows substance use. They provide some evidence from evaluation studies, including controlled experiments, of these programs' effectiveness, but further research is needed to assess whether the results can be duplicated in different cities.

Its contributions notwithstanding, Beckett and Herbert's study would have been stronger if it had more fully addressed two issues. First, it does not directly assess the broken windows hypothesis that banishment and exclusion reduce crime. The populations most affected by these new laws typically have higher-than-average rates of involvement in a variety of personal and property crimes; Beckett and Herbert's interviews indicate that being banished reduced offending in some cases, but its specific deterrent effect is likely quite small. They need, but lack over-time community level data on SODA, SOAP, and violent and property crime to assess whether banishment has the general deterrent effect predicted by broken windows. Second, Beckett and Herbert trace the revival of banishment to a number of structural and legal changes. These include shortages of affordable housing, employment opportunities, and social assistance; gentrification; and increases in the desire of Seattle citizens, business owners, politicians and police to reduce the visibility of urban homelessness. Beckett and Herbert also highlight an array of legislative changes that addressed the unconstitutionality of older vagrancy and loitering laws, with new sets of prohibitions and punishments for specific activities (e.g., sleeping on a park bench or loitering with the intent to sell drugs). Although these changes are important elements of the context in which banishment has been revived, Beckett and Herbert do not have the necessary comparative data to explore more systematically the causal contribution of these and other factors. Hopefully, subsequent research will build on Beckett and Herbert's excellent case study and assess more fully the various factors that help explain why Seattle and other cities have embraced banishment, while others have pursued other policies. These limitations notwithstanding, *Banished* deserves to be widely read. It will hopefully be influential, both in and outside the academy.

Divergent Social Worlds: Neighborhood Crime and the Racial-Spatial Divide. By Ruth D. Peterson and Lauren J. Krivo. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2010. Pp. xxvi+157. $37.50.

Ross L. Matsueda
University of Washington

A pernicious feature of most urban areas in the United States is extreme residential segregation by race, a phenomenon that Douglas Massey and

Nancy Denton forever seared into our consciousness with the term "American apartheid." Residential segregation is associated with racial disparities in income and in access to public services, the creation of an urban underclass, and large racial differences in criminal violence. In *Divergent Social Worlds*, Ruth Peterson and Lauren Krivo examine the latter, sketching an integrated theory of race, space, and crime, and using the theory to guide their empirical analyses of new data on neighborhoods within major cities of the United States. The importance of their work cannot be overstated: racial differences in criminal violence and illicit drug use—along with discrimination in the criminal justice system—have created alarming racial disparities in mass incarceration, as documented by leading sociologists such as Bruce Western, Katherine Beckett, Becky Pettit, Lawrence Bobo, Loïc Wacquant, and others.

   Peterson and Krivo begin by specifying a structural theory of the racial and spatial distribution of crime, drawing on a broad range of sociological theories—structural race theory, social disorganization theory, and theories of residential segregation. Following Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, they assert that race is a key organizing principle within society, which has created a racially structured society. Political, economic, and ideological dimensions of society are hierarchically structured along racial lines, and reproduced through the racial distinctions made in everyday interactions and institutional practices. Dominant racial groups have an interest in maintaining their privileged positions and therefore marshal their ample resources to maintain the system; subordinate racial groups have an interest in change but lack the resources to change the system. This "core racist reality" is reproduced through conventional institutions—schools, labor markets, politics, criminal justice, and health care.

   Peterson and Krivo argue that a key structural mechanism by which racial hierarchies have been reproduced in America is residential segregation. They trace segregation to a long history of overt and illegal discrimination in the housing market—including redlining and real estate blockbusting—as well as contemporary practices of mortgage banks pushing predatory loans, real estate agents steering minorities into neighborhoods of similar color, and other more subtle forms of discrimination. The intersection of a racial structure and residential segregation has produced a hierarchical "racial-spatial divide," in which racial-ethnic minorities find themselves at the bottom of the spatial (inner-city disadvantaged neighborhoods) and socioeconomic (meager education and secondary sector jobs) hierarchy and privileged whites find themselves at the top. This divide has, in turn, produced disparate social worlds, in which the interests, resources, opportunities, and concerns of racial groups located in distinct neighborhoods increasingly diverge, ultimately leading to unequal rates of crime. At the city level, residential segregation hampers the development of common shared interests and perspectives to combat crime, and a lack of a manufacturing base provides a weak foundation for supporting public services for improving local conditions. At the neighbor-

hood level, social disorganization in disadvantaged areas not only impedes neighborhood informal control of crime, but also breeds violence as a way of resolving disputes, and encourages theft and illegal rackets as a source of income.

Armed with this theoretical perspective, Peterson and Krivo analyze the National Neighborhood Crime Study (NNCS), which serves as the empirical linchpin of their study. The NNCS is a remarkable compilation of neighborhood census and crime data across major cities of the United States, which allows multilevel and cross-level analyses by nesting 9,593 neighborhoods within 91 cities. The analysis unfolds in three stages. The first reconfirms, with their dataset, that blacks and whites remain extremely segregated residentially. Using different measures of socioeconomic (dis)advantage—poverty, joblessness, high-status jobs—Peterson and Krivo consistently find that predominantly white neighborhoods are advantaged while neighborhoods of color, especially predominantly black neighborhoods, face huge disadvantages. Their charts and diagrams lead to the inescapable conclusion that whites and racial-ethnic minorities live in divergent socioeconomic worlds generated by racialized social structures.

The second stage of analysis examines whether these racialized structures are empirically related to crime rates across neighborhoods and cities. The authors use multilevel Poisson models with overdispersion parameters to model counts of violent and property crime. At the city level, crime is associated with extreme residential segregation, the absence of a strong manufacturing base, and greater percentages of African-Americans. At the neighborhood level, crime is associated with residential instability, fewer immigrants, and fewer investments in the community. Moreover, the structural variables—particularly disadvantage—help explain why white neighborhoods have lower rates of violence than do neighborhoods of color. Even controlling for all structural covariates, however, differences in violence rates by racial-ethnic neighborhood composition remain.

The third stage of analysis seeks to explain this remaining difference by examining the spatial proximity of distinct racial-ethnic neighborhoods to other neighborhoods. Here, Peterson and Krivo go beyond the usual model of spatial autoregressive effects of neighborhood violence (the dependent variable), but also model the spatial effects of other structural covariates. They find that, net of the other covariates of their models, spatial proximity to neighborhoods that are residentially unstable, non-white, and disadvantaged is associated with higher rates of violence. Moreover, when considered jointly, the spatial variables explain the remaining gaps between black-white and Latino-white rates of neighborhood violence. Hence, the "racial-spatial divide."

Peterson and Krivo have already made the NNCS dataset available to the public, which will undoubtedly spawn additional research and create a multiplier effect on our criminological knowledge. One fruitful line of theorizing and research would build on Peterson and Krivo's work by

specifying the role of individual actors in producing, reproducing, and responding to the racial-spatial divide. All but the most ardent structuralists would agree that a complete theory of race, disadvantage, and crime would also specify how individual agency helps create, maintain, and change racial hierarchies, and how those structures then translate into individual and collective acts of crime. This question would open new puzzles and pose very difficult problems that lie at the core of the discipline. How do individual actions coalesce into macro organizational outcomes? How do individuals—residents, members of racial groups, criminals—coordinate their actions into instrumental collective action? Answers to these questions would take the NNCS as a point of departure, but then broaden analyses to include survey data on individuals and data on observations of collective action nested within neighborhoods. Such research would augment the substantial contributions this monograph makes to our theoretical and empirical understanding of race, place, and crime in our cities. *Divergent Social Worlds* is perhaps the most important book on urban crime since Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay's pioneering work, *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*, was published over 50 years ago (University of Chicago Press, 1942). Destined to become a classic, Peterson and Krivo's book is necessary reading for students of race-ethnicity, crime and violence, and urban processes.

Why Girls Fight: Female Youth Violence in the Inner City. By Cindy D. Ness. New York: New York University Press, 2009. Pp. xiv+182. $21.00 (paper).

Lisa Pasko
University of Denver

Although girls' capacity for aggression and violence has historically been ignored or trivialized, girls' violence has always existed, even if it was less often reported to authorities or taken seriously by academics. When it was taken seriously by academics and justice professionals, girls' violence was either consigned to the "mean girl" relational aggression category or dismissed as a rare phenomenon limited to a handful of deranged young women. Showing that girls' fights are not uncommon, Cindy D. Ness, in *Why Girls Fight: Female Youth Violence in the Inner City*, corrects this former oversight and explains why female adolescent youths in west and northeast Philadelphia (named Melrose Park and Lee neighborhoods) readily engage in street fights and other forms of physical violence. Using a dual lens of psychological and sociological analysis, she systematically shows that the answer is not a simple one. It requires an interrogation of the environment that surrounds and affects girls' social worlds, an investigation into the normative "girl code" of the streets, and a critical