

Crime

Published: 01/09/2008 - 16:55

Please use the following links to access these Crime sub-chapters:

Data - " [Crime - Data](#) " *data concerning crime ordered by data year and subject of the data in parentheses.*

Law and policy - " [Crime - Law and Policy](#) " *The Controlled Substances Act and information related to it.*

Research - " [Crime - Research](#) " *research studies concerning various aspects of drug related crime, with the subject of the research in italicized parentheses.*

Adolescents - " [Adolescents - Crime](#) " *data concerning adolescents and crime.*

Tables - " [Crime - Tables](#) " *Please use the following links to access these data tables:*

" [Total, marijuana and drug arrests by year](#) "

" [Marijuana arrests percent share of total drug arrests by year](#) "

" [Drug and marijuana arrests percent change over prior year](#) "

1.

(crime - transnational organized crime) "The simple fact is that transnational organized crime is big business in an increasingly globalized economy. From China to Nigeria to Mexico, entrepreneurial criminals will navigate around laws and across borders, supplying illegal or illegally acquired goods and services to meet the demands of the highest bidders. Whether it is drugs, human kidneys, human beings, illegally harvested timber, weapons, or rhinoceros horns, as long as someone is willing to buy it, someone will be willing to sell it."

Source:

Haken, Jeremy, "Transnational Crime In The Developing World," Global Financial Integrity (Washington, DC: Center for International Policy, February 2011), p. 1.

<http://www.gfintegrity.org/storage/gfip/documents/reports/transcrime/gfi...>

2.

(crime - transnational organized crime - definition) "Transnational organized crime refers to those self-perpetuating associations of individuals who operate transnationally for the purpose of obtaining power, influence, monetary and/or commercial gains, wholly or in part by illegal means, while protecting their activities through a pattern of corruption and/or violence, or while protecting their illegal activities through a transnational organizational structure and the exploitation of transnational commerce or communication mechanisms. There is no single structure under which transnational organized criminals operate; they vary from hierarchies to clans, networks, and cells, and may evolve to other structures. The crimes they commit also vary. Transnational organized criminals act conspiratorially in their criminal activities and possess certain characteristics which may include, but are not limited to:

- In at least part of their activities they commit violence or other acts which are likely to intimidate, or make actual or implicit threats to do so;

- They exploit differences between countries to further their objectives, enriching their organization, expanding its power, and/or avoiding detection/apprehension;

- They attempt to gain influence in government, politics, and commerce through corrupt as well as legitimate means;
- They have economic gain as their primary goal, not only from patently illegal activities but also from investment in legitimate businesses; and
- They attempt to insulate both their leadership and membership from detection, sanction, and/or prosecution through their organizational structure."

Source:

"Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime: Addressing Converging Threats to National Security," Office of the President of the United States (Washington, DC: April 2011)

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/2011-strategy-c...>

3.

(crime - strategy to combat transnational organized crime) "This [Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime] complements but does not replicate the work of other major U.S. security initiatives. It is guided by the *National Security Strategy* and interlocks with other U.S. strategies and initiatives, to include the *National Drug Control Strategy*, the *National Strategy for Counterterrorism*, the *International Strategy for Cyberspace*, the *National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction*, the U.S.-Mexico *Merida Initiative*, the *Law Enforcement Strategy to Combat International Organized Crime*, the *National Strategy for Maritime Security, Countering Piracy Off the Horn of Africa: Partnership & Action Plan*, and several other U.S. security assistance, counterdrug, and capacity-building efforts around the world."

The Strategy names these components: 1.) Crime-Terror-Insurgency Nexus. 2.) Drug Trafficking, 3.) Human Smuggling, 4.) Trafficking in Persons, 5.) Weapons Trafficking, 6.) Intellectual Property Theft, and 7.) Cybercrime.

Source:

"Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime: Addressing Converging Threats to National Security," Office of the President of the United States (Washington, DC: April 2011), p. 4.

http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/Strategy_to_Combat_Transna...

4. Crime - Data

(2010 - crime - drug manufacturing arrests) Of the 1,638,846 arrests for drug law violations in 2010, 81.9% (1,342,215) were for possession of a controlled substance. Only 18.1% (296,631) were for the sale or manufacture of a drug.

(2007 - crime - drug manufacturing arrests) Of the 1,841,182 arrests for drug law violations in 2007, 82.5% (1,518,975) were for possession of a controlled substance. Only 17.5% (322,207) were for the sale or manufacture of a drug.

Source:

"Crime in the United States 2010," FBI Uniform Crime Report (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, September 2011), Table 29.

<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2010/crime-in-the-...>

Arrests for Drug Abuse Violations:

<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2010/crime-in-the-...>

=====

"2007 Crime in the United States," (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, September 2008), Table 29.

http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2007/data/table_29.html

Arrests for Drug Abuse Violations:

<http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2007/arrests/index.html>

5.

(2010, 2009, 2008, 2007, 1973 - crime - drug arrests) In **1973** , there were 328,670 arrests logged in the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) for drug law violations.

In **2007** , that number rose to 1,841,182 drug law violation arrests, representing a +460.2% increase during that thirty-four year span. Arrests concerning alcohol violations included 1,427,494 for Driving under the influence, 633,654 for liquor law violations, and 589,402 for drunkenness. Also in 2007, there were a reported 597,447 arrests for all violent crimes and 1,610,088 arrests for all property crimes, out of a total 14,209,365 arrests for all offenses.

The **2008** arrests for drug law violations equaled 1,702,537, a decline of -7.5% over those for 2007. Alcohol violations accrued 1,483,396 arrests for Driving under the influence, 625,939 for liquor law violations, and 611,069 for drunkenness. In 2008, there were a reported 594,911 arrests for all violent crimes, 1,687,345 arrests for all property crimes, and 14,005,615 arrests for all offenses.

In **2009** , arrests for drug law violations declined slightly (-2.3%) to 1,663,582. A small decrease also occurred in alcohol violations to 1,440,409 for Driving under the influence, to 570,333 for liquor law violations and to 594,300 for drunkenness. Violent crime arrests in 2009 equaled 581,765, with 1,728,285 arrests for property crimes. Arrests for all offenses totaled 13,687,241 down -2.3% over 2008.

For **2010** , drug law violation arrests again declined slightly (-1.5%) to 1,638,846. Alcohol violations also experienced small decreases with 1,412,223 arrests for Driving under the influence, 512,790 for liquor law violations and 560,718 for drunkenness. Violent crime arrests in 2010 numbered 552,077, and property crimes counted 1,643,962 arrests. Arrests for all offenses totaled 13,120,947, down -4.1% over 2009.

Source:

FBI Uniform Crime Reports 1973 (Note: 1973 data supplied by the National Criminal Justice Reference Service)

=====

"Crime in the United States 2010," FBI Uniform Crime Report (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, September 2011), Table 29.

<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2010/crime-in-the-...>

=====

"Crime in the United States 2009," FBI Uniform Crime Report (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, September 2010), Table 29.

http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2009/data/table_29.html

=====

"2008 Crime in the United States," FBI Uniform Crime Reports (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, September 2009), Table 29.

http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2008/data/table_29.html

=====

"2007 Crime in the United States," (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, September 2008), Table 29.

http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2007/data/table_29.html

6.

(2009 - crime - criminal records) "... an estimated 65 million U.S. adults [over one in four] who have criminal records often confront barriers that prevent even the most qualified from securing employment. ² "

"... an estimated 27.8 percent of the U.S. adult population has a criminal record on file with states."

(2) NELP [National Employment Law Project] based the estimate of U.S. adults with criminal records on the following methodology. According to a 2008 survey of states, there were 92.3 million people with criminal records on file with states, including those individuals fingerprinted for serious misdemeanors and felony arrests. U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of State Criminal History Information Systems, 2008 (Oct. 2009), at Table 1. In some states, misdemeanor arrests for less serious crimes do not require fingerprinting, thus this figure is likely an undercount of people with criminal records. To account for individuals who may have records in multiple states and other factors, and to arrive at a conservative national estimate, the 92.3 million figure was reduced by 30 percent (64.6 million). Thus, as a percentage of the U.S. population over the age of 18 (232,458,335 in 2009 according to the U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, ...), an estimated 27.8 percent of the U.S. adult population has a criminal record on file with states. This estimate is consistent with a Department of Justice finding that about "30 percent of the Nation's adult population" has a state rap sheet. ... The rise in people with criminal records may significantly be attributed to the increased arrests associated with the "War on Drugs."

Source:

Rodriguez, Michelle Natividad and Emsellem, Maurice, "65 Million Need Not Apply: The Case for Reforming Criminal Background Checks for Employment," National Employment Law Project (New York, NY: March 2011), pp. 3 & 27.

http://www.nelp.org/page/-/SCLP/2011/65_Million_Need_Not_Apply.pdf?nocdn...

7.

(2008 - crime - Mexico - drug operations) "Today Mexico is a major producer and supplier to the U.S. market of heroin, methamphetamine, and marijuana and the major transit country for cocaine sold in the United States. According to the Department of State's 2009 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report , as much as 90% of the cocaine entering the United States now transits through Mexico. A small number of Mexican DTOs control the most significant drug distribution operations along the Southwest border. The criminal activities of these Mexican DTOs reach well beyond the towns and cities of the border, extending along drug trafficking routes into cities across the United States. The Mexican DTOs have exhibited many characteristics of organized crime such as being organized in distinct cells and controlling subordinate cells that operate throughout the United States. ¹ "

Source:

Beittel, June S., "Mexico's Drug-Related Violence," Congressional Research Service (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, May 27, 2009), p. 7.

<http://www.fas.org/spp/crs/row/R40582.pdf>

==

United States Department of State, Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, "International Narcotics Control Strategy Report: Volume I, Drug and Chemical Control," (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State: March 2009), p. 414.

==

<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/120054.pdf>

Cook, Colleen W., "Mexico's Drug Cartels," Congressional Research Service (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, October 16, 2007), p. 5.

<http://ftp.fas.org/spp/crs/row/RL34215.pdf>

8.

(2008 - **crime - smuggling**) "Criminal organizations have demonstrated enduring and ever-evolving capabilities to creatively construct and use underground passageways to gain access through the border to transport narcotics, people, and other illicit contraband into the continental United States. Since May 1990, 101 crossborder tunnels have been discovered by law enforcement agencies. All but one have originated in Mexico and exited in either California or Arizona. There were 24 tunnels discovered in Calendar Year 2008 alone. One tunnel -- the longest crossborder tunnel discovered in United States history -- had ventilation, drainage, and lighting systems, as well as a cement floor and a pulley system. The entrance to the tunnel in Mexico was 85 feet below the surface, and the tunnel crossed the U.S. border at approximately 40-45 feet below the surface, with the entrance on the U.S. side approximately nine feet below the surface. Law enforcement authorities seized over two tons of marijuana in the tunnel, which was attributed to a well-known Mexican drug trafficking organization."

Source:

Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control Policy, "National Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy," (Washington, DC: June 2009), p. 45.

[http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/ondcp/policy-and-research/...](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/ondcp/policy-and-research/)

9.

(2005 - **crime - drug arrests by substance, race, and sex**) "Suspects arrested for cocaine powder and crack cocaine accounted for 42% of all suspects (29,886) arrested by the DEA in 2005 (table 2). Twenty-eight percent of suspects were arrested for cocaine powder; 14% for crack cocaine. The remaining 58% of suspects were arrested for methamphetamine (22%), marijuana (20%), opiates (8%), and other drug-related offenses (9%)."

"Most suspects arrested by the DEA for drug violations were male (84%). More than a quarter (29%) of male suspects were arrested for cocaine powder, followed by marijuana and methamphetamine (both 21%)."

"Females accounted for 16% of all DEA drug arrests in 2005 and 1 in 5 of all methamphetamine arrests. More than a quarter (27%) of females arrested by the DEA for drug violations were arrested for methamphetamine, followed by cocaine powder (21%) and marijuana (16%). Half of all suspects arrested by the DEA were age 31 or younger. Crack cocaine suspects—half were age 28 or younger—were somewhat younger by comparison."

"Hispanics constituted 44% of arrestees, followed by white (27%) and black (26%) suspects. Hispanics made up more than half of arrests for cocaine powder (56%), opiates (58%), and marijuana (54%). More than three-quarters (77%) of crack cocaine arrestees were black, and half of all methamphetamine suspects were white. In 2005, 27% of suspects arrested by the DEA were non-U.S. citizens."

Source:

Motivans, Mark , "Compendium of Federal Justice Statistics, 2005." Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, September 2008), p. 2.

<http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/fjs05.pdf>

10.

(2005 - **crime - treatment and crime rates**) "Increases in admissions to substance abuse treatment are associated with reductions in crime rates. Admissions to drug treatment increased 37.4 percent and federal spending on drug treatment increased 14.6 percent from 1995 to 2005. During the same period, violent crime fell 31.5 percent. Maryland experienced decreases in crime when jurisdictions increased the number of people sent to drug treatment."

Source:

Justice Policy Institute, "Substance Abuse Treatment and Public Safety," (Washington, DC: January 2008), p. 1.

http://www.justicepolicy.org/images/upload/08_01_REP_DrugTx_AC-PS.pdf

11.

(2000-2004 - **crime - drug and alcohol offenses in schools and colleges**) "Table 9 provides the reported instances in each offense record in which the offenders were suspected of using alcohol, computers, and/or drugs. ²² The data show that such use was minimal in situations occurring at schools during the 5-year study period. Of the 589,534 offense records, reports of offenders suspected of using drugs totaled 32,366, while reports of alcohol use totaled 5,844."

Source:

Noonan, James H., Vavra, Malissa C., "Crime in Schools and Colleges: A Study of Offenders and Arrestees Reported via National Incident-Based Reporting System Data," United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division (Washington DC: October 2007), p. 14.

<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/nibrs/crime-in-schools-and-colleges...>

12.

(2004 - **crime - number of DEA and FBI agents**) "The DEA employed about 4,400 officers with the authority to make arrests and carry firearms as of September 2004. These DEA agents primarily investigate major narcotics violators, enforce regulations governing the manufacture and dispensing of controlled substances, and perform various other functions to prevent and control drug trafficking."

"The FBI employed 12,242 full-time personnel with arrest and firearm authority. These agents investigate more than 200 types of federal crimes. The FBI has concurrent jurisdiction with the DEA over drug offenses under the Controlled Substances Act."

Source:

Reaves, Brian, "Federal Law Enforcement Officers, 2004" (Washington, DC: USDOJ, Bureau of Justice Statistics, January 2009), NCJ222984, Table 1, p. 2.

<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/flco04.pdf>

13.

(2003 - crime - sheriff's offices with drug enforcement units) "Nine in 10 sheriff's offices regularly performed drug enforcement functions (table 29). Sheriff's offices with drug enforcement responsibilities employed 90% of all local police officers.

Thirty-six percent of sheriff's offices operated a special unit for drug enforcement with one or more officers assigned full-time (table 30). A majority of sheriff's offices serving a population of 250,000 or more residents had a fulltime drug enforcement unit. There were an estimated 4,031 officers assigned full time to drug enforcement units nationwide. The average number of officers assigned ranged from 27 in jurisdictions with 1 million or more residents to 2 in those with fewer than 50,000 residents."

Source:

Hickman, Matthew J. and Reaves, Brian A., "Sheriff's Offices 2003" (Washington, DC: USDOJ, Bureau of Justice Statistics, May 2006), NCJ 211361, p. 15.

<http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/s03.pdf>

14.

(2003 - crime - sheriff's officers assigned to drug task forces) "In 2003 an estimated 47% of sheriff's offices had one or more officers assigned full time to a multi-agency drug enforcement task force (table 31), including 89% of sheriff's offices serving 1 million or more residents. About 71% of all officers worked for a department that assigned officers to a drug task force.

"Nationwide, an estimated 3,477 officers were assigned full time to a drug task force. The average number assigned full time ranged from 9 in sheriff's offices serving a population of 1 million or more to 1 in those serving fewer than 10,000 residents."

Source:

Hickman, Matthew J. and Reaves, Brian A., "Sheriff's Offices 2003" (Washington, DC: USDOJ, Bureau of Justice Statistics, May 2006), NCJ 211361.

<http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/s03.pdf>

15.

(2006 - **crime - prescription drug diversion and fraud**) "According to law enforcement reporting, some individuals and criminal groups divert CPDs [controlled prescription drugs] through doctor-shopping and use insurance fraud to fund their schemes. In fact, Aetna, Inc. reports that nearly half of its 1,065 member fraud cases in 2006 (the latest year for which data are available) involved prescription benefits, and most were related to doctor-shopping, according to the Coalition Against Insurance Fraud (CAIF). CAIF further reports that diversion of CPDs collectively costs insurance companies up to \$72.5 billion annually, nearly two-thirds of which is paid by public insurers. Individual insurance plans lose an estimated \$9 million to \$850 million annually, depending on each plan's size; much of that cost is passed on to consumers through higher annual premiums."

Source:

National Drug Intelligence Center, Drug Enforcement Administration, "National Prescription Drug Threat Assessment," (Washington DC, April 2009), p. 20.

<http://www.justice.gov/ndic/pubs33/33775/33775p.pdf>

16. **Crime - Law and Policy**

The Controlled Substances Act of 1970:

"(a) Establishment There are established five schedules of controlled substances, to be known as schedules I, II, III, IV, and V"

"(b)... The findings required for each of the schedules are as follows:

"(1) Schedule I. - (A) The drug or other substance has a high potential for abuse. (B) The drug or other substance has no currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States. (C) There is a lack of accepted safety for use of the drug or other substance under medical supervision.

"(2) Schedule II. - (A) The drug or other substance has a high potential for abuse. (B) The drug or other substance has a currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States or a currently accepted medical use with severe restrictions. (C) Abuse of the drug or other substances may lead to severe psychological or physical dependence.

"(3) Schedule III. - (A) The drug or other substance has a potential for abuse less than the drugs or other substances in schedules I and II. (B) The drug or other substance has a currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States. (C) Abuse of the drug or other substance may lead to moderate or low physical dependence or high psychological dependence.

"(4) Schedule IV. - (A) The drug or other substance has a low potential for abuse relative to the drugs or other substances in schedule III. (B) The drug or other substance has a currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States. (C) Abuse of the drug or other substance may lead to limited physical dependence or psychological dependence relative to the drugs or other substances in schedule III.

"(5) Schedule V. - (A) The drug or other substance has a low potential for abuse relative to the drugs or other substances in schedule IV. (B) The drug or other substance has a currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States. (C) Abuse of the drug or other substance may lead to limited physical dependence or psychological dependence relative to the drugs or other substances in schedule IV."

Source:

U.S. Code, Title 21, Chapter 13 -- Drug Abuse Prevention and Control -- Section 812, Schedules of Controlled Substances, p. 384.

[http://fwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/use.cgi?ACTION=RETRIEVE&FILE=\\$\\$a\\$\\$buse21.wais&start=2717826&SIZE=24600&TYPE=PDF](http://fwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/use.cgi?ACTION=RETRIEVE&FILE=$$a$$buse21.wais&start=2717826&SIZE=24600&TYPE=PDF)

<http://mapinc.org/url/1NCZa7Q>

17.

" **Initial** schedules of controlled substances Schedules I, II, III, IV, and V shall, unless and until amended (FOOTNOTE 1) pursuant to section 811 of this title, consist of the following drugs or other substances:"

[Editors note: Above emphasis added.]

SCHEDULE I

(b): (10) Heroin

(c): (2) 5-methoxy-3,4-methylenedioxy amphetamine [MDMA]. (8) Ibogaine. (9) Lysergic acid diethylamide [LSD]. (10) Marihuana [marijuana, cannabis]. (11) Mescaline. (12) Peyote. (15) Psilocybin. (16) Psilocyn. (17) Tetrahydrocannabinols.

Sec. 3: Gamma hydroxybutyric acid (GHB)

SCHEDULE II

(a): (1) Opium and opiate, and any salt, compound, derivative, or preparation of opium or opiate. (3) Opium poppy and poppy straw. (4) coca (FOOTNOTE 3) leaves, except coca leaves and extracts of coca leaves from which cocaine, ecgonine, and derivatives of ecgonine or their salts have been removed; cocaine, its salts, optical and geometric isomers, and salts of isomers ...

(b): (6) Fentanyl. (4) Dihydrocodeine. (11) Methadone.

SCHEDULE III

(a): (1) Amphetamine

(e): Anabolic steroids

SCHEDULE IV

(1) Barbitol. (7) Meprobamate [Milltown].

SCHEDULE V

(1) Not more than 200 milligrams of codeine per 100 milliliters or per 100 grams.

(5) Not more than 100 milligrams of opium per 100 milliliters or per 100 grams.

Source:

U.S. Code, Title 21, Chapter 13 -- Drug Abuse Prevention and Control -- Section 844, Penalties for Simple Possession, pp. 385-387.

[http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/usc.cgi?ACTION=RETRIEVE&FILE=\\$\\$xa\\$\\$busc21.wais&start=2717826&SIZE=24600&TYPE=PDF](http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/usc.cgi?ACTION=RETRIEVE&FILE=$$xa$$busc21.wais&start=2717826&SIZE=24600&TYPE=PDF)

<http://mapinc.org/url/1NCZaa7Q>

http://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/schedules/orangebook/e_cs_sched.pdf

18.

Sec. 844. Penalties for simple possession [of Controlled Substances in the United States]

STATUTE

(a) Unlawful acts; penalties

It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally to possess a controlled substance unless such substance was obtained directly, or pursuant to a valid prescription or order, from a practitioner, while acting in the course of his professional practice, or except as otherwise authorized by this subchapter or subchapter II of this chapter."

"Any person who violates this subsection may be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not more than 1 year"

"if he commits such offense after a prior conviction under this subchapter or subchapter II of this chapter, or a prior conviction for any drug, narcotic, or chemical offense chargeable under the law of any State, has become final, he shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for not less than 15 days but not more than 2 years, and shall be fined a minimum of \$2,500"

"if he commits such offense after two or more prior convictions under this subchapter or subchapter II of this chapter, or two or more prior convictions for any drug, narcotic, or chemical offense chargeable under the law of any State, or a combination of two or more such offenses have become final, he shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for not less than 90 days but not more than 3 years, and shall be fined a minimum of \$5,000."

Source:

U.S. Code, Title 21, Chapter 13 -- Drug Abuse Prevention and Control -- Section 844, Penalties for Simple Possession, pp. 416-417.

[http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/usc.cgi?ACTION=RETRIEVE&FILE=\\$\\$xa\\$\\$busc21.wais&start=2939781&SIZE=9863&TYPE=PDF](http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/usc.cgi?ACTION=RETRIEVE&FILE=$$xa$$busc21.wais&start=2939781&SIZE=9863&TYPE=PDF)

<http://mapinc.org/url/0npxgLDk>

19.

(cocaine & crack - law - former penalties for possession - crack/powder cocaine disparity)

Sec. 844. Penalties for simple possession [of Controlled Substances - also called the Crack/Powder Cocaine Disparity]

STATUTE

(a) Unlawful acts; penalties

"... Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a person convicted under this subsection for the possession of a mixture or substance which contains cocaine base shall be imprisoned not less than 5 years and not more than 20 years, and fined a minimum of \$1,000, if the conviction is a first conviction under this subsection and the amount of the mixture or substance exceeds 5 grams, if the conviction is after a prior conviction for the possession of such a mixture or substance under this subsection becomes final and the amount of the mixture or substance exceeds 3 grams, or if the conviction is after 2 or more prior convictions for the possession of such a mixture or substance under this subsection become final and the amount of the mixture or substance exceeds 1 gram."

UPDATE: On August 3, 2010, President Obama signed the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010. Per the Sentencing Project, "the minimum quantity of crack cocaine that triggers a 5-year mandatory minimum from 5 grams to 28 grams, and from 50 grams to 280 grams to trigger a 10-year mandatory minimum sentence. The amount of powder cocaine required to trigger the 5 and 10-year mandatory minimums remains the same, at 500 grams and 5 kilograms, respectively. The legislation also eliminates the mandatory minimum for simple possession of crack cocaine. The quantity disparity between crack and powder cocaine has moved from 100 to 1 to 18 to 1."

Source:

U.S. Code, Title 21, Chapter 13 -- Drug Abuse Prevention and Control -- Section 844, Penalties for Simple Possession, p. 417.

[http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/usc.cgi?ACTION=RETRIEVE&FILE=\\$\\$xa\\$\\$busc21.wais&start=2939781&SIZE=9863&TYPE=PDF](http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/usc.cgi?ACTION=RETRIEVE&FILE=$$xa$$busc21.wais&start=2939781&SIZE=9863&TYPE=PDF)

<http://mapinc.org/url/0npxgLDk>

===

The Sentencing Project, "Fair Sentencing Act Signed by President Obama," August 3, 2010.

http://www.sentencingproject.org/detail/news.cfm?news_id=984&pid=164

20.

(crime - law & policy - accepted medical use) "The 5-part test for fulfilling the accepted medical use criteria of Schedule II is now comprised of the following:

- the drug's chemistry must be known and reproducible;
- there must be adequate safety studies;
- there must be adequate and well-controlled studies proving efficacy;
- the drug must be accepted by qualified experts; and
- the scientific evidence must be widely available.

A drug must meet all 5 criteria to be considered for rescheduling by the DEA."

Source:

American Medical Association, Council on Science and Public Health, "Report 3 of the Council on Science and Public Health: Use of Cannabis for Medicinal Purposes" (December 2009) p. 8.

http://americansforaccess.org/downloads/AMA_Report.pdf

21.

(crime - law & policy - origin of the Controlled Substances Act) "With increasing use of marijuana and other street drugs during the 1960s, notably by college and high school students, federal drug-control laws came under scrutiny. In July 1969, President Nixon asked Congress to enact legislation to combat rising levels of drug use. Hearings were held, different proposals were considered, and House and Senate conferees filed a conference report in October 1970. The report was quickly adopted by voice vote in both chambers and was signed into law as the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970. ... Included in the new law was the Controlled Substances Act."

Source:

Eddy, Mark, "Medical Marijuana: Review and Analysis of Federal and State Policies," Congressional Research Service (Washington, DC: March 31, 2009), p. 3.

<http://www.fas.org/spp/crs/misc/RL33211.pdf>

22.

(crime - law & policy - placement of drugs in the Controlled Substances Act) "As this paper demonstrates, the pharmacological effect of a drug does not necessarily determine how a drug will be governed. Rather, it is the way a drug is framed that determines how the drug will be popularly understood and ultimately regulated. According to the Regulatory Regime / Norms model, the meaning of any drug (how it is perceived or understood) is initially ambiguous and indeterminate. As a result, the project of getting a drug into a particular regulatory regime is about allocating specific meaning and significance to the drug in order to prompt individuals to think and feel about the drug in a way that allows for regime placement. This is accomplished by framing a drug to match the norms of a particular regime. Thus, the critical work at the level of regulation is in the framing."

"Once a group has persuasively framed a drug in a way that resonates with the norms of its regime of choice, then the drug may be placed in that regime, regardless of whether the designation decision is supported by scientific or medical evidence. As we have seen with cocaine, marijuana and anabolic steroids, however, if a drug in the criminal regulatory regime is closely associated with socially maligned groups or racial minorities, then it is substantially more difficult for the drug to eventually migrate out of the regime."

Source:

Paul-Emile, Kimani, "Making Sense of Drug Regulation: A Theory of Law for Drug Control Policy," Fordham University School of Law, Cornell Journal of Law and Policy (December 2009), p. 52.

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1523401

23.

(crime - law & policy - temporary scheduling) "Because policymakers were concerned about the effects of pharmaceutically created and other modified drugs, Congress gave the Attorney General the authority to temporarily place a substance onto Schedule I of the CSA to "avoid imminent hazards to public safety."¹³ When determining whether there is an imminent hazard, the Attorney General (through the DEA) must consider the drug's history and current pattern of abuse; scope, duration, and significance of abuse; and risk to public health. Once scheduled through this temporary scheduling process, a substance may remain on Schedule I for one year. The Attorney General then has the authority to keep the substance on Schedule I for an additional six months before it must be removed or permanently scheduled."

Source:

Sacco, Lisa N. and Finklea, Kristin M., "Synthetic Drugs: Overview and Issues for Congress, Congressional Research Service (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, October 28, 2011), p. 3.

<http://www.fas.org/spp/crs/misc/R42066.pdf>

24. **Crime - Research**

(crime - research - effects of decriminalization) "Generalizing from the findings on Prohibition, we can hypothesize that decriminalization would increase the use of the previously criminalized drug, but would decrease violence associated with attempts to control illicit markets and as resolutions to disputes between buyers and sellers. Moreover, because the perception of violence associated with the drug market can lead people who are not directly involved to be prepared for violent self-defense, there could be additional reductions in peripheral settings when disputes arise see Blumstein & Cork, 1997; Sheley & Wright, 1996!"

Source:

Jensen, Gary F., "Prohibition, Alcohol, and Murder: Untangling Countervailing Mechanisms," Homicide Studies, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, February 2000), pp. 33-4.

<http://www.ncjrs.gov/App/publications/Abstract.aspx?id=180958>

25.

(alcohol - research - prohibition, alcohol consumption and homicide) "The data are quite consistent with the view that Prohibition at the state level inhibited alcohol consumption, and an attempt to explain correlated residuals by including omitted variables revealed that enforcement of Prohibitionist legislation had a significant inhibiting effect as well. Moreover, both hypotheses about the effects of alcohol and Prohibition are supported by the analysis. Despite the fact that alcohol consumption is a positive correlate of homicide (as expected), Prohibition and its enforcement increased the homicide rate."

Source:

Jensen, Gary F., "Prohibition, Alcohol, and Murder: Untangling Countervailing Mechanisms," *Homicide Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, February 2000), p. 31.

<http://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=170654>

26.

(crime - research - drugs and violent crime) "Contrary to conventional wisdom and popular myth, alcohol is more tightly linked with more violent crimes than crack, cocaine, heroin or any other illegal drug. In state prisons, 21 percent of inmates in prison for violent crimes were under the influence of alcohol--and no other substance--when they committed their crime; in contrast, at the time of their crimes, only three percent of violent offenders were under the influence of cocaine or crack alone, only one percent under the influence of heroin alone."

Source:

Califano, Joseph, *Behind Bars: Substance Abuse and America's Prison Population*, Forward by Joseph Califano, The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (1998).

<http://www.casacolumbia.org/absolutem/articlefiles/379-Behind%20Bars.pdf...>

27.

(crime - research - effect of police crackdowns) The Canadian Medical Association Journal published research on the impact of a police crackdown on a public illicit drug market in the Downtown Eastside (DTES) section of Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. The researchers found that:

"Our results probably explain reports of increased injection drug use, drug-related crime and other public-order concerns in neighbourhoods where activities related to illicit drug use and the sex trade emerged or intensified in the wake of the crackdown. Such displacement has profound public-health implications if it "normalizes" injection drug use among previously unexposed at-risk youth. Furthermore, since difficulty in obtaining syringes has been shown to be a significant factor in promoting syringe sharing among IDUs in Vancouver, displacement away from sources of sterile syringes may increase the rates of bloodborne diseases. Escalated police presence may also explain the observed reduction in willingness to use a safer injection facility. ³³ It is unlikely that the lack of benefit of the crackdown was due to insufficient police resources. Larger crackdowns in the United States, which often involved helicopters to supplement foot and car patrols, have not had measurable benefits and have instead been associated with substantial health and social harms."

Source:

Wood, Evan, Patricia M. Spittal, Will Small, Thomas Kerr, Kathy Li, Robert S. Hogg, Mark W. Tyndall, Julio S.G. Montaner, Martin T. Schechter, "Displacement of Canada's Largest Public Illicit Drug Market In Response To A Police Crackdown," *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, May 11, 2004; 170(10), pp. 1554-1555.

<http://www.cmaj.ca/cgi/reprint/170/10/1551>

28.

(crime - research - effect of police crackdowns) The Canadian Medical Association Journal published research on the impact of a police crackdown on a public illicit drug market in the Downtown Eastside (DTES) section of Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. The researchers found that:

"We detected no reduction in drug use frequency or drug price in response to a large-scale police crackdown on drug users in Vancouver's DTES. The evidence that drugs became more difficult to obtain was consistent with reports of displacement of drug dealers and was supported by the significantly higher rates of reporting that police presence had affected where drugs were used, including changes in neighbourhood and increases in use in public places. These observations were validated by examination of needle-exchange statistics.

"Our findings are consistent with those showing that demand for illicit drugs enables the illicit drug market to adapt to and overcome enforcement-related constraints. Although evidence suggested that police presence made it more difficult to obtain drugs, this appeared to be explained by displacement of drug dealers."

Source:

Wood, Evan, Patricia M. Spittal, Will Small, Thomas Kerr, Kathy Li, Robert S. Hogg, Mark W. Tyndall, Julio S.G. Montaner, Martin T. Schechter, "Displacement of Canada's Largest Public Illicit Drug Market In Response To A Police Crackdown," *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, May 11, 2004; 170(10), p. 1554.

<http://www.cmaj.ca/cgi/content/full/170/10/1551>

29.

(crime - research - disproportional minority drug arrests) "Police departments deploy most patrol and narcotics police to certain neighborhoods, usually designated "high crime." These are disproportionately low-income, and disproportionately African American and Latino. It is in these neighborhoods where the police make most patrols, and where they stop and search the most vehicles and individuals, looking for "contraband" of any type in order to make an arrest. The item that people in any neighborhood are most likely to possess, which can get them arrested, is a small amount of marijuana. In short, the arrests are ethnically- and racially-biased mainly because the police are systematically "fishing" for arrests in only some neighborhoods, and methodically searching only some "fish." ⁶ This produces what has been termed "racism without racists."

Source:

Harry G. Levine, Jon B. Gettman, Loren Siegel, "Arresting Blacks for Marijuana in California: Possession Arrests, 2006-08." *Drug Policy Alliance*, LA: October 2010, p. 13.

<http://drugpolicy.org/docUploads/ArrestingBlacks.pdf>

30.

(crime - research - policing of cannabis in the UK) South Bank University's Criminal Policy Research Unit conducted a detailed study of the policing of cannabis in England. The study found that:

"One in seven of all known offenders in England and Wales were arrested for the possession of cannabis.

"There has been a tenfold increase in the number of possession offences since the mid-1970s. There is no evidence that this increase has been an intended consequence of specific policy.

"Possession offences most often come to light as a by-product of other investigations.

"A minority of patrol officers 'specialise' in cannabis offences: 3 per cent of officers who had made any arrests for possession accounted for 20 per cent of all arrests.

"Arrests for possession very rarely lead to the discovery of serious crimes.

"Officers often turn a blind eye to possession offences, or give informal warnings.

"Of the 69,000 offenders who were cautioned or convicted in 1999, just over half (58 per cent) were cautioned.

"The financial costs of policing cannabis amount to at least £50 million a year (including sentencing costs), and absorb the equivalent of 500 full-time police officers.

"The researchers conclude that:

"- re-classification of cannabis to a Class C drug will yield some financial savings, allowing patrol officers to respond more effectively to other calls on their time;

"- the main benefits of reclassification would be non-financial, in removing a source of friction between the police and young people;

"- there would be a very small decline in detection of serious offences, but this should readily be offset by the savings in police time."

Source:

"Findings: The Policing of Cannabis as a Class B Drug," (London, England: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, March 2002), p. 1.

<http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/332.pdf>

31.

(crime - research - gangs and drugs) "The finding that gang homicides commonly were not precipitated by drug trade/use or other crimes in progress also is similar to previous research; however, this finding challenges public perceptions on gang homicides (5). The public often has viewed gangs, drug trade/use, crime, and homicides as interconnected factors; however, studies have shown little connection between gang homicides and drug trade/use and crime (5). Gangs and gang members are involved in a variety of high-risk behaviors that sometimes include drug and crime involvement, but gang-related homicides usually are attributed to other circumstances (6)."

Source:

"Gang Homicides — Five U.S. Cities, 2003–2008," Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control, January 27, 2012) Vol. 61, No. 3, p. 48.

<http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/pdf/wk/mm6103.pdf>

32.

(crime - research - drug dealing and employment) "The average "dealer" holds a low-wage job and sells part-time to obtain drugs for his or her own use. "Earnings for drug selling were positively correlated (though weakly) with legitimate earnings. Drug selling seemed to be a complement to, rather than a substitute for, legitimate employment."

Source:

Reuter, P., MacCoun, R., & Murphy, P., Money from Crime: A Study of the Economics of Drug Dealing in Washington DC (Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation, 1990), pp. 49-50.

<http://www.rand.org/pubs/reports/2005/R3894.pdf>

33. **Adolescents - Crime**

(2007 - adolescents - arrests for drug abuse violations)) There were an estimated 195,700 arrests of young people for drug abuse violations in 2007.

"Between 1990 and 1997, the juvenile arrest rate for drug abuse violations increased 145%. The rate declined 21% between 1997 and 2007, but the 2007 rate was still almost double the 1990 rate.

"Over the 1980–2007 period, the juvenile drug arrest rate for whites peaked in 1997 and then held relatively constant through 2007 (down 10%). In contrast, the rate for blacks peaked in 1995, then fell 49% by 2002. Despite the recent increase—23% since 2002—the rate in 2007 was 37% less than the 1995 peak."

Source:

Puzzanchera, Charles, "Juvenile Arrests 2007" (Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, April 2009), p. 10.

<http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojdp/225344.pdf>

34.

(2007 - adolescents - arrests for drug abuse violations)) The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention estimated that in 2007 there were 195,700 arrests of juveniles for drug abuse violations out of a total 2,180,500 juvenile arrests. By comparison, there were 97,100 violent crime index offense arrests and 419,000 property crime index offense arrests of juveniles that year.

Source:

Puzzanchera, Charles, "Juvenile Arrests 2007" (Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, April 2009), p. 3.

<http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojdp/225344.pdf>

35.

(2004 - adolescents - arrests for drug violations in schools and colleges) "The most common offense code reported in arrestee records was simple assault—a crime against persons, followed by drug/narcotic violations—a crime against society. These two arrest offense codes were reportedly associated with more than half (52.2 percent) of the total arrestees." These values were 51,462 "Simple Assaults" and 43,294 "Drug/Narcotics Violations" in Schools and Colleges over a five year period from 2000 through 2004. Other related counts during the same time frame were 5,108 "Drug Equipment Violations", 594 "Liquor Law Violations", 202 for "Drunkenness", and 95 for "Driving Under the Influence".

Source:

Noonan, James H., Vavra, Malissa C., "Crime in Schools and Colleges: A Study of Offenders and Arrestees Reported via National Incident-Based Reporting System Data," United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division (Washington DC: October 2007), pp. 14-16.

<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/nibrs/crime-in-schools-and-colleges...>

36.

(2003 - adolescents - juvenile drug arrest rates) "In contrast to the 1980-1993 period, the overall juvenile drug arrest rate increased by 77% in the short period between 1993 and 1997. Large increases were also seen in the rates of juvenile subgroups: male (72%), female (119%), white (109%), American Indian (160%), and Asian (105%). The black juvenile arrest rate for drug abuse violations, which had increased dramatically in the earlier period, increased an additional 25% between 1993 and 1997. Between 1997 and 2003, the juvenile drug arrest rate fell marginally (22%), with most of the overall decline attributable to a drop in arrests of blacks (41%) and males (24%)."

Source:

Snyder, Howard N., and Sickmund, Melissa, "Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 2006 National Report" (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, March 2006), p. 144.

<http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/nr2006/downloads/NR2006.pdf>

37.

(2003 - adolescents - trends in juvenile arrest rates) "In 1980, there were an estimated 1,476 arrests of persons ages 10-12 for every 100,000 persons in this age group in the U.S. population. By 2003, this arrest rate had fallen to 1,296, a decline of 12%. In 1980, 9.5% of all juvenile arrests were arrests of persons under age 13; in 2003, this percentage had decreased to 8.5% -- with the majority of the decrease occurring during the mid-1990s."

Source:

Snyder, Howard N., and Sickmund, Melissa, "Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 2006 National Report." (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, March 2006), p. 130.

<http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/nr2006/downloads/NR2006.pdf>

38.

(2003 - adolescents - substance use and nonfatal violent victimization) "Juvenciles using drugs or alcohol committed 1 in 10 of the nonfatal violent victimizations against older teens. This was 2-1/2 times higher than the percentage of victimizations against younger teens perceived to be committed by a juvenile who was using drugs or alcohol."

"Younger teens were more likely than older teens to report that their juvenile offender was not using drugs or alcohol. In about 4 in 10 victimizations against younger and older teens committed by juveniles, the victim could not ascertain whether or not the offender was using drugs or alcohol."

Source:

Baum, Katrina, PhD, "Juvenile Victimization and Offending, 1993-2003" (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Aug. 2005), p. 8.

<http://bis.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/jrv003.pdf>

39. **Crime - Tables**

(1980-2010 - Total, marijuana and drug arrests by year) Although the intent of a "War on Drugs" may have been to target drug smugglers and "King Pins," over half (52.1%) of the 1,638,846 total 2010 arrests for drug abuse violations were for marijuana -- a calculated total of 853,839. Of those, an estimated 750,591 people (45.8%) were arrested for marijuana possession alone. By contrast in 2000, a total of 734,497 Americans were arrested for marijuana offenses, of which 646,042 (40.9%) were for possession alone. From 1996-2010, there were 10.1 million arrests for marijuana possession and 1.4 million arrests for the sales and trafficking of marijuana, equaling a total of 11.5 million marijuana arrests during that fifteen year time frame.

US Arrests

Year
Total Arrests
Total Drug Arrests
Total Marijuana Arrests
Marijuana Trafficking/Sale Arrests
Marijuana Possession Arrests
Total Violent Crime Arrests
Total Property Crime Arrests

2010

13,120,947
1,638,846
853,839
103,247
750,591
552,077
1,643,962

2009	13,687,241 1,663,582 858,408 99,815 758,593 581,765 1,728,285
2008	14,005,615 1,702,537 847,863 93,640 754,224 594,911 1,687,345
2007	14,209,365 1,841,182 872,720 97,583 775,137 597,447 1,610,088
2006	14,380,370 1,889,810 829,627 90,711 738,916 611,523 1,540,297
2005	14,094,186 1,846,351 786,545 90,471 696,074 603,503 1,609,327
2004	13,938,071 1,746,570 773,731 87,329 686,402 586,558 1,644,197
2003	13,639,479 1,678,192 755,186 92,300 662,886 597,026 1,605,127
2002	13,741,438 1,538,813 697,082 83,096 613,986 620,510 1,613,954
2001	13,699,254 1,586,902 723,628 82,519 641,109 627,132 1,618,465
2000	13,980,297 1,579,566 734,497 88,455 646,042 625,132 1,620,928
1999	14,355,600 1,557,100 716,266 85,641 630,626 644,770 1,676,100
1998	14,528,300 1,559,100 682,885

	84,191
	598,694
	675,900
	1,805,600
1997	15,284,300
	1,583,600
	695,201
	88,682
	606,519
	717,750
	2,015,600
1996	15,168,100
	1,506,200
	641,642
	94,891
	546,751
	729,900
	2,045,600
1995	15,119,800
	1,476,100
	588,964
	85,614
	503,350
	796,250
	2,128,600
1990	14,195,100
	1,089,500
	326,850
	66,460
	260,390
	705,500
	2,217,800
1980	10,441,000
	580,900
	401,982
	63,318
	338,664
	475,160
	1,863,300
Total Fifteen Years	
1996-2010	211,832,563
	24,918,351
	11,469,120
	1,362,571
	10,106,550
	9,365,904
	25,464,875

Source:

Narrative analysis for this Fact by Mary Jane Borden, Editor of Drug War Facts.

=====

"Crime in the United States 2010," FBI Uniform Crime Report (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, September 2011), Table 29.

<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2010/crime-in-the-...>

Arrests for Drug Abuse Violations:

<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2010/crime-in-the-...>

=====

"Crime in the United States 2009," FBI Uniform Crime Report (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, September 2010), Table 29.

http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2009/data/table_29.html

Arrests for Drug Abuse Violations:

<http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2009/arrests/index.html>

=====

"2008 Crime in the United States," FBI Uniform Crime Reports (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, September 2009), Table 29.

http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2008/data/table_29.html

Arrests for Drug Abuse Violations:

<http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2008/arrests/index.html>

=====

"2007 Crime in the United States," (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, September 2008), Table 29.

http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2007/data/table_29.html

Arrests for Drug Abuse Violations:

<http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2007/arrests/index.html>

=====

"2006 Crime in the United States," (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, September 2007), Table 29.

http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006/data/table_29.html

Arrests for Drug Abuse Violations:

<http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006/arrests/index.html>

=====

"Crime in the United States 2005," FBI Uniform Crime Reports (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, September 2006), Table 29.

http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/data/table_29.html

Arrests for Drug Abuse Violations:

<http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/arrests/index.html>

=====

"Crime in the United States 2004," FBI Uniform Crime Reports (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 2005) Table 29.

http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius_04/persons_arrested/table_29.html

Arrests for Drug Abuse Violations:

http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius_04/persons_arrested/index.html

=====

"Crime in the United States 2003," FBI Uniform Crime Reports (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 2004), p. 269, Table 4.1 & and p. 270, Table 29.

<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u-s/2003/03sec4.pdf>

=====

"Crime in the United States 2002," FBI Uniform Crime Reports (Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, 2003).

http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius_02/html/web/arrested/04-table29.html

=====

"Crime in the United States 2001," FBI Uniform Crime Reports (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 2002), p. 232, Table 4.1 & and p. 233, Table 29. <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u-s/2001/01sec4.pdf>

=====

"Crime in the United States - 2000," FBI Uniform Crime Reports (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 2001), p. 216, Tables 29 and 4.1.

<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u-s/2000/tox00.pdf>

=====

"Crime in the United States - 1999," FBI Uniform Crime Reports (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 2000), pp. 211-212.

<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u-s/1999/tox99.pdf>

=====

"Crime in the United States - 1998," FBI Uniform Crime Reports (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1999), pp. 209-219.

<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u-s/1998/tox98.pdf>

=====

"Crime in the United States - 1997," FBI Uniform Crime Reports (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1998), p. 221, Table 4.1 & p. 222, Table 29.

<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u-s/1997/tox97.pdf>

=====

"Uniform Crime Reports for the United States 1996" Federal Bureau of Investigation (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1997), p. 213, Table 4.1 & p. 214, Table 29.

<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u-s/1996/tox96.pdf>

=====

"Crime in the United States - 1995," FBI Uniform Crime Reports (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1996), pp. 207-208.

<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u-s/1995/tox95.pdf>

=====

FBI, UCR for the US 1990 (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1991), pp. 173-174.

FBI, UCR for the US 1980 (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1981), pp. 189-191.

40.

(1995-2010 - marijuana arrests percent share of total drug arrests by year) The following table references the drug and marijuana arrests columns in the "US Arrests" table. It pairs "Total Marijuana Arrests," "Marijuana Trafficking/Sale Arrests," and "Marijuana Possession Arrests" against "Total Drug Arrests" to arrive at the percentage each has of the total for the respective years. This table shows the growing dominance of marijuana arrests among total drug arrests in the U.S., rising from a percentage of 39.9% of total drug arrests in 1995 to 52.1% of such arrests in 2010. Further, while arrests for sales and trafficking have wavered a few percentage points around 5-6% of total drug arrests, the numbers driving marijuana's increased dominance of drug arrests are those for simple possession, jumping from 34.1% in 1995 to 45.8% in 2010. Arrests for marijuana possession have risen from about a third to about a half of all drug abuse violation arrests over the fifteen year 1995-2010 period.

US Marijuana Arrests Percentage Share of Total Drug Arrests

- Year -

Marijuana

Total Arrests
Marijuana

Trafficking & Sale Arrests
Marijuana

Possession Arrests

2010
52.1%
6.3%
45.8%

2009
51.6%
6.0%
45.6%

2008
49.8%
5.5%
44.3%

2007
47.4%
5.3%
42.1%

2006
43.9%
4.8%
39.1%

2005
42.6%
4.9%
37.7%

2004
44.3%
5.0%
39.3%

2003
45.0%
5.5%
39.5%

2002
45.3%
5.4%
39.9%

2001
45.6%
5.2%
40.4%

2000
46.5%
5.6%
40.9%

1999
46.0%
5.5%
40.5%

1998
43.8%
5.4%
38.4%

1997
43.9%
5.6%
38.3%

1996
42.6%
6.3%
36.3%

1995
 39.9%
 5.8%
 34.1%

Source:

FBI Uniform Crime Reports 1970-2010. Please see cite sources for U.S. Arrests table.

41.

(1996-2010 - drug and marijuana arrests percent change over prior year) The following table references the total, drug and marijuana arrests columns in the "US Arrests" table. It shows the percentage change over the prior year for "Total Arrests," "Total Drug Arrests," "Total Marijuana Arrests," "Marijuana Trafficking & Sale Arrests," and "Marijuana Possession Arrests." Total Arrests in the United States have ranged between 13.1 million and 15.3 million over the fifteen year period (1996-2010), with the annual percent change for that time span averaging -0.9%. Drug arrests have ranged between a low of 1.4 million in 1996 and a high of 1.9 million in 2006, with an average percent change over the fifteen year period of +0.8%.

The percentage change values for marijuana arrests confirm their upward trend. Total marijuana arrests in 2010 (853,839) were +45% higher than those in 1995 (588,964). The year that the percentage growth in marijuana arrests peaked - 2003 - began a five-year upward trend largely driven by arrests for marijuana possession. For simple possession, the average annual percent change covering 1996-2010 equaled +2.8%; in contrast, that value for trafficking and sales was +1.4%.

US Total, Drug, and Marijuana Arrests Percentage Change over Prior Year

Year	Total Arrests	Total Drug Arrests	Total Marijuana Arrests	Marijuana Trafficking & Sale Arrests	Marijuana Possession Arrests
2010	-4.1%	-1.5%	-0.5%	3.4%	-1.1%
2009	-2.3%	-2.3%	1.2%	6.6%	0.6%
2008	-1.4%	-7.5%	-2.8%	-4.0%	-2.7%
2007	-1.2%	-2.6%	5.2%	7.6%	4.9%
2006	2.0%	2.4%	5.5%	0.3%	6.2%
2005	1.1%	5.7%	1.7%	5.7%	1.7%
2004	2.2%	4.1%	2.5%	-5.4%	3.5%
2003	-0.7%	9.1%	8.3%	11.1%	8.0%

2002	0.3%
	-3.0%
	-3.7%
	0.7%
	-4.2%
2001	-1.2%
	-2.0%
	0.5%
	-1.5%
	-6.7%
	-0.8%
2000	-2.6%
	1.4%
	2.5%
	3.3%
	2.4%
1999	-1.2%
	-0.1%
	4.9%
	1.7%
	5.3%
1998	-4.9%
	-1.5%
	-1.8%
	-5.1%
	-1.3%
1997	0.8%
	5.1%
	8.3%
	-6.5%
	10.9%
1996	0.3%
	2.0%
	8.9%
	10.8%
	8.6%
15-year Average	-0.9%
	0.8%
	2.6%
	1.4%
	2.8%

Source:

FBI Uniform Crime Reports 1970-2010. Please see cite sources for U.S. Arrests table.

Related Chapters:

- [Corruption](#)