

Spring 1962

The Negro Drug Addict as an Offender Type

Julian B. Roebuck

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Julian B. Roebuck, *The Negro Drug Addict as an Offender Type*, 53 *J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci.* 36 (1962)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

THE NEGRO DRUG ADDICT AS AN OFFENDER TYPE

JULIAN B. ROEBUCK

The author is Assistant Professor of Sociology at San Jose State College. He formerly was Instructor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Maryland. In addition, Professor Roebuck has served as Classification Officer and Case Worker for the District of Columbia Department of Corrections and as Parole and Classification Officer for the United States Bureau of Prisons.

It has been generally held that the drug addict differs in many personal and social characteristics from other criminal offender types. In what specific ways, however, does he differ? What is the nature of his criminal behavior? What is his family background? What is his general social background? And, are the answers to these questions different than the answers with respect to other criminal types? Exploring these questions and others, Professor Roebuck studied a sample group of Negro drug addicts, inmates of the District of Columbia Reformatory, and compared them, on a number of specific characteristics, with a larger sample of inmates of other offender types. The following paper presents the results of this study, which Professor Roebuck offers as a first step towards development of a satisfactory theory of the etiology of drug addiction.—EDITOR.

Several sociologists have demonstrated in research findings that incarcerated offenders share many personal and social characteristics. For the most part, however, the focus of attention has been on representative samples of delinquents and criminals in general. The relationships of these personal and social factors to offenders with different kinds of criminal behavior patterns have not been the subject of comprehensive and systematic study.¹ Robbers, housebreakers, narcotics offenders, and the rest usually have been treated as a single criminal category. The present paper differs from previous research in that it utilizes a typology of criminal categories which enables the researcher to isolate similarities and differences between types of offenders.² This is not the same thing as saying, "criminals in general have many personal and social characteristics in common"—a statement that has been made frequently enough. The use of the typology in the research reported in this paper permits a concentrated focus upon one relatively homogeneous group of offenders and a detailed empirical search

for significant similarities and differences between this group, the narcotic drug laws offender, and other offenders.

The data so obtained supports the impressions of sociologists and psychiatrists who have long noted that the drug addict (opiate addict) as an offender type cannot be defined as a criminal in the traditional sense of a robber, auto thief, burglar, murderer, etc.³ Generally, he is conceded to be a criminal only by virtue of a personal vice, no different than the alcoholic for example. Unlike the alcoholic, however, the addict's vice is a criminal act regardless of the social consequences. His behavior, as distinct from that of the traditional criminal, usually involves no victim, except, of course, the user himself. As has been noted by many observers, the drug addict is not a serious offender against person or property, nor is he to be found among the organized criminals, racketeers, or professional thieves.⁴ The fact is that most crimes associated with drug addiction involve direct or indirect violations of state or federal narcotics acts and occasional unsophisticated thefts, burglaries, and forgeries.⁵ The primary criminal motivation of this individual is neither gain nor the need to

¹ While in some studies certain offenders have been specified as ideal types, e.g., the alcoholic, drug addict, professional criminal, and sex offender, none of these studies have utilized categories of criminal behavior arrived at through the systematic sampling of large populations of offenders, nor have they specified clear-cut empirical criteria for the construction of such categories as might have been used.

² For a survey of several attempts to construct criminal typologies see Gibbons & Garrity, *Some Suggestions for the Development of Etiological and Treatment Theory in Criminology*, 38 *SOCIAL FORCES* 51 (1959).

³ RECKLESS, *THE CRIME PROBLEM* 353-56 (2d ed. 1955); Pescor, *A Statistical Analysis of Clinical Records of Drug Addicts*, Supp. 145 *PUBLIC HEALTH REPORTS* 26 (1938); Karpman, *Laws That Cause Crime*, 23 *AM. MERCURY* 74 (1931).

⁴ Lindesmith, *Dope Fiend Mythology*, 40 *J. CRIM. L. & C.* 199 (1949); Kolb, *The Drug Addiction Muddle*, 1 *POLICE* 57 (1957).

⁵ TAPPAN, *CRIME, JUSTICE AND CORRECTION* 165-67 (1960).

express aggression, but rather a physiological compulsion that demands satisfaction. In this his physical needs are little different from that of the diabetic, except that the latter will eventually die without insulin while the former will suffer extreme physiological discomfort without drugs. Thus, if the addict's motivation differs from that of the robber, the arsonist, or the professional thief, then it can be expected that he may possess social and psychological characteristics that distinguish him from the traditional criminal.

If a theory of the etiology of drug addiction is to be developed, the first requirement will be to find if there are significant differences between this offender and the traditional criminal. Until this step is taken, we do not know whether the differences that may be found between drug addicts and the law abiding may be a function of the arrest and incarceration process, rather than generic social or psychological differences. On the other hand, if there are no social or psychological differences between this offender and other offender types, it may well be that addiction has the same general etiology as other criminal behavior, only expressing itself in dissimilar ways. This paper reports the findings of a comparative study of 50 drug addicts and 350 traditional criminal types who comprised a sample group of 400 Negro inmates in the District of Columbia Reformatory.⁶ The findings represent a tentative step in providing the needed facts for a theory of the etiology of drug addiction.

A TENTATIVE CRIMINAL TYPOLOGY

The construction of a new typology was deemed necessary to provide the facts for a comparative study. Instead of using the conventional classification based on the offense for which the inmate was serving his sentence, a typology of criminal behavior based on the configuration of the total known arrests for the various criminal offenses of

⁶ The sample of 400 Negro felons was selected from 1,155 Negroes who entered the District of Columbia Reformatory, Lorton, Virginia, between the dates January 5, 1954, and November 8, 1955. The Reformatory (actually a penitentiary) houses a heterogeneous group of felons serving sentences of various lengths ranging to life imprisonment. The findings on which this paper are based were drawn from an unpublished doctoral dissertation, *A TENTATIVE TYPOLOGY OF 400 NEGRO FELONS*, completed at the University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, August, 1958, by the writer. The research was one of several studies conducted under the auspices of the Institute for Criminological Research, Department of Corrections, Washington, D. C.

each inmate was devised.⁷ It was assumed that an analysis of the official arrest histories of a sizeable sample of offenders would reveal for some offenders a repetition of the same kind of criminal charges; and that for classification purposes it would be useful to examine these repetitions and establish the sequence of offenses found therein. It was expected that certain sequences of arrests by criminal charge would reveal the offender's criminal scheme of life. The pattern of criminal behavior shown in the arrest history seemed to offer a more valid basis for a typology of criminal behavior than one based upon the particular crime for which the inmate was presently serving his sentence. The arrest history reflects a period of time and hence is longitudinal; this improves the likelihood of its indicating a fixed behavior pattern of criminality.⁸ The case of an offender whose official arrest history exhibits ten robbery charges out of twelve arrests may be cited as a hypothetical example of such a pattern. Similar sequences of arrests on other charges, e.g., assault, intoxication, housebreaking, etc., may be classified in this manner. This approach would make it possible to assign individual offenders to "criminal-pattern categories" on the basis of their past arrest histories. Obviously, some criminal histories would not disclose such a clear-cut criminal pattern. One would expect to find a variety of types.

It was assumed that criminals in their crime activities, as non-criminals in their legitimate activities, manifest a characteristic behavior

⁷ In determining criminal patterns (arrest history patterns) a chronological arrest history on each of the four-hundred cases was derived from the official arrest records. Legal nomenclature was adhered to; the offense categories (e.g., robbery, burglary, assault, etc.) found in the criminal codes of the District of Columbia (D. C. Code), of the United States (U. S. Code), and of the various states were followed. Two reasons prompted the use of legal labels: (1) the accessible official data concerned with the official criminal histories existed in terms of legal nomenclature, that is, arrests by criminal charge; (2) the criminal code, in the opinion of the writer, had established more definite substantive norms of behavior, and it contained a more clear-cut, specific, and detailed definition of criminal behavior for offenders, than had any other non-legal set of norms. See Tappan, *Who is the Criminal?*, 12 AM. SOCIOLOGICAL REV. 96 (1947).

⁸ Of course, this index, as any other official record, does not account for all the crimes committed by the inmate in his crime career. No offender is apprehended and charged with the commission of every crime he commits. However, as Sutherland and others have noted, the further one gets from a criminal's arrest history, the more obscure and distorted become the facts of his criminal activities. SUTHERLAND & CRESSEY, *PRINCIPLES OF CRIMINOLOGY* 25-26 (5th ed. 1955).

pattern which becomes their identifying mark. Moreover, there is considerable justification for assuming that particular patterns of behavior in adult life are associated with particular social and personal background factors. The crux of the typology problem appears to center on the following:

1. The presence of criminal patterns in the offender's criminal record.
2. The association of certain social and personal background factors with the above patterns.

In the construction of the typology it was recognized that some criminals exhibit variation in their criminal activities. It was extremely difficult to develop mutually exclusive categories of criminal types. An inmate classified in one criminal category on the basis of the predominance of one criminal charge in his arrest history may also have been charged with other crimes, e.g., the robber, who, in addition to several charges for robbery, has in his arrest history one or two charges for petty larceny. To meet this problem, the most frequent charge or charges in the inmate's arrest history were used as a basis for classification, and the charges appearing in the later phases of the inmate's arrest history were given greater weight. It was reasoned that the later entries in an offender's arrest history would more accurately reflect his present criminal behavior pattern than those entries occurring in the earlier stages of his arrest history.⁹

An analysis of the 400 arrest histories based on the frequency of criminal charges occurring in each history permitted the grouping of all cases into four general classes:

1. *Single pattern.* This label was attached to an arrest history which showed a high frequency of one kind of criminal charge. In order for an

⁹ In addition to frequency of charge, the role that time intervals between charges might play in determining patterning was taken into consideration. For instance, it would not be plausible to treat on equal footing two arrest histories, each of which showed four arrests for the same charge, if in one history the charges were equally spread over a thirty-year period, whereas in the other history, charges occurred within the same calendar year. Such extremes in the distribution of charges over time could have—methodologically speaking—introduced a serious weighting problem. Fortunately, a preliminary investigation of a large proportion of the study sample revealed a remarkable homogeneity in length of time intervals between charges. In fact, only ten out of the total 400 arrest histories exhibited an interval of five or more years between arrests (omitting, of course, time spent in incarceration). This finding precluded another potentially troublesome problem in respect to time lapses between arrests—that of extreme variations between intervals *within the same history*.

arrest history to be classified as a single pattern, it had to satisfy one of the following conditions:

- a) It had to show three or more arrests, *all* of which were for the same charge.
- b) An arrest history which contained at least four arrests for a given charge *and additional arrests for other charges* was divided into three chronological sections¹⁰ and qualified for a single pattern:
 - (1) If the four-or-more arrest charges appeared in the last section of the arrest history at least once; and,
 - (2) If the charge constituted at least 33 per cent of those charges which occurred in the last two sections of the arrest history.
2. *Multiple pattern.* An arrest history of two or more single patterns derived by the procedures set forth in Item 1(b), above.
3. *Mixed pattern.* An arrest history of three or more arrests in which none of the charges form a frequency pattern as defined above. ("Jack of all trades.")
4. *No pattern.* An arrest history of fewer than three arrests. (This is a residual category of those offenders with insufficient arrests to warrant analysis.)

The final result was a typology of 13 criminal patterns, 11 of which include distinct legal categories.¹¹

¹⁰ If the total number of arrests was divisible by three, the arrest history was divided into three equal sections. When the total number of arrests was indivisible by three, the latter section, or latter two sections were given more weight. "K" represents an *integral number of arrests, i.e., 1, 2, 3, . . .* Therefore, an arrest history showing (3K + 1) arrests was divided into the three following sections: K, K, and K + 1, thus giving more weight to the last section. Similarly a history showing (3K + 2) arrests was divided into the three following sections: K, K + 1, and K + 1, thus giving more weight to the last two sections. The arrest histories containing four or more arrests were divided in accordance with one of these three schemes in preparation for analysis.

- ¹¹
1. Single pattern of robbery (N32)
 2. Single pattern of narcotic drug laws (N50)
 3. Single pattern of gambling (N16)
 4. Single pattern of burglary (N15)
 5. Single pattern of sex offenses (N15)
 6. Single pattern of confidence games (N10)
 7. Single pattern of auto theft (N8)
 8. Single pattern of check forgery (N4)
 9. Triple pattern of drunkenness, assault, and larceny (N43)
 10. Double pattern of larceny and burglary (N64)
 11. Double pattern of assault and drunkenness (N40)
 12. Mixed pattern (N71)
 13. No pattern (N32)

COMPARISON OF NARCOTICS OFFENDERS WITH OTHER CRIMINAL TYPES

On the basis of the frequency of criminal charges found in the arrest histories, 50 of our sample of 400 offenders were classified as narcotic drug laws offenders.¹² These men, comprising one-eighth of the sample, were compared with the remainder of the sample on a large number (42) of personal and social characteristics obtained on each offender from institutional records and interviews.¹³ These characteristics, which covered much of the offender's life history, included family, neighborhood and school background, indices of personal disorganization, marital status, and indices of juvenile delinquency. These areas represent fields of investigation in which researchers have claimed to find marked differentials between offenders and non-offenders.¹⁴

The drug offenders were comparatively a young group (median age—25) of fairly literate offenders (S.A.T. grade median—8.6) of average intelligence (median I.Q.—100) who for the most part were reared in urban areas (94 per cent). (Remainder of sample: median age—33; S.A.T. grade median—5.0; I.Q. median—86; 65 per cent reared in urban areas.)

In many ways their early family, school, and community backgrounds and adjustments were more favorable than those of the other offenders. (See Table below.) They were reared less frequently in slum neighborhoods. They were more often products of one home situation, and the home was less commonly marked by criminality, conflict, demoralization, and parental desertion. Less frequently were their mothers migrants from the South and domestic servants. More often they were products of families which enjoyed strong ties. As further evidence of this familial milieu, these drug addicts less frequently expressed hostility toward their fathers, and they were less often disciplinary problems either at home or in school. Additionally, fewer of them were school truants and "home run-aways." They worked less frequently at street trades during childhood and adolescence, and fewer of them had had delinquent companions. Furthermore they were less often

¹² All 50 were heroin addicts as attested to by a medical examination conducted by a D. C. Department of Corrections physician.

¹³ The records included social case workers' admission summaries and case recordings, and clinical psychologists' personality profiles based on clinical interviews and Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventories.

¹⁴ RECKLESS, *op. cit. supra* note 3, at 43-66.

found to be members of juvenile delinquent gangs; fewer of them had been adjudicated juvenile delinquents; and a smaller proportion of them had been picked up by police prior to their eighteenth birthdays. A higher proportion of them (86 per cent) had adult criminal companions as adolescents. This factor was probably quite significant in their becoming drug addicts, as these adult companions were, for the most part, themselves addicts.

Probably the most important factor in the background of these offenders was maternal dominance. A higher proportion of them grew up in families where the mother was the dominant parental figure (82 per cent).¹⁵ The father figure seemed to have been quite indifferent to them, and in most cases he was dominated by the mother. Consequently, his presence and authority accounted for little in the family milieu. Quite frequently he spent long periods of time away from the home situation. As a typical addict commented:

"My old man was from nowhere, man. I seldom saw him. When he was home he sat in the corner and read the paper or something. Mama had to take care of things. She told us all what to do. . . . The old man walked the chalk too when she spoke. I don't know where he went. Probably out with some chick drinking or living it up."

From the inmates' comments during the interviews, the maternal figure appeared to be a strong-willed and mentally alert perfectionist who over-protected and over-indulged the offender at every turn. She often set high goals for the offender, who was usually her favorite child. During his formative years, she selected his limited number of playmates, many of whom were girls. This domination probably shielded the addict from the normal scuffles of boyhood. This is sharply portrayed by the following addict's comment:

"My mama man was a tight woman on me. She insisted I come home right after school. I wasn't allowed to run no streets, man. If I got in a fight, she raised hell. She didn't want me to

¹⁵ This difference and those noted in the immediately preceding paragraph were significant at the .01 level. The addicts were similar to the men in the remainder of the sample in that: a high proportion of them grew up in economically dependent homes (66 per cent); generally they were living in slum areas when last arrested (68 per cent); most of them had no marital ties (82 per cent). In addition to the statistical findings reported above, considerable qualitative evidence was gathered from extensive interviews by the author to support and extend the quantitative study. This material is summarized below.

COMPARISON OF SINGLE PATTERN OF NARCOTIC DRUG
LAWS OFFENDERS (N = 50) WITH ALL
OTHER OFFENDERS (N = 350)
*Per Cent of Offenders Exhibiting Selected Social
and Personal Attributes*

All Other Offen- ders— per cent	χ^2 Level of Sign- ificance	Nar- cotics Offen- ders— per cent	
44	=	12	Reared in more than one home
47	=	18	Mother fig. south. migrant
77	=	58	Mother fig. dom. servant
75	0	66	Dependent
39	=	8	Family broken by desertion
54	=	16	Demoralized family
47	=	12	Criminality in family
51	**	82	Mother figure dominant
73	**	98	Inad. superv. by father fig.
68	**	90	Inad. superv. by mother fig.
64	=	20	Conflict in family
46	=	18	Hostility to father fig.
20	0	14	Hostility to mother fig.
33	=	6	Disciplinary problem at home
50	=	16	Hist. running away from home
56	=	32	Weak parental fam. structure
75	=	36	No parental family ties
82	0	94	Reared in urban area
75	—	58	Reared in slum neighborhood
76	0	68	Living slum area at arrest
54	=	24	History of school truancy
52	=	10	Disciplinary problem at school
53	=	32	Street trades as juvenile
70	0	82	No marital ties
62	=	34	Juv. del. companions
39	=	12	Member juv. del. gang
49	=	10	Adjudicated juv. del.
55	=	8	Committed as juv. del.
59	=	28	Police contact prior to age 18
34	**	86	Crim. companions as juv.

KEY:

- ** Significantly above sample mean of all other offenders at .01 level
- = Significantly below sample mean of all other offenders at .01 level
- Significantly below sample mean of all other offenders at .05 level
- 0 No significant difference

play sports. Guess she was afraid I would get hurt. I didn't care much anyway. I enjoyed my spare time with her. She knew what was right for me."

Many of them stated that the mother encouraged them to participate in passive activities, e.g., reading, music, drawing, and art. As a consequence

they spent a good share of their leisure time during childhood in the home isolated from neighborhood play groups. These remarks from one offender were typical:

"Mama didn't go for no rough stuff. She was hard, but she knew what was right. I got interested in music and art because she encouraged me. You know, she was refined. She wasn't like these hip bitches in the street."

It is likely that this maternal pattern accounted for the statistically significant infrequency of these men as disciplinary problems at school and at home when compared with the other men in the sample.

On the other hand, their adulthood maladjustment in all probability reflected their isolated status as drug addicts. At the time of their arrests they were, for the most part, slum dwellers cut loose from conjugal group ties. Only nine had marital ties, though 49 had been married at one time or another.

Their remarks in the personal interviews demonstrated that heroin was the "prime mover" in their lives. They lived a hand to mouth existence in cheap rooming-houses where they were isolated from the majority of their former contacts with non-users, including their wives, children, and relatives (with the exception of the mother). This isolation was apparently self-imposed to allow escape from detection, proximity to drug sources and other addicts, and avoidance of the censure and reform attempts of relatives or other well wishers.

They had an excellent command of the criminal argot, and, as expected, they used the slang expressions generally identified with drug addicts. Though not closely identified with the organized underworld, their remarks indicated a greater criminal sophistication than possessed by others in the sample, with perhaps the exception of the professional gambler. While they were reluctant to discuss their criminal companions and their criminal activities, all of them admitted to the use of heroin with other drug addicts. They insisted that they engaged in theft and in the traffic of drugs in order to supply their drug needs. A typical quotation illustrates their attitude toward theft:

"My heart wasn't in it, but what could I do?

I couldn't make \$30.00 a day. If I didn't get drugs I got sick, so I hustled in some way. Usually I hustled alone."

All of them insisted that they were not "true"

drug peddlers, and they showed marked bitterness at being so identified. As one addict stated:

"By no stretch of the imagination am I a peddler. What the hell does the court treat me like one for? I was only trying to do a sick friend a favor when I copped the caps. I know how it is when I need to cop. You know you got to have it. Have you ever seen anybody sick? They punish me because I'm sick."

Approximately half of these men were jazz musicians who played in local night clubs. All of this group claimed that they were introduced to heroin by "fellow musicians," and they asserted that more than half of the musicians they knew used heroin or marijuana. As one fairly articulate musician commented:

"All the musicians I knew were well acquainted with drugs. Most of them used drugs in one form or the other . . . usually marijuana or heroin. A few cats didn't partake, but man they were regular fellows. I mean man they understand if the other cats "took off." The ones who didn't "cool it," drank the "hot stuff" (whiskey). It was more or less understood you had to get your "kicks" some way. Man, all musicians are sensitive and crazy. Playing long hours in clubs gets to be a drag. You need a kick to keep you cool. The trouble is when you get hooked you don't make enough money legit to buy the white stuff (heroin). You got to hustle."

Though their arrest histories were quite extensive (an average of nine arrests per man) few arrests were for offenses other than narcotic drug laws violations. Other violations were for non-violent property offenses, e.g., shop-lifting, petty larceny, and housebreaking. These acts apparently stemmed from their need to secure a personal supply of drugs. Forty-three of these offenders had never been arrested prior to their first use of drugs.

The District Attorney's Reports provided strong evidence that charges for the sale of narcotics were rarely motivated by gain per se. Frequently an addict became involved in a situation (technically defined in law as a sales situation) while acting as "contact man" between purchaser and the peddler from whom his own personal supply came. (The addict could be sure of at least a one-way cut!) This was the typical situation leading to a sales charge. In the few cases of sales charges where the offender actually possessed a supply for sale, they were found to be "small-time" street peddlers who sold drugs in order to earn money to

support their own habits. They generally picked up a small supply of drugs at certain intervals. Usually they knew only the first name of the seller, and they had no idea of his drug source. The "pick-up" spots were frequently changed, and therefore they had difficulty in purchasing drugs. In short, they did not appear to be on the inside of a "true" peddler's organization. They were merely tools of the organized peddler in that they actually made street sales, and in so doing rendered themselves potential "fall guys." Five of the 50 men had tie-ups with a dope ring which imported heroin from outside the District of Columbia and distributed to street peddlers. Though professional in the sense that they lived from money made by selling drugs, they were not simon-pure drug wholesalers; they dispensed drugs to addicted street peddlers, and they personally transported drugs from other areas into Washington, D.C. Such obvious action does not attest to their status as "true" professionals.

As a group they had excellent verbal ability; their vocabularies were quite impressive in relation to their formal education. Soft spoken and non-aggressive in speech and general demeanor, they tended to intellectualize their problem of addiction. By and large they were introspective, passive and withdrawn, rarely expressing interest in active sports such as hunting, fishing, baseball, and boxing. On the other hand, they were generally interested in reading, movies, writing, and especially in listening to music. For this group of men the association of drugs and music constituted a way of life which for many other types of offenders was represented by an association of alcohol and women. As one addict commented:

"Man, I like to shoot a pill or two . . . then rear back and relax after I put on some of that crazy jazz like, say Sonny Stitt [well-known musician]. . . . Man . . . progressive jazz grooves me. Drugs and plenty crazy music was what I lived for."

Rarely did they speak of close friends, and when they did, their remarks suggested acquaintanceships rather than friendships. They voiced a preference for socializing with one or two male companions rather than with a larger group. Object relations to others appeared weak. A strong identification with the mother figure was expressed. They evinced affected, superior attitudes. Ego-centric and lacking in self-criticism, they pretended to be quite satisfied with themselves as they were. They presented themselves in the interviews as victims

of circumstances over which they had no control. One sensed a certain fatalism and resignation prevalent among them. They expressed very little interest in, or respect for, the opposite sex, with the exception of their mothers. Wives, girl friends, and former women companions were of no major concern. In movement and in speech they manifested what seemed to be a strong feminine component, though none was overtly homosexual.¹⁶ Illustrative of their lack of sexual interest is this comment by one inmate:

"Man, women have never done too much for me. They are all the same anyway. When I was high—and man, I stayed high—I didn't want no woman. Course I have gone ahead with the thing if one insisted—you know, I was a man, but the kick from the drugs was the thing. Women want too much of your time. I had to hustle. Now if a broad could help me get some money or cop some drugs . . . well, you know, I went along with the happenings if I was able to. One way or the other I tried to satisfy the chick if she had some bread [money]."

They abhorred violence of any kind, as exemplified by this characteristic statement:

"Man, these thugs are nothing. I wouldn't dirty my hands on them. You got to move people with your mouth. Just know what to say out of your mouth. Violence of any kind is for ignorant people. Only fools fight. Who wants to be a hero?"

In summary, then, the addicts, unlike the other offenders, were criminals by virtue of their personal vice, drug addiction. As a group they were younger, more literate, and more intelligent than the offenders in the other patterns. They came less frequently from disorganized family backgrounds, and their childhood adjustments in school, at home, and in the community were such as to call less frequently for formal sanctions. They were less frequently involved in serious delinquencies which called for their adjudication as juvenile delinquents. On the other hand, they more frequently had adult criminal companions prior to their eighteenth birthdays. When engaged in delinquent or criminal activity they were more frequently "loners." They were reared by dominant mothers who kept them at home during their formative years, and who probably had much to do with rendering them what appeared to be

¹⁶ These observations are based upon both the reports of the clinical psychologists found in each admission summary and the author's own interviews.

"passive-dependent-dependent" personality types. During their adolescent and young adult years they were introduced to heroin by addict companions; and, for the most part they were not delinquent prior to their addiction. All of them stated that listening to jazz music was their chief means of recreation. Popular musicians who are known addicts were their heroes. Just what jazz music had to do with their addiction process is not known, but certainly there was a relationship. Other students of the addict have cited a relationship of drugs with jazz music.¹⁷

It may be that their personality type rendered them susceptible to the opiates. The state of euphoria produced by the opiate drugs is described in the literature as a peaceful, dreamy, and tranquil nirvana. This state is the antithesis of dynamic action. All these men abhorred alcohol, known to be somewhat of a personality irritant. The individual intoxicated on alcohol usually craves action and boisterous group entertainment. The drug addict, on the other hand, gets his "kicks" in a passive manner by listening to music or by daydreaming. Moreover, psychiatrists who have attempted therapy with both drug addicts and alcoholics have noted the difficulty involved in switching the drug addict to alcohol or the alcoholic to opiates.¹⁸ During the research interviews the drug addicts expressed a great distaste for alcohol. Forty claimed they never had liked alcoholic beverages. Five claimed they had never used any. On the other hand, the "problem drinkers" expressed a similar distaste for opiates, although several stated they had experimented with heroin at one time or another.¹⁹ These claimed it did nothing for them. The following quotations from the interviews illustrate this point:

Drug addict: "Man, the joy-juice [alcohol] never did nothing for me. I never liked the stuff. I tried it a few times before getting hooked. That stuff makes you sick and wild. Why cats use that stuff I can't understand. It tears you up."

Problem drinker: "Drugs! No, I don't go for the stuff. I shot a little H [heroin] once or twice

¹⁷ Winick, *The Use of Drugs by Jazz Musicians*, 7 SOCIAL PROBLEMS 240 (1959-60).

¹⁸ Meerloo, *Artificial Ecstasy*, ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ABERRATIONS, A PSYCHIATRIC HANDBOOK 201 (Podolsky ed. 1953).

¹⁹ Problem drinkers were included in another pattern of crime of the larger study. With the drug addicts excepted, the major recreational activities of all other criminal patterns revolved around alcohol, women, and gambling.

along the way, but I got only sick and sleepy. I want something to make me feel peppy not something to knock you out. That stuff takes your nature away."

Be this as it may, pressed for the need of funds with which to purchase drugs, the addicts turned to illegal methods. Legitimate work did not pay enough to support their habits. In order to escape police detection and secure a ready supply of drugs, they isolated themselves in slum areas, away from relatives and "square" acquaintances, where they associated with addicts and petty criminals. Their possession and use of drugs and the petty offenses they engaged in to secure a ready supply of drugs rendered them vulnerable to police apprehension. Not one was found to be a racketeer or gangster. In short, they made up a group of petty, habitual offenders.

SUMMARY

The writer concludes that the present study demonstrates the utility of a typology based upon criminal careers as established by arrest history patterns. The use of this typology permitted the delineation of clear-cut and homogeneous offender categories. Of these the narcotic drug laws offender was selected for an intensive comparative study with the non-narcotic offender population. Such a comparative study of drug addicts and traditional criminal types is deemed to be an essential first step in any attempt to develop a satisfactory theory of the etiology of drug addiction. The research reported here constitutes just such a first step. The empirical data, both quantitative and qualitative, clearly demonstrate that narcotic drug laws offenders differ from other criminal types in terms of theoretically relevant social and personal background factors.