

Drug addiction and crime in West Germany: a review of the empirical evidence

BY KARL-HEINZ REUBAND

Karl-Heinz Reuband is a sociologist who is a research fellow at the Zentralarchiv für empirische Sozialforschung, University of Cologne (Bachemer Strasse 40, D5000 Köln 41, Germany), and a visiting sociologist at the University of Trier. He has published on drug use, deviant behavior and crime, social and cultural change, and survey methodology, and is chair of the European Social Science Research Group on Drug Issues.

Moral panic about crime

Illegal drug use has become a rather common phenomenon in most of the Western industrialized countries in Europe and northern America. Emerging on a mass scale first in the late 1960s in the form of widespread cannabis use, it has been increasingly supplemented by an increase in the use of hard drugs such as heroin and cocaine since the 1970s. Whereas the prevalence levels with regard to cannabis and heroin use

differ across societies (Reuband, 1990a), the emergence of the phenomenon and its development over time have nonetheless caused some kind of "moral panic" in most societies (Reuband, 1991). This has also occurred in Germany. After being out of the public debate for some years, drug addiction has again become a dominant theme in the media. The problems are perceived as worsening, in terms not only of an increasing number of addicts, but also of the physical and social problems associated with drug addiction (cf. Reuband, 1989).

Crime has increasingly been singled out to demonstrate how serious the problem has become. The media, quoting official statements of local police or other agencies, portray an emergent crime wave with addiction as its prime determinant. A large proportion, if not the majority, of certain serious crimes is attributed to addiction. Burglars—as the argument goes—are nearly always "junkies" (*Der Spiegel*, 1988:34). Several agencies have said that 80% of all burglaries and robberies are committed by addicts (cf. *Deutsches Allgemeines Sonntagsblatt*, 1988; *Drogeninformation*, 1988:130; *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 1988). However, data substantiating the claims have never been put forward. Consensus among "experts" seems to have replaced a review of the available empirical evidence.

This article pulls together the fragmented data available on drug-generated crime in Germany that might shed some light on the interrelationship of drug use and criminal behavior. In order to frame the discussion, the article begins with a short review of the possible relevant dimensions along which societies may differ that impact on the drug-crime nexus. The discussion then turns to some of the characteristics of German drug policy and the present drug situation. The article is restricted to the western part of Germany, since data on East Germany, where the drug phenomenon is gradually evolving, are not available. The article focuses on the use of hard drugs—such as heroin, cocaine, and amphetamines—among

people who are generally addicted to these drugs. Cannabis is excluded from the discussion.¹

Social reaction to the drug problem and its possible impact on crime

Social reactions that have emerged in response to the drug problem vary among countries. The first important dimension along which societies may differ is the *legal* one. In most countries, the laws against drug possession and acquisition are enforced, although a few countries have been more tolerant, abstaining from punishing the mere possession of drugs.²

The second important dimension upon which societies may differ is the dominant mode of *treatment*. In some countries, methadone has been the most widespread form of treatment; in others, ambulatory and residential treatment has been preferred, and methadone has been used only minimally if at all. The third dimension along which societies may differ is *social welfare*—the extent to which addicts are able to obtain legal support for their living, to enter treatment, and to get medical help. In contrast to the aforementioned dimensions, this dimension is not directed specifically at the drug users, but at people in need in general.

Crime (and violent crime) committed by addicts might be driven by various factors. The pharmacological properties of the drugs may reduce inhibition to engage in crime and distort the perception of reality (Fagan, 1990). Crime may also be generated by the need to obtain money for financing the drug habit and related lifestyle. Among dealers, the need to control the market may motivate criminal activity (Johnson et al., 1990; Kleimann and Smith, 1990). The following discussion centers on the crimes committed to obtain money to finance the drug habit and the addict way of living.

Taking the aforementioned dimension of social reaction into consideration, the following seems likely: drug-induced crime will be negligibly influenced by the way the legal enforcement system reacts to drug users. Whether drugs are *de facto* legal or not does not affect the need to finance the habit and to obtain money—either legally or illegally. How the police react to the problem of drug selling, and in turn the prices addicts have to pay for the drugs, may be more important.³ But societies probably differ little in this respect. In most societies, police activities are specifically directed against the drug market, regardless of the sociolegal system concerning drug possession and acquisition. Variations in enforcement are more likely within societies across time or region, and less likely across societies.

The availability of methadone constitutes the second basic dimension that might affect the rate of drug-induced crime. The more it is available, the less the need to obtain money for financing the expensive use of heroin or other hard drugs. Addicts might simply turn to methadone as an additional or substitute drug whenever there is a shortage of heroin. U.S. studies have consistently shown that using methadone curbs crime among addicts to some extent (cf. Johnson et al., 1990:48). If this is true generally, the widespread introduction of methadone in a society should at least somewhat decrease the involvement of drug addicts in crime and drug-generated crime. Likewise, the existence of a social welfare system should reduce crime among addicts. The more developed the social welfare system, the greater the social and economic assistance that goes to the unemployed, regardless of whether they are addicts or not. The greater the proportion of legal money available to finance the drug habit *and* general living expenses, the less the need to turn to crime.

Whether these hypotheses are empirically true or not on a national level cannot be determined at present. What we still lack are comparable data for different countries that differ

along the above specified dimensions. We often have few data on the relevance of the phenomenon even within a country. Considering this, it seems desirable to draw together the scant available material that exists nationally and to make tentative comparisons as the first step in an attempt to derive some general conclusions.

Drug use and drug policy in Germany

Germany follows a policy that resembles the policies of other Western European countries in many ways (Albrecht, 1986 and 1989). Drug possession and acquisition—be it cannabis or hard drugs—is illegal, and the laws are enforced. The laws were changed in 1971 and 1981, increasing penalties for serious drug crimes, especially dealing and trafficking in drugs. The maximum penalties were raised to 10 years in 1971 and to 15 years in 1983, with 15 years representing the maximum term of imprisonment possible (other than a life sentence). At the same time, there has been a tendency toward therapeutic rather than repressive approaches in the courts, allowing cases to be dismissed if addicts agree to attend a treatment facility.

Although there is no differentiation between soft and hard drugs on the level of the law, separation is possible and is practiced in sentencing patterns. Drug offenders may be exempted from punishment if only small quantities of drugs were involved and the drugs were intended for personal use only. Sanctioning patterns based on drug type are at present difficult to describe, because the statistics do not differentiate between types of drugs. Data are available only for specific periods of time, when special investigations were made with regard to specific drugs (cf. Bundesregierung, 1989).

In contrast to the United States and the Netherlands, the German police are tied to the legality principle. They have to

intervene rather than exert their own discretion when observing offenses including drugs. Some manner of differential selection is possible by setting priorities—either on drug possession or drug dealing—as will be practiced primarily by the specialized drug squads in large cities (cf. Kreuzer et al., 1981). On the other hand, ordinary policemen usually intervene when aware of drug offenses. This is well reflected in the fact that the majority of drug cases are still cannabis cases (Bundeskriminalamt, 1991).

In the 1960s, drug offenders were virtually nonexistent in the prison system. Estimates in the 1980s indicated that every tenth prisoner was there because of a drug law violation. Among females, about 30% were imprisoned for a drug offense (Albrecht, 1989:188). The proportion of prisoners incarcerated for drug offenses has increased further, especially in large urban areas, and the trend is likely to continue.

The basic way of dealing with addicts' treatment needs is ambulatory counseling and residential treatment. Methadone—the most frequent treatment for addicts in the US (Anglin and Hser, 1990:394) as well as a few European countries (Albrecht and Kalmthout, 1989)—has been rejected by the medical and therapeutical professions for a long time. Methadone was made officially available only a few years ago, still only on a negligible scale, and only in a few states in Germany (Schuler, 1990; Bühringer and Platt, 1991).

Treatment is paid by health insurance or the social services and accordingly is free for all addicts. Furthermore, unemployment benefits and social service support people in need of help. Although this kind of assistance doubtless also applies to some of the addicts in the US (cf. Johnson et al., 1990:44), the overall assistance in Germany is greater and more extensive. In this respect, Germany greatly resembles the other Western European welfare states (cf. Alber, 1982 and 1989).

There are about 100,000 addicts in West Germany. Calculated on the basis of population size (56 million), the relative rate of addiction turns out to be rather similar to that of other Western European countries, even those that diverge in their forms of drug policy. Germany, the Netherlands, France and Denmark all appear to have more or less the same per capita levels of hard-drug users. The exceptions are Spain and Italy—countries with a much higher rate of hard-drug users per capita (Reuband, 1990a).

Heroin is the main drug used by addicts in Germany, either alone or in conjunction with other drugs. Cocaine or crack is found in only a minority of hard-drug users (Reuband, 1989; Simon, 1990; Bundeskriminalamt, 1991). In this respect Germany stands in sharp contrast to the US, where cocaine use has surpassed the use of heroin and other opiates (Johnson et al., 1990; Wish and Gropper, 1990). Therefore, insofar as the scant available evidence suggests, Germany does not seem to differ from most of the other European countries, where cocaine has played only a minor role in addiction.

The overwhelming proportion of drug addicts in Germany are Germans. Ethnic minorities—above all, the foreign workers from Turkey—are hardly represented. Although there are recent signs that drug use is becoming more widespread in the second generation of the Turkish migrants, drug addiction cannot be said to be an ethnic phenomenon to any noteworthy extent up to now.⁴ Whereas most addicts came from a middle-class background in the early 1970s, the recruitment pattern—in line with the general shift in composition of cannabis use—has changed. People from a working-class background are overrepresented now. As in most other countries affected by heroin addiction, men constitute the large majority of the addicts (cf. Berger et al., 1980; Kreuzer et al., 1981; Reuband, 1989; Bundeskriminalamt, 1991).

Data bases and their methodology

The following discussion makes use of the few available data sources that contain information on the relationship between crime and drug addiction in Germany. These are: (1) police statistics; (2) in-depth studies on the basis of police registers; and (3) surveys among addicts.

(1) Police statistics

One of the questions included in the formula for generating police statistics (cf. Bundeskriminalamt, 1991) concerns whether the offender is a user of hard drugs—i.e., of heroin, cocaine, amphetamines, or other addictive drugs. This question is answered affirmatively when injection equipment is found with the offender, when he himself admits being a user, or when he has previously been listed as an addict on the police record system. The latter system contains selected information on users of hard drugs who have been arrested in the past by the police and identified as hard-drug users.

It is doubtful that police check this specific record system in their day-to-day routine in every case. The policeman may be more interested in solving the specific case and preparing the necessary documentation than in checking possible reasons for the delinquency itself. Consequently, these data—which are available at both the local and the national level—set some lower limits concerning the involvement of drug addicts in crime.

(2) In-depth studies on the basis of police registers

A few attempts have been made at the local level to conduct systematic and extensive checks of the available police record systems, to more fully explore the linkages between criminal offending and addiction. These studies have evolved from attempts to investigate the origin of specific crimes (cf. Donicht, 1988) or the relevance of the drug phenomenon—with regard either to addicts or to drug users in general (Landeskriminalamt Baden-Württemberg, 1987; Schwanke, 1988). In both cases, police registers have been searched exten-

sively, including registers of hard-drug users.⁵ The data provide a somewhat better estimate of addict-generated crime, yet they are not without limitations. Perhaps the largest delimiter is the omission of addicts who have not been registered and do not admit drug use.

(3) Surveys
among
addicts

Three surveys have been conducted among addicts in Germany in which their criminal involvement was assessed in detail (Kreuzer, 1975; Kreuzer et al., 1981 and 1991). These studies have generally included addicts in prisons and residential treatment in a localized area. Given their composition and local restriction, the studies cannot be considered representative either regionally or nationwide. Nonetheless, these studies contain some useful information on the prevalence of specific types of delinquency. On the basis of the most recent of the studies (Kreuzer et al., 1991), the amount of drug-related crime in Germany was estimated for the first time.

Police statistics on drug addiction and crime

Remembering the premise that most crime is committed by addicts, the first question to address is what proportion of total crime is generated by addicts. The police statistics on recorded offenses and offenders can be used to answer this question. The following discussion is restricted to those offenses most frequently mentioned in the public debate about crime and drugs: robbery, burglary, and shoplifting. Police figures for robbery are further broken down into purse-snatching and other kinds of robbery (in order to differentiate between petty robbery and more serious forms of robbery).

Furthermore, offenses and offenders are differentiated. Offenses can be performed by several offenders, so that the number of offenders can exceed the number of offenses. On

the other hand, offenders who engage repeatedly in the same type of offense are only counted once for the time period of observation. As a consequence, both figures might differ. As Table 1 shows, the absolute number of offenses and offenders does, in fact, partially diverge. The relative figures, however, basically resemble each other.

TABLE 1

Addicts-generated crime in West Germany according to police statistics in 1990—selected recorded offenses

Type of offense	Offenses		Offenders	
	Abs.	%	Abs.	%
Shoplifting	15,200	3.5	6,850	1.8
Burglary of houses/apartments	3,404	13.8	1,358	8.2
Robbery	1,568	10.2	1,464	7.6
- Purse snatching	295	18.9	195	12.1
- Other forms of street robbery	304	6.5	346	5.1

Absolute (Abs.) figures indicate offenses committed by addicts; percentage (%) figures indicate addicts' offenses out of total offenses of the respective type.

SOURCE: Police Statistics (Bundeskriminalamt 1991: Tables 12 and 22).

Whatever figures are used as the basis of comparison, two findings are clear. First, the sheer absolute numbers of petty offenses—like theft—are much more widespread among addicts than are violent or more serious offenses. More than 15,000 shoplifting offenses registered by the police in 1990 were attributed to addicts. Addict-generated burglary offenses numbered approximately 3,400, and robbery offenses approximately 1,600. Second, only a small proportion of the total offenses in each category were attributed to addicts. Only about one in seven (14%) burglary offenses, and a similarly small proportion of robbery offenses, were attributed to addicts. Furthermore, the more serious forms of robbery are even less often generated by addicts than petty ones (5% vs. 12%). Therefore, addicts do not play a decisive role in the

more violent, threatening offenses. Neither do they play a major role in property crimes.

However, many would contend that this picture changes in metropolitan areas, where drug addiction is highest. We can explore this issue by examining the police statistics for Hamburg, the second largest city in Germany (1.8 million inhabitants). Hamburg has a relatively visible addiction problem, and the drugs-crime link is said to be especially strong. The number of new addicts is growing more rapidly in Hamburg than anywhere else in the country. The Hamburg police statistics do, in fact, indicate that the proportion of addict-generated crime is higher there than in the rest of Germany. Moreover, the rate is increasing at a faster pace than in the rest of Germany. Nonetheless, the same basic pattern persists. Even in Hamburg the proportion of addict-generated crime is much lower than the dominant portrait suggests. In 1983, only about 2% of all registered burglary offenses were committed by known addicts; in 1989 this rate increased to 18% (unpublished statistics from the Hamburg police department).

In-depth studies on the basis of police registers

As previously mentioned, one of the problems of the police statistics, both nationwide and in Hamburg, lies in the thoroughness—or lack of it—with which existing police records are checked by the police when investigating a crime. Such checks may not always be made, thereby contributing to an undercount of the addicts committing various crimes. Fortunately, there have been a few *in-depth studies* that have used extensive and thorough searches of police data to investigate the role of addicts in crime.

The first study, done in Hamburg in the mid-1980s by Klaus Donicht, found that addicts accounted for 21% of all household burglaries (Donicht, 1988:20).⁶ A later study by

Joachim Schwanke found that addicts accounted for roughly 35% of all household breaking-and-entering offenses in Hamburg in 1987. With regard to the other offenses committed by addicts, the rates were as follows: purse-snatching, 25%; other forms of street robbery, 19%; and shoplifting, 7% (Schwanke, 1988:119 and 1989).

Because of the concentration of drug addicts in big cities, the nationwide figures will naturally be lower. A study of robbery cases in the state of Baden-Württemberg—a less urbanized region—does, in fact, give a much lower percentage than the Hamburg data. According to the study, about 6% of all robbery cases were committed by users of hard drugs.⁷ The results of these in-depth studies bring about a slightly different picture concerning addicts' involvement in crime. The figures are somewhat higher than the police statistics ordinarily document for the respective city or region. Yet they are still far below the figures usually portrayed, which claim that a majority of burglaries and robberies are committed by addicts.

Surveys on addicts' involvement in crime

The proportion of addicts among offenders might be interpreted as an indicator of addiction-generated crime. However, the figures could be misleading, since they may be driven either by many addicts each committing a few offenses or by a few addicts committing many offenses. Theoretically, it is even conceivable that the percentage of addiction-generated crime increases while the percentage of addicts engaging in these crimes decreases. For this reason it is advisable to closely scrutinize these data on addicts' involvement in crime.

There are a few studies of addicts' criminal patterns that will allow us to develop a greater understanding of addicts'

involvement in criminal activity. These studies of known addicts in various regions of Germany were conducted by Kreuzer at different points in time. The first study, which included 40 addicts, was conducted in 1972 (Kreuzer, 1975). Subjects were primarily recruited in prisons, but a few were recruited from borstal homes (juvenile halls), hospitals and therapeutic communities. The study took place in Hamburg, and most of the addicts were from Hamburg. In the second study, in 1978/79 (Kreuzer et al., 1981), 77 addicts were interviewed. They were again recruited mostly in prisons, with some recruited in psychiatric hospitals, therapeutic communities or counseling centers. Most of the addicts were contacted in institutions in Hesse, but a noteworthy number were contacted in Berlin. In the third study, done in 1988/89, 100 addicts were interviewed. They were recruited from residential treatment facilities in Hesse.

In none of these studies were drug addicts recruited from the street. Therefore the data might be characteristic of the more habitual, perhaps even more criminally involved, addicts. Those in prison, treatment, or other institutions may represent those with the most serious history of involvement in criminal activity, as well as the longest addiction careers. Additional information—especially on prostitution (which is not a crime in Germany, but is regulated and can become a crime under certain circumstances)—is found in recent studies dealing with AIDS and sexuality among addicts. The data all have their own limitations due to the methodology employed. Nonetheless, taking the limitations into consideration, it is possible to draw some tentative conclusions about addicts' involvement in crime.⁴

Table 2 summarizes data on the crimes addicts engaged in during their addiction period. They indicate—again in contrast to widely held public conceptions—that street robbery and burglary are *not* the favorite strategies for income generation among addicts. Those addicts who did engage in crime

were more likely to engage in drug selling, followed by shoplifting. Nearly all addicts reported having sold hard drugs, and roughly three-quarters admitted shoplifting. Burglary had been practiced by 44% and robbery by 19% within the last year. Prostitution was engaged in by a quarter of the addicts, being restricted, as other studies also suggest, to women addicts. Between 43% and 65% of female addicts engage in regular or occasional prostitution, depending on the study. Prostitution is found among only about 7% to 15% of the male addicts (cf. Harms et al., 1987; Grosse Aldenhövel et al., 1986:347).

TABLE 2

**Crime patterns among addicts in West Germany—
selected offenses based on self reports (in %)**

Type of offense	Study			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	
	N = 40 1972	N = 77 1978/79	N = 100 1988/89	
			Last 12 months	Ever in life
Shoplifting	73	89
Burglary	..	38	44	53
Breaking into pharmacies	68	25	10	24
Robbery	..	22	19	31
Prostitution	..	31	26	35
Drug selling (hard drugs)	100 ^x	86	97	99

.. No specific information given in publication.

x Drug selling in general (including cannabis).

SOURCES: (1) Kreuzer 1975: Table 23, my own calculation; (2) Kreuzer et al. 1981:236ff.; (3) Kreuzer et al. 1991, 1992.

Note on the frame of reference: In the first study, crime ever committed in the addiction period was asked. In the second study, the question referred to the commitment of crime as a means to secure money for addiction. In the third study, two frames of reference were used: within the last 12 months and ever in life.

When compared across time, the data tentatively (due to limitations in regional representation and interview methodology) suggest that burglary in pharmacies (mostly of opiates and other drugs) has dropped dramatically since the early 1970s. The decline in the rates of pharmacy burglaries (also

observed in earlier data broken down according to drug generations; cf. Kreuzer, 1975:377) may be attributed to the increasing use of precautions against breaking and entering employed by pharmacies since the 1970s, as well as the introduction of illegally manufactured heroin into the drug market since the early 1970s. These changes have paralleled shifts in consumption patterns, with heroin replacing the traditional opiates (cf. Reuband, 1979).⁹

On the basis of the most recent study on crime among addicts, the first survey-based estimate of addict-generated crime in Germany was recently made. Using various correction factors to account for inaccuracies in the crime statistics, memory distortions on the part of the respondents, and other possible biasing variables, Kreuzer and collaborators estimate that 37% of all household burglaries and 22% of all robberies in Germany are committed by addicts (Kreuzer et al., 1991:348). The figures are similar in many respects to those obtained in the aforementioned in-depth studies for Hamburg and therefore might appear rather plausible. However, addicts in treatment, who form the basis of this judgment, usually have a longer history of drug use and drug-related lifestyles compared with those outside treatment (cf. Reuband, 1990b:530; Hunt, 1990:169). Therefore the extent of criminal involvement among addicts in general is probably overestimated. Furthermore, there is reason to doubt the usefulness of the rather arbitrary correction factors employed for making estimates in this study.¹⁰ The estimates should be viewed as the first in a series of more refined estimates based on more representative samples of addicts using a more elaborate interview methodology.

Discussion and outlook

Data on criminal behaviors among addicts in Germany are sparse. Yet the evidence is clear that the prevalent public con-

ceptions are nothing but myths. Neither is *most* crime, especially robbery and burglary, committed by addicts, nor do addicts typically engage in these types of crime. The imputation of a strong drug-crime relationship seems more to reflect a dramatization of evil than a real-world phenomenon. The findings do not, however, preclude shifts in the future toward increasing representation of addicts in crime. Neither do they preclude the possibility that under certain conditions, in certain locations, and relative to time-specific events, the picture may change.¹¹

It is difficult to assess the similarities and differences of the German data to those in other countries. In the United States, the National Institute of Justice has started to routinely gather urine specimens from arrestees in large cities, in order to investigate the proportion of drug users (Wish and Gropper, 1990). These data suggest that the proportion of hard-drug users in the United States—as measured by heroin and cocaine metabolites—is higher than among the German offenders. Nevertheless, it does not seem reasonable to do a direct comparison between this study and the German studies because of a number of methodological differences, not the least of which is the mode of data collection (urine test vs. self-report).

What can be done tentatively instead is to compare the percentage of addicts involved in crime on the basis of surveys of addicts. Because of similar question methodology, the recent Kreuzer study (see Table 2) can be compared with the Miami study by James Inciardi (1986:127). One can then see similarities as well as differences in the level of the various offenses. In some cases, like shoplifting and prostitution, the differences are minor. Nearly three-quarters (73%) of the German addicts reported that they had engaged in shoplifting within the last year, compared with 62% of the American addicts. About one in four (26%) of the Germans engaged in prostitution, compared with 22% of the Americans. Greater

differences emerge when it comes to burglary and street robbery. Whereas 44% of the Germans engaged in burglary, 53% of the Americans did. And while 19% of the Germans reported engaging in robbery, twice the proportion (38%) of the American addicts reported that they had engaged in robbery in the past year.

The real differences might be even greater, especially in the latter cases, since Kreuzer used a sample of addicts in treatment and Inciardi based his study on a street sample. If it is true that habitual users of hard drugs are more often represented in treatment settings than in a street study, the proportion of respondents involved in crime in Inciardi's study must necessarily be inflated. This would mean the German figures have to be corrected downwards to make for a strict comparability in addiction status. The greater involvement of Americans in the more serious and violent crimes—such as robbery and burglary—would be even more striking under these circumstances.

This finding could suggest that social policy does in fact have an important impact on addicts, since it is in this domain where strong differences between the United States and Germany exist. German addicts—like those in most of the other Western European countries—are entitled to social welfare and free medical support, so there is no need for them to engage in crime in order to generate money for their living expenses. What they have to generate above all is money for supporting their addiction habits. The two societies differ little with regard to criminal law and prosecution, and the methadone explanation, moreover, cannot be relevant in this case, since it is in the United States where methadone is widely applied.

However, it could be alternatively suggested that the general pattern of crime among addicts to some extent reflects the general pattern of crime in their country. Robbery (but not

burglary), for instance, is much more common in the US than in Germany (Kalish, 1988). Unfortunately, we cannot be sure, since we do not have studies that use identical methodology and are designed for comparison from the very beginning, taking into consideration various macrovariables. It is only by moving towards integrated cross-national research studies that we shall be able to come to more precise conclusions.

Notes

1. Although some data sources also contain information on the people known to the police as users of hashish or marijuana, these data are scarce and moreover of dubious quality.
2. The most well-known country in which a tolerant legal policy has been practiced is probably the Netherlands. However, other countries, such as Spain and to some extent Denmark, have tolerant legal policies with regard to soft or hard drugs or both (cf. Albrecht, 1986).
3. In order to combat the spread and sustenance of addiction, a rather logical strategy is fighting the dealers. However, the effect of this strategy on drug-induced crime may be different than anticipated. Fighting drug selling effectively raises the prices of drugs. Consequently, life becomes more difficult for drug addicts and those in the process of becoming addicted. They have to accumulate more money to maintain (or increase) their drug use. Some may use less or even abstain from drugs, or seek treatment under a condition of rising prices. But for others—perhaps the majority—rising prices means they must find better ways of generating more money to finance their habit. Therefore their engagement in crime will increase.
4. The proportion of migrant ("guest") workers among addicts is difficult to calculate. According to police data, foreigners (including ethnic minorities in Germany) charged with heroin use constituted 10% of the offenders in 1985 and 17% in 1990 (Bundeskriminalamt, 1986 and 1991). The majority lived in Germany. In order to calculate whether ethnic minorities are under- or overrepresented, it would be necessary to take the age category into consideration and to do a breakdown according to nationality. Treatment data, on the other hand, are of questionable value, since ethnic groups might be hesitant to use treatment facilities and consequently be underrepresented among clientele.
5. Schwanke (1988), for instance, uses a window of 10 years, and the Landeskriminalamt Baden-Württemberg even goes back 14 years to identify users of hard drugs (Landeskriminalamt Baden-Württem-

berg, 1987). Under certain circumstances this could mean addicts are included who are no longer addicts. However, the chance of overestimating addicts is probably lower than the chance of underestimating them.

6. What is also noteworthy according to the study by Donicht is that addicts seem to be overrepresented among the more frequent, intense offenders. According to the study, addicts constituted 9% of all burglars, but committed 21% of all burglary offenses (Donicht, 1988:20).
7. Unfortunately, the proportion of addicts among robbery suspects is not given but has to be calculated from different tabulations—from the number of drug users (including cannabis users) among robbery suspects as well as from the percentage of hard-drug users among drug users in general (Landeskriminalamt Baden-Württemberg, 1987:5, 24, my own calculation).
8. What cannot be determined is the extent to which addicts' engagement in delinquency is due to their addiction or to a general propensity to engage in crime. Several studies, including German ones, show that delinquency often precedes a drug career. There are, however, also indications that lend support to the hypothesis that drug addiction *reinforces* a preexisting tendency to delinquency and hence exerts some causal impact on the crime pattern of addicts (Kreuzer, 1975; Kreuzer et al., 1981; Nurco et al., 1988; Johnson et al., 1990:42).
9. Which offenses have replaced the breaking and entering of pharmacies is not quite clear, due to the lack of appropriate trend data for many of the offenses. However, it seems likely that addicts would turn to alternative strategies to obtain drugs. If legal opportunities are not increasingly made available, illegal means must increasingly be employed.
10. The authors use various "correction factors" for estimations that are themselves vague and often not substantiated by empirical research. It is not only the inaccuracies in registered crime figures that enter as a correction factor—it is also urbanity, impression management vis-à-vis the interviewer, over- and undercount by time reference of the interview, etc. The more the correction factors used to generate an estimate, the more the problem is exacerbated. A further potentially biasing factor lies in the number of estimated users of hard drugs. The number varies widely in the literature (Reuband, 1989). The author takes one that seems reasonable; however, a sound empirical basis for this figure is lacking. The number of addict-generated crimes will vary, depending on the number of addicts entered into the estimation.

11. Studies of the crime-drug link have primarily focused on the micro level. The *macro level*—referring to sociostructural contextual conditions—has been neglected. We do not know which types of crimes will emerge as dominant among addicts under what conditions of the drug market, police intervention, and structural opportunities. The variations in the drug scene *within* a nation, supplementary to cross-national studies, could well be a useful starting point for investigating macro-level phenomena in the drugs area.

References

- Alber, J. 1982. *Vom Armenhaus zum Wohlfahrtsstaat. Analyse zur Entwicklung der Sozialversicherung in Westeuropa*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus.
- . 1989. *Der Sozialstaat in der Bundesrepublik 1950–1983*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus.
- Albrecht, H. J. 1986. "Criminal law and drug control: A look at Western Europe." *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice* 10:17–40.
- . 1989. "Drug policy in the Federal Republic of Germany." In H. J. Albrecht and A. V. Kalmthout (eds.), *Drug Policies in Western Europe*. Freiburg: Max-Planck-Institut für ausländisches und internationales Strafrecht.
- Albrecht, H. J. and A. V. Kalmthout (eds.). 1989. *Drug Policies in Western Europe*. Freiburg: Max-Planck-Institut für ausländisches und internationales Strafrecht.
- Anglin, M. D. and Y. I. Hser. 1990. "Treatment of drug abuse." In M. Tonry and J. Q. Wilson (eds.), *Drugs and Crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berger, H., K.-H. Reuband, and U. Widlitzek. 1980. *Wege in die Heroinabhängigkeit*. Munich: Juventa Verlag.
- Bühringer, G. and J. Platt (eds.). In press. *Drug Addiction and AIDS Research: American and German Perspectives*. Malabar, FL: Robert I. Krieger.
- Bundeskriminalamt. 1991. *Polizeiliche Kriminalstatistik 1990*. Wiesbaden: Bundeskriminalamt.
- Bundesregierung. 1989. "Bericht der Bundesregierung über die Rechtsprechung nach den strafrechtlichen Vorschriften des Betäubungsmittelgesetzes in den Jahren 1985–1987." *Bundestags-Drucks* 11/4329.

Der Spiegel. 1988. No. 30, pp. 30-42.

Deutsches Allgemeines Sonntagsblatt. 1988. No. 34, p. 23.

Donicht, K. 1988. "Analyse Hamburger Wohnungseinbrecher anhand von über 1.000 Fallakten." Unpublished manuscript. Hamburg: Landeskriminalamt.

Drogeninformation. 1988. No. 3/4, p. 130.

Fagan, J. 1990. "Intoxication and aggression." In M. Tonry and J. Q. Wilson (eds.), *Drugs and Crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Grosse Aldenhövel, H., P. Brčanovic, V. Schumann, and M. A. Koch. 1986. "Anamnestic und HIV-serologische befunde bei personen mit intravenösem drogenmissbrauch." *Bundesgesundheitsblatt* 29(11):347-349.

Harms, G., U. Laukamm-Josten, U. Bienzle, and I. Guggenmos-Holzmann. 1987. "Risk factors for HIV infection in German i. v. drug abusers." *Klinische Wochenschrift* 65:376-379.

Hunt, D. E. 1990. "Drugs and consensual crimes: Drug dealing and prostitution." In M. Tonry and J. Q. Wilson (eds.), *Drugs and Crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Inciardi, J. A. 1986. *The War on Drugs: Heroin, Cocaine, Crime, and Public Policy*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co.

Johnson, B. D., T. Williams, K. A. Dei, and H. Sanabria. 1990. "Drug abuse in the inner city: Impact on hard-drug users and the community." In M. Tonry and J. Q. Wilson (eds.), *Drugs and Crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kalish, C. B. 1988. "International Crime Rates: Special Report." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Kleimann, M. A. R. and K. D. Smith. 1990. "State and local drug enforcement: In search of a strategy." In M. Tonry and J. Q. Wilson (eds.), *Drugs and Crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kreuzer, A. 1975. *Drogen und Delinquenz. Eine jugendkriminologisch-empirische Untersuchung der Erscheinungsformen und Zusammenhänge*. Wiesbaden: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft.

Kreuzer, A., C. Gebhardt, M. Maasen, and M. Stein-Hilbers. 1981. "Drogenabhängigkeit und Kontrolle." *Kriminologische Untersuchung über Phänomenologie des Heroinkonsums und polizeiliche Drogenkontrolle. BKA-Forschungsreihe*. Wiesbaden: Bundeskriminalamt.

- Kreuzer, A., R. Römer-Klees, and H. Schneider. 1991. *Beschaffungskriminalität Drogenabhängiger. BKA-Forschungsreihe*. Wiesbaden: Bundeskriminalamt.
- Landeskriminalamt Baden-Württemberg. 1987. "Auswertungsbericht Raubüberfälle 1986 in Baden-Württemberg unter Beteiligung von BTM-Konsumenten." Unpublished manuscript. Stuttgart: Landeskriminalamt.
- Nurco, D., T. Hanlon, T. W. Kinloch, and K. R. Duszynski. 1988. "Differential criminal patterns of narcotic addicts over an addiction career." *Criminology* 26:407-423.
- Reuband, K. H. 1979. "Drogengebrauch und soziale merkmale von fixern in der bundesrepublik." *Neue Praxis* 9:85-108.
- . 1989. "Illegale Drogen—Ein Sozialindikatorenreport." In Deutsche Hauptstelle gegen die Suchtgefahren (ed.), *Jahrbuch 1990 zur Frage der Suchtgefahren*. Hamburg: Neuland.
- . 1990a. "Drug use and drug policy: A cross-national comparison." Paper presented at the conference of the USSR Academy of Science, Institute of Sociology, USSR, April.
- . 1990b. "Empirische defunde zur sozialen zusammensetzung drogenabhängiger: Ergebnisse einer informantenbefragung." *Neue Praxis* 6:526-534.
- . 1991. "Attitudes towards drug use in Western Europe. A cross-national comparison." Paper presented at the second conference on drug use and drug policy, European social science group on drug issues, Lyon, France, September.
- Schuler, W. 1990. "Die stationäre Versorgung Suchtkranker in Deutschland." Deutsche Hauptstelle gegen die Suchtgefahren (ed.), *Jahrbuch Sucht 1991*. Hamburg: Neuland.
- Schwanke, J. 1988. "Die Beschaffungskriminalität von Drogenabhängigen in Hamburg." Unpublished manuscript. Hamburg: Landeskriminalamt Hamburg.
- . 1989. "Alarmierende dimensionen: Die beschaffungskriminalität von rauschgiftabhängigen in Hamburg." *Kriminalistik* 3:149-151.
- Simon, R. 1990. EBIS 1989: "Daten und trends aus den ambulanten beratungs- und behandlungsstellen." In Deutsche Hauptstelle gegen die Suchtgefahren (ed.), *Jahrbuch Sucht 1991*. Hamburg: Neuland.
- Süddeutsche Zeitung*. 1988. No. 177, August 3, p. 4.

Wish, E. D. and B. A. Gropper. 1990. "Drug testing by the criminal justice system: Methods, research, and applications." In M. Tonry and J. Q. Wilson (eds.), *Drugs and Crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.