



Research Bulletin

Vol. 2, No. 10

January 2004

Disproportionate incarceration of African Americans for drug offenses in the U.S.

By Arthur J. Lurigio, Ph.D., Loyola University Chicago and TASC, Inc.

Since the 1980s, an overwhelming emphasis on law enforcement strategies to combat illegal drug use and sales has resulted in dramatic increases in the nation's arrest and incarceration rates. Rates of arrest and incarceration for drug offenses continued at a record pace into the 21st century, while general population surveys reported declines in illegal drug use in the United States during the 1990s (Tonry, 1999). Drug offenses have been among the largest categories of arrests since the 1980s. From 1980 to 2000, for example, arrests for drug offenses more than

doubled. In 2000 alone, more than 1.5 million persons were arrested for drug offenses — more than four-fifths for drug possession (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002b).¹

The enforcement of drug laws also has been extensive, punitive, and expensive in terms of its financial and social costs (MacCoun & Reuter, 2001). In 2000, federal and state governments spent more than \$38 billion on drug enforcement strategies. In addition, drug law enforcement initiatives have contributed substantially to the costs of building and maintaining prisons, which have increased fourfold in the past 20 years. Furthermore, the nation's drug law enforcement policies have disproportionately affected persons of color, especially African Americans, who are significantly more likely than other racial groups to be arrested, prosecuted, convicted, and sentenced to prison for drug offenses (Tonry, 1995).

In May 2000, Human Rights Watch (HRW), a New York-based group "dedicated to protecting the human rights of people around the world," released a report that closely examined racial disparities in the proportions of persons admitted to state prisons for drug offenses in 1996 (HRW, 2000). Spurred by the HRW's (2000) report, TASC, Inc. of Illinois and the Department of Criminal Justice at Loyola University Chicago formed a working group to investigate further the nature and extent of racial disparities in the enforcement of drug laws and the incarceration of drug offenders in Illinois.



Rod R. Blagojevich, Governor
Sheldon Sorosky, Chairman
Lori G. Levin, Executive Director

Research Bulletins are published periodically by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. They focus on research conducted by or for the Authority on a topic of interest to Illinois criminal justice professionals and policymakers.

The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Authority, the State of Illinois, or the U.S. Department of Justice.

This project was supported by grant #00-DB-MU-0017 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

For more information about this or other publications from the Authority, please contact the Authority's Criminal Justice Information Clearinghouse at 312-793-8550, or visit our website at www.icjia.state.il.us

Printed by authority of the State of Illinois, January 2004.

The project, funded by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, involves a series of reports designed to encourage a constructive dialogue about the problem of racial disparities in drug law enforcement and prosecution strategies, and in incarcerations for drug offenses (cf., Donziger, 1996; Reiman, 1999; Walker, 1998). The project's goal is to provide objective information about racial disproportionality in drug law enforcement in Illinois, elucidating the reasons for disparities and identifying meaningful solutions at various stages in the criminal justice process.

In the context of this goal, this report, which is the first in a series, discusses national trends in arrests and incarcerations for drug offenses and describes the unrelenting growth in the country's prison population attributable mainly to increases in the number of persons sentenced to prison for drug offenses. It also demonstrates that African Americans are many more times likely than non-African Americans to be sentenced to prison for such crimes. Finally, the report discusses how racial disproportionality in drug law enforcement, prosecution, and sentencing practices has adversely affected the African American community.

Growth in the prison population

Prison population size

The prison population in the United States quadrupled from 1980 to 2000 and has exceeded the 1 million mark every year since 1995. The rate of incarcerations per 100,000 Americans climbed from 139 in 1980 to 478 in 2000 — a 243 percent increase (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002c). Among persons from 20 to 40 years old, which is the age category at greatest risk for incarceration, the increase in the imprisonment rate was even higher than it was in the overall general population (Mauer, 1999). Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the United States ranked among the top three industrialized nations with regard to incarceration rates. In 1995, among 59 nations in Europe, Asia, and North America, the United States' incarceration rate of 600 per 100,000 persons was second only to Russia's incarceration rate of 690 per 100,000 persons (Mauer, 1997). At the end of 2001, more than 1.3 million adults were incarcerated in state and federal prisons in the United States (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002f).

Sentencing policies

The enormous rise in the prison population at the close of the last century occurred when unprecedented numbers of persons were sentenced to prison for longer terms with fewer rehabilitative services or chances for parole. Correctional strategies during this era also were sparked by the high recidivism rates of released inmates (Martinson, 1974; Schmalleger, 2003). The burgeoning prison population also was fueled by the widespread enactment of determinate and mandatory minimum sentencing provisions and "three strikes and you're out" laws, which were passed in political and ideological climates that favored tougher crime control policies (Mauer, 1999; Mauer & Chesney-Lind, 2002; United States Department of Justice, 1999).

The effects of imprisonment on crime rates, however, have never been clearly demonstrated. In fact, statistics show that the effects of imprisonment on crime rates are ambiguous. From 1970 to 1995, steadily growing imprisonment rates have coincided with both increases and decreases in crime rates. In addition, both property and violent crime rates in 1995, following a precipitous 25-year increase in imprisonment rates, were higher than they were in 1970.

The value of imprisonment as a crime control tool has yielded diminishing returns because greater numbers of offenders have been imprisoned for less serious crimes, especially drug offenses, than for more serious crimes, such as violent offenses (Mauer, 1999). In other words, the high costs of building and operating prisons are not offset by dollars saved in terms of preventing the most serious and costly crimes. Moreover, research has shown that shifting economic resources from prison systems and into community-based programs, especially in early childhood and family interventions, would produce appreciable reductions in crime (Donohue & Siegelman, 1998; Matsuda, 1998).

Prison admissions

Prison admissions for drug and other offenses

The single most important cause of the explosive rise in the nation's prison population is the burgeoning number of prison inmates admitted for drug offenses (Tonry, 1995). In 1980, 19,000 inmates, or 6 percent of all inmates, were admitted to prison for drug offenses; in 1999, 251,200 inmates, or 20 percent of all inmates,

were admitted to prison for drug offenses—an astounding increase of 1,222 percent.² From 1980 to 1999, the rate of drug offenders admitted to prison rose tenfold, from 15 to 150 inmates per 100,000 Americans. The largest one-year increase in the number of incarcerated drug offenders (52 percent) occurred from 1988 to 1989 after the passage of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act, which launched the current war on drugs in the United States (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002d).

An arrestee's chances of being sentenced to prison following an arrest for a drug offense increased 447 percent from 1980 to 1992 (Beck & Gilliard, 1995). The numbers of drug offenders in prison rose 478 percent between 1985 and 1995, compared with an increase of 119 percent in the overall size of the prison population during those years (Mumola & Beck, 1997). Between 1990 and 1999, the number of drug offenders in prison increased by more than 100,000, accounting for 20 percent of the total growth in the prison population. Only the growth in the number of incarcerated violent offenders was larger, accounting for 51 percent of the total growth of the prison population during the 1990s (Beck & Harrison, 2001). The majority of drug offenders admitted to prison in the previous decade were convicted for low-level drug possession or sales — relatively few for high-level sales or drug trafficking — and most had no prior convictions for violent offenses (Sabol & Lynch, 1997). In 2001, the number of persons admitted to prison for drug offenses (251,100) exceeded the numbers of those sentenced for property offenses (238,500) and public-order offenses (124,600) (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002e). The number of women convicted for drug offenses has increased at a higher rate than those of men. Between 1990 and 1996, for example, the number of women convicted for drug offenses increased 37 percent, whereas the number of men convicted increased 25 percent (Greenfeld & Snell, 1999).

Prison admissions and race

Massive increases in the number of incarcerated persons have disproportionately involved African Americans (Lynch & Sabol, 2000). The percentages of African Americans sent to prison in the 1980s and 1990s increased at substantially higher rates than those of whites (Cahalan, 1986; Tonry, 1999). In 1979, for example, African Americans constituted 39 percent of

all prison admissions in the United States; in 1990, they constituted 53 percent of all prison admissions. From 1980 to 1996, the incarceration rate for African Americans rose from 554 to 1,574 per 100,000 Americans and was more than 7 times higher than the incarceration rate for whites (Blumstein & Beck, 1999; Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002e).

From 1986 to 1997, the percentages of African Americans under correctional supervision — in jail or prison or on probation or parole—rose from 5.7 percent to 9 percent, whereas the percentages of whites rose from only 1.4 percent to 2 percent (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002a). At the beginning of the 1990s, more African American men were under the control of the criminal justice system than enrolled in college (Haney & Zimbardo, 1998). The likelihood of incarceration for a male born in 1991 was 29 percent for African Americans, 16 percent for Hispanics, and 4 percent for whites (Bonczar & Beck, 1997). In 1995, nearly one in three African American men, aged 20 to 29, was under some form of correctional supervision on any given day in the United States (Mauer, 1999). In 1996, 1 in every 20 African American men was in state or federal prisons, compared with 1 in every 180 white men (HRW, 2000).

Nationwide, the percentages of incarcerated African Americans are higher than their representations in every state's general population and were 13 times higher than the percentages of incarcerated whites during the 1990s (HRW, 2000; Tonry, 1999). In 1996, the proportions of African Americans in prison in 11 states were more than six times greater than their representations in their states' general populations (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1997). African Americans' rates of incarceration in 2000 (9,749 per 100,000) were more than 9 times higher than whites (1,108 per 100,000) for men in their late 20s. Nearly 10 percent of African American men, aged 20 to 29, were in prison in 2000, compared with 3 percent of Hispanic men and 1 percent of white men (Beck & Harrison, 2001).

The over-representation of African Americans in the U.S. prison population was also quite evident in 2001. At the end of that year, African Americans accounted for 46 percent of inmates sentenced to prison for more than one year, compared with 36 percent of white inmates, and 16 percent of Hispanic inmates. Furthermore, the number of African American men in prison

in 2001 (585,200) eclipsed the numbers of white men (449,200) and Hispanic men (199,700). In contrast, whites accounted for 55 percent of adults on probation, whereas African Americans accounted for 31 percent of adults on probation. These racial disparities also occurred in the female prison population. The rate of incarceration among African American women in 2001 was 199 per 100,000, more than three times higher than the incarceration rate of Hispanic women (61 per 100,000) and more than five times higher than the incarceration rate of white women (36 per 100,000) (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002e).

Prison admissions, race, and drug offenses

The racial disproportionality that has occurred in the growth of the prison population is most pronounced for drug offenses (Lynch & Sabol, 2000). Research has shown that the war on drugs has led to an overrepresentation of African Americans at every stage of the criminal justice system (Tonry, 1995). In 1992, African Americans constituted 12 percent of the population in America, but they accounted for 35 percent of those arrested, 55 percent of those convicted, and 75 percent of those sentenced to prison for drug possession (Mauer & Huling, 1995). Furthermore, the sentencing disparity between powder and crack cocaine, a cheaper form of cocaine readily available in inner city neighborhoods, resulted in more African Americans being sentenced to mandatory prison terms. Almost 90 percent of the defendants sentenced for crack cocaine sales, at the federal level, have been African American (Tonry, 1995).

From 1985 to 1995, African Americans sentenced to prison for drug offenses accounted for 42 percent of the increase in the total number of African Americans in the prison population; violent and property offenses accounted for 37 percent and 14 percent of the increase, respectively. Among whites, the percentage increase attributable to those sentenced for drug offenses was 26 percent, much lower than the increase attributable to those sentenced for violent offenses (42 percent) and nearly equal to the increase attributable to those sentenced for property offenses (23 percent) (Mumola & Beck, 1997). In 2001, the one-year increase in the number of admissions to prison for drug offenses accounted for 27 percent of the total growth in the African American prison population, compared with only 15 percent of the growth in the white prison

population and 7 percent of the growth in the Hispanic prison population (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002e).

Race and prison admission rates for drug offenses in select states

Based on HRW's analyses of 1996 data on U.S. correctional populations, Illinois had the country's highest rate of African American prison admissions for drug offenses, which was 1,146 per 100,000 African American men, compared with 20 per 100,000 white men in the state. African American men were therefore 57 times more likely than white men to be admitted to Illinois prisons for drug offenses. The next highest states were Wisconsin and Minnesota, where African American men were 53 and 39 times more likely than white men, respectively, to be admitted to prison for drug offenses. In 10 states, African American men were 25 times or more likely to be admitted to prison for drug offenses, compared with white men. Among the largest states in the country — California, Texas, and New York — African American men were 5, 19, and 11 times more likely than white men to be admitted to prison for drug offenses, respectively (HRW, 2000).

Concentrated drug enforcement in lower-income communities

Race and arrests for drug offenses

Racial disparities in imprisonment for drug offenses can be accounted for largely by racial disparities in arrests for drug offenses (Blumstein, 1993; Crutchfield, Bridges, Pitchford, 1994). African American arrests for drug offenses climbed steeply during the 1980s, whereas white arrests for drug offenses remained relatively stable (Blumstein, 1993). Since the 1980s, greater political and media attention directed at the war on drugs has led to more police resources targeting drug users and sellers in lower-income, minority communities and not in higher-income, non-minority communities (Mauer, 1999). From 1979 to 1998, the proportions of African Americans arrested for drug offenses rose steadily and far exceeded the proportions of African Americans who used drugs, whereas the proportions of whites arrested for drug offenses declined steadily relative to the proportions of whites who used drugs during that same time period (HRW, 2000).

Racial disparities in arrests cannot be explained by racial differences in illicit drug use. The National Household Survey on Drug Abuse (NHSDA) has shown consistently that African Americans, whites, and Hispanics use drugs in roughly the same proportions as their representations in the general population. For example, in 1998, the NHSDA (1999) found that among the nation's 10 million current users of illicit drugs, approximately 72 percent were white, 15 percent were African American, and 10 percent were Hispanic — percentages that approximated each group's share of the U.S. population in 2000, which was 69 percent white, 12 percent African American, and 12 percent Hispanic (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001). Within each racial group in 2001, the NHSDA found that the percentages of whites, African Americans, and Hispanics reporting current illicit drug use were 7 percent, 7 percent and 6 percent, respectively (NHSDA, 2002).

Law enforcement resource allocation

Racial disparities in drug arrests can be attributed to differences in the allocation of police resources for combating drug offenses. As Mauer (1999) and others have suggested, police departments concentrate drug enforcement efforts in inner cities because of the nature of drug selling in those communities. Specifically, drug sales in poor neighborhoods are likely to occur in open-air drug markets, whereas drug sales in suburban neighborhoods are more likely to occur indoors. Open-air drug sales are easier for police officers to investigate and target for sting operations (Tonry, 1995). As the National Criminal Justice Commission has argued, street-level law enforcement “focus[es] almost exclusively on low-level dealers in minority neighborhoods” (Donziger, 1996, p. 115)

Undercover operations are more easily conducted in unstable, loosely knit underclass neighborhoods than in more stable and closely knit middle- or working-class neighborhoods where undercover officers would be more conspicuous (Tonry, 1995). In addition, public drug sales are highly disruptive to the social order in poor neighborhoods, and they elicit repeated calls for police services to arrest drug sellers and remove them from the streets (Davis & Lurigio, 1996). Arrests are seen as a gauge of police performance and effectiveness at both the officer and department levels. Therefore, the concentration of drug enforcement efforts in poor neighborhoods makes tactical sense and is

evidence of increased police responsiveness to and sensitivity toward residents' concerns about safety and public order (Davis & Lurigio, 1996; Tonry, 1995).

A study of Milwaukee's drug markets supports the notion of class differences in drug selling locations (Hagedorn, 1998). Although drug selling was prevalent in all areas of the city, the study found distinct class differences in the locations of sales. In inner city neighborhoods, drug dealing was conducted publicly, mostly on street corners. In suburban neighborhoods, drug dealing was conducted privately, mostly in bars, schools, workplaces, and rave clubs. Hence, in Milwaukee (and likely in other urban areas) African Americans purchased drugs on the streets, whereas whites purchased drugs in more secure environments away from the watchful eyes of residents and law enforcement officers.

Consequences of concentrated drug enforcement

Criminal justice costs

The concentration of law enforcement resources directed toward waging the war on drugs has had several consequences. Research suggests that significant increases in drug enforcement initiatives have drawn resources away from other law enforcement efforts. An investigation in Florida found that increases in the state's arrests for drug offenses during the 1980s were associated with decreases in the state's arrests for property crimes (Benson & Rasmussen, 1991). In Illinois, from 1984 to 1989, increases in arrests for drug offenses coincided with decreases in arrests for drunk driving (Benson & Rasmussen, 1996).

An over-reliance on costly imprisonment for drug offense convictions has resulted in fewer funds available for community-based correctional alternatives. Probation and parole populations have been growing at the same rate as prison populations, but funding for probation and parole agencies has lagged far behind that of prisons, resulting in higher caseloads for probation and parole officers and more probation and parole violations (Mauer, 1999). Even more disturbing are the findings of a RAND Corporation study of the effects of imprisonment on California's budget, suggesting that prison construction and maintenance have drained dollars from the state's

higher education and health care budgets (Greenwood et al., 1994).

Social costs

The massive imprisonment of African American men for drug offenses has taken a toll on African American communities throughout the United States. Large numbers of incarcerations for drug offenses have rendered the experience of imprisonment more mundane in African American neighborhoods, undermining the deterrent effects of prison and diminishing residents' respect for the criminal justice system (Clear, 1996; Clear, 2001). Imprisonment has also led to fewer numbers of African American men available to care for children, more single-parent households, and overall family disruption (Courtwright, 1996). The continually growing numbers of African American women incarcerated for drug offenses also has had a devastating impact on family stability and well-being in the African American community (Bloom & Steinhart, 1993).

Prison terms for felony drug offense convictions have foreclosed employment prospects and disenfranchised millions of African Americans. Fellner and Mauer (1998) estimated that 40 percent of African American men will temporarily or permanently lose their right to vote as the result of a felony conviction. In attempts to restore the voting rights of convicted felons, attorneys have recently filed cases challenging disenfranchisement laws. (For example, see Hayden vs. Pataki in New York State.)

Imprisonment's effects on family stability, neighborhood cohesion, and employment might actually increase crime rates in some communities (Clear, 2001; Mauer, 1999). Convictions for felony drug offenses also prohibit many African Americans and other Americans from being eligible for benefits such as student loans, public housing assistance, and drivers' licenses, resulting in deleterious, lifelong consequences for persons who have already served their sentences for drug law violations (Rubinstein & Mukamal, 2001; Travis, 2001).

Summary

Historically, there have never been more persons imprisoned per capita in the United States than there are today. The explosion of the prison population is

attributable largely to the war on drugs, which has placed an over-riding emphasis on enforcement strategies to reduce illegal drug use and sales. Because drug enforcement strategies are more easily implemented in poor, underclass neighborhoods, they have led to the disproportionate arrest and incarceration of minorities, especially African Americans. This has wreaked havoc on poor African American communities, undermining family and neighborhood stability and diminishing the social capital of African American men and women. For many, convictions for felony drug offenses have led to disenfranchisement and exclusion from job and housing opportunities.

REFERENCES

- Beck, A. J. & Gilliard, D. K. (1995). Prisoners in 1994. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Beck, A. J. & Harrison, P. M. (2001). Prisoners in 2000. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Beck, A. J. & Mumola, C. J. (1999). Prisoners in 1998. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Benson, B. L., & Rasmussen, D. W. (1996). Illicit drugs and crime. Oakland, CA: The Independent Institute.
- Benson, B. L., & Rasmussen, D. W. (1991). Relationship between illicit drug enforcement and property crimes. Contemporary Policy Issues, 9, 106-114.
- Bloom, B., & Steinhart, D. (1993). Why punish the children? San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Blumstein, A. (1993). Making rationality relevant: The American Society of Criminology 1992 Presidential Address. Criminology, 31, 3-8.
- Blumstein, A. (1993). Racial disproportionality of U.S. prison population revisited. University of Colorado Law Review, 64, 743-760.
- Blumstein, A. & Beck, A. (1999). Population growth in U.S. prisons, 1980-1996. In M. Tonry & J. Petersilia (Eds.), Prisons (pp. 17-61). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bonczar, T. P. & Beck, A. J. (1997). Lifetime likelihood of going to state or federal prison. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2002a). Demographic trends in correctional population by race. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2002b). Drug law violations. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2002c). Incarceration rate, 1980-2000. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (1997). National Corrections Reporting Program, 1996. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2002d). Number of persons in custody of state correctional authorities by most serious offense, 1980-1999. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2002e). Prisoners in 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2002f). U.S. correctional population reaches 6.6 million. (Advanced Press Release). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Cahalan, M. W. (1986). Historical corrections statistics in the United States. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Clear, T. (1996). Backfire: When incarceration increases crime. In The unintended consequences of incarceration (pp. 3-12). New York: Vera Institute of Justice.
- Clear, T. (2001). The problem with "addition by subtraction:" The prison-crime relationship in low-income communities. In M. Mauer & M. Chesney-Lind (Eds.), Invisible punishment: The collateral consequences of mass imprisonment (pp. 181-194). New York: The New Press.
- Courtwright, D. T. (1996). The drug war's hidden toll. Issues in Science and Technology, 14, 69-78.
- Crutchfield, R.D., Bridges, G. S., & Pitchford, S.R. (1994). Analytical and aggregate biases in analyses of imprisonment: Reconciling discrepancies in studies of racial disparity. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 31, 196-218.
- Davis, R. C., & Lurigio, A. J. (1996). Fighting back: Neighborhood antidrug strategies. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Donohue, J. J., & Siegelman, P. (1998). Allocating resources among prisons and social programs in the battle against crime. Journal of Legal Studies, 27, 30-43.
- Donziger, S. R. (ed.) (1996). The real war on crime: The report of the National Criminal Justice Commission. New York: Harper Collins.
- Fellner, J. & Mauer, M. (1998). Losing the vote: The impact of felony disenfranchisement laws in the United States. New York: The Sentencing Project and Human Rights Watch.
- Greenfeld, L.A., & Snell, T.L. (1999). Women offenders. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Greenwood, P.W., Rydell, C.P., Abrahamse, A.F., Caulkins, N.P., Chiesa, J., Model, K.E., Klein, S.P. (1994). California's new Three-Strikes Law: Benefits, costs, and alternatives. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Hagedorn, J. M. (1998). The business of drug dealing in Milwaukee. Milwaukee, WI: Wisconsin Policy Research Institute.
- Haney, C. & Zimbardo, P. (1998). The past and future of U.S. prison policy: Twenty-five years after the Stanford prison experiment. American Psychologist, 53, 711-720.
- Human Rights Watch. (2000). Punishment and Prejudice: Racial Disparities in the War on Drugs. New York: Author.
- Lynch, J. P., & Sabol, W. J. (2000). Prison use and social control. In J. Horney (Ed.), Criminal Justice 2000: Policies, processes, and decisions of the criminal justice system (pp. 7-44). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- MacCoun, R. J., & Reuter, P. (2001). Drug war heresies. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Martinson, R. (1974). What works: Questions and answers about prison reform. Public Interest, 35, 22-64.
- Matsuda, M. J. (1998). Crime and affirmative action. Journal of Gender, Race, and Justice, 5, 309-317.
- Mauer, M. (1997). Americans behind bars: U.S. and international use of incarceration, 1995. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project.
- Mauer, M. (1999). Race to incarcerate. New York: The New Press.
- Mauer, M. & Chesney-Lind, M. (Eds.) (2001). Introduction. In M. Mauer & M. Chesney-Lind (Eds.), Invisible punishment: The collateral consequences of mass imprisonment (pp. 1-12). New York: The New Press.
- Mauer, M. & Huling, T. (1995). Young black American and the criminal justice system: Five years later. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project.
- Mumola, C. J. & Beck, A. J. (1997). Prisoners in 1996. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- National Household Survey on Drug Abuse. (1999). Summary report: 1998. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.
- National Household Survey on Drug Abuse. (2002). Summary report: 2001. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.
- Olson, D. (2000). Trends and Issues Update: Prison sentences for drug offenders. Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.
- Reiman, J. (1998). And the poor get prison: Economic bias in American criminal justice. Neddham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Rubinstein, G., & Mukamal, D. (2001). Welfare and housing: Denial of benefits to drug offenders. In M. Mauer & M. Chesney-Lind (Eds.), Invisible punishment: The collateral consequences of mass imprisonment (pp. 37-49). New York: The New Press.
- Sabol, W. J. & Lynch, J. P. (1997). Crime policy report: Did getting tough on crime pay? Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Schmallegger, F. (2003). Criminal justice today (7th Edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Tonry, M. (1995). Malign neglect: Race, crime, and punishment in America. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tonry, M. (1999). Why are incarceration rates so high? Overcrowded Times, 10, 3-6.

Travis, J. (2001). Invisible punishment: An instrument of social exclusion. In M. Mauer & M. Chesney-Lind (Eds.), Invisible punishment: The collateral consequences of mass imprisonment (pp. 15-36). New York: The New Press.

United States Census Bureau. (2001). Census 2000 summary files for states: Population by race. Washington DC: Department of Commerce.

United States Department of Justice. (1999). Office of Justice Programs Fiscal Year 2000 Plan: Resources for the field. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Walker, S. (1998). Sense and nonsense about crime and drugs (Fourth edition). Boston, MA: Wadsworth.

NOTES

1. According to the Uniform Crime Report, drug offenses are defined as state or local offenses involving the unlawful possession, sale, use, growing, manufacturing, and making of narcotic drugs including opium or cocaine or their derivatives, marijuana, synthetic narcotics, and dangerous nonnarcotic drugs such as barbiturates.

2. Persons convicted of multiple crimes can receive multiple sentences for those crimes. However, they can be admitted to prison only once for multiple convictions. The most serious crime that led to a prison conviction is the one that counts as the crime for which they were admitted to prison.



Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

120 S. Riverside Plaza, Suite 1016

Chicago, IL 60606

Phone: 312-793-8550, TDD: 312-793-4170, Fax: 312-793-8422



Rod R. Blagojevich, Governor
Sheldon Sorosky, Chairman
Lori G. Levin, Executive Director