

Links between Imprisonment and Drugs

– A Research with international focus



CISST

CIVIL SOCIETY IN THE PENAL SYSTEM

TCPS

TURKEY'S CENTER FOR PRISON STUDIES



This research paper has been prepared by its author within the scope of the project titled “Advocacy for People in the Penal System” project funded by European Instrument on Democracy and Human Rights Programme of Delegation of the European Union to Turkey.

It doesn't represent European Union's or CISST/TCPS's official opinion.

**Links between
Imprisonment and Drugs**
– A Research with international focus

By Theresa Scheible

Edited by İdil Aydınoglu



CISST
CIVIL SOCIETY IN THE PENAL SYSTEM



TCPS
TURKEY'S CENTER FOR PRISON STUDIES

INHALT

1. Introduction	6
2. Drugs before Imprisonment: Relation of Drugs and Delinquency	8
2. 1. Theoretical Background	8
2.2 Drugs and Delinquency in Practice	10
3. Addiction in Prison	12
3.1 Security Problem	12
3.2 Trends concerning consumed illicit Substances	13
3.3 Costs of Drugs in Prison	14
3.4 Treating Addiction in Prison	14
4. After Release	16
5. Alternatives to Imprisonment	17
5.1 Trend: Softening in Prison Sentences	17
5.2 Drug Courts	17
6. Comparison: Drug Law in Turkey and Germany	19
7. Conclusion	21
Sources:	22

I. INTRODUCTION

Imprisonment is often perceived as a radically cut-off from the outside world. Nevertheless, evidence suggests that the ties between the two worlds seem not to rupture with incarceration regarding narcotics. But illicit substances do not only manage to enter prison walls - they are also linked to conditions leading to imprisonment or making release a major challenge.

Drugs being related to imprisonment are no longer an exception in many different countries. Applying an international focus on the relation between drugs and imprisonment, it can be observed that narcotics have become a relevant issue that requires further research.

This paper analyzes chronologically the different stages – ranging from “Drugs before Imprisonment” (2.), “Addiction in Prison” (3.) to “After Release” (4.) - that can be linked with substance abuse.

In “Drugs before Imprisonment” (2.1) first, the theoretical correlation between substance abuse and crime is outlined by introducing the ideas of different scholars. In the second part, “Drugs and Delinquency in Practice” (2.2) the focus turns from theory to a more practical observation of a possible correlation.

The chapter “Addiction in prison” examines several subitems: In 3.1 the “Security Problem” is outlined and how it is possible that drugs can infiltrate prison walls. The subchapter 3.2 talks about “Trends concerning consumed illicit Substances” in prison, while subchapter 3.3 will be concerned with the “Costs of Drugs in prison”. As the latter section suggests, costs do not only have an economic dimension. It talks moreover about the negative effects drugs can have on the prison environment. Closing chapter 3, “Treating Addiction in Prison” (3.4) deals with the provided or non-provided services in prison for medical treatment.

In the fourth chapter “After Release” (4.) the challenges of being confronted with an easier access to drugs after being released are emphasized.

“Alternatives to Imprisonment” (5.) encompasses two major ideas of dealing with increasing numbers of drug-related convicts: The subchapter “Trend: Softening Prison Sentences” (5.1) examines that many countries approach a loosening in punishment. “Drug Courts” (5.2) is another model that attempts to obtain individuals in their familiar environment with frequent supervision.

In the last section, two countries are compared regarding their drug laws: Germany and Turkey. (6.)

2. DRUGS BEFORE IMPRISONMENT: RELATION OF DRUGS AND DELINQUENCY

2. 1. Theoretical Background

The relation between crime and drugs is highly complex and a frequently discussed topic by scientists. White and Gorman propose that there are three possible correlations between drugs and crime (Powell 2011, p.10):

1. “Substance use leads to crime”

This category suggests that substance abuse can cause crimes as a direct effect. The criminologist Goldstein evolved in 1985 as one of the first theory suggesting such a correlation, which is called the Tripartite Model. It consists of three different arms. (Disney 2010, p. 4)

The first arm is psychopharmacological violence. It addresses the intoxication effects on the organism by drugs, that may create a higher likelihood of involvement in crimes. (Disney 2010, p. 4) These effects can represent neurochemical alterations within the organism as well as changes in judgement. (Powell 2011, p.12) Science approves that substance abuse affects the personality of the consuming person. This can lead to abnormal behavior and change in appearance, which becomes much more pronounced with ongoing consume. The structure of the brain can be changed through substances and effects on this delicate organ can be long-lasting or permanent - even when stopping consume. (National Institute on Drug Abuse 2014). The question if these behavioral changes also contain the likelihood of criminal behavior is hard to prove, as many factors correlate. Goldstein’s theory became very popular and therefore was base of many pieces of research scrutinizing his assumptions. Most analyzes are engaged with effects of illicit substances in general, but different substances tend to have different effects on the organism. (Powell 2011, p. 12) Goldstein himself mentioned especially alcohol, stimu-

lants, barbiturates, and PCP¹ as substances to be linked with vulnerability for criminal behavior. (Disney 2010, p. 4) The here mentioned substances might lack revision, as the drugs marked experiences rapid changes. Continuously new types of illicit substances are developed to bypass drug laws, which effects are rarely known. But effects not only vary in sort of drug but also other factors such as dose, purity of the drug, gender, hormonal differences and others (Powell 2011, p.13). This complicates the assessment of the first arm.

The second arm is economic compulsive violence. It refers to crimes which are committed with the purpose of financing the personal consumption of illicit substances. A crime committed within this category can be robbery, shoplifting, prostitution, dealing with drugs or theft but does not necessarily include violent behavior against others. (Disney 2010, p. 5)

The third arm is called systemic violence. It suggests that the system of drug-trading in its structure tends to be violent. Rivalries between competitive gangs, disposal of informers, or acts of revenge for selling unaltered drugs can represent crimes committed within the systemic violence. (Disney 2010, p. 5)

While Goldstein elaborated the link between drugs and delinquency by explaining crimes through the involvement of drugs, other scientists expressed their belief that it also could be the other way around. The question, therefore, is, f drugs tend to lead to crime or if crime tends to lead to drugs or if the relationship between drug and crime is rather coincidental. These two new considerations were added by White and Gorman, amplifying the theses of Goldstein.

2. “Crime leads to substance-use”

Gorman and White indicate that in a criminal environment, individuals furthermore can be encouraged to get involved with drugs. The correlation comes along with crime, as the misdemeanor can be endorsed by other persons within the criminal circle to consume, as well as the new income, acquired by criminal involvement, can tempt to purchase of illicit substances. (Powell 2011, p.10)

3. “The relationship is either coincidental or explained by a set of common causes”

As a third possible correlation White and Gorman declare, that it is also possible that there is no such correlation between crime and drugs. In this case findings that support a correlation could be explained through a rather coincidental environmental setting that leads to increased

1 Abbr. Phencyclidine

numbers in both areas. An insufficient social-support system, problems in school as well as gang-membership could be the virtual explanation for increased crime- and drug-rates among this vulnerable group.

2.2 Drugs and Delinquency in Practice

The expression “drug-related offences” comprehends several possible ways of being involved in drugs in conjunction with criminal offences. First is, that the offender commits a crime directly violating drug-laws. This can include drug purchase for personal use or dealing with drugs. According to a study in behalf of UNODC², drug possession makes globally 83% of all drug-related offences. (Allen 2015 b, p. 2) The second possibility is that the defendant perpetrates a crime not violating the drug-laws, but in connection with his or her addiction or drug-trading activities involving crimes. Crimes associated with obtaining drugs as well as crimes committed under the influence of drugs can be mentioned here. (Van Zyl Smit 2007, p. 63). A study among 7.000 prisoners in Latin America observed that 31 % of the arrested individuals have committed the crime under the influence of drugs or alcohol (Allen Rob 2015 b, p. 2) In the USA even 60 % of offenders have been tested positive for illicit drugs when arrested. (National Association of Drug Court Professionals n.d., p. 1)

Often both categories (dealing and possession/committing a crime under substance influence) correlate, as many dealers for instance are not only trading drugs but also financing their personal consume (Van Zyl Smit 2007, p. 63).

In a cross-national approach the statistics in the particular countries vary in terms of drug-related convicts but make proportionately a large part of prison population. (Allen 2015 a, p. 14) The proportion does not necessarily reflect the nationwide involvement with drugs, as it is more a result of strict national drug laws with long sentences. Many countries have established harsh drug laws - some of them even applying death penalty in order to fight illicit drug trafficking. (Van Zyl Smit 2007, pp. 62)

In the United States of America for instance the convicts make one percent of the total population. Hence, USA’s incarceration rates per capita are higher than the summation of the per capita proportion of the 26 largest European states. (National Association of Drug Court Professionals n.d., p. 1) One of the reasons for high incarceration rates among the States is the mandatory prison sentences in case of drug possession. (Allen 2015 b, p. 2) Also in Wales and England drastic measures in terms of prison sentences can be observed. Between 2013 and 2014 around 2000 have been immediately incarcerated for possession of class C drugs. To this category belongs valium, tranquilizers and anabolic steroids. (Allen 2015 b, p. 2)

2 United Nations Office on Drug and Crime

International law rejects capital sentences for drug offences, but nevertheless 33 countries worldwide still apply capital punishment. In China, Iran, Laos, Qatar, Malaysia, Pakistan, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Singapore, UAE, Thailand and Vietnam law stipulates death for this act. Every year, around 1000 individuals are executed worldwide for drug-related offences. (Allen 2015b, p.3)

The assumption that harsh drug laws could confine illicit substance abuse is not very sustainable, as findings suggest that the deterrent effect of sentences is very limited. A survey by the British government investigated the effects of drug-related laws and it found that the consume of illicit substances is much more complex and therefore not only reflecting rigidity of legislation. (Allen 2015 b, p. 2)

3. ADDICTION IN PRISON

Imprisonment is often perceived as a cutoff of the outside world, but evidence *suggests* that ties between the two worlds seem not to rupture with incarceration regarding drugs. The following section will engage with drugs and addiction in prison.

In a survey among prisoners in England and Wales, 31 percent of the convicts confirmed an easy access to drugs in prison. This easy access can enable individuals to feed existing addictions as well as it can encourage to make the first contact with drugs in general or leading to harder drugs. 29 Percent of England's and Wales's prison population state that they have already developed an addiction before arriving in prison. Under the users of heroin there was a 20 percent that had consumed heroin for first time in prison. (Center for Social Justice 2015, p. 9)

In the United States of America substance abuse seems to play a decisive role as well, as 80 % of offenders abuse alcohol or drugs. A 50% of the convicts in USA even are clinically addicted (National Association of Drug Court Professionals n.d., p. 1)

On an international level the Penal Reform International estimates that between 40 and 80 percent of the convicts entering prison have a drug problem. (Allen 2015 b, p.4)

3.1 Security Problem

But how is it possible that drugs can infiltrate in such a guarded environment? Possible smuggling routes are for instance “social visits, postage, corrupt staff, thrown over prison walls, and new or returning prisoners” (Center for Social Justice 2015, p. 12). Nevertheless, it is unclear how they manage that so many drugs can percolate through the security blockades. (Center for Social Justice 2015, p. 12) The CSJ³ indicates that the searching of visitors and prisons is insufficient in the applied

³ Center for Social Justice

techniques. They suggest introducing body-scanners, increasing the use of drug dogs and applying new technology based on intelligence gathering. With the latter they refer on a method that was first applied in Australia. The so-called Waste Water Analysis (WWA) is a method that consists in constant examination of the waste water in prisons on drugs. The technique allows to provide information on type and quantity of drug. The WWA could replace the Mandatory Drug Testing, which is rather ineffective in detecting consumers according to CSJ. (Center for Social Justice 2015, pp. 12)

3.2 Trends concerning consumed illicit Substances

The drugs market in prison is divided in three different segments: There is the consume of traditional drugs, new psychoactive substances and prescription drugs. Apparently, the use of new psychoactive substances increases among prisoners, while traditional drugs seem to decline. (Center of Social Justice 2015, p. 10)

What makes psychoactive substances interesting for personal use in prisons is not only the effect but also that those drugs in many cases do not come in conflict with national drug laws. (Oğlakcioğlu n.d., 746) In some countries like Germany for instance, the law must name the illicit substances in order to make them illegal. In such a case the invention of new substances that are not named in law can bypass national drug law. (Oğlakcioğlu n.d., 746)

There is one substance called “Spice” that skyrocketed in the last years in many countries and dominates for instance the prison market in Wales and England. In different countries it appears under different names, in Turkey for instance it is called “Bonzai”. The documented increase comes along with incremental reports of hospital admissions and increasing violence. (United Nations Office on Drug and Crime 2016, p. 61) Technically Spice is legal in many countries as national drug laws did not cover the substance within their laws. But the negative effects of Spice – both, physical and psychological – can be very serious: Seizures, loss of consciousness, paranoia, psychotic symptoms, hallucinations and anxiety. (Center of Social Justice 2015, p. 10)

The other segment, which are traditional drugs, covers drugs like Marihuana, heroin or cocaine. Some expert state that traditional drugs would decline in prison, but others give evidence that the number of needles confiscated in prisons would not support the theory of decline in the traditional segment. As a great portion of consume occurs undetected, there is no reliable data that could neither confirm nor reject the argument. (Center of Social Justice 2015, p. 11)

The third branch of drugs in prison are the prescription drugs. Prescription drugs can be used in order to treat addiction, but they also do have the potential to develop an addiction. Therapy with opiates is offered in some prisons, nevertheless the treatment in many cases is not satisfactory. Overprescription is a common phenomenon in treating addiction. (Center of Social Justice 2015, p. 11) It will be discussed more detailed in the subchapter “Treating addiction in prison”.

But prescription drugs are also available on the prison's black market as they are historically not included in the drug-testing. Often misused substances are for instance Methadone Buprenorphine, Tramadol, Gabapentin and Pregabalin. (Center of Social Justice 2015, pp. 29)

3.3 Costs of Drugs in Prison

The drugs marked that emerge in prisons do not only affect the health of the convicts, it also can create more extensive effects. The security in prisons for instance can be affected, as the convicts get involved in a system of debt, violence and interdependency. (Allen 2015 b, p.5) Furthermore, it can restrain the rehabilitation process and increase the chance of further involvement of crime (economic compulsive crimes in order to finance their personal consume). Last but not least, drugs also have a financial cost. A research made by the Home Office suggests that heroin and crack users make a 45 percent of all acquisitive crime in England and Wales, which has a cost of about 4,7 billion per year. (Center of Social Justice 2015, p. 11)

3.4 Treating Addiction in Prison

Prison as an institution does in many cases not provide appropriate treatment for inmates with addiction problems as rehabilitation is not a main institutional purpose. In US prisons for instance it is estimated that about 65 percent of the prisoners are clinically addicted, but only 11 percent are under medical treatment. It would be reasonable to not only sanction the prisoners but also to treat their addiction having regard to a possible future release and reintegration in society. In some cases, medical treatment is not only beneficial but also can save life, as withdrawal from sever addiction can be lethal without adequate treatment. (O'Leary n.d.)

In terms of medical treatment opioid substitution therapy is a treatment that is applied in some prisons. The opioid substitution therapy does not necessarily solve the problem of clinical addiction, but it can help reducing the harm of the concerned persons.

In some cases, opioid therapy is undifferentiated used and a culture of maintenance can be observed. In those cases, therapy does not aspire to the goal of total abstinence from any substances. It only replaces one addiction by another through over-prescription – sometimes even against the will of the individuals. Over-prescription often happens under circumstances when doctors rarely have contact with their clients. (Center of Social Justice 2015, p. 15)

In 2014 opiate therapy was only available in 43 countries, while just 8 countries offered needle and syringe programs in some of their prisons. The latter issue is also of great importance, as the risk of infection with certain diseases - submitted through the usage of infected needles – is higher in prisons. The non-availability of sterile needles can lead to an increase in infections like HIV, hepati-

tis or tuberculosis. Tuberculosis for instance is around 23 percent higher among prison population compared to rates among the general population. Regarding HIV the rates are even higher with around 50 percent. Relating to Hepatitis it is estimated that two third of prisoners that inject drugs do suffer under this disease. (United Nations Office on Drug and Crime 2016, p. 20)

So-called “Drug-Recovery- Rings” can be applied to create an environment that can support clinically addicted prisoners in becoming abstinent. Within this rings, prisoners and staff collaborate in order to reach the latter goal, while drugs must be kept out of this environment. The availability of drugs in such an area can be very harmful for the chance of rehabilitation. Nevertheless, it often happens that drugs infiltrate the environment and corrupt the effectivity of such Drug-recovery-Rings. (Center of Social Justice 2015, p. 15)

4. AFTER RELEASE

After being released many convicts face the challenge of having easy access to drugs in combination with an often very stressful and disillusioning experience. Even when having successfully defeated the addiction in prison, the new situation can easily lead to recidivism. Often prisoners are left alone with that challenge and the support system - that might have helped the convict while being incarcerated - drops out after release.

Data shows that around 95 percent of the prisoners start again consuming drugs after being released. (National Association of Drug Court Professionals n.d., p. 1) Recidivism and overdosing can often be observed. (Allen 2015 b, p. 2) Especially the first two weeks after release are very precarious. Drug-related death is 3-8 percentage higher than in the following 10 weeks. Furthermore, the mortality rate in the first weeks after release is 50-100 times higher than in general population because of substance abuse. (United Nations Office on Drug and Crime 2016, p. 20)

Mainly there are two reasons, that contribute to higher proportions of drug-related death of convicts that leave prison environment. First is that different substances are used simultaneously and create a lethal over-dose. This can for instance be the case when some depressants (e.g. benzodiazepines or alcohol) are used in combination with heroin. Secondly, after a more complicated access to drugs in prison, the body can have decreased tolerance to drugs. The drugs available outside of prison probably also might have a higher purity and therefore unexpected effects. (United Nations Office on Drug and Crime 2016, p. 21)

Therefore, the Center of Social Justice suggests not to release prisoners on Fridays, as many addiction support services in many areas are closed over the weekend. (Center of Social Justice 2015, p. 15)

There is some more evidence that imprisonment is not very effective to detain drug abusers from committing further crimes. Between 60 and 80 percent of drug users commit a new crime after being released from prison. (National Association of Drug Court Professionals n.d., p. 1)

This can lead to the question, if imprisonment is the right tool to deal with drug-using convicts.

5. ALTERNATIVES TO IMPRISONMENT

As already mentioned before, many countries intended to deter individuals through harsh sentences. This led to a large proportion of drug-related crimes within prison population in many countries. (Van Zyl Smit 2007, pp. 62) Over-crowded prisons demonstrated the ineffectiveness of excessive drug laws and motivated to think of other solutions than incarceration. One trend in the last years was, therefore, a contemplable relaxation of drug laws in some states.

5.1 Trend: Softening in Prison Sentences

Especially possession of little amounts for personal consume are not prosecuted in several countries as they used to be. Some of the countries that are planning to reduce sentences are: Dubai, Gambia, Georgia, Italy, Malta, Jamaica, Slovakia, Ecuador and Japan. US-federal States Washington and Colorado even legalized the recreational consume of Marihuana. (Allen 2015 b, p. 5)

5.2 Drug Courts

In the United States, where the proportion is higher-than-average, they introduced a new model of dealing with non-violent drug-addicted individuals in 1989 (Berman et al. 2007, p. 23). The promoted success of this system led to popularity of so-called Drug Courts. The concerned persons are kept in treatment for a long period and supervised closely. The Drug Court system allows individuals to recover in their ordinary living environment without being pulled out of the social system. Furthermore, it provides them with treatment and other facilities that help them staying clean and being a productive member of society. The individuals are in close contacts with judges, that review the success and can dispose of sanctions in case of noncompliance. Randomly drug tests are conducted in order to assure the recovery process. (Allen 2015 b, p. 4) There are several studies outlining the successful implementation of the Drug Court system. One of them for instance observed

methamphetamine users and found that Drug Courts were the most effective method out of eight different treatment programs. By using urine drug testing, they measured that Drug Courts can help persons with methamphetamine addiction to be abstinent for the longest period. They stated that compared to other methods the period could be “doubling, tripling and even quadrupling” (National Association of Drug Court Professionals n.d., p. 3) the length of time. Another positive effect the Drug Courts can have is that the entity of family can be preserved in many cases. The incarceration of individuals with addiction problems also implicates separation of kids and family. Kids in such circumstances are more likely to grow up in foster care. Regarding Drug Courts the chance of family re-unification is a 50 percent higher. (National Association of Drug Court Professionals n.d., p. 3)

What seems to be a laborious and therefore costly method at the first sight, turns out to be more economical on the second sight. It is estimated that Drug Courts can save between 4.000 and 12.000 Dollar per client as the costs of incarceration is reduced as it is the likelihood of revolving-door arrests and new trials. (National Association of Drug Court Professionals n.d., p. 3) The Drug Court Professionals use those estimations to emphasize that even more individuals could profit from Drug-Courts. In this stage the Drug Courts only cover less than 10 percent of all possible individuals in USA, that could benefit from the Courts system as they are abusing alcohol or drugs. The Association of Drug Court Professionals used those assumptions to calculate, what could be the outcome if all of the latter mentioned group could be assigned to the Drug Court System. They assume that treating all currently eligible individuals could save 1.17 billions of Dollars per year. (National Association of Drug Court Professionals n.d., p. 3) Nevertheless, I want to underline that while the NADCP⁴ only gives evidence on tremendous effects of Drug Courts; Berman, Rempel and Wolf indicate that many of the existing studies are conducted inaccurate. They used for instance inappropriate comparison groups which adulterated the findings. (Berman et al. 2007, p. 29) However, Drug Courts can be an effective tool in dealing with drug offences, also when effects might not be that overwhelming as some studies might suggest.

Apart of United States, also other countries apply a system that intends to avoid incarceration - with the difference that effectively it barely differs from imprisonment. In China and South East Asia people are held in mandatory drug detention centers. Also, in Brazil the facilities for medical treatment were found to be more like a prison than a hospital. (Allen 2015 b, p. 4)

⁴ Abbreviation of “National Association of Drug Court Professionals”

6. COMPARISON: DRUG LAW IN TURKEY AND GERMANY

In this part of the paper I want to leave the international focus, that was applied before. This section will compare drug laws in Turkey and Germany and furthermore highlight the distinction in application.

The main difference in the penal code of Turkey and Germany is that German law names the illegal substances while Turkish law allows more room for interpretation. German penal code uses a catalog specifying illicit substances. This implies that German law struggles with new substances flooding the drug market that intend to encompass national drug laws. When not namely mentioned in law, German authority is powerless in handling recently emerging drug types. Therefore, German drug law requires constant revision. The designer drug Spice for instance wasn't namely mentioned in the penal code and was officially legal, until it became listed. (Oğlakcioğlu n.d., 746)

Turkish law allows authorities more flexibility regarding designer drugs. It regards all psychotropic substances as narcotics that can cause addiction. Therefore, it is within the responsibility of the judges to decide whether the elements of a crime are fulfilled. On some occasions prescription drugs also can be categorized as illicit substances consequently Even if the wording in the TCK (Turkish Criminal Code) offers an open definition of illicit substances, there is a catalog helping judges to categorize the narcotics. Oğlakcioğlu states that this catalogue in some points appears outdated, as it suggests that dealing with traditional drugs (e.g. heroin, cocaine, morphine, or morphine-based drugs) even in small amounts being a major crime compared to dealing with high amount of substances like psilocin. (Oğlakcioğlu n.d., 746)

Turkish law allows sentences to vary between 2 to 5 years regarding personal consume or purchase. Once the individual has the chance for treatment or probation up to 3 years, but in case of non-compliance it easily can be turned into a prison sentence. (European Monitoring Center for Drugs and Drug Addiction 2017)

Producing, importing or exporting of drugs implies harsher prison sentences. Sentences may vary from 20 to 30 years. Selling of illicit substances can not be sentenced under 10 years - when being sold to minors the lowest sentence is 15 years. Furthermore, special conditions can lead to an increase in sentences. Such conditions are for instance the type of drug, malpractice of certain professional positions (e.g. doctors, pharmacist) or organized crime in groups. (European Monitoring Center for Drugs and Drug Addiction 2017a)

While Turkish law allows penalty also for minor offences as personal consume, German law does not mention consuming of illicit substances as a criminal offence. It is the unauthorized possession of drugs that fulfills the elements of a crime and therefore can be punished by prison sentences up to 5 years. Nevertheless, Germany is one of the countries following the trend of loosening prison sentences. Consequently, German law offers plenty of possibilities other than penal prosecution in case only small amounts of narcotics are seized. (European Monitoring Center for Drugs and Drug Addiction 2017b) Application of latter alternatives depends on various factors such as “type of the drugs involved, the involvement of others, the personal history of the offender and whether or not public interest would be served by prosecution”. (European Monitoring Center for Drugs and Drug Addiction 2017b) Some of the federal states of Germany have furthermore defined which amount of cannabis can still be considered as “small” amount not persecuted judicially. Up to 5g of active substances are without criminal prosecution. Even when limits are exceeded it is under certain circumstances still possible to receive treatment instead punishment. (European Monitoring Center for Drugs and Drug Addiction 2017b)

Whenever it comes to manufacturing, cultivation or supply the law requires jail sentences of up to 5 years. In special cases the punishment can be increased. Just as in Turkish law sentence can be increased up to 15 years when narcotics are handed to minors. Other reasons can be the involvement with ‘not insignificant’ quantities, professional trafficking, use of weapons or serious drug-related crimes. Regarding new psychoactive substances (NPS) a relatively new law from 2016 criminalizes “supply-related actions involving NPS that belong to groups of amphetamine-type stimulants, including cathinones and synthetic cannabinoids” (European Monitoring Center for Drugs and Drug Addiction 2017b) These offences are punishable by up to three years in prison or up to 10 years’ imprisonment in certain aggravating circumstances.

7. CONCLUSION

Drugs do play a significant role in relation to imprisonment. As they are deeply connected with prison sentences it would be wrong ignoring the issue and not thinking of possible ways to strengthen individuals at risk. This paper outlines, that consume of illicit substances can develop negative effects in all stages (before, while and after imprisonment) and therefore is a topic that can not only be attended in one single stage. Even when jail-environment would be completely drug-free, after release the risk is extraordinarily high that individuals could give in to drugs being easily accessible. Especially individuals who have the longtime perspective being released one day should have access to professional supervision of doctors, psychologists or social workers in order to prepare them for the future challenge. Only because prison environment is supposed to be free of drugs, it does not mean that it actually is. As outlined before, drugs infiltrating jails are not an exception on an international scope. This appeals to authorities to overthink the prison system, detect security gaps and consider alternatives to imprisonment as ways that might prepare individuals better for living together in society.

SOURCES

- ALLEN, Rob (2015 a): Global Prison Trends 2015. London: Penal Reform International. Online in: <https://www.penalreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/PRI-Prisons-global-trends-report-LR.pdf> [accessed on 22.03.2018]
- ALLEN, Rob (2015 b): Global Prison Trends 2015. Centerfold: Drugs and imprisonment. Special focus 2015 (Pull out section), London: Penal Reform International. Online in: <https://www.penalreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/PRI-Prisons-global-trends-report-LR.pdf> [accessed on 22.03.2018]
- BERMAN ET. AL (2007): Documenting Results. Research on Problem-Solving Justice. New York: Center for Court Innovation
- CENTER FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE (2015): Drugs in Prison. Online in: https://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/core/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/CSJJ3090_Drugs_in_Prison.pdf [accessed on 22.03.2018]
- DISNEY, Lynn et al. (2010): Illicit Drug Use and Criminal Behavior. A Literature Review. Washington: Office of National Drug Policy. Online in: https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/ondcp/policy-and-research/illicit_drug_use_and_criminal_behavior_literature_review_2010.pdf [accessed on 22.03.2018]
- EUROPEAN MONITORING CENTER FOR DRUGS AND DRUG ADDICTION (2017a): Turkey. Country Drug Report 2017. Drug laws and drug law offences. National drug laws. Online in: http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/countries/drug-reports/2017/turkey/drug-laws-and-offences_en [accessed on 03.05.2018]
- EUROPEAN MONITORING CENTER FOR DRUGS AND DRUG ADDICTION (2017b): Germany. Country Drug Report 2017. Drug laws and drug law offences. National drug laws. Online in: http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/countries/drug-reports/2017/germany/drug-laws-and-offences_en [accessed on 03.05.2018]

- NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF DRUG COURT PROFESSIONALS (n.d.): The Facts on Drugs and Crime in America. Online in: <http://www.nadcp.org/sites/default/files/nadcp/Facts%20on%20Drug%20Courts%20.pdf> [accessed on 22.03.2018]
- NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DRUG ABUSE (2014): Drug, Brains, and Behavior. The science of addiction. Maryland. Online in: <https://www.drugabuse.gov/publications/drugs-brains-behavior-science-addiction/drug-abuse-addiction> [accessed on 22.03.2018]
- O'LEARY, Dane (n.d.): Why imprisonment is more harm than help to addicted offenders. Online in: <https://skywoodrecovery.com/why-imprisonment-is-more-harm-than-help-to-addicted-offenders/> [accessed on 26.03.2018]
- OĞLAKCIOĞLU, Mustafa (n.d.): Das deutsche und türkische Betäubungsmittelstrafrecht im Vergleich – und was man alles voneinander lernen kann. Online in: http://www.zis-online.com/dat/artikel/2011_8-9_608.pdf [accessed on 03.05.2018]
- POWELL, Michael (2011): A comprehensive Analysis of the Drug-Crime Relationship. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Carbondale. Online in: http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1059&context=gs_rp [accessed on 22.03.2018]
- UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUG AND CRIME (2016): World Drug Report 2016. New York: United Nations publication. Online in: http://www.unodc.org/doc/wdr2016/WORLD_DRUG_REPORT_2016_web.pdf [accessed on 26.03.2018]
- VAN ZYL SMIT, Dirk (2007): Handbook of basic principles and promising practices on Alternatives to Imprisonment, New York: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crimes, p. 62-66

Civil Society in the Penal System / Turkey's Center for Prison Studies
Katip Mustafa Çelebi Mh. Billurcu Sk. No 5/2 Pk: 34433 Beyoğlu / İstanbul / Turkey
Tel / Fax : +90 212 293 69 82 e-mail: info@tcps.org.tr