

Substance use disorders in the criminal justice system: Challenges and solutions.

Victoria Stolzenberg*

Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Florida International University, USA

Introduction

Substance use disorders (SUDs) are a significant public health concern and a critical issue within the criminal justice system (CJS). The interplay between addiction and crime presents unique challenges for law enforcement, legal institutions, and rehabilitation programs. Individuals with SUDs often find themselves entangled in a cycle of criminal behavior, arrest, incarceration, and recidivism. Understanding the complexities of SUDs in the CJS is essential for developing effective solutions that address both the individual's needs and societal safety [1].

Research indicates that a substantial proportion of individuals within the CJS have a history of substance use disorders. According to the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), approximately 65% of inmates meet the criteria for SUDs, compared to just 10% of the general population. This alarming statistic underscores the urgent need for effective interventions within correctional facilities and post-release programs [2].

Substance use is often linked to criminal behavior, either as a direct cause such as drug trafficking, theft to support a drug habit, or violent crimes while under the influence or as a consequence of social and economic factors related to addiction. The interrelationship between crime and addiction complicates the effectiveness of the CJS, which is often ill-equipped to address the underlying issues that contribute to both problems [3].

The CJS faces numerous challenges in addressing SUDs, primarily due to systemic limitations and societal stigmas. Many correctional facilities lack adequate resources to provide comprehensive substance use treatment programs. According to a report by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, only 37% of state and federal prisons offer drug treatment programs, and many of these are underfunded and lack trained staff. As a result, many inmates receive little to no treatment for their SUDs during incarceration [4].

The stigma surrounding addiction can hinder the ability of individuals to seek help and can also affect how they are treated within the CJS. Individuals with SUDs often face judgment and discrimination, which can exacerbate their conditions and deter them from engaging in treatment [5].

The lack of effective treatment and support for individuals with SUDs leads to high rates of recidivism. Studies indicate

that individuals with substance use disorders are more likely to re-offend after release from incarceration, contributing to a cycle of crime and punishment that is difficult to break [6].

Many individuals with SUDs also experience co-occurring mental health disorders, such as depression or anxiety, which complicate treatment and increase the likelihood of criminal behavior. Integrated treatment approaches that address both substance use and mental health issues are often lacking within the CJS [7].

Addressing the challenges posed by SUDs in the CJS requires a multifaceted approach that encompasses prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation. Implementing diversion programs that redirect individuals with SUDs away from incarceration and into treatment can significantly reduce recidivism rates. These programs allow individuals to receive the help they need while still holding them accountable for their actions. Research shows that diversion programs are effective in reducing future criminal behavior among participants [8].

Establishing support systems for individuals after their release from incarceration is essential for preventing relapse and recidivism. This can include access to community resources, job training programs, and ongoing counseling. Studies have demonstrated that individuals who receive post-release support have better outcomes regarding recidivism and recovery. Providing comprehensive and evidence-based treatment options within correctional facilities is crucial. This includes access to medication-assisted treatment (MAT), counseling, and behavioral therapies. MAT has been shown to be effective in treating opioid use disorders and reducing the risk of overdose post-release [9].

Advocating for policy changes that prioritize treatment over incarceration can help shift the focus of the CJS. This includes advocating for increased funding for treatment programs, mental health services, and community resources that support individuals with SUDs. Training law enforcement officers and other criminal justice personnel in recognizing and addressing substance use disorders can improve outcomes for individuals involved in the system. Increased understanding of SUDs can lead to more compassionate and effective interventions [10].

Conclusion

The intersection of substance use disorders and the criminal justice system presents complex challenges that require

*Correspondence to: Victoria Stolzenberg, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Florida International University, USA. E-mail: victoria.stol@fiu.edu

Received: 01-Oct-2024, Manuscript No. AARA-24- 150143; Editor assigned: 02-Oct-2024, PreQC No. AARA-24- 150143 (PQ); Reviewed: 16-Oct-2024, QC No. AARA-24- 150143; Revised: 21-Oct-2024, Manuscript No. AARA-24- 150143 (R); Published: 30-Oct-2024, DOI: 10.35841/aara-7.5.227

innovative and comprehensive solutions. By understanding the social determinants of addiction, addressing systemic barriers, and implementing evidence-based practices, we can create a more effective and compassionate response to substance use within the CJS. Reducing the stigma associated with addiction, promoting treatment over incarceration, and providing support for individuals both during and after their involvement in the CJS are essential steps toward breaking the cycle of addiction and crime.

References

1. Grecco GG, Andrew Chambers R. The Penrose Effect and its acceleration by the war on drugs: a crisis of untranslated neuroscience and untreated addiction and mental illness. *Transl Psychiatry*. 2019;9(1):320.
2. Corrigan P. How stigma interferes with mental health care. *Am Psychol*. 2004;59(7):614.
3. Patnode CD, Perdue LA, Rushkin M, Dana T, Blazina I, Bougatsos C, Grusing S, O'Connor EA, Fu R, Chou R. Screening for unhealthy drug use: updated evidence report and systematic review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *Jama*. 2020;323(22):2310-28.
4. Hodgins S. Violent behaviour among people with schizophrenia: a framework for investigations of causes, and effective treatment, and prevention. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2008;363(1503):2505-18.
5. Leviton LC, Trujillo MD. Interaction of theory and practice to assess external validity. *Eval Rev*. 2017;41(5):436-71.
6. Li SD, Xia Y. Understanding the link between discrimination and juvenile delinquency among Chinese migrant children. *J Contemp Crim Justice*. 2018;34(2):128-47.
7. Wright PJ, Randall AK. Pornography consumption, education, and support for same-sex marriage among adult US males. *Commun Res*. 2014;41(5):665-89.
8. McCarthy CA, Ahern RJ, Dontireddy R, Ryan KB, Crean AM. Mesoporous silica formulation strategies for drug dissolution enhancement: a review. *Expert Opin Drug Deliv*. 2016;13(1):93-108.
9. Simons RL, Lei MK, Beach SR, Brody GH, Philibert RA, Gibbons FX. Social environment, genes, and aggression: Evidence supporting the differential susceptibility perspective. *Am Sociol Rev*. 2011;76(6):883-912.
10. McCarthy WJ, Anglin MD. Narcotics addicts: Effect of family and parental risk factors on timing of emancipation, drug use onset, pre-addiction incarcerations and educational achievement. *J Drug Issues*. 1990;20(1):99-123.