

FBI STATISTICS ON OFFENSES AND OFFENDERS

Jerome J. Daunt, Federal Bureau of Investigation

Criminal statistics are difficult to compile, understand and interpret. Police statistics such as published in the Uniform Crime Reports are no less so. Yet progress in the police control of crime as well as other phases in the administration of criminal justice requires more accurate and pertinent statistics on offenses and offenders. Stated very simply, what makes up these numbers and what do these numbers mean?

Uniform Crime Reporting is a voluntary cooperative program of local law enforcement agencies and the FBI to provide a nationwide view of crime, its extent, fluctuation and distribution. The system was originally developed by the International Association of Chiefs of Police in conjunction with social scientists and experts on the law and public administration. Since its inception in 1930, it has been administered by the FBI and continues to be endorsed and actively supported by the Committee on Uniform Crime Records, IACP.

Basically, Uniform Crime Reports is a collection of data on crimes known to the police either through citizen complaints or police arrest of offenders. The most widely known and used portion and perhaps the most important because of its intended purpose is the Crime Index. This Index consists of 7 offenses: murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny \$50 and over in value and auto theft. It was designed to serve as a convenient measure of criminality in a community. We call these 7 offenses Index or serious crimes because they are serious by their very nature or because they occur in such volume they are serious community and police problems. These are perhaps best described as predatory crimes. This Index obviously does not indicate the extent of organized crime or what is commonly referred to as "white collar" crime nor does it attempt to. It is, however, a practical measure of police activity as it relates to the most common local crime problems.

The uniform definitions of these crimes are primarily based on legal or the more common statutory terms. The rule is that all contributing agencies count and classify these offenses based on the uniform definitions without regard to local statutes or prosecutive policy. Necessarily, the definitions are quite broad and leave an area of discretion although

the vast majority of criminal acts can be readily classified within the framework of these definitions. Nonetheless, because of the wide variation in state penal codes, it is necessary to frequently remind contributors that the uniform crime definitions must be applied and local law ignored for the purposes of crime reporting.

For the past 3 years we of the FBI staff and the police executives who comprise the Committee on Uniform Crime Records have been giving special attention to improvement of crime reporting through a more detailed description of the criminal acts involved. Because of the role played by the Crime Index our efforts have been primarily focused on the Index offenses. We have conducted special monthly surveys on a nationwide basis looking into the nature of certain crimes such as burglary, aggravated assault, homicide, auto theft, etc. The purpose of the surveys is twofold; first, to examine the consistency of reporting and secondly, to develop practical subdivisions of these broad crime categories and thereby make available a better statistical description of these criminal acts.

We feel that through the additional reporting of certain specific information concerning general crimes, more consistent crime reporting will result. This additional information is normally included as essential data in police offense and investigative reports and so provides each contributing police agency with a better description of the types of criminal acts to be reported in each classification.

Of equal importance is the fact that through a more detailed itemization of criminal acts law enforcement is in a far better position to identify their nature and the extent to which the incidence of certain crimes can or cannot be controlled by law enforcement. This should be done by analyzing the occurrence of these crimes in relation to law enforcement's limited functions in crime control; namely, prevention by exposing the nature of crime, principally the effect of contributing community factors; suppression through properly oriented and alert patrol activity; and deterrence through successful investigation and apprehension of the offender. Police success then depends heavily on local citizen understanding and support, the action of the courts and the effectiveness of the correctional and rehabilitative process.

There is here available for illustration a revised monthly Return A which will be introduced in the Uniform Crime Reporting Program beginning in January, 1964. This is the vehicle for collecting the number of reported Index and Part 1 offenses from contributing police agencies nationally. Since basic police records and crime reporting had a common beginning in this country tally sheets and an instructional manual for establishing a basic record system to provide such a crime count is distributed free of charge to all contributors.

The approach by subdividing the broad crime classifications is apparent in forcible rape, robbery, assault and burglary which were previously collected as totals without differentiation. With respect to homicide it should be noted that in the summer of 1961 a Supplementary Homicide Report was initiated in the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. Rather than simply a request for a numerical count of willful killings, this new form requires the age, sex and race of the victim, the type of weapon used and the motive or circumstances surrounding the killing when it is known to the police. The Supplementary Homicide Report has become an excellent supervisory tool in verifying the count of willful killings by eliminating duplication and killings not properly classified within the uniform definition. It has also made available considerable information some of which was set forth in Uniform Crime Reports - 1962 concerning the character of these willful killings and the extent to which they were beyond control of the police.

These revisions in the Uniform Crime Reporting Program in no way change the standard definitions. Perhaps an explanation of the breakdown of assault and burglary best describe the reasoning involved. Because of the wide variation in state laws as well as prosecutive practice, these two crime classifications present a serious problem in uniform crime reporting. While all assaults, both simple and aggravated, now become an offense known to the police (Part 1) the Index will still be limited to those which are of an aggravated nature, namely 4A through 4D. As a result of a survey on aggravated assault in August, 1960, a ratio of weapons used was established. That survey indicated that over 1/2 of the aggravated assaults were committed with the use of 4A gun and 4B knife or other cutting instrument. This becomes a useful tool in supervising reporting.

Keep in mind that all assaults with a dangerous weapon and with an intent to commit serious injury are classified as aggravated even though no injury results or the injury is minor. While we would agree that assaults are not consistently reported to the police, the extension of Part 1 offenses to include all assaults provides each contributor with a better description of the types of criminal acts that should be included in this crime classification. At the same time, because of where and among whom they happen (2/3 occur within the family or among neighbors and acquaintances) assaults perhaps best demonstrate law enforcement's limited ability to control crime and the extent to which it is a social ill.

Burglary has been defined in the Uniform Crime Reporting Program from the beginning as any breaking or unlawful entry of a structure to commit a theft. Yet, in many jurisdictions a charge of burglary is only possible after establishing forcible entry. We know from a survey in October, 1961, that 70 percent of the burglary results from forcible entry, 20 percent from unlawful entry and 10 percent were attempts or means of entry was unknown. It is felt this new subdivision of burglary will provide a more uniform count as well as more meaningful statistics. It is possible that in the foreseeable future the Crime Index burglary will be limited to that resulting from forcible entry.

While no change is recommended in the larceny classification for 1964, it is still receiving serious consideration. Although a survey of state statutes in 1961 revealed that the median breaking point between grand and petty larceny is still \$50 among the 50 states, there is strong opinion that larceny by dollar evaluation should be dropped from the Crime Index. Larceny by type under the following categories will be collected on a supplementary return in 1964: (A) Pocket-picking (B) Purse-snatching (C) Shoplifting (D) From Autos (Except E) (E) Auto accessories (F) Bicycles (G) From Building (Except C) (H) From any coin-operated device or machine (Except G) (I) All other. We feel that 4 or 5 of the above types of larceny as a group should represent the Crime Index larceny offense without respect to the value of property stolen. This would provide greater uniformity in reporting and more consistency in trend information in view of the difficulty in obtaining accurate and comparable property loss values and the ever present cost of living factor.

RETURN A
MONTHLY RETURN OF OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE

TO BE FORWARDED TO THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.,
 BY THE SEVENTH DAY AFTER CLOSE OF MONTH. See other side for instructions - also tally sheet.

1 CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENSES (PART I CLASSES)	2 OFFENSES REPORTED OR KNOWN TO POLICE (INCLUDE "UNFOUNDED" AND ATTEMPTS)	3 UNFOUNDED, I. E., FALSE OR BASELESS COMPLAINTS	4 NUMBER OF ACTUAL OFFENSES (COLUMN 2 MINUS COLUMN 3) (INCLUDE ATTEMPTS)	5 NUMBER OF OFFENSES CLEARED BY ARREST THIS MONTH	
				a TOTAL OFFENSES CLEARED	b BY ARREST OF PERSONS UNDER 18 (INCLUDED IN 5a)
1. CRIMINAL HOMICIDE					
a. MURDER AND NONNEGLIGENT MANSLAUGHTER					
b. MANSLAUGHTER BY NEGLIGENCE					
2. FORCIBLE RAPE TOTAL					
a. RAPE BY FORCE					
b. ASSAULT TO RAPE - ATTEMPTS					
3. ROBBERY TOTAL					
a. ARMED - ANY WEAPON					
b. STRONG-ARM - NO WEAPON					
4. ASSAULT TOTAL					
a. GUN					
b. KNIFE OR CUTTING INSTRUMENT					
c. OTHER DANGEROUS WEAPON					
d. HANDS, FISTS, FEET, ETC. - AGGRAVATED					
e. OTHER ASSAULTS - NOT AGGRAVATED					
5. BURGLARY TOTAL					
a. FORCIBLE ENTRY					
b. UNLAWFUL ENTRY - NO FORCE					
c. ATTEMPTED FORCIBLE ENTRY					
6. LARCENY - THEFT (EXCEPT AUTO THEFT)					
a. \$50 AND OVER IN VALUE					
b. UNDER \$50 IN VALUE					
7. AUTO THEFT					
GRAND TOTAL					

TOTAL ARRESTS THIS MONTH For ALL OFFENSES Except Traffic	
ADULTS	JUVENILES (age as defined by your state)

DATE

PREPARED BY TITLE

CHIEF, COMMISSIONER, OR SUPERINTENDENT

MONTH AND YEAR

CITY AND STATE

DO NOT USE THIS SPACE	
	INITIALS
RECORDED	
REVIEWED	
PUNCHED	
VERIFIED	
ADJUSTED	

Auto theft was the subject of a special survey in October, 1962. Subdivision of this crime classification is also under continuing study by the FBI staff and the Committee on Uniform Crime Records, IACP. As indicated in the November, 1962, survey, about 80 percent of the autos stolen were for the purpose of transportation only or the purpose of theft was unknown. Eight percent were taken for the purpose of stripping for parts, 5 percent were used in another crime or escape and the remainder for the purpose of resale. While police agencies cannot always distinguish between the so-called "joy ride" and theft for profit or other purpose solely on the recovery of a stolen car, some such breakdown on a continuing basis would be useful not only in police administration but in a better statistical description of this offense.

In addition, changes in Uniform Crime Reporting as noted under 5B of the Return A will bring about a more complete Index as to the volume of crime being committed by young persons in each community. Heretofore, the measure available in Uniform Crime Reports as to juvenile criminality was limited to police arrests for specific criminal acts. The new measure is based on the number of offenses which are cleared-up either by the arrest of a person under 18 years of age or through exceptional clearances. These clearances will also be related directly to the subdivisions of the Part 1 crime classifications which will give us a better understanding of the specific nature of the criminal acts in which young people are becoming involved. Other changes in the Uniform Crime Reporting Program and which time does not permit lengthy discussion include a breakdown of narcotic and gambling arrests by type as well as separate additions to the Uniform Classifications of Offenses such as arson, vandalism, etc.

While Uniform Crime Reports furnishes extremely useful information on offenses, there is little information on the offender. In Uniform Crime Reports, this is limited to age, sex and race. In January, 1963,

the FBI launched a new statistical program to develop meaningful data on known offenders. This might be described as a follow-up on known offenders. Briefly, the criminal history of offenders as known through FBI identification records is being processed and stored on tape for computer analysis. A flagging mechanism within the Identification Division of the FBI which handles the fingerprint inquiries will make available all subsequent violations on each offender as recorded in fingerprint identification. The key to this new statistical program is the FBI one-number system for each offender. The information normally available on these criminal histories is date, place and identity of arresting agency, charge at the time of the arrest, court disposition, correctional action and the age, sex and race of the offender. The data is being coded in detail in order that a wide variety of analyses may be made. The first experimental tabulations utilizing this information will be available in a few months. We are particularly interested in recidivism studies measured by arrest, conviction and commitment, analysis of criminal behavior patterns, mobility of offenders and the extent to which the same offenders contribute to our crime counts year after year. Records being processed at the present time are basically those offenders who are being handled currently in some phase of the federal law enforcement system. We anticipate that at the end of the first calendar year, criminal histories on 50,000 individuals will have been processed.

Law enforcement is making valuable use of crime statistics particularly in the area of man power distribution but more needs to be done in using statistics as the tool to express a better identification of the nature of crime and the many types of offenders. Armed with the knowledge gained from additional analysis, law enforcement is better able to direct its efforts and at the same time supply valuable information to the courts and those in the correctional process as well as social scientists and the general public since all of us have a "stake" in the problem.