

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Addiction

in a Hurry

The hijacked reward system

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 5

The Core Ideas 7

How It Actually Works 21

What People Get Wrong 31

Use It 35

Terms 41

Go Deeper 44

Notes and Sources 46

Bibliography 56

The Whole Thing in One Page

The defining puzzle of addiction is that wanting can grow after pleasure has faded. A person may know the cost, dislike the experience, intend to stop and still feel the old cue pull attention towards one more drink, dose, bet or session. From outside, this looks like either bad character or a brain with no driver. Both pictures are too crude.

Addiction begins in machinery everyone needs. Brains learn what matters, predict what will happen, direct effort towards rewards and repeat actions that solve problems. Dopamine helps update those predictions and gives some cues motivational force. It is not a pleasure fluid, and there is no single reward centre. Pleasure, learning, wanting, habit, stress and self-control are partly separable processes spread across interacting circuits.

Some experiences teach this machinery with unusual force. A drug can alter signalling directly. Rapid delivery compresses the interval between action and effect. Dose shapes the disturbance. Uncertain outcomes can sustain attention and repetition. Repetition builds associations between the effect and the room, time, people, objects and feelings that preceded it. The product is never acting alone. Drug, person and setting shape one another.

With enough learning, the cue can arrive before the reward. Wanting becomes attached to the sight of a packet, the route home, an empty evening or a surge of shame. Meanwhile tolerance may reduce some effects, dependence may make stopping unpleasant or dangerous, and use may shift from seeking pleasure to escaping distress. Habits shorten the route from cue to action. Other rewards become slower, weaker or less available. Life narrows.

That is what the cover calls a hijack. The word is useful only as a metaphor. No foreign agent seizes one control panel, and agency does not vanish. The same person may resist in one setting and use in another, stop for months, return during crisis or recover when housing, treatment and relationships change. Addiction is constrained choice inside a system that has become badly tilted, not freedom untouched and not helplessness complete.

Diagnosis therefore rests on pattern and consequence, not on moral disgust, quantity alone or the presence of withdrawal. Clinicians look for impaired control, rising priority and persistence despite harm. Physical dependence can occur during appropriate medical treatment without addiction. Heavy use can cause great harm without fitting one neat label. Gambling and gaming disorders show that a swallowed chemical is not required, but not every absorbing pleasure deserves a diagnosis.

Recovery works because the machinery remains changeable. Medications can reduce withdrawal, craving or reward. Contingency management can make safer behaviour pay now rather than later. Therapy can identify triggers and rehearse alternatives. Friction can slow access. Naloxone and other harm-reduction measures keep people alive long enough to change. Stable housing, work, belonging and people who answer the phone enlarge the field of available rewards.

The reward system was never built for virtue. It was built to learn from consequences. Addiction is what happens when that learning becomes concentrated around one answer, and recovery is the work of making other answers matter again.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

A doorway can become an event before anything has happened. Consider three ordinary, illustrative cues. Someone turns on to the street where they used to buy heroin and their pulse changes. Another hears the electronic chime of a betting app and finds the phone already in hand. A third finishes dinner and feels the first cigarette of the evening calling from a packet in another room. The object has not supplied the drug or the win. The prediction has arrived first.

That small reversal changes how addiction should be understood. A decisive part of the episode may occur before consumption, in attention, memory and preparation. The person is responding to a learned forecast,

not making a fresh decision from neutral ground. That does not remove responsibility. It tells you where responsibility has to operate: earlier in the sequence, with different surroundings, enough delay and support that another action remains available.

This matters because the two common explanations both fail at the point where help is needed. The moral account says the person keeps choosing the harmful thing and should choose better. It notices agency but ignores how unequally the options have been trained. The fatalistic medical account can sound as if a damaged brain has taken over and only an expert can return it. It notices constraint but can erase the person whose effort, values and circumstances still affect every outcome. Effective treatment needs the truth in both: behaviour is caused, choice remains, and neither blame nor surrender follows.

The model also protects ordinary pleasure from sloppy diagnosis. Enjoying coffee, running, sex, work or a game is not evidence of disease. Frequency is not enough. Intensity is not enough. A strong desire can be healthy, and a repeated action can be useful. The clinical question is whether control has become impaired, whether one pursuit is displacing the rest of life, and whether the pattern persists despite substantial harm. Addiction is defined by narrowing and dysfunction, not by an observer finding somebody else's pleasure excessive.

Then there is treatment. A person dependent on opioids may be safer and more able to rebuild life while taking methadone or buprenorphine. Calling that a substitute addiction confuses a stable medical dose with an uncontrolled pattern organised around obtaining and using a volatile supply. A person with alcohol dependence may face dangerous withdrawal if they stop suddenly. Telling them to prove commitment by going cold turkey can turn moral theatre into a medical emergency. A person with stimulant use disorder may benefit from immediate, concrete rewards for verified change, even though paying people for progress offends the intuition that virtue should be its own reward. The reward system does not care about that intuition.

The subject also changes how products and policies look. Speed, availability, privacy, cues, credit, recommendation systems and the interval before another opportunity are not neutral details. They help determine how many lessons can be delivered, how quickly and under what emotional conditions. Restriction can reduce exposure, but punishment, exclusion and stigma can also deepen the stress and isolation that make relief more valuable. Good policy asks which part of the learning environment it is changing and what replaces the behaviour it hopes to suppress. That question applies in homes, clinics, prisons, schools, workplaces and the design meetings where products are made.

By the end of this hour, addiction should look neither mysterious nor easy. You will be able to separate pleasure from wanting, dependence from disorder, risk from destiny and lapse from collapse. More importantly, you will see why the way out is rarely one heroic refusal. It is a sequence rebuilt until the next safe action becomes easier to choose and worth choosing.

The Core Ideas

Reward Is a Learning System, Not a Pleasure Button

Dopamine acquired its public reputation through a mistranslation. A burst of it became a hit of pleasure, a detox became a way of draining temptation, and every enjoyable object became an attempt to spike the same chemical. The story is neat and wrong.

Reward is not a substance stored in one part of the brain. It is a working problem. An animal has limited time and energy. It must learn which states are better, which signals predict them, which actions can bring them about and whether the effort remains worthwhile. Human beings add language, plans, social approval, imagined futures and rules, but the basic problem remains: what deserves attention and what should happen next?

Pleasure is enjoyment. Learning updates expectations; motivation pulls towards an outcome. Attention selects what stands out, while memory

connects it to a setting and a history. Action-selection systems help choose what happens next. These processes communicate, but none is the master switch for the others.

Dopamine is central to parts of learning and motivation. Classic recordings from midbrain dopamine neurons in monkeys helped establish a useful pattern. An unexpected reward produced a response. Once a signal reliably predicted the reward, much of the response shifted towards the signal. If the expected reward failed to appear, activity dipped around the time it should have arrived. The signal resembled a prediction error: better than expected, as expected or worse than expected. This does not mean every dopamine neuron in every setting computes one pure quantity. It does mean dopamine is better understood as part of an updating and energising system than as bottled happiness.

A familiar message can recruit several parts of this machinery at once. Memory supplies the sender and the place; emotion gives the message urgency; plans and consequences compete with the impulse to act. The brain's anatomy helps explain the division of labour. Dopamine cells in the midbrain communicate with the nucleus accumbens, which helps turn predicted value into pursuit, and with prefrontal networks involved in planning. Memory and emotion networks supply context. Parts of the striatum support practised actions. These are overlapping circuits, not departments with exclusive jobs. Naming one region does not explain the episode, any more than finding the accelerator explains where a car is going.

These operations can separate. A meal becomes less pleasant as hunger fades; a notification seizes attention before its contents are known. Some people receiving dopamine-agonist treatment for Parkinson's disease develop impulse-control problems. That association is another reason not to read dopamine as a pleasure score. What a chemical does depends on where, when and how it acts.

Pleasure itself also depends on more than dopamine. Opioid and endocannabinoid signalling contributes to hedonic reactions in smaller,

specialised networks. Sensory systems, bodily state and prior expectation alter what an experience feels like. Pain relief can be rewarding because an aversive state ends. Social recognition can matter without a drug entering the body. A prediction can direct behaviour before enjoyment begins.

This wider model prevents two errors. The first is biological reduction: addiction is not a tank overfilled with dopamine. Different substances reach reward and stress circuits through different molecular routes, and behavioural addictions have no injected molecule. The second is moral reduction: the learning system does not ask whether a reward is admirable. It records what arrived, what predicted it and what solved the immediate problem.

Nothing in that machinery is diseased by definition. A flexible brain assigns value, learns from surprise and makes the future pull on the present. The vulnerability is part of the achievement: a system that learns what deserves pursuit can come to give one outcome far more weight than the rest of life can bear.

Speed, Dose and Pattern Shape What Gets Learned

A nicotine patch, a piece of nicotine gum and a cigarette deliver the same active drug while creating different lessons. What matters is not the chemical name alone. Route, dose, speed of delivery, concentration, frequency and the interval between action and effect shape both intoxication and learning.

Rapid delivery tightens the connection. When an action is followed almost at once by a large change in brain state, there is little ambiguity about what caused what. Smoking delivers nicotine to the brain quickly. Inhaled or injected drugs can produce steeper rises in concentration than slower oral formulations. A faster rise is often more reinforcing and can support repeated dosing, although pharmacology, expectations and the person's history also matter. This is why two products containing the same active drug need not carry the same risk.

Dose changes the size of the effect, but more is not a universal synonym for more addictive. A higher dose may increase reinforcement and toxicity, or become unpleasant. Half-life is the time it takes for a drug's concentration to fall by half. That helps determine how long it remains in the body, although subjective effects need not follow the same timetable. A short-lived effect may invite redosing; a slowly cleared drug may accumulate. Formulation can flatten peaks. Compare a prescribed medicine taken on schedule with an uncertain supply of changing strength. The chemical name may stay the same while both the exposure and the day organised around it change.

Drugs can directly alter the signalling through which the brain learns value. That does not make them false rewards. It means a chemical exposure can change both how someone feels and the machinery learning what produced the change.

Surprise matters without a substance too. Uncertain outcomes can hold attention because the next event might differ. Many gambling products combine variable results with short intervals between opportunities, repeatedly renewing anticipation. Gaming can involve similar features. Neither a reward schedule nor time spent playing diagnoses a disorder: most players do not develop one. The relevant question is what repeated pursuit comes to displace.

Cues amplify the teaching environment. Packaging, music, lighting, a dealer's message, a pub route, a payday or the feeling after an argument can all become predictors. Advertising can make the cue available before the product. Smartphones put some forms of access in the pocket, without a journey to a venue or a closing time. Stored payment details remove another pause. None of these features causes addiction by itself. They can, however, shorten the interval between an urge and an action, then make the next action easier too.

There is no honest league table that ranks all substances and behaviours for every person. Dependence liability, overdose risk, withdrawal, social harm and speed of progression are different dimensions. Heroin, nicotine, alcohol, cocaine, gambling and gaming cannot be placed on one clean

ladder without choosing what counts. Even within one category, product, route and setting can transform risk.

The useful unit is the whole encounter, not the chemical or activity in isolation. A cigarette taken outside with colleagues, a patch worn through the day and gum used before a familiar craving involve nicotine, but they do not give the brain the same sequence to learn. Ask what arrives, how quickly it arrives, what predicts it and how soon it can happen again. Those details help explain why changing delivery can be treatment even when the active molecule stays.

Wanting Can Rise While Liking Falls

Someone can describe wanting a drug they no longer enjoy without contradicting themselves. In that uncomfortable gap lies one of addiction's most revealing mechanisms.

Everyday language bundles desire and pleasure together. You want what you like, consume it, enjoy it and stop when satisfied. That sequence often works, which is why addiction looks irrational when it breaks. Neuroscience gives the break a cleaner shape by separating liking from wanting.

Liking is hedonic impact, the pleasure in the experience. Wanting, in the technical sense used by incentive-salience theory, is the motivational pull assigned to the reward and its cues. It can operate without a conscious plan and without matching reported enjoyment. A familiar sight or bodily state becomes attention-grabbing, action-ready and hard to ignore. The person may sincerely expect little pleasure and still feel an urgent need to proceed.

Repeated drug exposure can sensitise some motivational responses while tolerance develops to other effects. One means more response and the other less, but they concern different processes. Euphoria or sedation from a familiar dose may weaken while cues associated with obtaining it gain force. Abstinence, stress or returning to an old setting can change that response. What has become sensitive is the readiness to want under particular conditions, not pleasure as a whole.

This helps explain why craving is episodic. A person may feel settled in a new city, then become preoccupied on returning to an old street. The drug has not entered the body. A cue has revived the prospect of using. Memory, emotion and conscious expectations can join the response; no scan reads out the resulting desire like a thermometer.

Wanting can also attach to relief. The anticipated outcome may be the end of anxiety, shame, pain, agitation or withdrawal rather than a positive high. The immediate value is real. That is why telling someone the behaviour no longer makes them happy can miss its current function. Happiness may have ceased to be the offer. The offer is that the next ten minutes will be bearable.

The distinction does not imply that everyone with addiction dislikes every episode. Pleasure can remain. Social belonging, ritual and intoxication can still be valued. Nor does it establish one universal path. Some harmful use remains deliberate and goal-directed. Some people plan carefully because the substance or behaviour still seems the best available answer to a bad situation. Habit, compulsion and incentive salience contribute in different proportions across people and times.

That gap changes the target of treatment. Making an outcome less enjoyable may help, but it need not stop a cue from making the outcome urgent. A person can know exactly how disappointing the next episode will be and still struggle when the familiar message arrives. Changing the route home or arranging company at that hour addresses the prediction before it becomes pursuit. The task is not to win another argument about whether the drug is worth it. The person may already agree.

Pleasure asks how good an experience feels. Wanting pulls towards obtaining it. Usually the two are close enough that we can afford to confuse them. When they separate, the pursuit can organise a day that the person takes little pleasure in living.

Cues and Repetition Can Compress Choice

At first, obtaining a drug may require a chain of conscious decisions. Find the contact. Arrange money. Choose a place. Judge the risk. Later, the sequence can begin before the person has finished naming the urge. A message arrives, a route is taken, cash is withdrawn and the plan is under way. Repetition has compressed thought into procedure.

Psychology distinguishes goal-directed action from habit. A goal-directed action is sensitive to what the outcome is worth and to whether the action still produces it. A habit is triggered more directly by a situation and can persist after the outcome has lost value. Both are normal. Habits free attention for other tasks. You do not want to reconsider every movement involved in making tea or driving a familiar road.

Addiction can recruit the same efficiency. Repeated seeking and taking strengthen links among cues, actions and outcomes. Animal studies and human experiments implicate changing interactions between ventral and dorsal parts of the striatum, with control becoming less dependent on fresh evaluation. The popular version turns this into a conveyor belt from voluntary use to mindless compulsion. The evidence does not support one inevitable sequence for everyone. Human behaviour can remain planned, value-sensitive and responsive to alternatives even in severe disorder.

The better picture is competition among control systems. A cue-triggered routine can launch quickly. A goal-directed system can interrupt it, but only if the consequence, alternative and stopping rule are represented strongly enough in time. Stress, sleep loss, intoxication and cognitive load can weaken that interruption. Distance and delay favour the learned routine. The long-term cost may be certain yet psychologically faint; the immediate action is practised, available and close.

Context explains apparent inconsistency. Someone may avoid use at work, around a child or in a clinic, then lose control alone at night. That pattern is sometimes treated as proof that they could stop everywhere if they cared. It points towards a more useful explanation: different settings bring different

cues, constraints and alternatives. Control is neither absent nor evenly distributed. The task is to move the conditions that support it into the high-risk setting.

Rituals matter because they stitch the chain together. Grinding, pouring, rolling, logging in, checking odds, choosing music and preparing a room can become reinforcing steps. Each predicts the next and reduces the time available for reconsideration. The final act is supported by a sequence of smaller commitments. Interrupting an early link can be easier than resisting the completed chain.

This is also why abstinence does not erase learning. A cue association can weaken when repeatedly encountered without the old outcome, while new responses gain strength. Yet the original memory may remain and reappear after stress, time or a change of context. A return of craving after years does not mean nothing was learned in recovery. It means old learning can coexist with newer learning.

Compulsion describes severe difficulty resisting behaviour despite consequences. It does not establish a reflex with no agency. Nor can it be inferred from repetition alone. How much an episode owes to routine, cue-triggered wanting or a deliberate search for relief remains an empirical question, not a tribal loyalty.

Consider a hypothetical sequence: an argument, a cash withdrawal, a familiar route and a purchase. By the time the purchase is possible, several earlier decisions have made it easier. A plan can intervene sooner, perhaps with a call after the argument or a different route agreed in advance. The change need not remove the urge to interrupt its usual sequel. Addiction gains some of its power by making a harmful action efficient. Recovery can use that same efficiency in the other direction, rehearsing a safer response until it no longer has to be invented under pressure.

Relief Joins Reward: Tolerance, Withdrawal and Stress

The early question may be, “How good will this feel?” The later question can become, “How bad will I feel without it?” That shift does not happen in every addiction, but where it does, the motivational system acquires a second engine.

Tolerance means that repeated exposure produces a reduced response to a given dose, or that more is required to produce a previous effect. It can arise through several mechanisms. Receptors and signalling pathways adapt. Metabolism may change. Behavioural tolerance develops as people learn to function under familiar conditions. Tolerance is specific: it may develop faster to one effect than another, and it can fall during abstinence. That last fact helps make return to a previous opioid dose dangerous after a period without use.

Physical dependence is adaptation revealed when exposure stops or falls. Withdrawal differs by substance and person. Alcohol and benzodiazepine withdrawal can involve seizures, delirium and death. Someone who may be dependent needs clinical advice before stopping; benzodiazepine dependence can develop even at prescribed doses. Opioid withdrawal can cause severe vomiting, diarrhoea, pain, agitation and dehydration. A major fatal danger arises when use resumes after tolerance has fallen or when opioids are combined with other sedatives. Nicotine withdrawal often brings irritability and concentration problems; caffeine withdrawal can bring headache and fatigue. Withdrawal shows that the body has adapted. It does not, by itself, establish addiction.

That distinction matters in medicine. A patient taking an opioid for pain or a benzodiazepine as prescribed may become physically dependent. Stopping suddenly can produce symptoms, yet their life need not be organised around compulsive use. Conversely, gambling disorder involves no drug withdrawal in the pharmacological sense and can still produce severe loss of control and harm. Dependence and addiction overlap in many cases, but they are not synonyms.

Negative reinforcement means an action becomes more likely because it removes or reduces something aversive. A drink quiets tremor. An opioid ends withdrawal. A bet suspends dread. A stimulant postpones exhaustion. The relief teaches. As repeated cycles recruit stress systems and ordinary reward becomes less effective, the baseline between episodes can feel worse. George Koob and colleagues describe this as an allostatic shift: regulation is maintained around a costly new state rather than restored to the old one.

The model must not become a universal chemical story. People also use substances or behaviours to manage trauma memories, loneliness, chronic pain, social fear, boredom, poverty, discrimination or an untreated mental disorder. Sometimes the relief is pharmacological. Sometimes it is attentional, social or symbolic. A gambling session can supply absorption and temporary escape. Drinking can supply a group and a role. Removal without replacement exposes the problem the behaviour had been solving.

Stress then tightens the loop. Acute stress can increase craving and narrow attention. Chronic instability reduces the spare capacity needed for planning and delay. Consequences of use, including debt, conflict, job loss, shame and criminalisation, create more of the state from which relief is sought. The disorder begins to manufacture its own triggers.

The action may now promise escape rather than fun. Punishment alone can intensify the state being escaped. Withdrawal management can relieve an acute biological problem without resolving pain, debt or unsafe housing. A body can be drug-free while the conditions that made the drug valuable remain present.

Treatment becomes stronger when it asks two questions together: what is pulling the person towards the behaviour, and what are they trying to get away from? The same episode may contain desire, habit and relief. Each requires a different lever, and none is well described by “likes it too much”.

Vulnerability Is Built From Genes, Development and Circumstance

There is no addictive personality waiting to reveal itself. There are risk factors, protective factors and routes into disorder, and they combine differently.

Twin and family studies consistently find a substantial inherited contribution to substance use disorders at population level, but estimates vary by substance, population, age and method. That does not divide one person's addiction into genetic and environmental percentages. Heritability describes differences within a studied population under its existing conditions. It can change when availability, law or culture changes, and it does not identify a fixed destiny.

The genetics are polygenic: many variants contribute small effects, with both shared liability across disorders and substance-specific influences. There is no single addiction gene. Present datasets overrepresent people of European ancestry, limiting prediction elsewhere. A risk score is not a diagnosis, however impressive its decimal places look.

Development matters because learning, control and social worlds change with age. Adolescence and young adulthood bring heightened exposure to peers, novelty and identity formation while planning systems are still developing. Earlier initiation is associated with later disorder, but association includes family, social and genetic confounding. There is no birthday on which the brain becomes fully mature, and “twenty-five” is not a neurological switch. Risk can begin later through pain, bereavement, prescription exposure, unemployment or isolation.

Mental disorders and addiction commonly travel together. Depression, anxiety, attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, post-traumatic stress, psychosis and personality difficulties can raise risk or complicate recovery. The causal arrows run both ways and may share upstream causes. Treating one while refusing the other creates a service boundary where the person experiences one life.

Environment supplies exposure and alternatives. Price, marketing, prescribing, neighbourhood supply, online access and peer norms affect what can be learned. Housing, work, family safety, discrimination and criminal justice affect the cost of change. The famous follow-up of US soldiers returning from Vietnam remains a caution against permanent-trait accounts. Heroin use and reported dependence rose sharply in the war setting, then fell for many men after return. The cohort was unusual, the measures belong to their period and some continued to struggle. The study shows that severe involvement need not persist when circumstances change. It cannot isolate which changes were responsible, or promise the same result elsewhere.

Protective factors are not moral medals. A secure home, money, flexible work, transport, childcare, a trusted clinician and friends who do not use may turn an intention into a feasible plan. Their absence is sometimes redescribed as low motivation. A person sleeping rough beside an open drug market is being asked to perform a different behavioural task from someone leaving residential treatment for a stable household.

Biology still imposes limits. Potent opioids can suppress breathing in any social class; alcohol can injure organs regardless of biography. Context does not cancel exposure. It helps explain why the same exposure means different things in different lives, and why changing one condition need not change them all.

The pressures also interact. Imagine someone whose pain interrupts sleep and whose only dependable relief is a rapidly acting drug. Exhaustion can make a delayed alternative less attractive; easy access can make repetition almost effortless. Treating the pain, improving sleep or changing delivery addresses a different part of the same problem. None would erase every vulnerability. The value of this model is that it supplies more than one place to intervene, without pretending that everyone arrived by the same route.

The Same Plasticity Can Reopen Choice

People recover through different routes, with and without formal treatment, after short and long courses. Abstinence, medication or reduced harm may be the immediate goal. That range is hard to reconcile with a permanent hijacker. It makes more sense when the brain is understood as a system still capable of learning.

Old learning is durable, which is why recovery is not deletion. Cues can regain force after months or years. Stress can expose an action that seemed settled. A lapse can rapidly restore an old sequence. Yet new learning can become stronger, more available and supported by different surroundings. The practical aim is not a brain with no memory of the reward. It is a life in which that memory no longer wins most of the important contests.

Medication can change what a day demands. For someone repeatedly seeking short-acting opioids to avoid withdrawal, treatment with methadone or buprenorphine can reduce that pressure without requiring them to begin by enduring it unaided. These medicines reduce illicit opioid use; remaining in treatment is associated with lower mortality. Stabilisation can leave more room for work, relationships and other treatment. The medicine has not supplied a new life. It has helped make one possible. Whether treatment continues long term or is eventually tapered is a clinical decision, not a test of moral progress.

Behavioural treatment works on the same timetable problem from another direction. The harmful reward is often available now; the rewards of stopping arrive later. A therapy session can rehearse what to do when a particular cue appears. A contingency-management programme can attach an immediate reward to a verified goal. Neither asks the person to become immune to consequences. Both make consequences more useful. Recovery need not rely on a distant healthy future winning every argument against relief available in minutes.

Mutual-help groups can add identity, structure, models of change and a

social network organised around recovery. Twelve-step facilitation and Alcoholics Anonymous have evidence for helping some people with alcohol problems, including sustained abstinence in several comparisons, but they are not the only route and will not fit everyone. Peer support, secular groups, family work and culturally specific services can perform related functions through different languages.

Harm reduction keeps change possible, but its tools do different jobs. Naloxone can temporarily reverse opioid-induced respiratory depression; emergency help remains necessary. Sterile injecting equipment reduces infection risk. Supervised consumption settings provide someone who can recognise and respond to an overdose. Drug checking can identify some unexpected contents, but no test establishes that a product is safe. These are distinct protections, not interchangeable guarantees. Abstinence may be the safest goal for some people and substances. It is not a condition for deserving care.

Recovery also depends on what researchers call recovery capital: internal and external resources that make change sustainable. Health, housing, money, skills, purpose, legal stability, transport, relationships and a community that permits a new identity all count. An appointment has less chance of changing the week if the person leaves it with the same debt, the same ready supply and nowhere to sleep. Those obstacles belong in the treatment plan, not outside its definition.

Return to use is therefore information, not a verdict. It can be dangerous, especially when tolerance has fallen, and it may show that treatment intensity, medication, environment or support needs changing. Calling every lapse proof that the person is back at the beginning discards what has been learned and can convert one episode into abandonment.

The brain that learnt the old routine is also the brain that must learn the new one. Its ability to assign value, remember cues and practise actions was part of the vulnerability. That ability remains a resource. Safer actions and relationships can acquire weight through experience, especially when the surrounding world makes them easier to repeat. Recovery does not require

a return to a person who has never learnt any of this. It requires the past to have less control over what happens next.

How It Actually Works

Before the first exposure

Imagine an unopened bottle on a kitchen table. To one person it promises company, to another a way to quieten an exhausting day. Someone else barely notices it. The first difference appears before anybody drinks: what the available outcome is expected to do.

The contrast is illustrative, not a set of patient histories. An adult drinking with friends and an adult drinking alone after a frightening experience may consume the same chemical, but dose, speed, companions and anticipated relief can differ. An unpleasant effect may discourage repetition; relief or belonging may invite it. Neither reaction predicts a whole life. Nor does a sociable setting make heavy drinking safe. The first lesson is being shaped by more than the molecule, and the molecule still matters.

Inherited differences affect metabolism, impulsivity, stress response and vulnerability to other mental disorders. Development affects planning, peer sensitivity and opportunity. Pain, insomnia, grief and trauma alter what relief is worth. Supply determines which products are cheap, strong and close. Marketing supplies expectations before exposure. A prescription can provide medically useful access while also creating risk that depends on dose, duration, monitoring and the person's history.

The relevant starting point is therefore a field of possibilities. Most exposed people do not develop addiction. Some never repeat the experience. Some use heavily for a period and stop. Some suffer harm without impaired control. A smaller group finds that one outcome solves an immediate problem with enough force and reliability to be learned repeatedly.

The first lesson

Different drugs create different acute states because they act at different molecular targets. Opioids activate opioid receptors and can produce analgesia, euphoria and dangerous respiratory depression. Stimulants such as cocaine and amphetamine alter monoamine signalling through distinct mechanisms. Nicotine activates nicotinic acetylcholine receptors. Alcohol affects several signalling systems rather than one receptor. Cannabis acts mainly through cannabinoid receptors. Sedatives enhance inhibitory signalling. Pharmacology owns the full account of targets, dose and disposition. Addiction asks what the resulting state teaches.

Many addictive drugs increase dopamine signalling in mesolimbic pathways directly or indirectly, but that common route does not make them interchangeable. The subjective experience, bodily risks, withdrawal and time course differ. The drug may deliver pleasure, relief, energy, calm, social ease or escape. It may also cause nausea, panic or dysphoria. Prior belief and setting alter the interpretation of bodily changes.

Timing binds the lesson to the action. A rapid effect following smoking, inhaling or injecting can strongly reinforce the behaviour that produced it. Slower oral delivery spreads the change over time and can weaken the action-effect link, though it does not make a drug harmless. Repeated small doses can still build a dense network of cues. Someone who smokes through the day performs many thousands of tightly paired cue-action-drug sequences each year.

Behavioural addictions reach the learning system without a pharmacological agent. A bet produces uncertainty, anticipation and an outcome. A game can produce rapid feedback, social status and a persistent world. The recognised disorders involve impaired control and harm, not the mere presence of rewards. The same activity can be recreation for one person, work for another and a disorder for a third because the pattern, function and consequences differ.

The cue arrives first

After repetition, the brain begins predicting. The pub sign, lighter, payday, login screen, smell of smoke, argument or lonely hour becomes part of the learned event. Attention turns towards it. The body prepares. A thought that feels spontaneous may be the conscious edge of a process already under way.

Conditioning does not require a person to believe the cue is magical. It is enough that the cue has repeatedly preceded the outcome. Some cues are external, such as a place or person. Others are internal: anxiety, pain, fatigue, excitement or the first signs of withdrawal. A sequence can contain dozens of predictors, each handing control to the next.

This is why craving can look irrationally specific. The person may have no urge in hospital and an overwhelming urge on the walk home. The protected setting removed money, contacts, privacy and familiar routes while supplying structure and observation. Returning home restores the old map. Treatment that interprets this as a sudden loss of sincerity misunderstands what changed.

Craving is not one measurable object. It can mean an intrusive thought, bodily tension, anticipated relief, deliberate intention or cue-triggered pull. It often rises and falls rather than increasing until action becomes inevitable. Delay matters because the peak can pass. So do company, distance and a rehearsed next step. The aim is not to argue with every urge. It is to prevent the urge from inheriting a completed plan.

Repetition changes the competition

Each episode has immediate effects and delayed consequences. The immediate outcome is vivid. The delayed cost is represented in memory, language and plans. As repetition strengthens cue-action links, the immediate sequence becomes easier to start and harder to interrupt. Meanwhile other rewards may weaken through neglect: friendships thin, work becomes unstable, food and sleep deteriorate, hobbies disappear. The harmful option is gaining practice while its competitors lose it.

Tolerance can encourage escalation when a previous dose no longer produces the expected effect. Sensitised cue responses can increase pursuit even while enjoyment falls. Habits can make initiation more automatic. Intoxication can impair the control needed to stop once use begins. Stress and withdrawal can make abstaining feel costly now. None of these mechanisms alone defines addiction. Together they can tilt repeated choices in the same direction.

Consequences feed back. Debt creates fear. Conflict creates loneliness. Stigma encourages secrecy. Criminalisation can add unstable supply, imprisonment and exclusion from work or housing. The person may then use to escape states partly produced by prior use and its social response. The cycle becomes self-supporting.

The phrase loss of control can mislead if imagined as a switch. Control often fails in particular ways: using more than intended, starting earlier, being unable to stop after the first dose, returning after a firm decision, or spending increasing time obtaining, using and recovering. People may retain control over where, when or with whom while losing it over frequency or total amount. Clinical assessment needs the pattern, not a courtroom verdict on whether choice existed.

What clinicians diagnose

No blood test establishes addiction. Diagnosis is based on behaviour, experience, time and impairment. Systems differ in wording, but the centre is stable: difficulty controlling use or behaviour, growing priority over other activities, and continuation despite harm. Craving, tolerance and withdrawal may support the picture but are not required in every disorder.

Quantity matters because exposure creates risk, yet it cannot carry the diagnosis alone. A person can drink at a medically hazardous level without reporting impaired control. Another can gamble infrequently but produce severe financial and relational harm during episodes. A patient can develop tolerance and withdrawal while taking a medicine as directed. The question is how the pattern is organised and what it is doing to life.

Severity is dimensional. Mild and severe presentations should not be forced into one stereotype. So should course. Symptoms can remit, recur or change substance. A period of abstinence in prison or hospital demonstrates non-use under constraint, not necessarily stable control in ordinary life. A return to use after treatment is clinically important but does not erase every gain.

Assessment also asks about immediate danger. Intoxication, overdose, self-harm, violence, pregnancy, safeguarding, infection, nutrition and unstable housing can outrank the diagnostic label. Co-occurring depression, psychosis, trauma, attention problems or chronic pain may require treatment at the same time. A service that demands one problem be solved before acknowledging the other has mistaken administration for a person.

The stopping point can be dangerous

Stopping is not one biological event. For some behaviours and substances, the main difficulties are craving, low mood, sleep disruption and the return of problems that use had masked. Alcohol and benzodiazepine withdrawal can be life-threatening. Anyone who may be physically dependent should seek clinical advice before abruptly stopping or sharply reducing use, including people taking benzodiazepines as prescribed. Medically assisted withdrawal manages acute risk. It does not, by itself, treat the learned cues or the conditions to which the person will return.

Opioid withdrawal can be intensely aversive and can cause vomiting, diarrhoea, dehydration, pain and rapid return to use. A major fatal danger comes after tolerance has fallen: an amount previously survived can then suppress breathing. Release from prison, discharge from detoxification and gaps in treatment are high-risk transitions because the person may return to an unpredictable supply with less tolerance.

For a suspected overdose, call emergency services immediately: 999 in the UK, or the local emergency number elsewhere. Unresponsiveness and absent or abnormal breathing are emergency signs. Give naloxone if opioid overdose is possible and it is available, follow the dispatcher's instructions

and stay with the person. Naloxone can displace opioids from receptors and temporarily restore breathing, but its effect can wear off before the opioid does; further doses may be needed. It buys time for help, not permission to leave. Avoiding solitary use and dangerous sedative combinations, and recognising reduced tolerance, can reduce risk before an emergency begins.

The moral temptation is to make safety conditional on abstinence. The clinical logic runs the other way. A dead person cannot recover, and a preventable infection, prison sentence or eviction can make later change harder. Reducing harm preserves both life and future options.

Treatment begins by matching the problem

There is no generic treatment called rehab that fits every disorder. Good care starts with the substance or behaviour, severity, withdrawal risk, previous attempts, physical and mental health, goals, social conditions and what treatment the person will accept.

The initial goal may be abstinence, reduced use, stabilisation on medication, safer consumption, restored sleep, attendance or survival through a crisis. These goals can change. Presenting abstinence and harm reduction as enemy philosophies obscures the practical sequence. A person may begin by carrying naloxone and using less dangerously, enter opioid agonist treatment, stabilise housing and later choose further change. Another may need immediate abstinence because continued alcohol use is medically unsafe. The goal follows risk and preference, not one ideology.

Motivation is also not a possession people either bring or lack. It varies across time and outcomes. Someone may want to keep the relief, lose the debt, avoid withdrawal and preserve a relationship, all at once. Motivational interviewing makes that ambivalence discussable rather than demanding a declaration of pure commitment before help begins.

The setting matters. Outpatient care can preserve work and family life. Residential treatment can provide distance and intensity but may create a difficult return to unchanged surroundings. Peer-led support can be

immediate and durable. Primary care, specialist services, pharmacies, emergency departments, prisons and digital services each see different parts of the problem. The best doorway is the one the person can enter and continue using.

Medicine changes the contest

For opioid dependence, methadone and buprenorphine are two of the best-supported treatments, not consolation prizes. Taken in regulated doses, they prevent withdrawal, reduce craving and disrupt the repeated cycle of seeking an uncertain short-acting supply. Retention in treatment is associated with lower all-cause and overdose mortality. The danger rises when treatment ends, which makes arbitrary discharge for continued use particularly perverse.

Naltrexone takes a different approach: it blocks opioid receptors rather than activating them. For opioid dependence it is an option after detoxification in selected patients. A clinician must establish an adequate opioid-free interval before it begins, because starting too soon can precipitate severe withdrawal. Naltrexone and acamprosate also have evidence for improving alcohol outcomes, with selection shaped by goals, health and contraindications. For adults who smoke, options such as nicotine replacement, varenicline and bupropion can improve quit rates, especially with behavioural support. These are different tools, not competing versions of one cure.

No medication has the same established, broadly recommended role for stimulant or cannabis use disorders that opioid agonist treatment has for opioid dependence. In the United States, the 2024 ASAM and AAAP guideline places contingency management at the centre of stimulant treatment and allows selected off-label medicines under clinical judgement. For cannabis use disorder, psychosocial treatment remains central and no broadly established medicine has emerged. These gaps do not make the disorders less biological. They reflect differences in pharmacology, outcomes and the evidence base.

Average trial effects do not determine every person's outcome, but medicine also has a defined scope. Adherence, dose, access, side effects and treatment duration matter. A medicine can reduce withdrawal, intoxication or craving without supplying housing or a new peer group. The correct comparison is not medicine versus willpower. It is the untreated system versus a system whose biological pressure has been altered enough for other changes to hold.

Learning can be prescribed

Behavioural treatment works by changing predictions, skills, contingencies and context. Cognitive behavioural approaches identify high-risk situations, examine expectations, plan responses and practise coping. They do not require pretending thoughts cause everything. Their value lies in making the sequence visible early enough to alter it.

Contingency management makes a consequence arrive sooner. In a typical design, a person provides a sample to test for a target drug and earns a voucher when the agreed result is verified. The reward is tied to a specific behaviour, not to a clinician's impression that the person seems sincere. Programmes differ, and testing has limits, but the principle is consistent: make progress pay while it is happening. Evidence is particularly strong for stimulant use disorder. Critics call it bribery. The brain calls it a reliable consequence. Health years from now still matters; a prompt reward gives it some competition today.

Cue exposure, mindfulness and acceptance-based methods can help some people notice urges without completing the routine. Skills training can improve refusal, emotion regulation and problem solving. Family approaches can change reinforcement within the household. Treatment for trauma, depression, attention problems or pain may reduce the states from which use offers escape, though no single therapy should be sold as the hidden cure for all addiction.

Mutual-help organisations add repetition of another kind: meetings, commitments, language, peers and visible examples of life after use.

Alcoholics Anonymous and related twelve-step facilitation have evidence for some alcohol outcomes and can be accessed for years at low cost. Other people prefer SMART Recovery, secular groups, medication-focused care, cultural or faith communities, or no group. Fit affects continuation, and continuation affects opportunity to learn.

Recovery changes the environment of choice

Early recovery can feel unrewarding because the old option is immediate and overlearned while ordinary life pays slowly. Sleep may be poor. Trust returns by instalments. Work, money and health can remain damaged after use stops. Expecting instant gratitude misunderstands the timetable.

Recovery capital names the resources that make the safer sequence sustainable: physical health, housing, income, transport, skills, legal stability, supportive relationships, identity and places where time can be spent without constant cue exposure. These are not extras added after clinical treatment. They change the decision problem itself.

The person also needs new sources of reward. Exercise, food, work, caregiving, art, faith, sport and friendship are not interchangeable prescriptions, and they do not produce a pharmacological substitute high. Their role is cumulative. They make attention, status, relief, structure and belonging available through more than one route. A life with several valued answers is harder for one cue to dominate.

Remission can be stable. Population studies find many people improve, sometimes without specialist treatment, while clinical cohorts often contain more severe and recurrent cases. Both observations are true because the samples answer different questions. Calling addiction inevitably progressive ignores natural recovery. Calling treatment unnecessary ignores those at highest risk and the deaths that occur while waiting.

A lapse should trigger a rapid review of what changed: medication stopped, tolerance fell, a cue returned, housing was lost, pain worsened, support vanished or the treatment never matched the function of use. Shame adds little information. The aim is to shorten the episode, restore safety and

revise the system before repetition rebuilds momentum.

Recovery is therefore measurable in more than abstinent days. Reduced mortality, less hazardous use, stable treatment, better health, restored function, safer relationships and growing choice can all matter. The endpoint belongs partly to the person, but immediate risk still places limits on what can safely be left alone.

How we know

Addiction science combines methods that see different parts of the process. Animal experiments permit tight control over drugs, cues and reinforcement but cannot reproduce human meaning, poverty or law. Human laboratory studies can measure craving, choice and brain activity under controlled conditions while sampling short episodes and selected volunteers. Imaging shows correlated activity and adaptation, not a photograph of compulsion or a diagnostic test.

Longitudinal cohorts reveal course and risk but cannot randomise childhood, neighbourhood or exposure. Genetic studies estimate population-level liability and remain ancestry-limited. Clinical trials can test treatments, though retention, comparison care and selected participants affect transportability. Administrative and mortality data capture severe outcomes while missing much recovery outside services. Qualitative work shows how relief, identity and institutions are experienced, but does not estimate universal frequencies.

The strongest claims in this book are those that survive across levels: reward learning is distributed; dopamine is not a pleasure meter; dependence and addiction differ; risk is heterogeneous; context affects course; and matched medication and behavioural treatment can improve outcomes. The precise mixture of wanting, habit, stress and choice in one person remains a clinical question rather than a settled scan.

What People Get Wrong

“Dopamine is the pleasure chemical”

The phrase survives because dopamine responds around rewards, drugs affect dopamine pathways and a single chemical is easier to sell than a distributed learning system. It also turns ordinary enjoyment into a meter: more dopamine, more pleasure, more danger.

The evidence separates the pieces. Midbrain dopamine activity often reflects prediction error, cue value, motivation and learning. Responses can move from an unexpected reward to the cue that predicts it. In animal work, changing dopamine can increase pursuit without increasing characteristic hedonic reactions; human studies also separate cue-driven motivation from reported enjoyment. Pleasure depends on opioid, endocannabinoid, sensory and cortical processes as well. The exact function varies across circuits and tasks.

This correction matters because a “dopamine detox” is not a neurological drain-cleaning exercise, and a high dopamine response does not diagnose addiction. Reducing constant cue exposure may still help attention and habits. The explanation is behavioural: fewer prompts, fewer rehearsals and more room for other actions. Addiction concerns a pattern of impaired control and harm, not contamination by a molecule required for movement, learning and motivation. The chemistry matters, but its meaning comes from the circuit, timing and behaviour it changes.

“Addiction is either a choice or a brain disease”

The argument persists because each side protects something important. Choice language preserves agency and accountability. Disease language recognises altered biology, suffering and the need for treatment. Each becomes false when it claims the whole field.

Repeated use changes the brain because learning changes the brain. Drugs can add pharmacological adaptations, and severe addiction can constrain attention, valuation and control. Yet brain change alone does not

settle whether disease is the best organising label. Reading, bereavement and skilled practice also change brains. People respond to reasons, incentives, relationships and settings even when control is impaired.

A better account is constrained agency within a biopsychosocial disorder. Actions still have causes and consequences. Responsibility can be preserved without blame, humiliation or the fantasy that everyone faces the same choice. Medical care can be offered without declaring the person powerless. The correction matters at the bedside and in policy: punishment is not treatment, but treatment that erases participation can fail too. The task is to increase the person's practical control, not win a metaphysical argument about whether it ever existed. Disease language can support access to care in some systems and can encourage fatalism when presented as irreversible, so its effects should be judged rather than assumed.

“Tolerance and withdrawal prove addiction”

This mistake is persuasive because tolerance, escalating dose and feeling ill on stopping often appear in severe substance addiction. Older language also used dependence and addiction loosely, leaving the words tangled.

Tolerance is a reduced response after repeated exposure. Physical dependence is adaptation revealed by withdrawal when exposure falls. Both can occur during appropriate medical treatment. A patient taking an opioid, benzodiazepine or another medicine may need careful tapering without compulsively seeking it or continuing despite harm. Conversely, gambling disorder has no pharmacological tolerance or withdrawal and can still involve impaired control, rising priority and major consequences.

The distinction changes care. A physically dependent patient should not be stigmatised as addicted, and abrupt cessation may be unsafe. Someone with severe behavioural addiction should not be dismissed because no drug is present. Addiction is diagnosed from the organisation of behaviour and life, with tolerance and withdrawal treated as relevant features rather than entrance tickets. Language that collapses the categories can produce both

undertreatment and dangerous overconfidence. It also obscures falling tolerance, which can raise overdose risk when use resumes after abstinence.

“There is one addictive personality”

People search for a type because it promises prediction. If addiction belongs to impulsive, damaged or irresponsible personalities, everyone else can feel protected and clinicians can look for one profile.

Risk does not arrange itself so neatly. Genetic liability is spread across many variants. Impulsivity, sensation seeking, compulsivity, stress sensitivity and emotional distress can contribute, but no trait appears in everyone and each exists in many people without addiction. Some people plan their use carefully. Some develop addiction during treatment for pain; physical dependence alone is a separate possibility. Some develop problems during trauma, bereavement or isolation. Others have stable lives until product availability or circumstance changes.

The correction matters because prevention must address exposure, development and setting as well as individual vulnerability. It also changes prognosis. A trait is easily mistaken for a permanent sentence; a pathway contains points where conditions can move. Assessment should ask what function the behaviour performs, when control fails, what alternatives exist and which risks are modifiable. A stereotype misses both the quiet patient who does not look chaotic and the apparently reckless person whose real problem is untreated distress. Family history raises questions for assessment; it does not answer them.

“You have to hit rock bottom”

The myth turns catastrophe into a treatment requirement. It is compelling because some recovery stories contain a dramatic loss followed by change, and the narrative gives suffering a clean purpose.

There is no clinical threshold at which motivation suddenly becomes authentic. People change after small warnings, major crises, accumulated

exhaustion or an opportunity that arrives at the right time. Waiting can mean overdose, liver failure, suicide, imprisonment, infection, lost custody or death. Those are not therapeutic ingredients.

Intervention can begin wherever the person is. A brief conversation, medication, safer-use advice, family boundary, financial block, contingency programme or housing offer may alter the next decision. Ambivalence is expected; it does not disqualify care. Harm reduction can preserve life and contact while goals develop. The correction also protects families from staging ever harsher consequences in the hope of manufacturing readiness. Boundaries may be necessary for safety, but abandonment is not a motivational technology. The best moment to widen choice is before the remaining choices have been destroyed. Early help also permits smaller, safer experiments in change while work, housing and relationships still provide leverage.

“Relapse means treatment failed”

The word invites an all-or-nothing verdict: either perfect abstinence or a return to the beginning. That frame matches acute treatments in which recurrence can signal failure, but addiction has a variable course and its risks change over time.

Return to use can show that medication ended, tolerance fell, cues reappeared, distress rose or the treatment never addressed the behaviour's function. It can be brief or sustained. It can also be lethal, especially with opioids after abstinence, so reassurance must not become minimisation.

Treatment should be judged across outcomes: survival, retention, reduced hazardous use, fewer overdoses, better health, restored function and sustained remission. One episode can coexist with months of learning and improvement. The useful response is rapid safety, renewed treatment and analysis of the failed link. Discharge, shame and the claim that the person was never serious often remove protection at the moment risk is highest. A lapse is not nothing. It is evidence, and evidence should change the plan. Stable remission is common enough to reject hopelessness, while recurrent

severe illness is common enough to reject complacency.

“Anything pleasurable can be an addiction”

The modern label spreads because it makes strong habits sound scientific and allows products to be criticised with medical force. People speak of addiction to sugar, phones, exercise, shopping, sex, work or television when they mean frequent, tempting or hard to reduce.

Pleasure, repetition and regret are not enough for a disorder. Clinical classifications recognise substance disorders and a limited set of behavioural addictions, notably gambling and gaming in ICD-11. Other proposed categories remain debated, may sit under different diagnoses or may describe harmful behaviour without a distinct addiction syndrome. The absence of recognition does not make suffering imaginary; it means the best model is unsettled.

The correction protects both sides. Ordinary enthusiasm should not be pathologised because somebody spends more time on it than an observer approves. Serious impairment should not be trivialised by comparing it with liking biscuits. Ask about control, priority, persistence, harm and function. Then ask whether addiction is the model that best explains the pattern, rather than using the word as a louder synonym for wanting something often. Classification should earn its place by improving explanation, prognosis or care.

Use It

Look for narrowing, not indulgence

The most useful question is not how much pleasure somebody is taking. It is what the pursuit is displacing.

Map the field around it. Has work become a route to money for use? Are meals, sleep and appointments organised around access or recovery? Have friends become sources, cover or obstacles? Does the person continue after the effect has become disappointing? Does one behaviour answer

boredom, pain, celebration, shame and loneliness alike?

Narrowing distinguishes addiction from enthusiasm more cleanly than intensity does. A musician can practise for hours while life grows larger through skill, friendship and purpose. A person can drink less than somebody else while their world contracts around the next opportunity. Quantity and frequency still matter for medical risk, but they do not reveal the whole structure. Ask instead: "What has it started deciding for you?" That makes control, function and cost visible without demanding a confession of bad character.

Separate liking, wanting, relief and habit

Ask four questions about the same episode. Was the outcome enjoyable? How strong was the pull before it happened? What unpleasant state did it remove? How much of the sequence ran as a practised routine?

The answers may differ. Imagine someone who enjoys a drink with dinner but, on another evening, feels a powerful pull towards drinking they expect to regret. A physically dependent person may instead drink in the morning to relieve shaking after alcohol levels have fallen. That is a reason for clinical assessment and a safe withdrawal plan, not advice to self-treat with alcohol. Pouring at a familiar hour can also be partly routine. Enjoyment, wanting, relief and habit overlap, but they are not one event with four names.

Medication may reduce withdrawal or reward. Therapy may address the fear or memory from which relief is sought. A changed route or blocked payment may interrupt habit. A planned call may compete with cue-triggered wanting. The exercise is analytical, not diagnostic; its value is to prevent one explanation from doing every job.

Map the teaching conditions

Write the sequence from cue to consequence as if examining a machine. What happened in the hour before? How quickly could the reward be reached? What did it cost at that moment? How large, variable and immediate was the effect? How soon could the next episode begin? Who was present? What state was the person in?

Small details matter. A saved card removes payment friction. A nearby dealer removes travel. A fast route compresses cause and effect. Private access removes observation. A variable reward preserves uncertainty. A payday or argument supplies a cue. Together they create a dense training schedule.

Then reverse the map. Add a pause before access, arrange company during the high-risk hour, or make an appointment feasible by arranging transport. The useful change is the one that interrupts this person's sequence, not the longest list of precautions.

A plan that starts at the final moment is arriving after most of the system has voted.

Move the environment before testing willpower

Keeping an app, contact or alcohol cabinet within reach can turn each evening into the same difficult test. Avoiding the cue may feel like admitting weakness, even though the aim is to change behaviour, not audition for exceptional self-control. There is no extra clinical credit for recovering on the hardest available setting.

Control is easier in some settings than others. Use that fact. Build an environment in which the preferred action occurs often enough to become practised. Early recovery may justify blunt controls: self-exclusion, supervised dosing, removing supply, avoiding a social group or living elsewhere for a time.

Environment includes people and institutions. A clinician who offers rapid follow-up changes the interval after a lapse. An employer who permits

treatment attendance changes its opportunity cost. Stable housing can reduce constant cue exposure and makes medication storage possible. A family boundary can reduce rescue of harmful behaviour while preserving contact and emergency help.

Willpower is real. It is also a limited intervention. Spend it where redesign cannot do the work first.

Measure function and control, not quantity alone

Counting drinks, doses, cigarettes, bets or hours can reveal exposure and trend. It can also mislead when treated as a complete verdict.

Put function beside the count: money diverted, care neglected, unsafe episodes and attempts to stop that did not hold. Record improvements too, such as treatment continued, rent paid and activities resumed. A ledger of problems should also register recovery.

Low quantity does not excuse severe episodic harm. A high prescribed dose does not by itself establish addiction, nor does a prescription guarantee safety. Ask about impaired control and consequences as well as whether treatment is helping. Counts become useful when attached to a specific substance, exposure and pattern.

Is choice widening? Are episodes shorter or less dangerous? Is control returning where it used to fail? Recognise progress without pretending that a high-risk pattern is safe.

Build a stack, not a single answer

Addiction is rarely sustained by one mechanism, so treatment should not be forced into one contest between medication, therapy, meetings and determination.

Immediate dangers such as overdose, severe withdrawal or violence come first. Medication, where appropriate, can reduce pressure to use; practical support makes it easier to continue treatment. A therapy plan needs somewhere to be practised. A financial block needs rent and food protected,

not just a closed account. Look for a missing support or a contradiction between supports, rather than demanding that one intervention carry the whole week.

The stack differs by disorder. Opioid agonist treatment can be central for opioid dependence. Alcohol care may combine withdrawal management, medication and psychosocial treatment. Contingency management has particular value for stimulant disorders. Gambling may require financial blocks; gaming problems may require restoration of sleep, school, work and family routines.

No layer has to wait for perfect motivation. A person can receive naloxone while still using, medication while ambivalent, housing before abstinence and respect before proving anything. Engagement is one of the outcomes the stack is built to preserve.

The limits

This model explains a family of mechanisms, not every repeated harmful action. Violence, eating disorders, obsessive-compulsive disorder, mania, self-harm and ordinary bad habits can contain urgency, relief or repetition without being addictions. Calling them all reward-system hijacks can conceal the diagnosis and treatment they need.

A brain image cannot tell a person's story: whether an action was coerced, regretted or chosen under intolerable conditions. Circuit language can become a polished way of ignoring poverty and pain. The reverse mistake is to treat social context as if pharmacology and overdose were optional details.

Evidence is uneven. Animal and laboratory studies isolate mechanisms but cannot reproduce a whole life. Treatments differ in their support, and service records overrepresent severe or recurrent problems. A useful model must leave room for people unlike those in the study.

This book is not a personal detoxification plan. Abrupt withdrawal from alcohol or some sedatives can be dangerous, and opioid tolerance can fall

quickly enough to make return lethal. Individual decisions about stopping, tapering or medication need clinical assessment.

The one thing to keep

Keep the widening test.

An activity can take hours without taking over a life. The warning is that other choices keep losing their place: a meal delayed, a visit cancelled, money already promised to something else spent again. The person may still think clearly about the costs. What has narrowed is their ability to make that knowledge govern the next action, in the situations where it matters.

The doorway near the start of this book was powerful because it predicted an outcome. Recovery need not make the doorway invisible or the memory vanish. Imagine returning, feeling the old pull, but having an appointment to reach or someone expecting you elsewhere. Neither guarantees safety. Each can help make the next action less dependent on the cue. The change is in what happens after the urge, not only in whether it appears.

There will still be consequences to face. Trust may take longer to rebuild than a routine; health and money may not recover fully. The widening test does not waive those debts. It asks whether a life is becoming less organised around repeating them. More reliable treatment, a protected evening or an honest conversation can matter before the whole story looks resolved.

The person walking past that doorway has not defeated learning. They are learning something else: that the cue can arrive without deciding the rest of the day. Addiction made one outcome crowd out its rivals. Recovery gives the rivals a chance to become real again. A reward system need not forget the old life for a person to have more of a new one.

Terms

Addiction. A persistent pattern in which control over a substance or behaviour is impaired, priority rises and use continues despite substantial harm. It describes organised dysfunction, not enthusiasm or moral weakness.

Substance use disorder. A diagnostic category covering clinically significant problems related to alcohol or other drugs. Systems differ in criteria and severity language, so the term is broader than physical dependence.

Behavioural addiction. An addiction-like disorder organised around a behaviour rather than an ingested substance. Gambling and gaming are recognised in ICD-11; other proposed categories remain disputed or differently classified.

Reward. An outcome that an organism values and will often work to obtain. Reward includes pleasure, learning and motivation, but those components can separate and depend on context.

Reinforcement. A consequence that increases the future probability of an action. Positive reinforcement adds a valued outcome; negative reinforcement removes an aversive state. Neither word means morally good or bad.

Dopamine. A neurotransmitter involved in movement, learning, attention and motivation. In reward tasks it can signal prediction errors and cue value. It is neither a pleasure meter nor an addiction toxin.

Salience. The quality of standing out and capturing attention. A salient cue can dominate perception because it is novel, threatening, rewarding or strongly learned, without being objectively important.

Incentive salience. Motivational value attached to a reward or cue, experienced as wanting or pull. It can increase independently of reported pleasure and helps explain persistent pursuit after enjoyment declines.

Prediction error. The difference between an expected outcome and the outcome received. Better or worse surprises update future expectations; fully predicted outcomes carry less new information for learning.

Cue. An external or internal signal associated with an outcome, such as a place, smell, message, emotion or withdrawal sensation. Cues can provoke attention, craving and a prepared action.

Craving. A strong desire or urge to use a substance or perform a behaviour. It can include conscious intention, anticipated relief and cue-triggered motivation, and it often rises and falls.

Conditioning. Learning in which signals predict outcomes or actions become linked to consequences. Conditioning explains why contexts and rituals can acquire power before the substance or reward arrives.

Habit. A response triggered relatively directly by a familiar situation rather than freshly evaluated against its outcome. Habits conserve thought but can persist when circumstances or values have changed.

Compulsion. Behaviour experienced as difficult to resist and repeated despite adverse consequences. The term marks impaired control; it does not prove that choice, planning or sensitivity to context has vanished.

Tolerance. Reduced response to a given exposure after repetition, or the need for more to obtain a previous effect. It can differ across effects and fall during abstinence.

Sensitisation. Increased response after repeated exposure. In addiction theory, cue-triggered motivational wanting may sensitise even while tolerance develops to pleasure or intoxication, because different processes are adapting.

Physical dependence. Physiological adaptation revealed by withdrawal when a substance is stopped or reduced. It can occur during appropriate treatment and is neither necessary nor sufficient for addiction.

Withdrawal. A substance-specific cluster of symptoms after exposure falls

in a dependent person. Severity ranges widely; alcohol and some sedative withdrawal can be dangerous and require medical management.

Negative reinforcement. Learning through the removal of an unpleasant state. Using to end anxiety, pain or withdrawal can strengthen behaviour powerfully even when the resulting experience is no longer pleasurable.

Allostasis. Regulation around a changed operating state rather than return to the old baseline. Addiction models use it to describe growing stress and reward deficits between repeated episodes.

Route of administration. How a drug enters the body, such as swallowing, smoking, inhaling or injecting. Route shapes speed, concentration, risk and how tightly an action is paired with effect.

Pharmacokinetics. What the body does to a drug through absorption, distribution, metabolism and elimination. In addiction, the speed and shape of exposure can alter reinforcement and overdose risk.

Intoxication. A temporary state caused by a substance, affecting consciousness, perception, judgement, coordination or behaviour. Intoxication can be harmful without addiction, and addiction can persist between intoxicated episodes.

Overdose. Exposure sufficient to cause severe toxicity, loss of consciousness, respiratory depression, organ injury or death. Risk depends on substance, potency, mixtures, tolerance, route and available emergency response.

Harm reduction. Policies and practices that reduce death, disease and social damage without making abstinence a precondition. It includes naloxone, sterile equipment, safer supply measures and practical risk advice.

Naloxone. An opioid antagonist that can reverse opioid-induced respiratory depression when given in time. Its effect may wear off before some opioids do, so emergency assessment remains necessary.

Contingency management. A behavioural treatment that provides prompt rewards when objectively verified target behaviours occur. It makes recovery-related consequences immediate and has strong evidence, especially for stimulant disorders.

Opioid agonist treatment. Treatment with medicines such as methadone or buprenorphine that stabilise opioid signalling, prevent withdrawal and reduce illicit use and mortality. A regulated dose is not untreated addiction.

Remission. A period in which diagnostic symptoms are absent or substantially reduced. Remission can be stable or interrupted and should be distinguished from cure, protected abstinence and complete restoration of function.

Recovery capital. The personal, social and material resources that support change, including health, housing, income, relationships, skills, identity and community. It explains why intention travels farther in some environments.

Go Deeper

The accessible neuroscience

Judith Grisel, *Never Enough: The Neuroscience and Experience of Addiction* (Doubleday, 2019). Grisel combines behavioural neuroscience with an account of her own drug use and recovery. It is the easiest next step for a newly interested reader if the mechanisms in this book were the main attraction, moving drug by drug through adaptation, tolerance and the problem of repeated attempts to alter brain state. Personal experience gives it force, but no single recovery story represents the range of addiction. Grisel is strongest on how repeated drug effects recruit opposing adaptations, and less concerned with gambling, service design or the politics of diagnosis.

The technical model

George F. Koob, Michael A. Arends and Michel Le Moal, *Drugs, Addiction, and the Brain* (Academic Press, 2014). This is the demanding option: a textbook treatment of molecular targets, circuits, drug classes and the cycle from intoxication through withdrawal and preoccupation. Read it for the neurobiology of rapid drug delivery, withdrawal and the shifting balance between reward and stress. It gives greater weight to a chronic brain-disorder model than several other works listed here, which makes it useful rather than neutral. The density is closer to an advanced university course than a popular book, so use it selectively by drug class or mechanism.

The context classic

Norman E. Zinberg, *Drug, Set, and Setting: The Basis for Controlled Intoxicant Use* (Yale University Press, 1984). Zinberg asked why people using the same drug can develop different patterns and placed social sanctions, rituals and setting beside pharmacology and personality. The cases and language belong to a particular US period, and later evidence has moved on. The framework remains one of the clearest correctives to explaining outcomes from the substance alone. It is especially useful beside the Vietnam-veteran evidence, because both force the reader to distinguish exposure from the setting that gives exposure its meaning and course.

The learning interpretation

Maia Szalavitz, *Unbroken Brain: A Revolutionary New Way of Understanding Addiction* (St Martin's Press, 2016). Szalavitz treats addiction as a developmental learning disorder and links neuroscience to childhood, policy, treatment and her own recovery from heroin and cocaine use. It is sharp on why humiliation and one-size-fits-all treatment fail. Its organising model is an argument, not consensus, so read it against Koob rather than as the last word. It is also the best of these four on language, stigma and the damage done when systems demand a single route to recovery.

Notes and Sources

Scope and terminology

Addiction as an umbrella. Clinical classifications do not use one identical label across all substances and behaviours. This book uses addiction for a persistent, clinically significant pattern organised around impaired control, increasing priority and continuation despite substantial harm. The diagnostic wording is anchored in the World Health Organization's 2024 clinical manual for ICD-11. DSM-5-TR uses substance-specific disorders graded by symptom count and places gambling disorder with substance-related and addictive disorders. The differences matter in specialist practice, but not enough to justify teaching a newcomer two parallel taxonomies throughout the book.

The subtitle. Reward system is shorthand for distributed processes involved in learning, motivation, attention, memory, pleasure and action selection. It does not name one anatomical centre. Hijacked is treated as a metaphor for motivational narrowing, not as a claim that a foreign agent takes permanent control or that agency disappears. The manuscript repeatedly limits the metaphor because the stronger literal reading would conflict with heterogeneity, context sensitivity and recovery.

Substance use, dependence and addiction. The World Health Organization's current descriptions, the broad review by Volkow and Blanco, and UK clinical guidance support the distinctions used here. Intoxication, harmful use, physical dependence and addiction can overlap without being interchangeable. Tolerance and withdrawal are therefore presented as mechanisms and possible diagnostic features, not as sufficient proof of addiction.

Illustrative material. The doorways, messages, cigarettes, unopened bottle and contrasting drinking situations are hypothetical illustrations, not documented patients or composites of identifiable people. The argument-to-purchase sequence and examples of converging pressures or recovery supports are also explicitly imagined. The

contingency-management example describes a programme design, not an individual treatment result. None is offered as evidence of prevalence or proof that an intervention will work for a particular person.

The Whole Thing in One Page and Why You Should Care

The diagnostic centre. Impaired control, increasing priority and persistence despite harm are recurring clinical concerns, not an identical checklist across diagnoses. ICD-11 distinguishes harmful patterns of substance use, substance dependence and disorders due to addictive behaviours; DSM-5-TR grades substance use disorders through a different cluster of symptoms. Tolerance and withdrawal are not compulsory features of every disorder. High engagement alone does not establish gaming disorder. The book uses the shared concerns to orient a reader, not to replace formal assessment.

Dopamine and distributed reward. Schultz, Dayan and Montague established the influential reward-prediction-error account from primate dopamine recordings. Berridge and Robinson distinguish motivational wanting from hedonic liking. Berridge and Kringelbach review the smaller hedonic networks and the contribution of opioid and endocannabinoid signalling, while Le Merrer and colleagues examine the opioid system in greater depth. These sources support the rejection of dopamine as a pleasure fluid and of reward as a single centre. They do not establish one universal computation performed by every dopamine neuron, which is why the prose is deliberately qualified.

Treatment and safety. The statements about methadone, buprenorphine, alcohol withdrawal, contingency management and naloxone are not decorative examples. They are the practical consequences of keeping dependence, reinforcement and disorder separate. Current UK alcohol guidance, NICE recommendations, the Sordo mortality meta-analysis, the Ginley contingency-management meta-analysis and current government naloxone guidance support them. Individual eligibility, dosing and withdrawal management remain clinical matters.

The Core Ideas

Reward, prediction and pleasure

The primate recordings described in the reward discussion are from Schultz, Dayan and Montague. Dopamine responses moved from an unexpected reward towards a predictive cue and dipped when an expected reward failed to appear. Later work has refined and diversified the account. The manuscript therefore says the activity resembled a prediction error and avoids claiming that dopamine has one meaning in every circuit or task.

The circuit sketch follows the syntheses by Koob and Volkow and by Volkow and Blanco. It retains the midbrain, nucleus accumbens, prefrontal networks, memory and emotion systems, and striatum, but describes them through a familiar cue rather than an anatomical inventory. Their functions overlap. No single region is treated as the location of addiction.

The liking and wanting distinction follows incentive-sensitisation theory as restated by Berridge and Robinson in 2016 and reviewed again in 2025. Liking refers to hedonic impact; wanting refers to incentive salience, the motivational pull acquired by rewards and cues. The theory explains an important pattern but is not presented as the sole mechanism of every addiction. The role of endogenous opioid systems in hedonic reactions is supported by Le Merrer and colleagues. The Parkinson's disease example is supported by the large cross-sectional study by Weintraub and colleagues, which linked dopamine-agonist treatment and other clinical factors with impulse-control disorders. It is an example of altered motivation, not proof that all addiction is excessive dopamine.

Speed, dose and surprise

Samaha and Robinson, Allain and colleagues, and human cocaine imaging by Volkow and colleagues support the importance of delivery speed and pharmacokinetics. Faster delivery can strengthen reinforcement and addiction-relevant plasticity, but it is not a standalone ranking device. Dose, formulation, half-life, frequency, expectation and prior learning remain relevant. The nicotine patch, gum and cigarette comparison is used because the active drug can be held broadly constant while delivery profile and cue structure change.

The discussion of uncertain rewards is limited to a learning principle. Variable and salient outcomes can sustain responding, but no reward schedule diagnoses gambling or gaming disorder and most exposed people do not develop either. Product mathematics, house edge and the gambling industry belong to *Gambling in a Hurry*. Game design and gaming culture belong to *Video Games in a Hurry*.

Wanting and liking

Berridge and Robinson support the possibility that cue-triggered wanting can intensify or persist while reported pleasure declines. Sensitisation and tolerance can coexist because they refer to different responses. The text does not claim that everyone with addiction dislikes the substance or behaviour, or that incentive salience can be read directly from a scan. Conscious expectation, relief, habit, social meaning and deliberate choice may all contribute to the same episode.

Habit, compulsion and goal-directed choice

Everitt and Robbins review the evidence for shifts from voluntary action towards habitual and compulsive drug seeking, including changing striatal control. Hogarth presents a strong rival account in which much human addictive behaviour remains goal-directed and is selected for expected reward or relief. The manuscript retains both because the evidence does not justify an inevitable conveyor belt from first use to mindless habit. Compulsion is used clinically to describe severe difficulty resisting behaviour, not metaphysically to prove that agency is absent.

Tolerance, withdrawal and stress

Koob and Volkow's three-stage neurocircuitry model supplies much of the account of intoxication, withdrawal and preoccupation, including recruitment of stress systems and allostatic change. It is a useful organising model, not a complete account of every person. The manuscript therefore places pain, trauma, loneliness, poverty, social role and meaning beside pharmacological adaptation.

Current UK guidance supports the warning that alcohol withdrawal can include seizures, delirium and death and that sustained heavy use may require medically assisted withdrawal. The book does not offer a threshold or taper because safe management depends on history, current intake, prior withdrawal, physical illness, other drugs and available monitoring. Opioid withdrawal is described through its severe symptoms and dehydration risk without using comparative reassurance that could obscure the more important overdose danger after tolerance falls. The 2025 joint ASAM benzodiazepine guideline distinguishes physical dependence from use disorder and warns against abrupt discontinuation in patients likely to be dependent, including those taking prescribed doses. Advice to seek assessment precedes stopping; the book supplies no self-directed taper.

Genes, development and circumstance

Deak and Johnson review twin and family evidence for a substantial inherited contribution to substance use disorders, with estimates varying by substance, population and method. Heritability is a population statistic, not a divisible share of one person's disorder. Hatoum and colleagues analysed data from more than one million participants and found both shared and substance-specific genetic liability. Their ancestry composition supports the warning against treating present polygenic scores as universal clinical predictions.

The developmental account follows Leah Somerville's caution against treating brain maturity as one measurable endpoint. It avoids the popular claim that the brain completes development on a twenty-fifth birthday. Planning, reward sensitivity, peer context and exposure change across adolescence and young adulthood, but maturation is gradual, regionally uneven and shaped by task and environment. Earlier initiation predicts later disorder without by itself proving a simple causal effect, since genetic and social risks precede exposure.

Robins, Helzer and Davis interviewed 898 Vietnam returnees and found that narcotic involvement changed sharply after return for many men. The study is retained because it challenges permanent-trait accounts. Its unusual military cohort, historical measures, selection and continued problems for a minority prevent universalisation. It does not show that a change of setting cures every opioid disorder. The study was published in 1975 and followed men selected among US Army returnees in 1971. It did not randomise the return home or separate the effects of availability, social roles, selection and other changes.

Recovery and reopened choice

Sordo and colleagues pooled cohort evidence showing lower all-cause and overdose mortality during methadone or buprenorphine treatment than out of treatment, with high-risk periods around entry and cessation. The evidence is observational, but the direction is consistent enough to support the book's claim that retention matters. NICE continues to recommend methadone and buprenorphine for opioid dependence. Its separate appraisal places oral naltrexone as an option for selected formerly opioid-dependent people who have completed withdrawal and are committed to abstinence.

McPheeters and colleagues reviewed pharmacotherapy for alcohol use disorder and support the use of naltrexone and acamprosate in suitable patients. NICE tobacco guidance supports the statement that nicotine replacement, varenicline and bupropion can improve cessation outcomes when clinically suitable. Ginley and colleagues found lasting benefit from contingency management on objective drug-use outcomes. The 2024 ASAM and AAAP guideline calls contingency management the current standard of care for stimulant use disorder and permits selected off-label pharmacotherapy. Kelly, Humphreys and Ferri found that manualised twelve-step facilitation can improve continuous abstinence compared with several established treatments, while other outcomes and non-manualised groups vary. The text therefore says Alcoholics Anonymous helps some people rather than declaring one mandatory route.

Recovery capital follows Laudet and White's work on personal, social and material resources. Tucker, Chandler and Witkiewitz review the epidemiology of improvement from alcohol problems outside specialist treatment. MacKillop cautions against treating chronic relapse as the necessary course of every addiction. These sources support stable remission and natural recovery without implying that treatment is unnecessary for severe cases or that waiting is safe.

How It Actually Works

Acute drug mechanisms. The short survey of opioids, stimulants, nicotine, alcohol, cannabis and sedatives follows the synthesis by Volkow and Blanco and standard pharmacology. It is intentionally limited to what the resulting state teaches. Receptor pharmacology, metabolism, interactions and prescribing belong to *Pharmacology in a Hurry*.

Behavioural addictions. ICD-11 recognises gambling disorder and gaming disorder within disorders due to addictive behaviours. Their shared diagnostic structure does not make them chemically identical to substance disorders, and it does not license expansion of addiction to every repetitive pleasure. The book uses them to show that ingestion is not necessary for severe learned narrowing.

No biomarker diagnosis. Imaging, genetics and laboratory tasks can illuminate mechanisms and group differences, but none currently diagnoses addiction in one person. Clinical diagnosis rests on history, control, priority, persistence, consequences, impairment and course. This is why the manuscript resists language suggesting that a scan photographs compulsion.

Withdrawal and overdose. The alcohol warning follows the UK clinical guidelines and the sedative warning the 2025 joint ASAM guideline. The World Health Organization's opioid-overdose guidance and Sordo's mortality meta-analysis support the risks after tolerance falls. WHO and the CDC support naloxone as an emergency response, not a substitute for continuing care. The UK emergency number and need for immediate help are checked against the NHS page on poisoning. Drug checking may identify some hazards but cannot certify safety; the ASAM and AAAP guideline discusses its limits. The manuscript separates overdose response, infection prevention and testing rather than assigning every harm-reduction measure the same evidence for mortality.

Matching treatment. UK guidance supports personalised goals, integrated attention to mental and physical health, harm reduction, psychosocial care

and recovery support. Opioid agonist treatment, alcohol medicines, tobacco medicines and contingency management have different evidence bases and cannot be collapsed into generic rehabilitation. The 2024 ASAM and AAAP stimulant guideline names contingency management as standard care and permits selected off-label pharmacotherapy. For cannabis, the body states only the narrower conclusion that no medicine has a role comparable to opioid agonist treatment, rather than turning one jurisdiction's approval status into a universal claim. Naltrexone induction requires clinical assessment after an adequate opioid-free interval; UK guidance explicitly warns of precipitated withdrawal if opioids remain in use. Named tobacco medicines are examples, not an exhaustive formulary. The 2025 Cochrane review by Spiga and colleagues likewise found the medicine evidence incomplete; its searches ran to May 2024. This supports caution, not a claim that future or symptom-specific pharmacotherapy is impossible.

Course and samples. Community surveys include many people who improve without entering specialist services. Treatment cohorts contain a higher proportion of severe, recurrent and socially complicated cases. Both can be accurate. The manuscript avoids an exact universal remission rate because definitions, observation periods, substances, severity and treatment selection differ.

What People Get Wrong

Brain disease and agency. Heilig and colleagues defend an updated brain-disease model while accepting several criticisms of deterministic and homogeneous versions. Hall, Carter and Forlini question whether the model's evidence and public promises justify its dominance. Blithikioti and colleagues renewed that critique in 2025, arguing that competing definitions of brain disease obscure the empirical dispute. Lewis frames brain change as learning rather than disease, and Pickard develops responsibility without blame. The book's constrained-agency formulation is a synthesis across this dispute. It is not presented as settled philosophical consensus.

Rock bottom and relapse. Current treatment guidance does not require catastrophe or pure motivation before care. Harm reduction, early

intervention and iterative treatment are compatible with abstinence goals. Return to use can be dangerous and clinically meaningful without erasing every prior gain. Stable remission is common enough to reject inevitability, while recurrent severe courses are common enough to reject reassurance as a substitute for care.

Category expansion. ICD-11 provides firm homes for gambling and gaming disorders and permits clinical judgement within its wider classification, but proposed addictions to phones, sex, shopping, work, exercise or food remain heterogeneous and contested. The manuscript does not deny harm in those patterns. It asks whether addiction improves diagnosis and treatment rather than using the word as an intensifier.

Use It and Terms

The six lenses in Use It are analytical applications of the book's model, not a validated screening instrument or a personal treatment protocol. They are designed to reveal sequence, function, cue structure, competing rewards and environmental constraints. Quantity remains medically important even where it does not settle diagnosis.

The safety limit is deliberate. Withdrawal from alcohol or benzodiazepines can be dangerous; benzodiazepine dependence does not require misuse or a high dose. Reduced opioid tolerance can make return to a previous amount fatal. Naloxone is emergency treatment, not a substitute for emergency assessment or continuing care. Decisions about withdrawal, tapering and medication require clinical advice. The drinking illustration separates pleasure, cue-triggered wanting and withdrawal relief across different situations; it is not a suggested dosing sequence.

Terms favour definitions a reader will encounter again. Negative reinforcement means removal of an aversive state, not punishment. Dependence refers to adaptation, not necessarily compulsive use. Remission is distinguished from cure and from abstinence maintained only by external constraint. Recovery capital includes material conditions because housing, transport, income and legal stability alter what choices are

feasible.

Go Deeper

The four editions and publishers were checked before inclusion. Grisel's *Never Enough* was published by Doubleday in 2019. Koob, Arends and Le Moal's *Drugs, Addiction, and the Brain* was published by Academic Press in 2014. Zinberg's first Yale University Press edition of *Drug, Set, and Setting* appeared in 1984; later paperbacks carry later dates. Szalavitz's *Unbroken Brain* was published by St Martin's Press in 2016. Each work advances a viewpoint, which is why the recommendations tell the reader what to use it for and where to resist it.

Clinical guidance and the important mechanism, treatment and historical claims were checked again on 5 September 2026. Current guidance is distinguished from older studies: the Vietnam follow-up, laboratory learning experiments and treatment reviews retain their own observation periods and populations. The UK alcohol guidelines, WHO overdose information, NICE treatment recommendations and the ASAM guidelines inform the clinical account. No exact population-wide remission rate or comparative drug-danger ranking is inferred from incompatible datasets.

Bibliography

Diagnostic, clinical and official sources

American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. 5th ed., text rev. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association Publishing, 2022.

American Society of Addiction Medicine and partner societies. *Joint Clinical Practice Guideline on Benzodiazepine Tapering: Considerations When Benzodiazepine Risks Outweigh Benefits*. 2025.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. "Lifesaving Naloxone." Updated 11 June 2025.

Department of Health and Social Care. *Clinical Guidelines for Alcohol Treatment*. London: Department of Health and Social Care, 2025. Updated 17 April 2026.

Department of Health and Social Care. "Supplying Take Home Naloxone Without a Prescription." Updated 23 April 2025.

National Health Service. "Poisoning." Reviewed 12 June 2025; accessed 5 September 2026.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Drug Misuse in Over 16s: Psychosocial Interventions*. Clinical guideline CG51. London: NICE, 2007.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Methadone and Buprenorphine for the Management of Opioid Dependence*. Technology appraisal TA114. London: NICE, 2007.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Naltrexone for the Management of Opioid Dependence*. Technology appraisal TA115. London: NICE, 2007.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Tobacco: Preventing Uptake, Promoting Quitting and Treating Dependence*. NICE guideline NG209. London: NICE, 2021. Updated 4 February 2025.

National Institute on Drug Abuse. "Cannabis (Marijuana)." Updated 24 September 2024.

World Health Organization. *Clinical Descriptions and Diagnostic Requirements for ICD-11 Mental, Behavioural and Neurodevelopmental Disorders*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2024.

World Health Organization. "Opioid Overdose." Fact sheet. Updated 29 August 2025.

Research and reviews

Allain, Florence, Ellie-Anna Minogianis, David C. S. Roberts, and Anne-Noël Samaha. "How Fast and How Often: The Pharmacokinetics of Drug Use Are Decisive in Addiction." *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 56 (2015): 166-179. DOI: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.06.012.

Clinical Guideline Committee Members, ASAM Team, AAAP Team, and IRETA Team. "The ASAM/AAAP Clinical Practice Guideline on the Management of Stimulant Use Disorder." *Journal of Addiction Medicine* 18, no. 1S (2024): 1-56. DOI: 10.1097/ADM.0000000000001299.

Berridge, Kent C., and Morten L. Kringelbach. "Pleasure Systems in the Brain." *Neuron* 86, no. 3 (2015): 646-664. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuron.2015.02.018.

Berridge, Kent C., and Terry E. Robinson. "Liking, Wanting, and the Incentive-Sensitization Theory of Addiction." *American Psychologist* 71, no. 8 (2016): 670-679. DOI: 10.1037/amp0000059.

Blithikioti, Chrysanthi, Eiko I. Fried, Emiliano Albanese, Matt Field, and Ioana A. Cristea. "Reevaluating the Brain Disease Model of Addiction." *The Lancet Psychiatry* 12, no. 6 (2025): 469-474. DOI: 10.1016/S2215-0366(25)00060-4.

Deak, Joseph D., and Emma C. Johnson. "Genetics of Substance Use Disorders: A Review." *Psychological Medicine* 51, no. 13 (2021): 2189-2200. DOI: 10.1017/S0033291721000969. Corrigendum published 2022.

Everitt, Barry J., and Trevor W. Robbins. "Drug Addiction: Updating Actions to Habits to Compulsions Ten Years On." *Annual Review of Psychology* 67 (2016): 23-50. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-psych-122414-033457.

Ginley, Meredith K., Rory A. Pfund, Carla J. Rash, and Kristyn Zajac. "Long-Term Efficacy of Contingency Management Treatment Based on Objective Indicators of Abstinence From Illicit Substance Use Up to 1 Year Following Treatment: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical*

Psychology 89, no. 1 (2021): 58-71. DOI: 10.1037/ccp0000552.

Hall, Wayne, Adrian Carter, and Cynthia Forlini. "The Brain Disease Model of Addiction: Is It Supported by the Evidence and Has It Delivered on Its Promises?" *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2, no. 1 (2015): 105-110. DOI: 10.1016/S2215-0366(14)00126-6.

Hatoum, Alexander S., Sarah M. C. Colbert, Emma C. Johnson, et al. "Multivariate Genome-Wide Association Meta-Analysis of Over 1 Million Subjects Identifies Loci Underlying Multiple Substance Use Disorders." *Nature Mental Health* 1, no. 3 (2023): 210-223. DOI: 10.1038/s44220-023-00034-y.

Heilig, Markus, James MacKillop, Diana Martinez, Jürgen Rehm, Lorenzo Leggio, and Louk J. M. J. Vanderschuren. "Addiction as a Brain Disease Revised: Why It Still Matters, and the Need for Consilience." *Neuropsychopharmacology* 46 (2021): 1715-1723. DOI: 10.1038/s41386-020-00950-y.

Hogarth, Lee. "Addiction Is Driven by Excessive Goal-Directed Drug Choice Under Negative Affect: Translational Critique of Habit and Compulsion Theory." *Neuropsychopharmacology* 45 (2020): 720-735. DOI: 10.1038/s41386-020-0600-8.

Kelly, John F., Keith Humphreys, and Marica Ferri. "Alcoholics Anonymous and Other 12-Step Programs for Alcohol Use Disorder." *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 3 (2020): CD012880. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD012880.pub2.

Koob, George F., and Nora D. Volkow. "Neurobiology of Addiction: A Neurocircuitry Analysis." *The Lancet Psychiatry* 3, no. 8 (2016): 760-773. DOI: 10.1016/S2215-0366(16)00104-8.

Laudet, Alexandre B., and William L. White. "Recovery Capital as Prospective Predictor of Sustained Recovery, Life Satisfaction, and Stress Among Former Poly-Substance Users." *Substance Use & Misuse* 43, no. 1 (2008): 27-54. DOI: 10.1080/10826080701681473.

Le Merrer, Julie, Jérôme A. J. Becker, Katia Befort, and Brigitte L. Kieffer. "Reward Processing by the Opioid System in the Brain." *Physiological Reviews* 89, no. 4 (2009): 1379-1412. DOI: 10.1152/physrev.00005.2009.

Lewis, Marc. "Addiction and the Brain: Development, Not Disease." *Neuroethics* 10 (2017): 7-18. DOI: 10.1007/s12152-016-9293-4.

MacKillop, James. "Is Addiction Really a Chronic Relapsing Disorder?" *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 44, no. 1 (2020): 41-44. DOI: 10.1111/acer.14246.

McPheeters, Melissa, Elizabeth A. O'Connor, Sean Riley, et al. "Pharmacotherapy for Alcohol Use Disorder: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *JAMA* 330, no. 17 (2023): 1653-1665. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2023.19761.

Pickard, Hanna. "Responsibility Without Blame for Addiction." *Neuroethics* 10 (2017): 169-180. DOI: 10.1007/s12152-016-9295-2.

Robins, Lee N., John E. Helzer, and Darlene H. Davis. "Narcotic Use in Southeast Asia and Afterward: An Interview Study of 898 Vietnam Returnees." *Archives of General Psychiatry* 32, no. 8 (1975): 955-961. DOI: 10.1001/archpsyc.1975.01760260019001.

Samaha, Anne-Noël, and Terry E. Robinson. "Why Does the Rapid Delivery of Drugs to the Brain Promote Addiction?" *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences* 26, no. 2 (2005): 82-87. DOI: 10.1016/j.tips.2004.12.007.

Robinson, Terry E., and Kent C. Berridge. "The Incentive-Sensitization Theory of Addiction 30 Years On." *Annual Review of Psychology* 76 (2025): 29-58. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-psych-011624-024031.

Schultz, Wolfram, Peter Dayan, and P. Read Montague. "A Neural Substrate of Prediction and Reward." *Science* 275, no. 5306 (1997): 1593-1599. DOI: 10.1126/science.275.5306.1593.

Somerville, Leah H. "Searching for Signatures of Brain Maturity: What Are We Searching For?" *Neuron* 92, no. 6 (2016): 1164-1167. DOI:

10.1016/j.neuron.2016.10.059.

Sordo, Luis, Gregorio Barrio, María J. Bravo, et al. "Mortality Risk During and After Opioid Substitution Treatment: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Cohort Studies." *BMJ* 357 (2017): j1550. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.j1550.

Spiga, F., T. Parkhouse, V. M. Tang, J. Savović, B. Le Foll, and S. Nielsen. "Pharmacotherapies for Cannabis Use Disorder." *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 9 (2025): CD008940. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD008940.pub4.

Tucker, Jalie A., Susan D. Chandler, and Katie Witkiewitz. "Epidemiology of Recovery From Alcohol Use Disorder." *Alcohol Research: Current Reviews* 40, no. 3 (2020): 02. DOI: 10.35946/arcr.v40.3.02.

Volkow, Nora D., and Carlos Blanco. "Substance Use Disorders: A Comprehensive Update of Classification, Epidemiology, Neurobiology, Clinical Aspects, Treatment and Prevention." *World Psychiatry* 22, no. 2 (2023): 203-229. DOI: 10.1002/wps.21073.

Volkow, Nora D., Gene-Jack Wang, M. W. Fischman, et al. "Relationship Between Subjective Effects of Cocaine and Dopamine Transporter Occupancy." *Nature* 386 (1997): 827-830. DOI: 10.1038/386827a0.

Weintraub, Daniel, Juergen Koester, Marc N. Potenza, et al. "Impulse Control Disorders in Parkinson Disease: A Cross-Sectional Study of 3090 Patients." *Archives of Neurology* 67, no. 5 (2010): 589-595. DOI: 10.1001/archneurol.2010.65.

Books materially used

Grisel, Judith. *Never Enough: The Neuroscience and Experience of Addiction*. New York: Doubleday, 2019.

Koob, George F., Michael A. Arends, and Michel Le Moal. *Drugs, Addiction, and the Brain*. Academic Press, 2014.

Szalavitz, Maia. *Unbroken Brain: A Revolutionary New Way of*

Understanding Addiction. New York: St Martin's Press, 2016.

Zinberg, Norman E. *Drug, Set, and Setting: The Basis for Controlled Intoxicant Use*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984.