

The new abstentionists*

Around Bonfire Night 2007 a rocket shook the peak of England's drug treatment structure – someone asked how many patients ended up drug-free. Clothless as the fabled emperor, 3% was the answer. Bullish engagement and crime reduction claims were dismissed as irrelevant. Scotland had already suffered a similar attack. The new abstentionists were on the march and the statistics seemed to be with them. But their attacks and the defences put up against them were based on questionable assumptions and misinterpreted or just plain mistaken figures. This forensic examination of the claims examines the good and not-so-good to emerge from this episode and finds some inspiration for the future.

by Mike Ashton

© Mike Ashton, November 2007

Mike Ashton is the editor of [Drug and Alcohol Findings](http://findings.org.uk), a UK-based web service (<http://findings.org.uk>) devoted to analysing evaluation of interventions to reduce drug or alcohol problems, but is writing here in a personal capacity. He can be contacted at mike.ashton@blueyonder.co.uk.

For variously their comments, assistance and encouragement, the author is grateful to: Daphne Obang, member of the executive of the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services; Harry Shapiro of DrugScope; Neil McKeganey of the Centre for Drug Misuse Research in Glasgow; Kazim Khan of T3E UK; Tim Millar of the National Drug Evidence Centre in Manchester; Peter McDermott of The Alliance and an NTA board member; Richard Phillips of Phoenix Futures (who helped draft the document referred to in the text as from the leaders of the UK's most influential treatment services); Ian Wardle and Maggie Rogan of the Lifeline Project; John Witton and John Strang of the National Addiction Centre; Sara McGrail, Freelance Drug Policy Specialist; Malcolm Roxburgh, Information Manager at the National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse; and David Clark of WIRED. It should not be assumed they were commenting on behalf of any organisations with which they are affiliated or agree with any of the sentiments expressed in this text. Though they have enriched it, they bear no responsibility for the text nor for any remaining errors, misinterpretations or gaps.

This web publication retains the warts and unreconstructed referencing of the original draft. It is presented as a stimulus to debate prior to print publication of a more refined version in *Druglink*, the magazine produced by DrugScope, Britain's national drug misuse information service. That version and later drafts of this version may feature comments received, which should be sent to harrys@drugscope.org.uk. This can be done by clicking the button below.

*For the avoidance of doubt, this title is not intended to embrace any particular individuals but to identify a tendency . In particular it should be clear from footnote 22 that it does not refer to the signatories to the document cited as reference 23.

Towards the end of October 2007 the NTA's¹ crime-reduction justification for investing in treatment wilted before the BBC's straightforward assumption that treating addiction ought to be about getting people off drugs.² Even after correcting the BBC's mistakes,³ the NTA's figures showed that in England just 3% of people in drug treatment in 2006/7 were recorded as having completed treatment and left drug-free at the end of the year, confirming the substance of the BBC's attack.

It was a blundering but in some ways welcome return to forefronting what I'd guess most people think treatment should be about. However, there was some less welcome collateral damage. The focus on completing and leaving treatment was entirely contrary to recent research and expert opinion supporting 'continuing care' as the appropriate treatment model for many dependent substance users.^{4 5} That it continues indefinitely is a defining feature of methadone maintenance, placing it in the middle of the firing line.

Tories weigh in

A few months before, David Cameron's New Conservatives had released the fruits of their addictions policy think tank. No barb was sharper than the claim that "maintenance methadone prescribing which perpetuates addiction and dependency has been promoted under current policy while rehabilitation treatment has been marginalised".⁶ Maintenance was further condemned as "undermin[ing] the efficacy of criminal justice treatment interventions".

With sweeping disregard for evidence and accepted definitions, the treatment which across the world has done most to curb addiction^{7 8 9} (leading to its designation by WHO as an "essential medicine"¹⁰) and with it almost certainly crime¹¹ was portrayed as sustaining both; ally had become enemy.

The solution? Among other things, the "radical reform" needed in treatment is "about facing the fact that abstinence is the most effective method of treatment."¹² This 'fact' takes some facing because the favoured settings were to be intensive day care and residential rehabilitation, neither with the solidity of the evidence base accrued by methadone.^{13 14} But to be fair, once the assumption is made that abstinence is the only goal really worth striving for, evidence is irrelevant; *by definition*, treatments which embody this objective are also the only ones really worth investing in.

Forsaking 'harm reduction', the Conservative advisers' christened their new policy thrust "harm prevention" – coincidentally (or more probably, derivatively) the term also adopted by Australian abstentionists in their bare-knuckle word fight with compatriots who keep faith with harm reduction despite the federal government's backsliding.

Polarisation in Scotland

In Scotland, where the administration is said to be planning to urge drug users "to ditch methadone and other softly-softly approaches in favour of 'cold turkey'",¹⁵ the polarisation has yet to reach these depths – but it's getting there, prompting Holyrood's former deputy justice minister (also an addictions psychiatrist) to attack "the current anti-methadone direction of the drugs debate in Scotland".¹⁶ MSP and former Scottish health minister Susan Deacon was moved to warn that "the space for sensible and honest discussion seems to be inversely proportionate to the size and complexity of the task".¹⁷

Uncannily, the 3% figure also took centre stage there as the proportion of patients who remained

“totally drug-free”¹⁸ three years after starting methadone. According to a *Sunday Times* headline, it meant the programmes “fail” the remaining 97%.¹⁹

But in all this debate, little was what it seemed. Contentions seemingly anchored in hard statistics and solid research were at best questionable, at worst misleading and counterproductive. Certainties are elusive largely because the best UK data we have on drug dependence treatment²⁰ still derives from the NTORS study in England, whose patients started those treatments over twelve years ago. Still, we can plumb that data mine for clues to what might be happening today and also call on fragments of more recent evidence.

The aim here is to raise issues most of which have no secure resolution and in the process to question the certainties we thought we had. Not to say, for example, that treatment *doesn't* save us all money, but to question whether it has been *shown* that it does. If this prompts convincing reassurances that all really is well, so much the better.

Recovery returns look poor

The charge that Britain's treatment system fails all but a few rests on the twin assumptions that abstinence is the only acceptable goal, and that only by becoming drug-free can former patients become, in *The Independent's* words, “productive members of their community”.²¹

To a more nuanced degree,²² the second assumption is shared by the leaders of the UK's most influential treatment conglomerates and national NGOs: “What [methadone maintenance] treatment does not appear to do, however, is to provide a true exit from the interrelated behaviours, harms, risks and lifestyle norms associated with dependent drug use ... MMT offers better life prospects than class A dependent drug use; it is equally true that abstinence offers better life prospects than MMT.”²³

Given these twin assumptions, the returns from treatment look poor indeed. To the man or woman on the omnibus, represented by the BBC's home editor Mark Easton, the more intangible benefits in the form of reduced crime fail to convince. Whatever else it does, if treatment doesn't put the patient back on their feet and if possible effect a cure, then it has a hard time looking like ‘treatment’ at all.

Health minister Dawn Primarolo put up a defence indicative of a great deal of compassion and understanding of the difficulties faced by addicts in “rebuilding” devastated lives, speaking movingly of “families in chaos” and decimated “social support networks”,²⁴ but neither she nor the NTA's riposte²⁵ fundamentally challenged the assumptions on which the BBC's attack was based, leaving treatment vulnerable to further attacks on the same basis. We'll test those assumptions one by one against the evidence and against alternative values.

Abstinence is good?

Though Brian Iddon (chair of the all-party Parliamentary Drugs Misuse Group) notably demurred,²⁶ other parties to the debate implicitly accepted abstinence as an unquestioned good, the most desired goal if often a distant one. By ‘abstinence’ here, the BBC, the drugs field leaders, and the NTA, all understood abstinence from legal medications substituting for illegal drugs, not just abstinence from illegal drugs.

The single most important fact their contributions failed to stress is that getting opiate dependent patients abstinent without putting sufficient (and perhaps very costly) investment in to anti-relapse rehabilitation is a very good way to help them kill themselves through loss of tolerance and overdose. Let alone a poor quality of life, too many will have none at all.²⁷

The death toll from opiate blocking treatment in Australia is perhaps the worst example. Post-detoxification patients trying to avoid relapse by taking naltrexone faced at least a 1 in a 100 chance of dying within about three months, usually from opiate overdose in the weeks following drop-out or treatment termination. The true figure may have been as high as 8 in a 100, many times the risk associated with substitute prescribing.²⁸ After this study, a doctor advising patients tempted to try this route to a drug-free (at least, opiate-free) life would, or should, have to warn that some research indicates they face close to a 1 in 10 chance of being dead within three months.

In contrast, the fact that being (not *having been*) in methadone treatment saves lives is its clearest and most consistent benefit,²⁹ demonstrated at a city-wide level recently in Barcelona. In the '90s the life expectancy of heroin users entering treatment there increased by 21 years, largely due to the expansion of low threshold oral methadone maintenance programmes.³⁰ Without the protection afforded by methadone, and even though all the study's subjects had entered specialist addiction treatment of some kind, heroin users were seven times more likely to die.

Drug-free treatment completion equals success?

What of the majority who do survive? In the NTA's figures these are the people recorded as having completed treatment drug free.³¹ They are not in treatment and have not been referred on for further treatment, yet without the continuing support of substitute drugs or a protected environment, they have become drug-free. These surely are the success stories?

If they were, we would expect them not to burden the statisticians again or not for a long time, because a return to the statistics means a return to treatment, which means relapse to dependent drug use. At the end of 2004/5 in England, 3626 individuals³² had completed treatment drug-free without having to return.³³ But during that year there were 5759 drug-free, treatment-completed discharges. So even within the same year, many drug-free discharges probably ended in relapse and return to treatment.³⁴

But what of the 3% the BBC taunted the minister with, in 2006/7, the 5829 patients and clients who completed treatment drug free and *did* make it through to the end of the year without having to return?

For a clue to their fate we have to turn to Cheshire and Merseyside, regions with an unusually long series of data compatible with the national monitoring system.³⁵ At the end of 1998 about 6% of patients were recorded as having been discharged drug free after completing treatment. Of these, 57% returned over the next six years. Judging from this, their relapse rate was *greater* than people who failed to complete their treatment, 54% of whom later returned. In the very next year, 46% of the drug-free treatment completers in 2001/2 (last year for which data was presented) returned to treatment, just 3% fewer than the drop-outs.

For these regions at least, if by 'successful' we mean treatment which helps patients construct lives satisfying and stable enough to avoid relapse and further treatment, there is no evidence³⁶

that drug-free completion is any more indicative of success than the ‘failure’ of premature drop-out. Using these as indicators of success or failure may be entirely to miss the point.

In Scotland the renewed focus on abstinence seemed justified by an impressive accounting of its “benefits” in that country’s own version of NTORS, the DORIS study.³⁷ Three years after entering treatment there were sometimes vast differences between the abstinent and non-abstinent in social integration (education/employment and crime), self-perceived health, and mental health in the form of suicide attempts or self-harm – and they all favoured abstinence. It underlined “the benefits for both the individual and the wider community of drug users having an extended period of abstinence,” concluded the researchers.

Set aside for the moment the criterion for abstinence (of which more below), the more fundamental issue is whether abstinence *caused/enabled* those other gains – as the term ‘benefits’ implies – or whether it was the other way round, or some other causal configuration.

Abstinence was measured over the past three months, its ‘benefits’ over the past 17. Already one essential ingredient for establishing causality is missing – that cause must be shown to come before effect. It seems just as conceivable that someone lucky or determined enough to land a job or a training place or to overcome self-destructive impulses had enough stake in life to then abandon illegal drug use – or as Professor McKeganey, the lead researcher suspects, a complex process in which abstinence reinforces life changes and vice versa.³⁸

This is no nit-picking, but has important practice implications. For example, if abstinence is required for social reintegration then we should go for abstinence in our interventions and let the rest follow. Aiming for social reintegration first would simply be a waste of time without a foundation of abstinence to build on. If it was the other way round, then we’d do better to focus at least as much on social reintegration regardless of whether the individual was currently abstinent.

Just such a debate has been going on in the USA where ‘housing first’ advocates have tested the assumption that multiply problematic substance users³⁹ need to be drug-free before they can benefit from housing. The answers were that they don’t, and that providing housing first helps them reintegrate, stabilise and improve their quality of life even if they are not yet drug-free.⁴⁰ In other populations and other circumstances this might not be the case, but it does illustrate the unreliability of the ‘abstinence is essential’ assumption and the potential for counterproductive denial of services when it is taken as gospel.

Patients want to become abstinent

The drive to reinstate abstinence as the kite mark of successful treatment is legitimised partly by the claim that this is what the patients want, a respect for their desires which may have something to do with them coinciding with those of the commentators. ‘If abstinence is what the patients want, who are we to cold-water their ambitions?’ runs the argument, and it is a powerful one with more than a grain of validity. But again, reality is more complex and less certain.

This particular argument kicked off when Scottish version of NTORS reported the “surprising” finding that 57% of patients opted for abstinence as their sole goal for changing their drug use.⁴¹ Stabilisation and harm reduction were further down the list. In fact, given the make-up of the sample it would have been surprising to find anything else: 44% were starting drug-free and/or explicitly abstinence-based treatments and a similar proportion were in prison at the time

including many who started in methadone.⁴² In both cases, abstinence would normally have been the only sensible objective.⁴³

Still, even in methadone programmes, 43% endorsed abstinence as their sole objective, seemingly at odds with their treatment – though perhaps not if that was methadone-based detoxification. It's also the case that nearly 60% of methadone patients endorsed stabilisation and harm reduction goals even if they also wanted to become drug-free.

But these are quibbles compared to the issue of exactly what the patients meant when they ticked the “abstinence/drug free” option. The question was, “What changes in your drug use do you hope to achieve by coming to this agency?” Would patients just starting on methadone really include this medication among their ‘drug use’? If so, it begs the question of why some started this treatment if all they wanted was not to be on it. More plausibly, they meant the drugs *causing* them trouble, not the medications helping overcome these. And if they did include methadone among their drug use, on what time scale did they want to abandon it? Straight away, or at some time in the future when they were ready? No one knows.

What we do know is that over the next eight months 35%⁴⁴ to 41%⁴⁵ of the patients sustained even two weeks’ abstinence (from drugs other than cannabis) and that at the end of this period 15%⁴⁶ to 17%⁴⁷ were not using. Most of the 57% who eight months before professed abstinence as their sole goal had yet to get there. It seems a fair bet that had those on methadone been taken at their word, and the assumption made that they meant ‘now’ rather than ‘when ready’, some would have died in the attempt, come close to dying, and/or blighted their health and future prospects through continued unsafe drug use and crime.

In England recently a rather more specific question was put to methadone patients.⁴⁸ Asked about their treatment goals, as many wanted to stay on their current dose or reduce as wanted to stop – and in this case the question was specifically about *long-term* goals. What if the question had been about starting to stop right now and ending drug-free in a couple of weeks time?

The drift towards maintenance in supposedly methadone reduction programmes in NTORS seems to suggest ambivalence about such a proposition, and these were patients who on the face of it had opted for reduction. In so far as reduction *was* implemented, outcomes were poorer. “The more reductions in methadone that were given during treatment, the more likely the patient was to be a regular heroin user at follow-up,” the sole treatment feature related to this outcome.⁴⁹

Together these studies at most suggest that in the indeterminate long-term, a fair proportion of methadone patients would like not to have to take medication in order to sustain their recovery. In this they are no different from patients taking other medications for long-term conditions, many of whom who feel uneasy about having to keep taking the pills even if this is clearly in their interests.⁵⁰ Their wishes must not be ignored, and in any event it is their choice, but neither would it be responsible for doctors to simply say, ‘Go ahead, good for you. Why not tomorrow?’

However, all this is to focus too narrowly on substance use. What drives most patients to resort to treatment is not substance use as such, but the mess this combined with the way society responds to it has made of their lives.⁵¹ Had they been asked and the results reported, we might have found that the patients’ priorities were getting out of debt, avoiding crime and prison, getting off the streets, mending broken relationships, or improving health. In these senses, stabilisation and harm reduction might well have topped the list in the DORIS study.

3% drug-free in Scotland, 25% in England?

This startling comparison derived from research led by Professor Neil McKeganey, the academic most closely associated with the abstentionist revival.⁵² His results appalled some Scottish politicians and media commentators – just 3% of methadone patients abstinent three years after starting treatment. Worse still for a nation newly emergent from Westminster's thumb, the English were doing better. There the corresponding figure was 25% after two years, complained the *Sunday Times*⁵³ and a news service read by Scotland's top administrators and policymakers.⁵⁴

It was a comparison they were invited to make by the researchers but one in which mistake was piled on mistake. As far as can be told, the 3% figure derived from a paper published in 2006 documenting the fate of 695 (all those who could be reinterviewed) out of 1033 drug users who had started treatment in 2001 in Scotland.⁵⁵ It is to date the most significant outcome report from the DORIS study, Scotland's NTORS.

Curious criterion

For the DORIS team anything other than drinking or smoking in the three months preceding interviews conducted roughly three years after treatment entry meant the former patients were not abstinent. Unlike NTORS, they opted to deny the abstinent label to anyone using cannabis or being prescribed legitimate substitute medication.

Curiously, someone could be 'abstinent' if they were drinking morn till night but not if they had smoked a joint once in the past three months. Nor could the criterion be made sense of as confining 'abstinence' to legal drug use since it excluded legal opiate substitutes. These decisions were justified by appeal to the abstinence objective endorsed by most of the sample, yet, as the researchers had admitted,⁵⁶ they had little idea what respondents meant when they ticked this option.

On this criterion, overall just 8%⁵⁷ of the sample qualified as abstinent. Elsewhere in the paper was the damning 3% figure, taken by press and politicians to mean that just 3% of the patients who started methadone three years before had emerged abstinent. But in fact the 3% (as published, 3.4%) related to "post-index-agency" treatment, in other words, to patients who had started methadone *after* leaving their first DORIS treatment. Nowhere does the paper tell us what happened to people who *started* the study on methadone.

Invalid comparison

Already this invalidates the comparison with the 25% figure from England. More properly rounded to 24%, this derives from the NTORS study and *does* relate to treatment starters.⁵⁸ There were other major discrepancies. First, people who confined themselves to legally prescribed methadone were embraced by NTORS' abstinence outcomes. The DORIS researchers adjusted for that, raising their estimate for abstinent (ex)methadone patients in Scotland to 11%, a fact ignored by the press reports.

For the DORIS team, that evened the playing field.⁵⁹ Still the Scottish figures looked bad. But in fact the field remained tilted, not just because of the post-index treatment issue explained above, but because *NTORS ignored cannabis use*. Given that this is the most pervasive of the illegal drugs, it could have made a substantial difference to the estimates, bringing the Scottish and English figures much closer than they seemed. Clues to how much closer can be extracted from an earlier

DORIS paper in which, for example, at the 16-month follow-up another 7% of the sample would have been considered abstinent had cannabis been disregarded.⁶⁰

The scare that just 3% of Scottish methadone patients reached abstinence nirvana compared to 25% south of the border was based on error after error, and with it the panic that things must be badly wrong and something radical done to even out the discrepancy.

Divert to residential rehabilitation?

Despite that, it seems likely that abstinence as the DORIS team defined it was indeed rare after methadone, since these programmes were among the bag of non-residential rehabilitation community services which ended in 6% abstinence. The contrast was stark with residential rehabilitation, where the figure was 25%. Rather than the comparison with England, for the researchers this was the key finding.⁶¹ Since they⁶² could divine little difference between methadone and rehabilitation caseloads, the impression was that diverting more patients in to residential rehabilitation would improve the nation's abstinence outcomes and with them social reintegration.

Some caution was to be expected here because, as the Scottish Executive itself was advised by one of its reports, internationally the evidence for residential rehabilitation is weak compared to methadone maintenance.⁶³ After reviewing the evidence, England's National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence could not be sure that residential rehabilitation led to any greater degree of abstinence or drug use reduction than non-residential treatments.⁶⁴ Wholesale diversion of current or would-be future methadone patients in to rehabs would be a leap into the gloom (if not entirely in to the dark) with people's lives.

The view that nevertheless some diversion is warranted presumes that among the methadone-prescribed thousands are patients who, if only they were given the chance (or a big enough push), would do as well in rehabilitation as the few who currently make it through the doors. That may be true, but very scarcity of rehabilitation entrants in Scotland gives rise to the suspicion that they are either very unusual or unusually lucky in the support available from local services and purchasers.

It seems likely that the hoops aspirants have to go through to secure funding for and admission to residential care would screen out the people on whom this investment was most likely to be wasted, or who might undermine the therapeutic power of peer relations in these closed communities. This, after all, is one of the reasons for the assessments. Community-based services are expected to be less choosy and have fewer mechanisms for exerting choice over their patients.

For all these reasons, until proven otherwise, it is unsafe to assume that patients who would otherwise have started on methadone would do well if diverted to residential care, or indeed, vice versa. Similar considerations led the NTORS researchers to avoid direct comparisons of the performances of the different treatment modalities in the study. These would be invalid unless there was a level playing field in terms of caseload and that simply could not be assured.⁶⁵ The other complication, one also (see below) applicable to DTORS, was that over the years patients rarely confined themselves to a single treatment modality, complicating the assessment of just what it was which led to the final outcomes.

Plus ça change

The more pragmatic of today's advocates for rebalancing treatment towards residential rehabilitation argue that methadone's prominence is partly due to the inaccessibility of the

resources needed to help patients live without drugs, legal or illegal. They acknowledge that substitute prescribing will still be needed, but needed for fewer people if more had access to the 24-hour, 360-degree life-changing influences which can be provided in a residential setting.

At its most defensible the argument runs that if we had enough of the right kind of institutions, if they were attractive and easily and rapidly accessible, and if post-discharge anti-relapse supports were sufficiently prompt, accessible, attractive and robust, maintenance might wither to cater for the few who could not or would not take advantage of these offers.

Curiously, a very similar argument was put forward over 60 years ago by the Rolleston committee – to justify opiate maintenance prescribing. Effectively, but more elegantly, they argued that if only we had more accessible (in those days, that meant more affordable) rehabilitative institutions⁶⁶ we might be able to withdraw most people and maintain few – but we haven't, so needs must.⁶⁷

In both eras the argument may have some validity but remains to be proven because the infrastructure has yet to be put in place to be able to test it. Highlighting that gap – the apparent retreat from residential rehabilitation not just in Scotland but elsewhere in the UK – is one useful thing to emerge from this episode.

Caution is warranted not just by an international research record blighted by high drop-out rates, but also because here in the UK both DORIS and NTORS showed that even if everyone had access to residential rehabilitation, that wouldn't eliminate the need for substitute prescribing. In Scotland it seems that most (perhaps 48) of the 85 residents who had already had the benefit of residential rehabilitation then had to be rescued from relapse by methadone treatment,⁶⁸ and in England perhaps a third.⁶⁹

If in Scotland some of these then exited methadone drug-free, they could have accounted for a large proportion (after all, there were only 21) recorded as drug-free after having started DORIS in residential rehabilitation. Similarly we don't know how many who emerged drug-free directly from rehab had previously been stabilised via methadone maintenance. Answers to these questions are needed before we can assume that the credit for the rehab 'successes' was not also shared by methadone.

Methadone is incompatible with a truly productive life?

Despite the risks (according to research, probability) of losing the stability gained on methadone and of relapse with all its consequences, maybe the potential prize in terms of a truly productive, socially integrated life makes it worth trying to do without the medication? Here we come across the clearest fallacy in the current debate, the place where black turns white and vice versa – the contention that only the drug- and in particular the methadone-free can achieve this transformation.

Far from methadone impeding reintegration, depriving patients of this treatment is itself a very effective way to impede and reverse social reintegration.⁷⁰ Where before long-term retention was seen as a the main mechanism for the treatment's effectiveness and a sign of its success, now it is being devalued as a failure to become drug-free.

Turn back to the '60s and Dole and Nyswander's original methadone maintenance study, and reintegration was very much not just the objective, but the core outcome and the selling point focused on by its creators.⁷¹ You don't have to believe, as Vincent Dole did, that addiction is a metabolic disease to accept that some opiate dependent patients need to continue to take opiate-type medications precisely *in order* to function in ways which to them and to us look every bit as

productive as the lives of many teetotallers or social drinkers. To focus on whether they are taking drugs is to miss the point – it doesn't matter, what matters is the quality of their lives and their contributions to society.

In so far as this *is* hampered by their treatment, it could be because of the stigma we attach to it and the restrictions we place upon it which can preclude a normal family and working life. At its most basic, in English prescribing services provision outside normal office hours is often poor,⁷² and here and elsewhere the demands of supervised consumption and regular attendance, and the fear of being exposed as a patient, risk a self-fulfilling prophecy.^{73 74 75 76 77} Even the drugs field itself is ambivalent about employing drug users still in treatment.

Tarnishing the silver bullet

Opiate substitution is as close as we get to a silver bullet in addiction treatment. But in PR terms in Britain, and to a degree in practice, its potential has been squandered. First was the unique freedom British doctors had to prescribe injectables including injectable heroin, an option largely abandoned here only to be picked up and validated in continental Europe.⁷⁸

The oral methadone services left in the wake of this retreat have allowed themselves to concede the reintegration ground to drug-free services – allowed themselves *not* to be seen as potentially an effective platform for non-residential rehabilitation. This is partly because in reality they *have* failed to realise this potential. Nationally the ambition has been titrated down to keeping patients off the streets and out of the courts, a poverty of ambition now rightly being challenged.

In NTORS, despite being in regular contact with a medical service, methadone patients' improvements in physical and psychological health were disappointing.⁷⁹ Inputs to improve aspects of their lives other than those catered for by methadone itself seemed minimal – a weekly half-hour one-to-one counselling session in the first month (and for a quarter none at all) dropping to about fortnightly after three months, and for a few, group counselling.⁸⁰

But more of the *kind* of counselling they received would not necessarily have improved things. How much they got in the first month was unrelated to substance use at six months, and those who were counselled did no better on this measure than those left to get their support from other sources.⁸¹ Compared to primary care services, in the first month specialist clinics provided both nearly twice the number and the length of counselling sessions, and continued to provide more, yet (see below) if anything outcomes were better at the surgeries.⁸²

Probably around the time the NTORS patients were being treated, interviews with staff and patients at London methadone services offered a rare glimpse of the dynamics behind these statistics.⁸³ Therapeutic relationships were undermined because patients saw counsellors primarily as gatekeepers to methadone, and by resource constraints which left time for little more than monitoring progress rather than counselling and support. Patients who feared that illegal drug use would meet with a disciplinary sanction and dose reduction reacted by withholding information, creating distrust and tension and impeding even the ability to monitor progress and react accordingly.

If it's thought that the route forward is greater access to specialist treatment and greater adherence to good practice guidelines, findings from NTORS and elsewhere should give pause for thought. Despite their specialisation, hospital bases, psychiatrist leads and multi-disciplinary

teams, drug dependence clinics have not been shown to perform better than experienced and supported GPs. In NTORS the GPs saw comparable patients but cut crime more rapidly and achieved greater improvements in psychological health and non-opiate drug use, and at each time point from one month to two year recorded slightly better retention (assuming that retention is good and black and white have not yet been reversed).^{84 85}

In Liverpool in the mid '90s the health care contrast was in some respects stark. Primary care methadone patients were several times more likely to have been tested for hepatitis B or hepatitis C and to have been immunised⁸⁶ against hepatitis B than those at the specialist clinic, and retention at the primary care service seemed much better even taking into account caseload differences.⁸⁷

Surely things are better now?

Some things⁸⁸ have got better since the NTORS patients started their treatments in the mid '90s, but in term of the abstinence and reintegration outcomes which came to the fore in October 2007, they may have as easily have got worse.

Methadone services

A few indicators can be extrapolated from NTORS itself. Compared to the primary care services run by GPs, in that study the specialist clinics adhered more closely to what was and still is being urged as good practice. Over the first six months, six of the eight clinics practised supervised consumption compared to one of the seven surgeries, daily dispensing was more common, and they almost exclusively prescribed oral methadone while GPs occasionally prescribed the deprecated methadone tablets or ampoules, which guidelines said should be reserved to specialists.⁸⁹ Yet (see above) the GPs did as well or better. Similarly, the GPs performed relatively well despite offering even less counselling than the clinics, and counselling quantity was unrelated to substance misuse outcomes.

Such findings raise a question mark over whether specialist staff and settings and counselling of the kind provided in the '90s (and for all we know, today), and the guidelines promoted as good practice, really are indicators of good quality treatment, and whether further progress in these directions will make things better or worse for the patients.

They also suggest a way forward. As the authors of the Liverpool study commented, "It may be that general practice provides a stable, more flexible and convenient setting, with the integration of other aspects of health care". Recent specialist training initiatives for GPs and the expansion of shared care may be spreading these benefits, as long as increased standardisation and regulation is not at the same time eroding the personalised care which may lie at the heart of their successes.

More recent findings from London methadone clinics and GP shared care services revealed a "relatively poor response to treatment", a verdict delivered by authors which included staff of the services concerned.⁹⁰ When the services took a census of their patients in March 2003, typically their patients had been in treatment for 14 months.

According to the information they gave to their keyworkers and recorded on forms completed by those workers, they were now using heroin two to three times a week compared to daily at intake. Even with respect to the drug targeted by the treatment it did not look good. It looked worse when the less manipulable evidence of urine tests was available – as expected, 84% opiate positive

at intake, but on average over a year in to treatment still 60% positive.

Evidence that the punitive expectations of London methadone patients in the '90s might not be misplaced today comes from an NTA survey published in 2007.⁹¹ Mystifyingly, it was not uncommon for methadone services to 'reward' cessation of cocaine use by offering increased doses of opiate substitute medications or greater choice of the type of medication. The flip side must be that the unfortunates unable to curb their cocaine use were denied these aids to restraining their illicit opiate use.

Finally from 2004, a bleak account of the role of methadone from a bleak part of England, a northern sink estate distinguished locally by an unenviable set of indicators of community and family breakdown.⁹² The report is based on in-situ interviews with 50 local problem drug users (on this estate, not hard to find), 31 of whom were in treatment, primarily methadone.

Most of the 50 had experienced school exclusion, three-quarters left without a formal qualification, marketable skills were rare, and a history of homelessness was the norm. All but six were unemployed even in the informal economy. Serious drug use had started early, for most following the example set by their parents. 60% had been in prison, though currently half were steering clear of crime.

Overwhelmingly their comments on methadone were negative. Though some myth-swallowing was evident, these are redolent of a treatment which most grudgingly tolerated for the partial relief it gave from criminality and the hard grind of sourcing all one's drugs illegally. To the authors, the reason was obvious: "For many of our sample, the problem of methadone is in many ways that numbers of them actually do not wish to stop using heroin; hence the complaints about getting an extra addiction."

Methadone is partly what you want to and, given all your other life circumstances, are able to make of it. On the Trees estate it became sucked in to a polydrug repertoire which now cost less as a result, but otherwise seems to have diminished not a jot .

Several years on, these it seemed were some of the faces of the "poor response" group in NTORS, the 1 in 6 methadone patients who a year after starting treatment continued with high-rate use of heroin and other illicit drugs.⁹³ The other 5 in 6 (if that's what it remains) either do not live in such places or have better things to do than to associate with other drug users or hang around the estate, the individuals most available to the researchers. Rather than being typical of methadone patients, they exemplify what the treatment's role *can* become when the routes via which it could be used to construct a better life (which many wanted) seem closed off.

Criminal justice referrals

NTORS also supplied a finding which suggests that the recent influx of patients via the criminal justice system might be making it harder to get good outcomes. This time the finding emerged from the residential services, mainly residential rehabilitation. After leaving, residents who relapsed to regular heroin use were exactly twice as likely (56% versus 28%) to have entered under some form of criminal justice supervision or awaiting trial or sentence, the only pre-entry feature distinguishing lapsers and relapsers from abstainers.⁹⁴

A similar impression was gained in the north west of England in 2002 from patients entering ten specialist opiate prescribing services.⁹⁵ Six months later fewer than half were still there though another 5% were said to have completed their treatments. Patients referred from the criminal

justice system were nearly three times as likely to have prematurely terminated treatment. In methadone services, drop-out or throw-out usually means resumption of dependent opiate use.

Some contrary evidence comes from Kent where in 2003/04 structured day care services offered similar treatments to court-ordered and 'voluntary' clients, and both did equally well.⁹⁶ But in this study only patients who stuck around long enough for the first interview on average three weeks⁹⁷ after treatment entry could be included, and many didn't. With other attritions, the upshot was that less than half were recruited to the study and under 4 in 10 were interviewed at the first follow-up point.

Among this minority there were the (from NTORS) familiar reductions in crime and substance use but only "modest" improvements in physical or psychological health and none in access to training or employment, though housing and relationships had improved. The authors acknowledge that recruitment problems may have been one reason why their study gave a different impression to that obtained in the north west.

Residential rehabilitation

The most expensive and intensive way to try to transform dependent drug users in to sustainably drug-free former users is residential rehabilitation, the modality which UK drugs field leaders say is most suited to abstinence outcomes.⁹⁸ In NTORS, one year after starting these programmes⁹⁹ a further 34% of drug users had achieved abstinence from illegal opiate-type drugs, stimulants and benzodiazepines over the past three months.

However, 20% were once again in residential care. Despite the investment made in their rehabilitation, perhaps just 1 in 7 were enabled to sustain abstinence out in the real world¹⁰⁰ and some (conceivably, every single one) of these will have had to enter methadone or other community-based treatment programmes to avoid continued relapse.¹⁰¹ Of the heroin users among them, within a fortnight of leaving residential care half had returned to the drug.¹⁰²

If the drugs field leaders who signed their recent joint statement are right, there is little if any reason to believe things have improved and several reasons to believe they may have got worse. Financial screws have been tightened and staff time has been diverted to institutional survival, while ill-informed commissioning and inadequate inspection regimes have been unable to safeguard quality.

Apart from the Scottish DORIS study mentioned above, research on more recent performance is almost completely lacking. One study of interest for this and for its criminal justice connections assessed how three DTTO teams in England in 2003 and 2004 handled their crack using caseloads.¹⁰³ Two of the three sites could not even provide basic records. The third, in London, was able to provide case records for 70 relevant offenders, 48 of whom had undergone residential rehabilitation.

Up to five of the 70 offenders may (we don't know – we only know the rest did not) have completed their court orders and remained free of crack or heroin use or heavy drinking. At the three sites the inflexibility of the order and of the treatment providers combined with poor inter-agency working and administration to comprehensively fail the offenders enmeshed in their systems. We know that the early DTTO schemes suffered similarly;¹⁰⁴ if these were teething troubles, at these sites they persisted in to maturity.

McDonaldisation lives on

Holistic, individualised care which addresses the debt, housing, relationship, vocational, educational, legal and physical and mental health issues facing drug dependent patients is predicated on holistic, individualised assessment and care planning. If you don't know what someone needs and wants, it's hard to provide it.

When in 2005/06 the Healthcare Commission and the NTA investigated prescribing services in England, this was one of the weakest areas.¹⁰⁵ Half the local drug partnerships (drug action teams or the equivalent) and 4 in 10 services were "weak" in this respect. When it came to assessing and planning for the risks facing the patients and their associates, the corresponding figures were 70% and 52%.

Some of the biggest gaps were extraordinary: a fifth of services not assessing overdose history, half not assessing for alcohol dependence, the same proportion for abscesses, another half not enquiring who else shared the home, and the biggest gap of all, 6 in 10 failing to assess risks of transmission of blood borne viruses. With basic gaps like these, the chances of a holistic social as well as medical assessment and care plan seem remote.

These figures were reached solely by looking at the services' forms and documented procedures. Conceivably, experienced and thorough practitioners actually did investigate all these issues and more. Even then the failure to systematically prompt and document such assessments begs questions. Perhaps more conceivably, despite the forms and procedures, assessments and plans were in practice sometimes missed or short-cut – as in US drug services where state-of-the-art patient profiling measures mandated by the state were completed so those boxes could be ticked, but the results sat on shelves rather than informing service delivery.¹⁰⁶

What the NTA took from the prescribing side of the data was that "There is a need to move away from standard policies, which prescribe the same amount for each service user and for prescribing to be linked more closely to individual need".¹⁰⁷ If services are failing even in that core form of individualisation, the same seems at least as true in respect of the 'ancillary' wrap-around services.

Even when patients take the initiative and ask for help, they don't always get it at the most basic level of a referral – in a survey of English drug service patients conducted in 2005, this applied to about 4 in 10 each of those seeking housing or employment or training assistance and over half seeking financial support.¹⁰⁸ The respondents in this study were not a random sample – they were recruited by the services themselves – opening up the possibility that these were the patients most engaged with (and therefore most approachable and available to) the service.

What does this add up to? In the small parts where the veil has been lifted, a treatment 'system' in respect of offenders sometimes hardly worthy of that term and across the board struggling to move beyond crime and substance use reductions to effect the kinds of changes in people's lives which could sustain their recovery. Despite questionable interpretations and prescriptions for change, here is the grain of truth in the BBC's accusations and the new abstinence lobby's charge that too little is being done to turn around the increasing numbers of lives touched by Britain's treatment system.

It's not necessarily the fault of the providers. They have to follow where the targets and brownie point tallies lead them or lose contracts, and they just don't lead far beyond 'Get 'em in and get 'em out, treatment completed'. As long as the 31 December intervenes, a return in short order counts as just another successful patient recruitment.

In Germany the potentially self-defeating consequences of the drive for standardisation and efficiency in order to produce the required numbers has been analysed in a paper teasingly titled, “What do hamburgers and drug care have in common: some unorthodox remarks on the McDonaldization and rationality of drug care”.¹⁰⁹ The reader is challenged to read it and see if ‘Germany’ could not be replaced with ‘Britain’ without invalidating the text.

At least society benefits from reduced crime?

Last of the shibboleths we’ll shake just a little is the biggest one of all, the one into which the NTA poured nearly all its eggs and our money – the certainty that treatment saves us all money by cutting crime. This finding from NTORS led the government to embrace treatment as the single most effective tool within its grasp to cut national levels of acquisitive crime.

Though it did (deliberately past tense) the job in the sense of extracting money from the Treasury, this justification is now being publicly challenged as an inappropriate goal and insufficient outcome for treatment. Such ethical misgivings might be derided as failing to grasp the hard-nosed reality of what it takes to prise open the public purse, but if at all, the argument stands up only if it can be shown that crime really has been cut.

The queries aren’t about whether crime falls when dependent heroin or cocaine users enter treatment – on average, it does – but about whether treatment is the cause and whether these changes cumulate in to something which noticeably dents national crime levels and creates economic savings.

At this level, the crime justification has no reliable evidence to back it up, resting on a degree of coincidence in trends in the crimes the government assumes are drug-related and the implementation of the drug strategy’s treatment-based and criminal justice initiatives.¹¹⁰ Knowledgeable commentators have pointed out that these crimes had been falling before the current strategy started and probably continued to fall for reasons unrelated to levels of dependent substance use – and, by extension, for reasons unrelated to the numbers curbing their use through treatment.¹¹¹ The crime most closely associated with addiction – shoplifting – has actually been rising throughout the life of the drug strategy.¹¹²

The same commentators questioned the foundations for the drugs-crime link which underpins the strategy, based as it is on data from less than a quarter of the offenders unlucky enough to get arrested, a small fraction of all the active offenders in Britain.

Despite these caveats, some elements of Britain’s crime rate *may* have fallen less steeply had there not been the investment in addiction treatment, but that’s the best we can say. In any event, crime reduction only ever justified treatment for a minority of the people who seek it – the 1 in 10 patients in NTORS who were highly criminally active before treatment and among whom reductions in crime were concentrated.¹¹³

£3 crime cost savings for £1 treatment

Still, it might be argued, a treatment net which captures these prolific offenders pays for itself even it also captures less troublesome patients. With its headline finding of £3 social cost savings (mainly due to reduced crime) for each £ spent on treatment, NTORS seemed to prove the case. But both sides of the equation rested on assumptions seemingly so convenient for everyone concerned that their fragility has been overlooked.

Most people assume the £ was the full cost of the treatments studied in NTORS, but in fact it was the *extra* amount spent on treatment in the year after entering the study compared to the year before. This stroke-of-the-pen cuts the costs by nearly half but conflicts with the way other studies have done similar calculations.¹¹⁴ In some papers the NTORS team countenance the possibility that prior treatments received by 80% of the sample had cumulated in to the benefits harvested during the NTORS year,^{115 116 117} suggesting that these costs too would have to be added.

On the other side, the £3 consisted largely of costs to the victims of crime, which in turn consisted largely of the value of stolen property.¹¹⁸ Effectively, the assumption was made that these were losses to society as a whole – yet some parts of society benefited in the form of cheap or free goods. Some economists treat these as ‘transfer payments’¹¹⁹ and cancel them out when it comes to calculating the net loss to society. Because these were the proceeds of crime, NTORS decided not to, inflating the cost-savings side of the equation.

What difference the alternative assumption would have made in NTORS we cannot know, but we do know that in California disregarding such losses cut the cost savings to a third of the previous estimate.¹²⁰ This seminal study made this calculation precisely to reach an estimate of the real costs to society *as a whole*, including its drug dependent members.

In Britain an economic analysis¹²¹ of the costs of methadone and buprenorphine maintenance, on which the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence based its guidance,¹²² tried excluding victim costs to provide an alternative accounting of the benefits to society. It revealed the “considerable impact that the inclusion of victim costs has on the results”, an impact which eliminated the apparent advantage of treatment versus no treatment.

Add in the possibility that the crime careers of the NTORS patients had peaked before treatment entry and might have declined somewhat even without treatment, and it becomes highly questionable whether NTORS did demonstrate social cost savings from treatment. But a failure (if that’s what it was) to *demonstrate* benefits is not the same as there being none. Benefits there almost certainly were in terms of saved and improved lives. These were not included in NTORS’ economic estimates, leaving crime as the main component.

More with less

That brings us to the final problem – money. Per patient, resources for addiction treatment have been cut and will probably continue to be cut.¹²³ Getting more patients more quickly out the back door of treatment is how the NTA hopes to square the circle of getting more in the front with proportionately fewer resources.¹²⁴

The problem is that keeping people on methadone is relatively cheap. To bring them to the point where they can safely and sustainably do without it will not be. Turning round lives often blighted by severe psychological problems and a disastrous history stretching back to childhood, reversing the deficits accrued during a decade or more devoted to dependent drug use, transforming environments which are more addiction- than recovery-friendly, and getting the rest of society to cooperate – that costs.

The risk is that this difficult and expensive work will not be done or will be short-changed. In order to meet the new expectations about ‘successful’ treatment completion, people may be led to exit treatment only to come back sooner rather than later because their lives have not

fundamentally altered for the better, or exit more finally via overdose and disease. Already some services have assumed that their mission now is to keep people for 12 weeks then get them out as soon as possible as a treatment completion or referral on, the criteria for success they think is being set from the centre.

Lives are being turned round, but to make this the norm will take special people who can forge and stick with relationships which instil optimism and confidence, and a preparedness to go well beyond treatment to (among other things) low caseload, intensive case management, supported housing and supported employment, intensive and assertive outreach teams, persistent and active aftercare, and reconstruction of family relationships.

Another way to square the more-for-less circle is to provide these inputs by accessing and benefiting from generic welfare, housing and reintegration resources.¹²⁵ In a resistant or resource-starved environment, this hasn't always been shown to produce dividends.¹²⁶ Assuming that the services the most disadvantaged patients need will be provided through partnerships with other agencies, yet still be accessed by and effectively delivered to drug users whose lives are in a mess and unappealing fodder for the average housing department or apprenticeship scheme, is at worst unrealistic, at best a long-term solution to the cash squeeze. Equity and economy demand that the attempt be made and it certainly *can* succeed, but making these attempts is also an intensive and costly business.

First stop making things worse

Arguably the most important things we can do cost little or nothing and may actually save money, yet are the hardest to achieve. Rather than spending money to make things better, we can stop acting and spending in ways which makes things worse, the link Dawn Primarolo failed to make. Stigma and discrimination due to drug use contribute to poor health and psychological damage and make people unwilling to come out and seek help until things are so bad they can't carry on.

^{127 128 129} At this point the route back may be so steep that maintenance and harm reduction are the only feasible options. Even the prisoners in our jails feel the added stigma of being known as an 'addict', the main reason in one sample why they did not seek help.¹³⁰

Criminalisation, imprisonment and stigma tear apart the family and social ties and destroy the opportunities for decent housing and employment¹³¹ which could be clung to as anchors to help people haul themselves out of a bad patch with drugs. The few of these recovery resources dependent drug users may have started with are systematically dismantled by the same state which then tries to mitigate the damage. As Italian addiction psychiatrist Umberto Nizzoli put it, 'the doors are closed behind them',¹³² blocking the way back to conventional ties and rewards and helping to create the 'chronic relapsing' condition we find so hard to reverse.¹³³

Can we change?

One way to make sense of all this is to see addiction not as something inside the patient's head, but as a relationship between them and the world around them, a two-way process as much in our heads and hearts as theirs. The implication is that we can overcome their dependence by changing the world around them sufficiently radically and persistently and in the right ways.

Their social world is a large part of that environment and the most formative, and the one over

which we all have some degree of control. Rather than messing in their heads with chemicals and reprogramming neurones through cognitive-behavioural strategies or Skinnerian contingencies, we can mess within our own, reprogram how we and the world we control relates to them, and get similar and perhaps more lasting results. When the worlds as a whole is recalcitrant, we can do this by sectioning off a bit in the form a residential centre and radically altering the environment within, but the results are vulnerable on return.

Though their promoters may not realise it or articulate it, this is the basis for the new found enthusiasm for residential care and wrap-around services as vehicles for more comprehensively altering how the world around them relates to the patients and residents.

It seems to be a lesson never learnt once and for all but continually rediscovered. One inspiring tutorial was played out in the late 1950s at the alcohol clinic of the Massachusetts General Hospital, then run by Morris Chafetz, later to become founding director of the US National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.¹³⁴

He suspected that pessimism about whether alcoholics would accept and benefit from treatment derived partly from the dismissive and hostile attitudes of the broader society, including the very staff supposed to be helping them. If these were replaced by optimism and respect, patients might embrace the help they needed, and the grounds for pessimism might evaporate. He was right. Dr Chafetz showed that not only can a service's performance be improved, it can be transformed by the simple application of empathy and organisation.

It seems simple but in fact it's difficult because it requires people who in the first place care enough to try, have the imagination and empathy to put themselves in the seemingly alien shoes of the 'the addict', organisations supportive of their visions, and the clout and drive to beat steeply stacked odds to make these a reality.

In my experience Britain has an abundance of just such people working in its drug treatment sector. Many have come across from or still occupy the other side of the treatment table. Over the past 30 years I've been struck by the creativity, groundedness, and practical compassion of people doing a job most of us couldn't get to the starting blocks with. Those were and still are the kind of people drawn to working with the multiply excluded and widely despised. Give them the right systems and the right environment to work with, and they will help create transformations, just as Morris Chafetz did.

They also need a society accommodating enough to be able to persuaded to embrace dependent drug users not just within its ghettoised addiction treatment centres, but in the rest of its service provision and social life – and this when some of the makings of a recovery-friendly environment are in short supply not just for drug users, but for everyone.

Top among them in Britain are decent affordable housing and economically and psychologically rewarding work as routes for people to emerge from welfare dependency despite extensive and intensive disadvantage. Many need treatment in the form of methadone, but as much or more they need housing where not everyone uses drugs, and jobs which give a modicum of self-respect and pay enough to make it worth jeopardising unemployed or disabled statuses.¹³⁵

When we just can't manage to change in all these ways, we can at least radically alter one aspect of the drug user's social environment – we can give them the drugs they previously had to source by relating to criminal circles and devote their lives to finding by hook or by crook, and offer them a socially accepted role as patient rather than junkie criminal.

This is a massive shift in itself but sometimes an incomplete one because they remain stigmatised, excluded from the mainstream and crippled by the obligations placed upon them. But at least we can do it and do it and do it en masse. And some (we should help to make it more) grasp this and create lives which contribute to society in ways those of us who get by on a drip feed of alcohol or

nicotine or nothing at all should envy.

-
- ¹ National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse, the health service body responsible for advancing addiction treatment in England.
- ² <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/7068572.stm> accessed 30 October 2007.
- ³ Hayes P. *Drug treatment in England and the BBC*. <http://www.nta.nhs.uk> accessed 4 November 2007.
- ⁴ Humphreys K. *et al.* "Toward more responsive and effective intervention systems for alcohol-related problems." *Addiction*: 2002, 97, p. 126–140.
- ⁵ McLellan A.T. "Have we evaluated addiction treatment correctly? Implications from a chronic care perspective." *Addiction*: 2002, 97, p. 249–252.
- ⁶ Gyngell G. *Breakthrough Britain. Ending the costs of social breakdown. Volume 4: addictions*. Policy recommendations to the Conservative Party. Social Justice Policy Group, 2007.
- ⁷ *Proposal for the inclusion of methadone in the WHO model list of essential medicines*. World Health Organization, 2004.
- ⁸ Mattick R.P. *et al.* "Methadone maintenance therapy versus no opioid replacement therapy for opioid dependence (Cochrane Review)." In: *The Cochrane Library*, Issue 4, 2002. Oxford: Update Software.
- ⁹ Simoons S. *et al.* *The effectiveness of treatment for opiate dependent drug users: an international systematic review of the evidence*. Scottish Executive Effective Interventions Unit, 2002.
- ¹⁰ *Essential medicines. WHO model list 14th edition*. World Health Organization, March 2005.
- ¹¹ Ashton M. "Force in the sunshine state." *Drug and Alcohol Findings*: 2000, issue 4. http://findings.org.uk/count/downloads/download.php?file=Ashton_M_25.pdf.
- ¹² In this strange formulation abstinence has become a treatment modality not a treatment goal.
- ¹³ Simoons S. *et al.* *The effectiveness of treatment for opiate dependent drug users: an international systematic review of the evidence*. Scottish Executive Effective Interventions Unit, 2002.
- ¹⁴ *Drug misuse: psychosocial interventions*. National Clinical Practice Guideline Number 51. National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health, 2007.
- ¹⁵ Barnes E. "Cold turkey plan for Scots addicts." *Scotland on Sunday*: 17 December 2006.
- ¹⁶ Professor Richard Simpson, *Holyrood* magazine, March 2007.
- ¹⁷ Deacon S. "The political addiction to tough talking on drugs has failed us all." *Sunday Herald*: 14 January 2007.
- ¹⁸ Barnes E. "Cold turkey plan for Scots addicts." *Scotland on Sunday*: 17 December 2006.
- ¹⁹ Womersley T. "Methadone programme fails 97% of heroin addicts." *Sunday Times*: 29 October, 2006.
- ²⁰ Until the Scottish NTORS, DORIS, fully discharges its outcome data and the English follow-up to NTORS DTORS starts to produce data. See <http://www.gla.ac.uk/centres/drugmisuse/DORIS.html> and <http://www.dtors.org.uk/DTORSHome.aspx> respectively.
- ²¹ Michael Savage. "The big question: are drug treatment programmes a waste of taxpayers' money?" *The Independent*: 31 October 2007.
- ²² They were careful not to in any way condemn methadone maintenance or to fail to acknowledge the benefits and continuing need for such services.
- ²³ *Residential Rehabilitation and the national drug strategy*. 19 October 2007. http://www.phoenix-futures.org.uk/Filestore/Downloads/Residential_Rehabilitation_and_national_drug_strategy.pdf
- ²⁴ Radio 4 Today programme 18 October 2007, http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/today/listenagain/zthursday_20071018.shtml.
- ²⁵ Hayes P. *Drug treatment in England and the BBC*. <http://www.nta.nhs.uk> accessed 4 November 2007.
- ²⁶ Michael Savage, *op cit*.
- ²⁷ Best D. *et al.* "Overdosing on opiates part I: causes." *Drug and Alcohol Findings*: 2000, issue 4. http://findings.org.uk/count/downloads/download.php?file=Best_D_17.pdf.
- ²⁸ Gibson A. *et al.* *Mortality related to naltrexone in the treatment of opioid dependence: a comparative analysis*. NDARC Technical Report 229. [Australian] National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre, 2005. Summary at <http://ndarc.med.unsw.edu.au>, full report from NDARC, University of New South Wales, Sydney NSW 2052, Australia.
- ²⁹ Best D. *et al.* "Overdosing on opiates part I: causes." *Drug and Alcohol Findings*: 2000, issue 4. http://findings.org.uk/count/downloads/download.php?file=Best_D_17.pdf.
- ³⁰ Brugal M.T. *et al.* "Evaluating the impact of methadone maintenance programmes on mortality due to overdose and AIDS in a cohort of heroin users in Spain." *Addiction*: 2005, 100, p. 981–989.

-
- ³¹ Scott G. *Core data set reference data*. NTA and NDTMS, 2007.
http://www.nta.nhs.uk/areas/NDTMS/docs/core%20data%20set/ndtms_core_data_set_reference_data_v4.6.pdf
- ³² Note that within a year one individual can have several discharges.
- ³³ *Statistics from the National Drug Treatment Monitoring System (NDTMS) 1 April 2004–31 March 2005*. National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse, 2006.
- ³⁴ Part of the difference between these figures represents an unknown number (according to an NTA source, a “fair proportion”) of concurrent treatment episodes each ending with drug-free completion rather than a return to treatment, making it impossible to be precise.
- ³⁵ Beynon C.M. *et al.* “Trends in drop out, drug free discharge and rates of re-presentation: a retrospective cohort study of drug treatment clients in the North West of England.” *BMC Public Health*: 2006, 6:20.
<http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/6/205>
- ³⁶ We cannot know for sure because this extrapolation depends on the unevidenced assumption that the treatment completers were no more likely to return to treatment after relapse than the drop-outs. It is possible that, for example, the drop-outs relapsed at twice the rate but in proportion only half as many reacted to that relapse by returning to treatment. Also the treatment sequences may have differed in important ways. A drug-free discharge to residential rehabilitation may be indicative of good progress but not a return to a detoxification service.
- ³⁷ McKeganey N. *et al.* “Abstinence and drug abuse treatment: results from the Drug Outcome Research in Scotland study.” *Drugs: Education, Prevention & Policy*: 2006, 13(6), p. 537–550.
- ³⁸ Personal communication from Professor Neil McKeganey, 19 November 2007.
- ³⁹ Typically dually diagnosed and in unstable or no accommodation.
- ⁴⁰ See for example Gulcur L. *et al.* “Housing, hospitalization, and cost outcomes for homeless individuals with psychiatric disabilities participating in continuum of care and housing first programmes.” *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*: 2003, 13, p. 171–186.
- ⁴¹ McKeganey N. *et al.* “What are drug users looking for when they contact drug services: abstinence or harm reduction?” *Drugs: Education, Prevention & Policy*: 2004, 11(5), p. 423–435.
- ⁴² Neale J. *et al.* “Comparing community and prison-based drug treatments.” *Drugs: Education, Prevention & Policy*: 2004, 11(3), p. 213–228.
- ⁴³ Scottish Prison Service. *Partnership and coordination. SPS action on drugs. Revised guidance on the management of drug misuse in Scotland's prisons*. 2000.
- ⁴⁴ A lower bound assuming all patients not re-interviewed were also not abstinent. It seems unlikely that more were abstinent than among the reinterviewed sample. Calculated as 30% all drugs + 11% cannabis only = 352 of 859 respondents = 35% of the 1007 baseline sample.
- ⁴⁵ The proportion of the followed up sample.
- ⁴⁶ A lower bound assuming all patients not re-interviewed were also not abstinent. It seems unlikely that more were abstinent than among the reinterviewed sample. Calculated as 11% all drugs + 6% cannabis only = 146 of 859 respondents = 15% of the 1007 baseline sample.
- ⁴⁷ The proportion of the followed up sample.
- ⁴⁸ Best D. *et al.* *The NTA's 2005 survey of user satisfaction in England*. National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse, 2007.
- ⁴⁹ Gossop M. *et al.* “Outcomes after methadone maintenance and methadone reduction treatments: two-year follow-up results from the National Treatment Outcome Research Study.” *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*: 2001, 62, p. 255–264.
- ⁵⁰ Holt M. “Agency and dependency within treatment: drug treatment clients negotiating methadone and antidepressants.” *Social Science & Medicine*: 2007, 64, 1937–1947.
- ⁵¹ See for example Marlatt A. *et al.* “Help-seeking by substance abusers: the role of harm reduction and behavioral-economic approaches to facilitate treatment entry and retention” In: Onken L.S. *et al.*, eds. *Beyond the therapeutic alliance: keeping the drug-dependent individual in treatment*. NIDA Research Monograph 165. US Department of Health and Human Services, 1997.
- ⁵² Though it would be wrong to pigeonhole him in this category. His support also stretches to the what many will consider the very far end of the harm reduction spectrum – safer injecting rooms.
- ⁵³ Womersley T. “Methadone programme fails 97% of heroin addicts.” *Sunday Times*: 29 October, 2006.
- ⁵⁴ *Executive to revamp drug policy*. 4th December 2006. <http://www.holyrood.com/home.aspx>, accessed 5 December 2006. Mistakenly this report said the figure related to Wales as well as England.
- ⁵⁵ McKeganey N. *et al.* “Abstinence and drug abuse treatment: results from the Drug Outcome Research in Scotland study.” *Drugs: Education, Prevention & Policy*: 2006, 13(6), p. 537–550.

-
- ⁵⁶ McKeganey N. *et al.* "What are drug users looking for when they contact drug services: abstinence or harm reduction?" *Drugs: Education, Prevention & Policy*: 2004, 11(5), p. 423–435.
- ⁵⁷ And probably fewer of the full sample given the numbers not followed up. This applies to all subsequent figures.
- ⁵⁸ Gossop M. *et al.* "The National Treatment Outcome Study (NTORS): 4–5 year follow-up results." *Addiction*: 2003, 98., p. 291–303.
- ⁵⁹ "If we had defined abstinence in the same way as the NTORS researchers (to include the use of prescribed methadone) ..."
- ⁶⁰ McKeganey N. *et al.* "What are drug users looking for when they contact drug services: abstinence or harm reduction?" *Drugs: Education, Prevention & Policy*: 2004, 11(5), p. 423–435.
- ⁶¹ Personal communication from Professor Neil McKeganey, 19 November 2007.
- ⁶² Personal communication from Professor Neil McKeganey 13 November 2007.
- ⁶³ Simoens S. *et al.* *The effectiveness of treatment for opiate dependent drug users: an international systematic review of the evidence*. Scottish Executive Effective Interventions Unit, 2002.
- ⁶⁴ *Drug misuse: psychosocial interventions*. National Clinical Practice Guideline Number 51. National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health, 2007.
- ⁶⁵ Gossop M. *et al.* "The National Treatment Outcome Research Study in the United Kingdom: six-month follow-up outcomes." *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*: 1997, 11 (4), p.324–337.
- ⁶⁶ And they also said, the power to detain people in them.
- ⁶⁷ Ashton M. "The Rolleston legacy." *Drug and Alcohol Findings*: 2006, issue 15.
http://findings.org.uk/count/downloads/download.php?file=Ashton_M_28.pdf
- ⁶⁸ This seems to be the implication of table III.
- ⁶⁹ Gossop M., *et al.* *NTORS at one year. The National Treatment Outcome Research Study. Changes in substance use, health and criminal behaviours at one year after intake*. Department of Health, 1998.
- ⁷⁰ See for example: Winick C. "A mandatory short-term methadone-to-abstinence program in New York City." *Mount Sinai Journal of Medicine*: 68 (1), 2001, p.41–45; Knight K.R. *et al.* "Involuntary versus voluntary detoxification from methadone maintenance treatment: the importance of choice." *Addiction Research*: 1996, 3(4), p 351–362.
- ⁷¹ Ashton M. "Methadone maintenance: the original." *Drug and Alcohol Findings*: 2006, issue 14.
http://findings.org.uk/count/downloads/download.php?file=Ashton_M_26.pdf
- ⁷² Healthcare Commission and National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse. *Improving services for substance misuse: a joint review*. Commission for Healthcare Audit and Inspection, 2006.
http://www.nta.nhs.uk/areas/standards_and_inspections/documents/Joint_review%20full_report_0506.pdf.
- ⁷³ Stone E. *et al.* "User views on supervised methadone consumption." *Addiction Biology*: 2003, 8, p. 45–48.
- ⁷⁴ Cox G. *et al.* "Maintaining or enabling? Evaluation of a methadone prescribing service in Dublin City." In: *Pieces of the jigsaw: six reports addressing homelessness and drug use in Ireland*. Dublin: Merchants Quay, 2004.
- ⁷⁵ Quaglio G. *et al.* "Patients in long-term maintenance therapy for drug use in Italy: analysis of some parameters of social integration and serological status for infectious diseases in a cohort of 1091 patients." *BMC Public Health*: 6, 2006.
- ⁷⁶ Smith I. *et al.* *The estate they're in*. Trafford: The Edge, 2004.
- ⁷⁷ Fraser S. "The chronotope of the queue: methadone maintenance treatment and the production of time, space and subjects." *International Journal of Drug Policy*: 2006, 17(3), p. 192–202.
- ⁷⁸ Ashton M. "Role reversal." *Drug and Alcohol Findings*: 2003, issue 9.
http://findings.org.uk/count/downloads/download.php?file=Ashton_M_22.pdf
- ⁷⁹ Gossop M. *et al.* *NTORS at one year. The National Treatment Outcome Research Study. Changes in substance use, health and criminal behaviours at one year after intake*. Department of Health, 1998.
- ⁸⁰ Gossop M. *et al.* "Treatment process components and heroin use outcome among methadone patients." *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*: 2003, 71(1), p. 93–102.
- ⁸¹ Gossop M. *et al.* "Effectiveness of drug and alcohol counselling during methadone treatment: content, frequency, and duration of counselling and association with substance use outcomes." *Addiction*: 2006, 101, p. 404–412. Though when, as most did, the sessions focused on drug use, cocaine and heroin use fell slightly more compared to non-counselled patients.
- ⁸² Gossop M. *et al.* "Methadone treatment for opiate dependent patients in general practice and specialist clinic settings: outcomes at 2-year follow-up." *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*: 2003, 24(4), p. 313–321.

-
- ⁸³ Lilly R. *et al.* "Juggling multiple roles: staff and client perceptions of key worker roles and the constraints on delivering counselling and support services in methadone treatment." *Addiction Research*: 1999, 7(4), p. 267–289.
- ⁸⁴ Gossop M. *et al.* "Methadone treatment practices and outcome for opiate addicts treated in drug clinics and in general practice: results from the National Treatment Outcome Research Study." *British Journal of General Practice*: 1999, 49, p. 31–34.
- ⁸⁵ Gossop M. *et al.* "Methadone treatment for opiate dependent patients in general practice and specialist clinic settings: outcomes at 2-year follow-up." *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*: 2003, 24(4), p. 313–321.
- ⁸⁶ Or to be naturally immune.
- ⁸⁷ Lewis D. *et al.* "General practice or drug clinic for methadone maintenance? A controlled comparison of treatment outcomes." *International Journal of Drug Policy*: 2001, 12, p. 81–89.
- ⁸⁸ Such as numbers of problem drug users in treatment (and possibly the proportion too, though this is unclear) and short-term retention.
- ⁸⁹ Department of Health [etc]. *Drug misuse and dependence – guidelines on clinical management*. HMSO, 1999.
- ⁹⁰ Dunn J. *et al.* "Notes from practice: Methadone prescribing in north central London – doses, compliance, goals and treatment setting." *Drugs: education, prevention and policy*: 2007; 14(2), p. 181–191.
- ⁹¹ Weaver T. *et al.* *Are contingency management principles being implemented in drug treatment in England?* National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse, 2007.
http://www.nta.nhs.uk/publications/documents/nta_rb33_contingency_management_summary.pdf
- ⁹² Smith I. *et al.* *The estate they're in*. Trafford: The Edge, 2004.
- ⁹³ Gossop M. *et al.* "Patterns of improvement after methadone treatment: 1 year follow-up results from the National Treatment Outcome Research Study (NTORS)." *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*: 2000, 60, p.:275–286.
- ⁹⁴ Gossop M. *et al.* "Factors associated with abstinence, lapse or relapse to heroin use after residential treatment: protective effect of coping responses." *Addiction*: 2002, 97, p. 1259–1267.
- ⁹⁵ Millar T. *et al.* *Treatment effectiveness: demonstration analysis of treatment surveillance data about treatment completion and retention*. National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse, 2004.
- ⁹⁶ McSweeney T. *et al.* *The quasi-compulsory treatment of drug-dependent offenders in Europe: UK findings*. Institute for Criminal Policy Research and European Institute of Social Services, 2006.
- ⁹⁷ Stevens A. T. *et al.* *The quasi-compulsory treatment of drug-dependent offenders in Europe. Final national report – England*. Institute for Criminal Policy Research and European Institute of Social Services, 2006.
- ⁹⁸ *Residential Rehabilitation and the national drug strategy*. 19 October 2007.
- ⁹⁹ Unfortunately the study conflated inpatient and residential rehabilitation programmes though over 70% of the residential sample came from the latter.
- ¹⁰⁰ "British residential drug treatment services respond well to the stimulant boom but could do better if clients stayed longer" Background text for Nugget 4.7, *Drug and Alcohol Findings*: 2000.
http://findings.org.uk/count/downloads/download.php?file=nug_4_7_back.doc.
- ¹⁰¹ Gossop M., *et al.* *NTORS at one year. The National Treatment Outcome Research Study. Changes in substance use, health and criminal behaviours at one year after intake*. Department of Health, 1998. Over a third of former residential care patients were in community-based (which includes or may entirely consist of methadone) programmes one year after starting their residential treatment.
- ¹⁰² Gossop M. *et al.* "Factors associated with abstinence, lapse or relapse to heroin use after residential treatment: protective effect of coping responses." *Addiction*: 2002, 97, p. 1259–1267.
- ¹⁰³ Turnbull P. J *et al.* *Supervising crack-using offenders on drug treatment and testing orders*. National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse, 2007. http://www.nta.nhs.uk/publications/documents/nta_rb22_crack_users_dttos.pdf
- ¹⁰⁴ Ashton M. "First test for the DTTO." *Drug and Alcohol Findings*: 2001, issue 6.
http://findings.org.uk/count/downloads/download.php?file=Ashton_M_23.pdf
- ¹⁰⁵ Healthcare Commission and National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse. *Improving services for substance misuse: a joint review*. Commission for Healthcare Audit and Inspection, 2006.
http://www.nta.nhs.uk/areas/standards_and_inspections/documents/Joint_review%20full_report_0506.pdf.
- ¹⁰⁶ Gurel O. *et al.* "Developing CASPAR: a computer-assisted system for patient assessment and referral." *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*: 2005, 28(3), p. 281–289.
- ¹⁰⁷ http://www.nta.nhs.uk/areas/standards_and_inspections/2005-06_review/key_messages.aspx accessed 15 November

2007.

¹⁰⁸ Best D. *et al.* *The NTA's 2005 survey of user satisfaction in England*. National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse, 2007. www.nta.nhs.uk.

¹⁰⁹ Kemmesies U.E. "What do hamburgers and drug care have in common: some unorthodox remarks on the McDonaldization and rationality of drug care." *Journal of Drug Issues*: 2002, p. 689-708.

¹¹⁰ *Drug strategy fact booklets*. UK government, 2007. <http://drugs.homeoffice.gov.uk/publication-search/drug-strategy/strategy-facts-booklet?view=Standard&pubID=237897>

¹¹¹ Reuter P. *et al.* *An analysis of UK drug policy*. UK Drug Policy Commission, 2007. <http://www.ukdrugpolicycommission.org.uk/docs/UKDPC%20drug%20policy%20review.pdf>.

¹¹² *BRC Retail Crime Survey 2006/7*. London: British Retail Consortium, 2007.

¹¹³ Ashton M. "NTORS." *Drug and Alcohol Findings*: 1999, issue 2. http://findings.org.uk/count/downloads/download.php?file=Ashton_M_12.pdf

¹¹⁴ Ashton M. "NTORS." *Drug and Alcohol Findings*: 1999, issue 2. http://findings.org.uk/count/downloads/download.php?file=Ashton_M_12.pdf

¹¹⁵ Stewart D. *et al.* "Methadone treatment: outcomes and variation in treatment response within NTORS." In: Tober G.S., *et al.* *Methadone matters: evolving community methadone treatment of opiate addiction*. London: Martin Dunitz, 2003. p. 249-258.

¹¹⁶ Gossop M. *et al.* "Patterns of improvement after methadone treatment: 1 year follow-up results from the National Treatment Outcome Research Study (NTORS)." *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2000, 60, p.:275-286.

¹¹⁷ Gossop M. *et al.* *NTORS at one year. The National Treatment Outcome Research Study. Changes in substance use, health and criminal behaviours at one year after intake*. Department of Health, 1998.

¹¹⁸ Godfrey C. *et al.* "Economic analysis of costs and consequences of the treatment of drug misuse: 2-year outcome data from the National Treatment Outcome Research Study (NTORS)." *Addiction*: 2004, 99, p. 697-707.

¹¹⁹ Simoens S. *et al.* "Pharmaco-economics of community maintenance for opiate dependence: a review of evidence and methodology." *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2006, 84(1), p. 28-39.

¹²⁰ Gerstein D.R. *et al.* *Evaluating recovery services: the California drug and alcohol treatment assessment (CALDATA)*. California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, 1994.

¹²¹ Connock M. *et al.* "Methadone and buprenorphine for the management of opioid dependence: a systematic review and economic evaluation." *Health Technol Assess*: 2007;11(9).

¹²² *Methadone and buprenorphine for the management of opioid dependence*. NICE technology appraisal guidance 114. [UK] National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, 2007.

¹²³ Ashton M. "NTA strategy: raising expectations, but heading for a funding crisis." *Drink and Drugs News*: September 2005.

¹²⁴ National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse. *Board meeting 4 May 2005. Treatment Effectiveness Strategy*. "Moving people through and out of treatment also improves the efficiency of local treatment systems enabling the system to engage with newly presenting clients without having continually to expand capacity."

¹²⁵ Klee H. *et al.* *Employing drug users: individual and systemic barriers to rehabilitation*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2002. www.jrf.org.uk

¹²⁶ Vanderplasschen W. *et al.* "Effectiveness of different models of case management for substance abusing populations." *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*: 2007, 39 (1).

¹²⁷ Ahern J. *et al.* "Stigma, discrimination and the health of illicit drug users." *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2007, 88, p. 188-196.

¹²⁸ Smith I. *et al.* *The estate they're in*. Trafford: The Edge, 2004.

¹²⁹ Young M. *et al.* "Interpersonal discrimination and the health of illicit drug users." *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*. 2005, 31(3), p. 371-391.

¹³⁰ Fountain J. *et al.* *The delivery of prison drug services in England and Wales, with a focus on black and minority ethnic prisoners*. Preston: Centre for Ethnicity and Health, 2004.

¹³¹ Klee H. *et al.* *Employing drug users: individual and systemic barriers to rehabilitation*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2002. www.jrf.org.uk

¹³² An eye-opening description which I first heard used by Professor Umberto Nizzoli of the drug dependence service in Reggio Emilia in Italy at a seminar organised by T3E (UK).

¹³³ Ashton M. *Burgered: quality of life and addiction treatment*. Unpublished, available on request from the author.

¹³⁴ Ashton M. "The power of the welcoming reminder." *Drug and Alcohol Findings*. 2004, issue 11.
http://findings.org.uk/count/downloads/download.php?file=Ashton_M_29.pdf

¹³⁵ Smith I. *et al.* *The estate they're in*. Trafford: The Edge, 2004.