Up, Down, Turn Around

Recovery in the Wrong Order

Evan William Johnston

Revised Edition · 2026

Contents

Copyright **2**

Introduction: The First Position **3**

Part I - The Reversal **4**
1. The Question Nobody Wants Asked 4
2. Updown Admittance: Owning the Choice 5
    Admittance Is Not Admission to Powerlessness 8
3. Before the First Drink 10
4. The System That Makes People Smaller 11
    The Therapeutic Community Problem 12
5. Safety Is the First Treatment 14
6. Awakening, Ownership and Responsibility . . . 15
    Ownership: I Drink Because I Want To 16
7. The Cup and the Substance 17
    The Belladonna Question 18
    Enjoy It or Do Not Do It 19
    The Cup of Suffering 21
    When the Substance Loses Its Job 22
8. What Recovery Could Look Like 24

Part II - The Social Construction of Recovery **26**
9. When Description Becomes Identity 26
10. Who Gets to Define Recovery? 27
11. The Institution as a Meaning-Making System . . 29
12. Language, Power and the Therapeutic Community 30

13. Choice, Desire and the Social Production of Agency 31
14. Responsibility Without Identity Collapse 32
15. The Red-Wine Story Revisited 34

Part III - Opening the Ontology **37**
16. What Kind of Thing Is a Person? 37
17. Identity in Context 38
18. Agency as a Relation 40
19. Recovery as a Changing Field 41
20. The Relativist Question 42
21. Keeping Reality Without Keeping One Story . . 43
22. What the Model Cannot Know in Advance . . . 45

Part IV - The Human Test **47**
23. A Case Is Not a Law 47
24. Alternative Readings 48
25. Where the Model Might Be Wrong 50
26. What a More Open Treatment System Might Become 51

Part V - The Seven Movements in Practice **55**
A New Order 55
Admittance: The Door Opens Inward 58
Safety: The Present Must Become Different . . 59
Awakening, Presence and Awareness 62
Agency: From Awareness to Choice 64
Self-Management: Recovery Enters Ordinary Life 67
What the Evidence Actually Supports 69
The Group and the Island 71
The Ideal Rehab: Utopian, Perhaps; Useless, No 73
Australian Rehab Models: A Living Comparison 76
The Buttery: Why the Special Case Matters . . 80
Personal Recovery Stories: Evidence of Possibility 81

The Philosophical Consequence: A Wider Consciousness 83
A Practical Architecture for the Updown Centre 84
Responsibility Without Shame, and Without Escape 86
What the Model Cannot Promise 87

Part VI - The Human Mechanisms 89
Trauma Without Reduction 89
The Nervous System and the Return of Choice 91
Craving Is Not an Order 92
Time, Development and the Problem of Twenty-Eight Days 94
The Single Room: A Door Between Self and World 95
Voluntary Disarmament 96
Family: The First Social Test 97
Work, Money and the Rebuilding of Ordinary Competence 98
Social Visibility 99
Relapse as Information, Not Metaphysics . . . 100
Coercion and the Limits of Choice 101
Harm Reduction Without Moral Confusion . . 101
Spirituality Without a Required Religion . . . 102
Measuring What Matters 103
A Research Programme for Updown 103
Staff as the Environmental Nervous System . . 104
Admission as the First Act of Treatment 105
Selection: Who Belongs in the Community? . 105
Leaving: The Final Test of the Institution . . . 106

Part VII - Extending the Argument 107
The Difference Between Knowing and Noticing 107
The Present Moment Is Not a Tiny Point in Time 108
Why a Person May Resist Being Seen 110
The Institution as a Temporary World 111
The Economics of Safety 111

The Problem of Purity 112
Learning to Live Without the Centre of the Story 113
What Different Recovery Philosophies Can Borrow From One Another 113
Why the Seven Movements Are Better Seen as Conditions Than Rules 114
The Question of Identity After Recovery . . . 115
The Larger Social World 115
The Ethical Test 116
The Measure of a Better Future 116

Part VIII - Making the Idea Concrete **118**
The Admission Interview 118
The Quiet Architecture of Recovery 119
Choice Needs Consequences 120
Community as a Social Laboratory 121
From Residential Safety to the Street Outside . 122
A Pluralist Clinical Ethic 122
Beyond the Binary of Disease and Willpower . 123
The Recovery Self as a Moving Centre of Gravity 124
The Final Reversal 124
Final Synthesis: Admittance -> Get to Safety -> Awakening -> Become Present -> Awareness -> Regain and Establish Agency -> Learn to Manage Yourself . 125

Part IX - The World After Rehab **127**
A Recovery Plan That Looks Like a Life 127
The Ordinary Evening 128
The Recovery of Time 129
The Recovery of Attention 129
What a Better Society Would Ask 130
The Final Word Is Not Abstinence or Moderation 130
A Closing Image 131
It Is Enough 132
The Sequence Reconsidered 133

Afterword - The World We Are Building **136**

Selected Sources and Further Reading **140**

For anyone who was told that freedom had to begin by giving it away.

Copyright

© 2026 Evan William Johnston. All rights reserved.

Research and other sources are cited in the text and listed in Selected Sources and Further Reading at the end.

The discussion of alcohol and other drugs is educational and philosophical in nature. Acute withdrawal and other medical risks require appropriate clinical assessment and care.

Introduction: The First Position

My starting position is precise: recovery should be organised around the restoration of the person's capacity to participate in their own life. I therefore propose a developmental order: admittance -> get to safety -> awakening -> become present -> awareness -> regain and establish agency -> learn to manage yourself.

I am not beginning from the proposition that every existing treatment system is useless. Nor am I claiming that addiction is simply trauma, that every person can recover without treatment, or that a substance can be made safe by changing the story around it. I am beginning from a narrower proposition: the order in which a human being is asked to do things may alter what that human being is able to do.

A person who is frightened may need protection before confrontation. A person who has learned to distrust their own judgement may need opportunities to practise judgement before being asked to demonstrate it. A person whose problem has become an identity may need room to become something larger than the problem before independent life can feel believable.

The question that follows is not whether safety is nice. It is whether safety, awareness and agency can be understood as conditions that make responsibility stronger rather than weaker.

Part I - The Reversal

1. The Question Nobody Wants Asked

What if recovery begins in the wrong place? The question is deliberately uncomfortable. It does not deny addiction, dependence, craving, damage or the usefulness of treatment. It asks whether the order in which certain ideas are introduced may change what a frightened human being is able to do.

A person does not have to become smaller in order to become free. What if the person described as powerless is not powerless? What if the person called an addict for life is a human being who suffered for a long time, discovered that a substance could change the unbearable state inside them, and then learned to interpret that discovery as evidence of permanent defect? What if recovery does not begin with surrender, confession or obedience but with safety? These questions are not designed to insult anyone who found a way through twelve-step recovery. They are designed to disturb a particular assumption: that the first task of a person who has lost control must be to surrender the right to trust themselves. That assumption has consequences. A frightened person can enter treatment already believing that they are defective. If the institution then tells them that their thinking is unreliable, their judgement cannot be trusted, their life is unmanageable and their identity is

permanently attached to the problem, the institution may call this humility. The person may experience something else: disappearance. Updown is an attempt to reverse that movement. It is not a straight line from broken to fixed. It is an order turned upside down. The proposal is simple enough to remember and large enough to reorganise an entire way of thinking: SAFETY BEFORE SURRENDER. AWAKENING BEFORE CORRECTION. OWNERSHIP BEFORE DEPENDENCE.

The proposition is simple enough to remember and large enough to reorganise an entire way of thinking: **safety before surrender; awakening before correction; ownership before dependence.** The argument will not stay at the level of slogans. It will ask what those reversals mean when they meet trauma, institutions, bodies, relationships, evidence and the ordinary difficulties of being alive.

The first task, then, is not to make the person surrender. It is to make reality speakable without making the person disappear inside the description of the problem.

2. Updown Admittance: Owning the Choice

The word **admittance** is central to Updown, but it means something deliberately different from an admission of powerlessness. The distinction needs to be made plainly because the two ideas can sound similar while moving in opposite directions.

In the familiar language of Alcoholics Anonymous, a person is asked to admit that they are powerless over alcohol.[11] Updown begins with a different kind of admission: **admit that you do it because you want what it gives you.**

If you like the effect, admit that too.

This is not self-condemnation. It is not saying, "I am bad because I drink." It is not saying, "I have complete freedom and therefore nobody else or nothing else matters." It is much simpler. It is saying: **I did it because I wanted the effect. It gave me something. I liked what it gave me, so I kept choosing it.** Perhaps it gave relief. Perhaps it quietened fear. Perhaps it changed boredom, loneliness, anger, shame, anxiety or exhaustion. Perhaps it produced pleasure. Perhaps it did several things at once. Whatever the reason, the person is the one who wanted the effect strongly enough to seek it.

That point matters because the person who keeps telling themselves, "I do not really want this; I am powerless; it just happens to me; I hate it; I must stop; why did I do it again?" can become trapped in a circular argument with the substance. They use, feel guilty, fight the desire, make promises, explain the failure, experience the desire again, and use again. The substance may be consumed once. The argument with the substance can be consumed all day.

Updown calls this **the obsession**. The first task is therefore not necessarily to defeat the substance by force. It is to take the substance out of the centre of the person's mental life by ending the internal war around the choice. The person says, in effect: *I want it. I know that I want it. I know what I want from it. I no longer need to invent a story in which I am dragged helplessly towards it.*

That produces a deliberately simple Updown formulation: **if I want it, I will get it; if I do not want it, I will not get it.** The point is not to claim that dependence, withdrawal, craving or conditioning do not exist. They can make a desired action extraordinarily difficult to resist. The point is to locate the decision where the decision actually occurs:

in the person. The person may be constrained, frightened, conditioned or dependent, but they are not required to surrender authorship of the fact that they are seeking an effect.

This is why Updown admittance is not an admission of powerlessness. Powerlessness says, in its strongest form, *the substance is in charge of me*. Updown admittance says, *I am the person who keeps going after what the substance gives me*. The first can turn the relationship into a permanent identity. The second makes the relationship visible.

And there is an important paradox here. For some people who are still using, the removal of guilt may make the desire easier to see rather than easier to obey. If the person can finally say, "Yes, I like it," the need to defend the desire can fall away. The person no longer has to spend every hour arguing with themselves about whether the desire is real. They can experience it directly. They can notice what it does, what it costs, what it promises, what it prevents, and whether they would choose the same life again. The internal noise becomes information.

This is why the Updown approach can say something that initially sounds dangerous: **if you are going to use, stop adding the second suffering of guilt and dishonesty to the first. Admit that you want the effect. Admit, if it is true, that you enjoy the experience.** The purpose is not to turn continued use into a recommendation or a moral victory. The purpose is to remove the false struggle that keeps the substance psychologically enormous. A person who stops fighting a fact can finally examine the fact.

That can become the first opening into awakening. The person notices: *I am doing this. I know why I am doing it. I can notice the moment I decide. I can notice what happens before, during and after. I am here.* The user begins to become

the observer of the behaviour rather than being completely absorbed in it. The substance is no longer an unexplained force. It has a function, a history, a set of meanings and a relationship with a person who is beginning to see the whole arrangement.

Only then does the rest of the Updown sequence become possible. **Admittance -> get to safety -> awakening -> become present -> awareness -> regain and establish agency -> learn to manage yourself.** The sequence begins with owning the choice, not surrendering it.

Admittance Is Not Admission to Powerlessness

The distinction can be stated as plainly as possible.

AA-style admission of powerlessness: *I am powerless over alcohol.*

Updown admittance: *I choose it because I want what it does for me. I may be deeply constrained by the relationship, but I will not pretend that I am not the person seeking the effect.*

The difference is not a minor change of vocabulary. It changes the psychological starting point. Updown does not begin by asking the person to surrender the authorship of the behaviour. It asks them to reclaim it without guilt.

That does not erase consequences. A person can want something and still recognise that it is harming them. They can like an effect and dislike the life organised around obtaining it. They can understand why they chose a behaviour and still decide that they no longer want the consequences. They can say, at the same time: *I wanted it. It helped me. I chose it. It hurt me. I hurt other people. And I can choose what happens next.*

That is the form of admittance on which Updown rests. It does not make the person smaller. It makes the choice visi-

ble.

A problem can be serious without becoming the whole person. The language of permanent identity sits at the centre of the argument. "I am an addict." "I am powerless." "I cannot manage my life." "I will always be in recovery." For some people, this language is useful, stabilising and truthful to their lived experience. The Updown objection is not that these sentences are forbidden. It is that they can become larger than the behaviour they were meant to describe. A distinction appears repeatedly in the Updown argument: "I lost control of this part of my life" is not the same proposition as "I am incapable of control." The first identifies an event or pattern. The second turns the event into a theory of the whole human being. Once that happens, treatment can begin to organise itself around the assumption that the problem is permanent. The consequences may be subtle. A resident learns the programme vocabulary. They learn what counts as denial. They learn how much disclosure is expected. They learn how to describe their motives. They learn how to monitor themselves through the categories supplied by the institution. Eventually, the institution can become the lens through which the person sees themselves. Updown therefore asks a provocative question: why wait until the end of treatment to return the person to the thing treatment says it wants them to recover - authorship? If independent living is the goal, perhaps authorship should be practised from the beginning. There is also an ethical balance here. Rejecting permanent identity does not mean pretending a recurring problem never happened. A person can acknowledge dependence, craving, damage, withdrawal and risk without turning any of those descriptions into a total metaphysical sentence. The central distinction is between a description that helps

a person orient themselves and a description that closes the future. Identity sounds like a property, but perhaps it operates partly as a relationship between the person and the people around them. The word "addict" may do something different when spoken by a doctor, a peer, a family member, a criminal court, a person in a support group, or the person themselves. The meaning of the identity may therefore be inseparable from its context.

3. Before the First Drink

To understand the substance, move one step backwards. Most treatment stories begin with the substance. Updown asks what happened before the first drink. Fear, isolation, rejection, abuse, neglect, loneliness, chronic vigilance, a body that could not settle, a social world in which relief was scarce: these possibilities form the background to a different kind of inquiry. The Updown argument is careful not to say that trauma causes every addiction. That caution should remain. People arrive at problematic substance use through different routes, and different routes can coexist in one life. The important move is not to replace a substance-centred explanation with a trauma-centred explanation as though one were simply the hidden master cause. It is to enlarge the field of inquiry. For some people, the first drink was experienced as relief. A substance could soften fear, quiet thought, permit sleep, create courage, reduce loneliness or provide distance from an otherwise unbearable internal state. That does not make the substance a healthy medicine. It helps explain why the behaviour can become compelling. The original metaphor is useful: the substance may have been the solution before it became the problem. Once a solution is repeated, it can become a habit, then a dependency,

then a source of damage of its own. The person can end up caught between the original function of the behaviour and the new consequences created by the behaviour. What matters for Updown is that treatment should not stop at removing the substance while ignoring the experience for which the substance became useful. The harder question becomes: what would need to change in the person's life so that the relief was no longer necessary, or so that another way of meeting the same need became possible? Later, the social constructionist and ontological perspectives will complicate the idea of a single "original cause". They will ask whether the very idea of a cause is shaped by the story available to a community. A trauma story, a disease story, a moral story and a spiritual story may each illuminate part of the life. The challenge is to use explanations without allowing them to become prisons.

4. The System That Makes People Smaller

A helping system can become harmful without intending to do harm. The Updown argument describes "structural gaslighting" as a way of thinking about institutions that repeatedly teach people to distrust their own perceptions, judgement or capacity. The term is intentionally structural. It does not require individual staff members to be malicious. A system can produce a pattern without anyone consciously designing the pattern. A frightened resident may be quiet in group. That quietness might be interpreted as denial, resistance, social anxiety, dissociation, disrespect or thoughtful privacy. Someone has to choose the frame. Once chosen, the frame influences what the next event

means. The resident who says little is invited to prove honesty; the resident who says too much is told they are controlling; the person who disputes an interpretation may be accused of denial. This can create a small world in which everything becomes evidence. A private thought becomes evidence. A disagreement becomes evidence. A request for a cigarette becomes evidence. An extra spoon of sugar becomes evidence. The institution can slowly become a laboratory in which ordinary behaviour is repeatedly translated into moral or diagnostic categories. Updown does not argue against structure. It argues for meaningful structure. A boundary can protect people. A routine can create predictability. A consequence can interrupt harm. The distinction is between a rule that protects a person and a rule that mainly demonstrates who has authority. The stronger version of the argument is not "institutions are bad". It is "institutions participate in the reality they are trying to manage". Once that is recognised, the institution has to examine not only what it believes about residents, but what its own practices are teaching residents about themselves. That proposition will become central in Part II. If the institutional vocabulary helps create the identity it claims merely to recognise, then recovery is partly a problem of language and power. The question is no longer only whether the diagnosis is accurate. It becomes: what does this description make possible?

The Therapeutic Community Problem

Community can heal. Community can also become an unsupervised social world. Connection is the goal. Overwhelm is not. Do not mix vulnerability with danger and call the mixture therapy. The therapeutic community

contains a difficult contradiction. Community can be healing. Community can also become a social hierarchy, and hierarchy becomes dangerous when the people inside it are frightened, impressionable, coerced or accustomed to institutional survival. A voluntary resident who has chosen treatment is not psychologically situated in the same way as a person who entered because the alternative was prison. Neither person is automatically good or bad. Their circumstances are different. The same is true of risk. A person new to treatment may need protection from people who have learned to dominate. A person who is deeply traumatised may need gradual contact rather than immediate immersion in a crowded social world. The proposal is not to dehumanise court-mandated residents. It is to stop pretending that all treatment environments can be identical. Separate pathways can still be humane pathways. Coercion may exist at the legal level without being reproduced in every social interaction. Large groups can also turn recovery into theatre. Residents learn what the institution admires. They learn how to sound honest. They learn how to perform remorse. They learn how to challenge another resident in the approved language. The loudest or most institutionally fluent person can become socially powerful. That is not necessarily awakening. It may simply be adaptation to another system. Updown prefers graduated contact: one trusted relationship, then a small stable group, then wider social participation when the person is ready. Four to six people appears repeatedly in the available evidence as a useful design hypothesis - not a scientific magic number. The deeper principle matters more than the exact number: socialisation should be graded, predictable and psychologically survivable.

5. Safety Is the First Treatment

Safety is not decoration. It is a condition of possibility. The word "safety" can sound soft until we ask what happens without it. A person shaped by danger may continue to scan faces, doors, footsteps and voices after the immediate danger has ended. They may anticipate humiliation or betrayal. They may prepare an answer before a question is asked. What looks like armour may be a learned form of survival. Updown therefore makes a distinction between physical safety and felt safety. Physical safety means protection from violence, intimidation, exploitation, predatory behaviour and uncontrolled chaos. Felt safety means the body gradually learning that the present is not identical with the past. The phrase "absolute safety" in the Updown argument is not meant literally. It is an experiential ideal: the experience of enough safety that the person does not have to remain permanently defended. That leads to practical proposals: no threats disguised as therapy, no deliberate humiliation, no forced vulnerability before trust exists, predictable routines, private space, permission to step back, appropriate medical care, and an environment that feels like care rather than punishment. None of these propositions removes responsibility. They change the conditions under which responsibility can be experienced. The most important mechanism in the model is voluntary disarmament. The institution does not rip the armour away. It creates evidence that the armour may no longer be necessary. Over time, the person can put down what they are protecting themselves with because they themselves decide it is safe enough to do so. At this point the ontological question begins to appear. Is safety something the person possesses inside themselves, or something that emerges

between person and environment? If a person is calm in one relationship and defensive in another, which state is the "real" person? The relational answer may be that neither has to be the final essence. Each reveals something about what becomes possible under different conditions. This is the first major bridge from the manifesto into the later inquiry. Safety is not merely an input delivered to a stable individual. It may alter the field in which identity, agency and meaning are formed.

6. Awakening, Ownership and Responsibility

The person has to become present before the meaning of choice can become clear. In the Updown argument, awakening is not a supernatural requirement. It is a return to presence: I am here. I am safe now. That happened then. It is not happening now. I can see what is happening inside me. I can choose. The point is not mysticism. It is the shift from automatic reaction toward reflective participation. This matters because a person can perform recovery language while remaining absent from their own experience. They can confess without understanding. They can perform remorse without integration. They can repeat spiritual vocabulary without discovering what they actually believe. Updown therefore places awakening before correction, while still allowing correction to matter once the person is genuinely present. Ownership follows. The deliberately uncomfortable phrase is: "You chose it. You can unchoose it." This cannot reasonably mean that every decision was made under conditions of perfect freedom. Dependence, craving, withdrawal, conditioning, social pressure and fear can nar-

row options severely. The useful claim is narrower: at some point the behaviour may have been chosen because it produced an effect the person wanted, and recognising that desire may be a route back into authorship. Responsibility then becomes possible without shame. A person can say: I was hurt, and I hurt people. I was surviving, and I caused damage. I did not choose what happened to me, and I am responsible for what I do next. Shame collapses those distinctions into "I am bad". Responsibility leaves the action specific and the future open. The model therefore places agency and accountability together. It does not use agency to excuse harm, and it does not use responsibility to manufacture permanent self-contempt. This balance is crucial because it points beyond the usual opposition between "disease" and "willpower". The later lenses will complicate ownership further. If identity is formed partly in relationship, then the ability to say "I choose" may itself depend on whether a social environment recognises the speaker as a legitimate author of their own life. Agency can be real without being purely internal.

Ownership: I Drink Because I Want To

Ownership is the return of authorship, not the fantasy of total freedom. Updown admittance comes first: I did it because I wanted the effect. I liked what it gave me. I kept choosing it because I kept wanting what it gave me. That is not an admission of moral failure. It is an admission of agency. You chose it. You can unchoose it. This is where Updown becomes uncomfortable. The conventional language says: you are powerless over alcohol. Updown says: you are the person who keeps going after what alcohol gives you. That statement needs to be held carefully. Dependence can

later narrow choice. Craving, withdrawal, conditioning and compulsion can make stopping brutally difficult. A person can sincerely want to stop and still feel unable to stop. But the underlying insight remains. There was something in the drink that the person wanted. Relief. Sleep. Quiet. Courage. Numbness. Pleasure. Permission. Distance. When desire is denied, shame rushes in. When shame rushes in, the person is caught between 'I want this' and 'I am not allowed to want this.' The internal war begins. Drinking becomes both relief and evidence of failure. The next drink is used to escape the pain created by the last one. The use may have begun as a choice for relief. Dependence can later make that choice feel compulsory. Recovery restores the capacity to choose again. That is the Updown formulation.

Not: 'You did everything freely.' Not: 'Nothing is your fault.' Not: 'The substance has no power.' Instead: 'There is still a person inside this problem, and the person must eventually become visible again.' To own a choice is to recover the right to change it.

7. The Cup and the Substance

The substance and the suffering may be connected without being identical. The visible object is the drink; the invisible contents may be fear, shame, grief, rage, loneliness and the sense of being trapped inside one's own mind. The task is to separate what has become fused.

The significance of the substance can exceed its chemistry. It may become reward, rebellion, adulthood, romance, escape, grief, permission or failure. It can become a symbol that condenses a whole life into one object. Once that happens, the substance can be treated as though it were simultaneously the cause, the punishment and the explanation.

That is precisely the knot this chapter wants to loosen.

The Belladonna Question

A founding experience can be meaningful without becoming unquestionable. Question the order. Question the language. Do not take someone else's recovery away from them. A founding story can be meaningful without becoming unquestionable.

Alcoholics Anonymous deserves a particular kind of criticism: neither worship nor contempt. Its history includes a question that is too interesting to ignore. Bill Wilson, one of AA's founders, experienced the event he later described as a profound spiritual awakening while being treated at Towns Hospital. Wilson himself described his treatment at Towns Hospital as the "so-called belladonna treatment"; historical accounts describe that treatment as involving belladonna and related compounds associated with delirium and other striking alterations of consciousness.[33] That fact does not prove that Wilson's experience was merely pharmacological. It does not prove that it was not spiritual. It does not prove that AA's later programme is fraudulent. It does not even settle what Wilson himself experienced. It does something more modest and, in my view, more valuable. - It makes unquestioning certainty harder. If the founding awakening occurred in the context of a treatment capable of profoundly altering consciousness, then perhaps we should be careful about treating the exact recovery philosophy that followed as if it arrived from heaven already complete. Perhaps the awakening can be honoured while the order is questioned. Perhaps spirituality can be retained without making surrender the first psychological move. Perhaps the person can awaken and then decide what they believe. This

matters because AA is no longer only a fellowship of people choosing their own path. Its language and assumptions have travelled into treatment

centres, workbooks, institutional routines and professional settings. A voluntary spiritual practice can become an institutional requirement. That is where Updown draws the line. I am not interested in taking AA away from someone who found a way to live through it. If the rooms, the people, the language and the fellowship are what keep someone alive and well, that recovery is theirs.

I am interested in refusing the claim that every person must pass through the same gate. And I am willing to say something sharper: I have come to regard the conventional AA model as deeply discredited as a universal theory of human recovery. I do not mean that every member is deceived, that every meeting is useless or that every spiritual experience is false. I mean that a model built around permanent powerlessness and lifelong identity should not automatically be treated as the final word. There is also an institutional question. Whenever a system can preserve itself by keeping people dependent on its language, rituals or authority, it deserves scrutiny. That is a question about organisational incentives, not a claim that its founders knowingly designed a con. Updown refuses to turn suspicion into history. QUESTION THE ORDER. DO NOT DESTROY SOMEONE'S RECOV- ERY TO MAKE YOUR POINT.

Enjoy It or Do Not Do It

Refusing the split between desire and honesty. The first victory is not abstinence. The first victory is honesty. Enjoy It or Don't Do It The risky idea is the one that finally ends the war. This is the point at which Updown stops sounding po-

lite. For the person who is still using and trapped in guilt, the model proposes a deliberately provocative experiment: stop pretending you do not want the relief. If you are going to use, use without the theatrical layer of self-hatred. Admit that there is something you like. Notice what it gives you. Let yourself experience the fact that you chose it. And if you cannot genuinely tolerate

the idea that this is your choice, then the question becomes more interesting still: why are you doing it? The phrase 'Enjoy it, or don't do it at all' is not a celebration of addiction. It is an attempt to remove the split. For years, some people live like this: drink, regret, promise, resist, crave, fail, drink, regret. The substance is consumed once. The guilt is consumed every day. Updown asks what happens when the guilt is withdrawn from the equation. The drink becomes a drink. The wine becomes wine. The person becomes a person. And suddenly a strange thing can happen: choice becomes visible. As long as the person believes, 'I have no choice; I must stop; I am failing because I keep doing this,' every drink becomes proof of powerlessness. But if the person says, 'I am doing this because I want the effect, and I am not going to spend another day punishing myself for that fact,' something opens. The choice can now be examined. What is it costing me? What do I actually enjoy? What have I built around it? Would I choose this life again? What would I choose instead? There is no need to answer immediately. The Updown idea is that the person must be allowed to discover the answer without being pushed toward a predetermined conclusion.

For some, that will reveal a wish to stop. For some, it may reveal a wish to change the pattern. For some, it may reveal that the substance was carrying a burden that now belongs elsewhere. The first victory is not abstinence. The first vic-

tory is honesty.

The Cup of Suffering

The image of the cup can be understood without turning it into a narrow Christian narrative.

Jesus drinking the cup represents a person entering fully into suffering. The cup is not simply wine. It is the burden of life: fear, betrayal, pain, injustice, confusion, loneliness, and the terrible things human beings can do to one another.

Many people drink that cup in different forms. For some, suffering becomes alcohol or drugs. The substance is not necessarily the original source of the suffering. It becomes the means by which a person tries to bear it.

In this interpretation, the significance of Jesus is not that he condemns the person for seeking relief. It is that suffering is seen and understood. The universe, or God, is not indifferent to the person's agony.

"Forgive them, for they know not what they do" recognises the confusion and damage of human beings acting from ignorance and pain.

"It is finished" is not a debt collection. It is not a sentence that the person must remain condemned. It is the end of the ordeal.

The person does not have to keep drinking the cup of suffering.

The red wine can then be separated from the metaphor.

Red wine itself is not the entire history. It is not the trauma, the anger, the darkness, or the shame. It is a drink. It may be enjoyed, misused, put down, or left alone. Once it is no longer required to represent suffering, it loses some of its psychological power.

A person may say: "I drank that cup. I lived through that

suffering. I do not have to keep drinking it."

And then: "I do not have to keep drinking the wine either."

There is no need to turn the wine into an enemy. It can go free. The person can go free.

The metaphor does not make alcohol harmless. Dependence, withdrawal, conditioning and other material consequences remain real. The point is simply that suffering and the substance used to bear suffering are not identical. They can be treated as related but distinct realities.

The point of the cup is not to make alcohol harmless. Alcohol can create dependence, withdrawal, conflict and physical damage. The point is to distinguish the material substance from the suffering that a person may have come to place inside it.

When the Substance Loses Its Job

A substance can stop being necessary without becoming an enemy. I did not defeat red wine. I reached the end of wanting it. When the suffering changes, the meaning of the substance can change with it. A substance can acquire symbolic power that far exceeds its chemistry. A glass of wine can become Friday night, escape, reward, permission, rebellion, comfort, punishment, grief, memory, adulthood, childhood, loneliness, romance or failure. It becomes more than liquid. It becomes a story. That story can keep a person drinking long after the original reason has changed. This is why Updown cares so much about separating wine from suffering. The point is not that alcohol becomes harmless once trauma is resolved. It does not. The point is that the psychological meaning can change. The same drink can be consumed in two entirely different interior worlds. In one, the person is

desperately trying to escape themselves. In the other, the person knows exactly what they are doing and is no longer using the substance as a message about their worth. The second state does not automatically lead to abstinence. It does, however, make something possible that shame makes difficult: observation. The person can watch their own behaviour without turning it into a trial. They can discover whether they still want it. They can discover whether the pleasure remains. They can discover whether the cost has become larger than the benefit. And eventually they can discover the most important fact of all: sometimes

you stop wanting a thing. Not because it was defeated. Because it is finished.

Self-Management: The Point of the Whole Exercise Recovery must eventually become ordinary competence. Self-management is the last word in the sequence because it is the point at which recovery ceases to be the central identity of the person. The person begins managing a life again. That means money, work, health, sleep, housing, relationships, appointments, food, exercise, sexuality, recreation, conflict, boredom and time. None of these is as philosophically dramatic as "awakening", yet ordinary life is where the truth of the model has to appear. A person who can speak brilliantly about trauma but cannot pay a bill is still struggling. A person who can maintain abstinence but remains unable to tolerate intimacy has recovered one relationship and not another. A person who can manage work but collapses whenever a partner becomes disappointed has gained competence in one field and needs growth in another. Self-management is therefore not a final exam. It is a set of capacities that become distributed through life. Recovery is successful when the person's practical competence becomes broader than the programme that

taught it. This is why self-management naturally leads to work and family. A job is not simply employment; it is a social system requiring punctuality, negotiation, frustration tolerance, contribution and self-presentation. Family life

requires repair, reciprocity, boundaries, flexibility and the ability to remain present when other people have needs that compete with one's own. The same sequence applies. Admittance: this relationship is hurting. Safety: I can speak without immediate retaliation. Awakening: I recognise what I am doing. Presence: I remain in the conversation. Awareness: I see the pattern. Agency: I choose a different response. Self-management: I practise that response until it becomes part of ordinary life. The recovery centre should therefore teach the person to leave. It should not become

the most organised version of their existence. The destination is not institutional competence. It is adult life. What the Evidence Can and Cannot Say

The separation can be understood without demanding that every person reach the same conclusion. For one person, the consequence may be complete abstinence. For another, an early harm-reduction path may lead elsewhere. The deeper requirement is honesty about what the substance is doing in the life and what the person is capable of choosing safely.

The wine can become wine again. The suffering can be understood as suffering. The person can become larger than both.

8. What Recovery Could Look Like

An institution should embody the future it says it wants to create. If safety is central, the environment must feel safe. If agency is the goal, the person must experience agency

while receiving care. If ordinary life is the destination, the institution must not become more psychologically real than ordinary life. The practical proposals remain important: calm and secure surroundings; clear protective boundaries without humiliation; differentiated pathways where legal coercion creates genuinely different circumstances; small stable groups; gradual social contact; trauma-focused work introduced according to stability and readiness; time measured by need and development rather than an arbitrary calendar; participation in care decisions; practical preparation for money, work, housing, relationships and health; harm reduction considered by relative risk rather than moral purity; and medical care when withdrawal requires it. The original test of the institution is not how well the resident obeyed. It is how much more capable the person became of managing their own life because the institution was there. A successful treatment system makes itself less necessary. This gives Updown a practical shape without requiring it to become a rigid protocol. The institution can have rules, but rules should have reasons. A good rule protects people. A pointless rule mainly demonstrates who has authority. That distinction is not merely administrative. It teaches residents what kind of world they inhabit and what kind of person they are expected to become. A deeper question now appears: what if the categories through which the argument is stated are themselves part of the process under investigation? What if "addict", "recovery", "agency", "responsibility" and even "person" are not transparent descriptions but social achievements? What would institutional success look like if the measure were increased authorship rather than compliance? What is lost when a useful treatment model becomes a fixed protocol?

Part II - The Social Construction of Recovery

The shift here is epistemological. We move from asking whether the original claims are true to asking how such claims become knowable, speakable and authoritative. Social constructionism does not require us to deny suffering or material consequences. It asks how human beings come to recognise, name and organise those realities.

9. When Description Becomes Identity

The story about the person can become part of the person's experience of being a person. Social constructionism begins with a deceptively simple observation: descriptions do things. The word "addict" can describe a pattern, signal risk, organise treatment, create fellowship or provide a person with language for a painful experience. But a description can also begin to organise the person. Once a category is repeated by professionals, family, peers, institutions and the person themselves, it may become more than a label. It becomes a social position. This helps clarify the original Updown concern about permanent identity. The issue is not whether "addict" is true or false in the abstract. The issue is what the category makes possible in a particular

context. Does it help the person recognise danger? Does it provide belonging? Does it make selfunderstanding easier? Or does it narrow identity until every action is interpreted through the category? The same behaviour can be narrated differently. A drink can be called relapse, coping, pleasure, rebellion, self-medication, ritual or failure. Each description invites a different response. That response then changes what the behaviour means to the person. Language therefore becomes part of the environment rather than a neutral label laid on top of an already completed reality. This does not mean that words invent everything from nothing. Bodies still respond to substances. Withdrawal still occurs. People still experience craving. Families still suffer. What social constructionism changes is the epistemological stance: we ask how these events become organised into a story and how some stories gain more authority than others. That turns identity into a process rather than a simple possession. A person may inhabit different identities in different relationships. "Patient", "parent", "employee", "friend", "addict", "survivor" and "ordinary person" can each become salient under different conditions. The question becomes whether the treatment system leaves enough room for several identities to coexist or whether one category becomes the master description.

10. Who Gets to Define Recovery?

The question is not only what recovery is, but who gets to decide what counts as recovery. The word recovery appears to name an objective state, but different communities use it differently. One group may define recovery as abstinence. Another may emphasise functioning, harm reduction, freedom from compulsion, restored relationships, spiritual change or

ordinary participation in life. A person may use one definition privately and encounter another in treatment. The social constructionist question is therefore one of authority. Whose definition becomes official? Whose account is treated as reliable? When does a personal philosophy become an institutional requirement? A voluntary practice may be meaningful precisely because a person chose it. The same practice, when imposed, can acquire a different meaning. This is especially relevant to twelve-step language and the idea of powerlessness. The original earlier text does not deny that Alcoholics Anonymous has helped many people. The sharper question is whether its particular understanding of the person should automatically become a universal grammar of recovery when transported into institutions with different populations, different histories and different degrees of coercion. The epistemological point is that a recovery model cannot escape interpretation by simply claiming to describe reality. Its categories determine what it notices. A person who refuses the word addict may appear to one system to be in denial and to another to be reclaiming identity. The disagreement is not only factual. It concerns the framework through which the facts are made meaningful. That does not imply that every definition is equally good. Some descriptions can be more useful, more humane, more accurate for a given task, or better at predicting harm. Social constructionism is strongest when it does not become lazy relativism. The point is not that nothing is true. It is that the criteria by which something becomes accepted as true are themselves socially organised and therefore deserve examination. institution.

11. The Institution as a Meaning-Making System

A treatment system is not outside the person's reality; it enters it. Institutions do more than provide services. They classify, sequence, document and interpret. A treatment plan says what the person is thought to need. A progress note says what counts as improvement. A group ritual says what counts as honesty. A disciplinary process says what counts as unacceptable behaviour. A discharge summary creates an official account of the person's recent past. Once viewed this way, the institution becomes a meaning-making system. It does not merely respond to addiction; it helps construct the category through which addiction is experienced. A resident learns not only what to do, but how to talk about what they are doing. They learn the right explanation for a relapse, the right posture toward authority, the right emotional register, the right way to demonstrate insight. This may be beneficial. Shared language can create understanding. Ritual can create community. A common framework can reduce confusion. The problem appears when the framework becomes the only legitimate language. Then a person may become highly competent in institutional speech while becoming less certain of their own account. The concept of structural gaslighting becomes clearer here. The institution does not have to tell deliberate lies. It only needs to make one interpretation easier to survive than competing interpretations. If questioning a formulation is labelled resistance, then compliance becomes evidence of insight and disagreement becomes evidence of illness. The system begins to confirm itself. A reflexive institution would ask not only "What is wrong with this person?" but

"What are our categories doing to the person?" The question is not an accusation. It is a methodological discipline. It asks staff to notice how their observations are influenced by the categories they already use. The resulting principle is modest but important: treatment systems should be able to describe uncertainty. "We do not know yet" can sometimes preserve more truth than an interpretation presented as final fact.

12. Language, Power and the Therapeutic Community

Community can support recovery, but community is never neutral. The Updown argument is sceptical of therapeutic communities that place vulnerable people into dense social hierarchies and then call the resulting pressure therapeutic. A social constructionist lens asks why the hierarchy becomes powerful. Part of the answer is that communities produce norms. They teach members what a good resident sounds like, what a bad resident sounds like, which emotions are admirable, which objections are suspicious and which forms of disclosure are rewarded. Large groups can therefore become theatres of compliance. Residents learn to speak the institutional language. The person who is most fluent may appear the most insightful. The person who is uncertain may appear resistant. A resident can become skilled at performing recovery without the performance corresponding to an equivalent transformation in everyday life. This does not make community useless. People need people. A small stable group can provide witness, humour, recognition and ordinary companionship. The issue is the quality of the relationships. Community becomes danger-

ous when peer surveillance is mistaken for intimacy or when vulnerability becomes a source of status. The original design hypothesis of small groups - often four to six people - is best understood here as a proposal about scale rather than a magical number. Smaller groups can make it easier for people to experience themselves as people rather than cases. Yet different people may require different levels of contact. The social constructionist position is to investigate how different social arrangements produce different experiences rather than declaring one arrangement universally correct. This also changes the meaning of confrontation. Confrontation may be helpful in some relationships and destructive in others. Its effect depends partly on who has the power, what the person believes will happen next, what history the interaction activates and what meaning the community gives to disagreement. The relevant question is not "Is confrontation therapeutic?" in the abstract. It is "What does this particular interaction make possible for this particular person?"

13. Choice, Desire and the Social Production of Agency

"I choose" is not only a statement about freedom. It is also a statement about recognition. The Updown proposition that the person chose what drinking gave them remains deliberately provocative. The social constructionist perspective adds another layer. The meaning of "choice" is not formed by the individual alone. People learn what counts as a legitimate choice from the social world around them. A person may be told that wanting alcohol proves denial. They may then learn to hide desire. Another person may be told

that every drink proves disease. A third may understand drinking as an ordinary pleasure. The behaviour may be similar while the account of the behaviour differs. That account influences what the person can say about themselves, and therefore what options can be considered without shame. The phrase "Enjoy it or do not do it" can therefore be reread. Its purpose is not to celebrate drinking. It is to remove an internal split long enough to observe the relationship honestly. What do I want? What does it give me? What does it cost? Is the pleasure real? Is the relief real? What life does it fit? What life does it prevent? Social constructionism does not guarantee that this conversation produces abstinence. It simply argues that an honest account may require allowing desire to be spoken. A person who cannot admit wanting a behaviour cannot easily investigate what the behaviour means to them. At this point agency looks less like a possession and more like a conversational position. The person experiences themselves as an agent partly because the surrounding relationship treats them as someone whose experience and interpretation matter. That does not erase biological constraint or compulsion. It means that agency is not only inside the skull. It is also produced between people. This creates a more balanced reading of the original claim. "You chose it" can be useful when it restores authorship. It can be harmful when it denies constraint. The challenge is to hold both truths without collapsing either into the other.

14. Responsibility Without Identity Collapse

Identity can remain open while consequences remain real. The original Updown position distinguishes shame from re-

sponsibility. Shame says, "I am defective." Responsibility says, "I did something." Social constructionism sharpens this by looking at the relational work done by those statements. A permanent identity can make repair difficult because the person is asked to prove they are bad rather than change what they actually did. But a purely selfprotective constructionism could go wrong in the opposite direction. If every harmful act is explained away as "context", responsibility disappears. That is not the goal. People still owe one another repair. Money may need to be repaid. Relationships may need to be rebuilt. Boundaries may need to be accepted. Harm may need to stop. The more useful distinction is between explanation and excuse. A history can explain behaviour without making the behaviour harmless. A trauma narrative can illuminate a pattern without removing accountability. Social constructionism is valuable here because it can make more context visible while still leaving consequences intact. The strongest formulation is therefore relational: responsibility happens between people. An apology matters because another person was hurt. Restitution matters because something material was lost. A boundary matters because someone needs protection. A consequence matters because a pattern needs to stop. Responsibility is not mainly a ritual of self-punishment; it is work performed within relationships. This produces an important balance for the whole book. The person is not reducible to what they did, but what they did cannot be erased by a more flattering narrative. Identity remains revisable; consequences remain binding. That is a more demanding position than either permanent condemnation or complete absolution. The ontological question now becomes visible. If the self is not one fixed thing, how can responsibility remain stable? Perhaps because responsibility does not require a fixed essence.

It requires continuity enough for a person to recognise that what happened belongs to their life and that their future actions can alter what happens next.

15. The Red-Wine Story Revisited

The lived story is evidence of possibility, not proof of a universal law. It is included because the theory came after the experience rather than being imposed on it.

The experience was simple. The less I fought with the wine, the less important the wine became. The experience was not an abstract exercise. I did not arrive at Updown because I had invented a theory in a comfortable chair. I arrived at it because I had spent years living inside the problem and then, unexpectedly, found myself somewhere safe. I was fifty-two. I had spent roughly thirty years living with the consequences of trauma and the patterns that grew around it. I had been to rehab. I stayed for a month. Then I walked out. What happened after that mattered precisely because it was not planned as an experiment. For the first time in a very long time, I was in a safe place. I had a part-time job that was not too demanding. I had enough space

around me to notice what life felt like when I was not in permanent emergency. And I decided on something very simple: I was going to enjoy my life in the moment. I did not decide to become a model of sobriety. I did not decide to win. I decided to stop suffering because I was drinking. The difference was astonishing. I continued to drink red wine. About a bottle a night. But the relationship to it changed. Instead of drinking while simultaneously prosecuting myself, I made it an interest. A hobby, almost. I tried different wines. I paid attention to them. I separated the wine from

the suffering. That distinction became crucial. I had already spent years in therapy. My therapist had helped me reach a place where I could understand the trauma underneath my behaviour. I knew I was not drinking because I was still trapped in the same place I had once been. I had closure on the trauma in a way I had not had before. And then there I was, drinking again. So I decided that if drinking was going to be part of my life, I was going to stop turning it into a moral catastrophe. I called it what it was: a lifestyle choice that was not healthy, like smoking. My

choice. My responsibility. And I was not going to spend one more day in misery because I had made it. My therapist did not tell me to drink. That part was mine. What mattered was that she did not turn my decision into a battle. Because the battle disappeared, the sessions became more interesting. We did not have to spend the hour talking about alcohol as though it were the only thing happening in my life.

That was strange. The less I fought with the wine, the less important the wine became. I could look at it. I could enjoy it. I could admit what I wanted from it. And because I could admit that I wanted it, I could finally imagine that I might one day not want it. - The moment ownership returned, the possibility of refusal returned with it. That is the part of Updown that I think is hardest to understand from the outside. People often imagine that agency means declaring, 'I can stop whenever I want.' It is not that. Agency is quieter. It is the ability to say, 'This is what I am doing. I understand why. I am not lying to myself about it. I am allowed to look at the choice.' Once I could look at the choice, I could eventually change it. The Day I Didn't Want It There was no victory speech. I can choose it. I can choose not to. The day came when I had simply had enough. Not because someone told me that I was powerless. Not because I was

frightened into sobriety. Not because I had finally perfected the right recovery language.

Conclusion

What happened next mattered because the battle itself had changed. The wine was no longer required to represent failure every time it appeared. The person could look at the choice rather than merely prosecute themselves for having it. Eventually the desire changed. There was no need for a victory ceremony. There was simply a point at which red wine was no longer wanted.

The intellectually important conclusion is not that this is how everybody should stop drinking. Several explanations can coexist: a safer environment may have reduced stress; earlier therapy may have changed the relationship to trauma; shame may have released attention; development and circumstance may have shifted; the meaning of alcohol may have changed; or desire itself may simply have changed. The case therefore remains what a case should be: a concrete life that reveals a mechanism worth investigating.

The story also gives the book one of its most important distinctions. Agency is not the declaration, "I can stop whenever I want." Agency is quieter. It is the ability to say, "This is what I am doing. I understand why. I am not lying to myself about it. I am allowed to look at the choice." Once the choice can be looked at, it can sometimes change.

Part III - Opening the Ontology

The question now turns further inward. Social constructionism has shown how descriptions and relationships participate in making identities. Relativist ontology asks what follows if we take that insight seriously enough to question whether the person, the addiction and even agency have a single fixed mode of being.

16. What Kind of Thing Is a Person?

Perhaps the deepest question is not "What is this person?" but "What becomes true about this person here?" Ordinary language encourages us to treat the person as an object: a stable thing with properties. We say someone is intelligent, difficult, traumatised, alcoholic, resilient, manipulative, generous, avoidant or responsible. These descriptions are often useful. Yet the same person can appear radically different in different relationships and states. The question is whether this is inconsistency or whether it tells us something about the ontology of persons. A relativist ontological approach does not say that the person is imaginary. It says that what is real about a person may be partly relational. A frightened person in one room and a confident person in another are not necessarily two false versions competing for the title of "real self". They may be different expressions of a

person under different conditions. This changes the treatment question. Instead of asking only what trait the person has, we ask which relations, contexts and histories bring which capacities into view. Is judgement present? Under what conditions? Is agency absent? Or is agency constrained by a particular relationship, bodily state, memory or institutional arrangement? Does a person become more capable when the surrounding world becomes more predictable? This is not identical to saying that everything depends on context. Some things resist interpretation. Bodies have limits. Substances have pharmacological effects. Withdrawal can be dangerous. Other people can be hurt. Material circumstances matter. The relativist move is not to dissolve these realities but to resist the claim that any one description exhausts them. The person can therefore be understood as a field of potentialities rather than a single inventory of fixed traits. The word "identity" still matters, but it may be closer to an evolving pattern than a permanent object. That pattern has continuity, history and consequences, yet remains responsive to relationship and context. Once we see the person this way, the Updown argument becomes more subtle. Treatment does not merely restore a hidden self. It may participate in producing a new configuration of the person - one in which different capacities become easier to inhabit.

17. Identity in Context

Identity is not only what a person says they are; it is also what a social world makes possible for them to be. The question of identity becomes sharper when we examine context. A person may be a patient in one setting, a parent in another, a worker in another, a friend in another, an "addict" in another. These identities are not merely masks placed

over a fixed interior. Each relationship invites particular behaviours, expectations and forms of recognition. This suggests that identity has both continuity and variation. We are not infinitely different people every hour. Yet neither are we identical across every setting. The mistake may be expecting identity to behave like an object. A person may have a pattern that persists while its expression changes with context. Treatment systems can then be understood as identity environments. A programme that constantly asks, "What is your addiction doing?" produces one centre of gravity. A programme that also asks about work, humour, friendship, creativity, family, sexuality, practical competence and ordinary pleasure makes more aspects of identity available. This does not prove that broader identity causes recovery. It does suggest a possible mechanism by which a person becomes more than the institutional category through which they entered care. The social constructionist lens had already shown that language can influence identity. Relativism adds that context may not merely alter the description of the same object; it may alter which capacities and relations become constitutive of the person at that moment. That leads to a useful caution. We should not assume that the "true" self is always the self outside treatment, nor that the self inside treatment is always artificial. Both are real in their contexts. The question is which context allows a fuller range of capacities and which context unnecessarily narrows them. In this sense, recovery can be thought of as movement between contexts rather than movement from one fixed self to another. The destination is not necessarily an ideal personality. It may be a life in which the person can occupy a wider range of identities without one problem-category swallowing the rest.

18. Agency as a Relation

Agency may be real without being solely internal. The Updown argument speaks of "giving ownership back". The social constructionist version reframes this as recognition: a person needs to be treated as someone whose own account matters. The relativist version goes further by asking whether agency is partly a relation rather than a possession. This can be seen in ordinary life. People make better decisions when they have enough sleep, enough food, privacy, information, social support and time. They make different decisions under threat, intoxication, exhaustion, coercion or acute distress. It would be strange to say that agency simply exists or does not exist across all these states. It may be better understood as something that expands and contracts with the conditions around it. This does not erase personal responsibility. On the contrary, it may clarify it. If agency is situated, then responsible treatment should ask what conditions make responsible action more possible. The task is not merely to demand better choices from the person. It is also to examine the field in which the choices are made. The word "choice" can therefore be understood relatively. One person may genuinely have several options. Another may see only one. A third may know intellectually that alternatives exist but remain unable to inhabit them under current conditions. All three can be describing something true about the relationship between themselves and their circumstances. This provides a more balanced interpretation of powerlessness. The claim "I am powerless over alcohol" may describe a real experience in a specific relation to the substance. It does not have to become a permanent theory of the entire person. Conversely, "I am fully in control" may also be false in a particular state.

Agency can be partial, fluctuating and recoverable. The treatment implication is subtle. Instead of simply telling people to take responsibility, the institution can design conditions that let responsibility be practised: making choices, handling money, negotiating boundaries, asking for help, managing disagreement, making decisions and experiencing the consequences of those decisions within a protected setting.

19. Recovery as a Changing Field

Recovery may be less like reaching a destination than changing the field in which a life is lived. The original Updown sequence appears linear: safety, stabilisation, presence, awakening, ownership, responsibility, understanding, release, self-management and walk out. The relativist perspective makes the sequence more fluid. People can move backwards, sideways and repeatedly through the same issues because the relations around them change. A person may be highly capable at work and overwhelmed in intimacy. Another may be confident in treatment and destabilised on returning home. A third may stop using a substance but remain trapped in the identity built around the problem. A fourth may become socially capable while still struggling with physical health. There is no necessary reason for these dimensions to improve together. This suggests that "recovery" may function better as a family of changing relationships than as a single state. Relationship to the substance. Relationship to the body. Relationship to other people. Relationship to work. Relationship to pleasure. Relationship to memory.

Relationship to authority. Relationship to self-description. Each can change at a different pace. The

institutional test therefore becomes richer. Did the person leave more capable of moving through these relationships? Can they manage practical life? Can they ask for help without surrendering agency? Can they recognise danger without seeing danger everywhere? Can they tolerate uncertainty without returning immediately to old forms of control? Can they live ordinary life without the institution remaining the centre of gravity? This approach also changes the meaning of relapse. Relapse may still be harmful and may require action, but it need not answer the ontological question "What are you really?" It becomes one event in a changing field. The person may need to examine what changed, which relations narrowed, what meanings returned, and what support is necessary now. The destination is therefore neither permanent recovery nor permanent disease. It is a widening capacity to live with complexity.

20. The Relativist Question

What if no single description of the person has to contain the whole truth? Relativism is easily misunderstood. It can sound like the claim that everything is merely subjective, that facts are optional, or that every explanation is equally good. That is not the position being explored here. The more modest proposition is that what something is, for the purposes of human understanding, may depend partly on the relation in which it is considered. A drink can be described as chemistry, pleasure, ritual, coping strategy, symbol, habit or source of dependence. Different descriptions answer different questions. A person can be described as a patient for the purpose of organising care, an employee for the purpose of discussing work, a parent for the purpose of understand-

ing family obligations, and an addict for the purpose of discussing a recurring substance-use problem. None of those descriptions has to become the person's sole ontology. The same applies to agency. A person can be constrained in one relation and highly capable in another. Responsibility can be strong even when freedom is partial. Safety can be physical in one sense and relational in another. Recovery can mean abstinence to one person, restored functioning to another, or freedom from the need to organise life around the substance to a third. This does not mean there are no better and worse accounts. Some descriptions are more predictive. Some are kinder without becoming less truthful. Some help people act; others make action harder. Some reveal consequences that matter; others hide them. The relativist position is therefore not intellectual surrender. It is a demand for context. The practical benefit is humility. Treatment professionals can remain expert without becoming metaphysicians. They can say what they know, what they infer and what they do not know. A philosophy can guide practice without pretending to have discovered the final form of the human being. At this point the question changes character. The central reversal invites continued examination rather than another fixed doctrine. Once we see that identities, meanings and capacities may be context-dependent, the correct response is not another fixed doctrine. It is better questioning.

21. Keeping Reality Without Keeping One Story

Opening the ontology does not require abandoning reality. One danger of a constructionist or relativist reading is that it can be taken as an invitation to dissolve material reality

into interpretation. The model should resist that move. Bodies still have limits. Drugs and alcohol have effects. Withdrawal can be medically dangerous. Financial damage, relationship breakdown and physical deterioration can occur regardless of which narrative a person prefers. The philosophical move is more precise. Material reality does not have to be denied in order to recognise that human beings encounter it through categories, relationships and contexts. The pain is real; how we understand the pain is also real. The substance has chemistry; what the substance means in a particular life is not reducible to chemistry alone. This distinction helps hold together two kinds of truth. A person can say, "Alcohol was causing me serious harm," while also saying, "Alcohol once helped me survive a particular state." Those statements do not cancel one another. They answer different questions. One concerns consequence. The other concerns function and meaning. Likewise, a person can say, "I caused harm," and "I was responding to circumstances I did not choose." Again, both can be true. The challenge is to resist the cultural pressure to select a single story and then erase the inconvenient parts of the other. The same pluralism should apply to treatment. Medication can be useful. Therapy can be useful. Mutual aid can be useful. Structured environments can be useful. Harm reduction can be useful. Spiritual practice can be useful. The relativist stance does not tell us to abandon these possibilities. It asks us to examine what each practice does in context and whether it expands or contracts the person's range of responsible living. In that sense, the most open version of Updown is not anti-system. It is anti-closure. It wants systems that can act while remaining capable of learning.

22. What the Model Cannot Know in Advance

An open model has to leave some things genuinely open. A treatment philosophy becomes dangerous when it predicts too much. The original Updown model begins with strong claims about order, but the three-layer synthesis reveals several places where certainty should stop. We cannot know in advance that trauma is the central explanation for every addiction. We cannot know that safety will always be the first intervention required, because different people can arrive with different immediate needs. We cannot know that removing shame will always increase change; for some people, urgency may initially depend on a strong recognition of danger. We cannot know that a small group is best for every person. We cannot know that a person who regains agency will necessarily choose abstinence. Nor can we know that permanent identity language is always harmful. Some people may experience an enduring recovery identity as a source of vigilance, community and protection. Some may find spiritual surrender meaningful. Some may want an external structure precisely because their own internal organisation is fragile. An open model must allow those experiences to count as evidence against its own preferred interpretation. This is where the argument becomes properly investigative. The task is not to prove Updown correct. It is to specify what observations would count against it. What would we expect to see if the model were wrong? Which populations might do better with a different sequence? Under what conditions might confrontation help? When might institutional structure strengthen agency rather than weaken it? A theory becomes stronger when it can imagine its own

disconfirmation. Updown should therefore be understood as a hypothesis about conditions under which some people may recover more effectively, not as a final map of human nature. The benefit of this restraint is not weakness. It is adaptability. A model that can learn from the people it is intended to serve may remain alive in ways a doctrine cannot.

Part IV - The Human Test

A theory of recovery ultimately encounters particular lives. The purpose of this section is not to replace evidence with anecdote, but to test the framework against the complexity of lived experience and imagined disagreement.

23. A Case Is Not a Law

The fact that something happened once can be philosophically important without being statistically decisive. The red-wine narrative matters because it is the origin of the theory. But the more carefully the experience is examined, the more carefully that story has to be held. One person stopped drinking after a change in safety, meaning, identity and desire. That experience matters. It tells us that a path exists. It does not tell us that the path is universally available. A case can be useful in at least three ways. It can reveal a mechanism that would otherwise remain invisible. It can challenge a dominant assumption. It can generate hypotheses worth testing. The red-wine story does all three. It suggests that the relationship to a substance can change before the behaviour changes. It questions the assumption that self-condemnation is necessarily a motivator. It proposes that agency may be supported by a different conversational field. Yet the story could also

be read differently. Perhaps the safer environment altered the physiology of stress. Perhaps the therapeutic work reduced a previously dominant need for relief. Perhaps the person simply reached a developmental point at which desire changed. Perhaps several mechanisms operated together. A relativist framework does not need to decide immediately among these explanations. This pluralism is important because different explanations may all contain part of the truth. The story does not have to be reduced to "agency worked". It may be more fruitful to say that a cluster of relations changed and that those changes altered the meaning and desirability of the substance. The most interesting question, then, is not "Can everyone recover this way?" It is "What should we investigate when similar changes occur in other lives?" That is a much more open scientific and philosophical question. In this sense, the personal story becomes a starting point rather than an ending. It is not the proof of Updown. It is the experience from which Updown learned to ask questions.

24. Alternative Readings

A balanced book should make room for interpretations that disagree with its author. One possible reading of the original problem is that the order really is wrong: that safety and agency are often undermined by treatment cultures that overvalue surrender, confrontation and permanent identity. Another reading is that surrender language can sometimes reduce the burden of decision-making for people who are exhausted, and that external structure may be experienced as relief rather than oppression. Another interpretation of the red-wine experience is that my previous therapeutic work had already changed the underlying condition, so the later

reduction in importance of alcohol may reflect the delayed effects of that work more than any distinct Updown mechanism. Another possibility is that the language of agency happened to fit this person particularly well because of their temperament or history. There is also a challenge from biology. The more strongly one emphasises context and meaning, the easier it is to understate neuroadaptation, conditioning and the physiological dimensions of dependence. A relativist framework should therefore treat biological explanations as part of the field, not as ideological opponents. There is an ethical challenge too. Removing shame may help some people become honest, but urgency can matter. If a person is in immediate danger, the treatment question cannot be reduced to preserving narrative freedom. Protective action may need to take precedence. The social and ontological perspectives do not abolish such situations; they need to help us respond to them without pretending that protection settles the larger question of who the person is. Finally, there is the possibility that permanent identity can sometimes be liberating. A person may say, "I am an addict" and experience the statement not as a prison but as a concise warning to themselves. It may provide a community and a set of practices that they genuinely value. Updown should not erase that lived meaning merely because my experience of identity was different. The strongest synthesis is therefore not "Updown versus AA", "social constructionism versus medical models", or "relativism versus reality". It is a conversation among different ways of making sense of the same complex lives.

25. Where the Model Might Be Wrong

An idea becomes more credible when it can survive an honest attempt to break it. Updown may be wrong about order. Some people may need immediate behavioural structure before they can make use of safety. Some may need confrontation to break through a pattern of avoidance. Some may experience surrender as relief rather than loss. Some may become more capable through longterm participation in a recovery community rather than through rapid return to ordinary life. Updown may also underestimate the danger of romanticising choice. The fact that a person initially wanted relief does not mean that later dependence is simply an unchanged preference. The capacity to want and the capacity to stop can diverge sharply. Any model that talks about ownership must be careful not to imply a level of freedom that the person does not actually experience. The social constructionist version could also be wrong if it overstates the power of language. A label may influence experience, but influence is not the same as total causation. Some consequences occur independently of interpretation. The body cannot always be talked into another state. Some substances remain dangerous regardless of the story attached to them. The relativist version can fail if it becomes an excuse for avoiding judgement. Treatment still has to choose. Safety standards have to be set. Violence has to be prevented. Medical crises have to be treated. Some behaviours cannot be allowed in shared environments. "It depends" cannot become a way of never deciding. The answer is not to retreat to certainty. It is to make decisions while remaining explicit about the grounds on which they are made. A treatment centre might say: this boundary exists because another person could be harmed. This intervention is used because the present medical risk

is high. This identity label is used for documentation but is not intended to define the person beyond the task for which it is necessary. That is the kind of institutional language that an open Updown model would favour: clear enough to act, modest enough to revise.

26. What a More Open Treatment System Might Become

Become The institution should be strong enough to protect people and humble enough to learn from them. A synthesis of the three perspectives produces a treatment environment that is neither permissive nor punitive. It begins with practical safety because people cannot reliably think, choose or relate under unmanaged threat. It recognises that treatment is also a social world in which identities are named and negotiated. And it recognises that no single description of the person should automatically become their final ontology. The environment would therefore keep clear boundaries, but it would explain them in terms of protection and functioning rather than moral ranking. It would provide medical care when needed. It would differentiate pathways where coercive circumstances genuinely differ. It would use small groups where appropriate, while allowing variation in social needs. It would create opportunities for ordinary decisions rather than reserving autonomy as a reward for compliance. Staff would be expected to distinguish observation from interpretation. Instead of "manipulative", they might ask what the person was trying to achieve and why that strategy made sense in context. Instead of "in denial", they might say "the person does not agree with this formulation". Instead of "non-compliant", they might identify the exact be-

haviour and its consequence. This does not require the elimination of professional expertise. It requires expertise to remain relational and reflexive. The clinician can know things the resident does not know. The resident can know things the clinician does not know. Both forms of knowledge can be imperfect. The purpose of the relationship is to make better decisions possible, not to establish one person as the final author of another person's identity. The institution would also measure a different outcome. Not simply attendance, compliance, disclosure or correct language, but increased capacity: managing money, making decisions, recognising danger, tolerating distress, repairing relationships, asking for help, handling conflict, finding ordinary pleasure, maintaining health and living beyond institutional supervision. The deepest measure would remain the one Updown has always implied: does care lead outward? Does the person's life become larger than the programme? Does the institution become less necessary? If so, the treatment has done something remarkable. It has helped create conditions under which it can eventually withdraw from the centre of the person's life.

Appendix The Updown Sequence Reconsidered The sequence is retained here, but with three readings. The first treats it as the practical order proposed by the manifesto. The second treats it as a set of relational and conversational conditions. The third treats it as a provisional map whose relevance can vary by person and context. Step Name Original Updown Constructionist / Relativist reading 01 Admittance Own the choice without guilt. Say what the behaviour gives you and why you keep choosing it. Admittance is not an admission of powerlessness. 02 Get to safety Make the present different from the past. Safety is also a relational achievement; attend to withdrawal, sleep, health

and acute needs and ask what conditions make felt safety believable. 03 Awakening Support reflective awareness and the return to participation in one's own experience. Presence is influenced by language, relationship, environment and bodily state. 04 Become present Allow the person to become present rather than demanding performance. 05 Awareness Expand what can be noticed: body, thought, desire, relationships, consequences and possibility. 06 Agency Regain and establish authorship within real constraints. Agency is real, but not necessarily absolute. It can be constrained and supported. 07 Responsibility Face consequences and repair harm without permanent shame. Responsibility is relational and can remain firm while identity remains revisable. 08 Understanding Explore trauma, attachment, defences, conditioning and function. No single explanation should automatically become the master cause. 09 Self-management Practise ordinary adult competence. Capacity should be tested in the actual contexts the person will live in. 10 Walk out Leave treatment more capable of living than dependent on the institution. The goal is not a final identity but an enlarged field of competent participation. A final distinction This synthesis is not an argument that every person should stop using by willpower. It is not an argument that substances are harmless. It is not an argument that withdrawal is safe to manage without appropriate medical care. It is not an argument that trauma causes every addiction. It is not an argument that social construction makes material suffering unreal. And it is not an argument that relativism makes every interpretation equally valid. It is an argument for keeping several levels of inquiry alive at once. Begin with the lived problem. Examine the conditions in which it occurs. Examine the language in which it is described. Examine the relationships through

which the description gains authority. Then examine the ontology beneath all of it: what kind of person, agency, identity and recovery are we assuming exist? The answers need not all be the same for everyone. That is not a failure of the model. It may be the point.

Part V - The Seven Movements in Practice

A New Order

My starting position is simple and deliberately strong: recovery is more likely to become durable when the order of recovery follows the return of the human capacity to choose. The sequence proposed here is admittance -> safety -> awakening -> presence -> awareness -> agency -> self-management. It is not a claim that every medical emergency can wait for a philosophical conversation. It is not a claim that abstinence is unnecessary, that alcohol or drugs are harmless, or that a person can simply decide their way out of physiological dependence. It is a claim about the human work that follows, and about the conditions under which that work can become possible.

Admittance comes first because denial is not merely a lie. Sometimes it is a defence. Sometimes it is fear. Sometimes it is the refusal to accept an identity that feels imposed. The useful form of admittance is therefore not humiliation or capitulation. It is the moment a person can say something true without having to destroy themselves in the saying: this is happening; this is costing me something; I do not want to continue like this; I need to find out what is actually going on.

Safety follows because truth is harder to face in an atmosphere of threat. Safety here means both physical protection and the growing bodily experience that the present is different from the past. It means enough privacy, predictability, dignity and freedom from intimidation that the person can lower their defensive posture without surrendering their right to disagree. Trauma-informed practice places safety, trust, collaboration and empowerment at the centre of care; the Updown model takes those principles and asks what happens when they are treated not as supportive extras but as the conditions from which the rest of recovery develops.[1][2]

Awakening is the change from merely knowing something conceptually to noticing it as lived reality. A person may know for years that alcohol is harming them and yet remain caught in the same loop. Awakening is the moment the loop is seen from inside: the body, the thought, the urge, the memory, the consequence and the possibility of something else begin to appear in the same field of attention. It can be spiritual without requiring a religion. It can be psychological without being reduced to a diagnosis. It can be understood as consciousness becoming interested in its own activity.

Presence is more immediate. To be present is to inhabit the current moment enough to notice what is happening without automatically fleeing into memory, fantasy, rehearsal, intoxication or institutional performance. Presence is not permanent serenity. It is the ability to return. It is the difference between reacting to an old world and participating in the world that is actually here.

Awareness then deepens presence. Awareness notices not only that I am here, but what here contains. I notice my body, my emotions, other people, the room, the tone of the con-

versation, the consequences of my choices, the stories I tell about myself and the ways those stories influence what I can imagine. At its widest, awareness is an expansion of consciousness: the field of what can be perceived, considered and connected becomes larger.

Agency grows out of that enlargement. The person who can notice more has more information from which to choose. The person who feels safe enough to pause has more opportunity to choose. The person who is socially recognised as an author has more reason to speak as one. Agency is therefore neither magical willpower nor a binary possession. It is a capacity that can be constricted and expanded by biology, environment, relationships, time, sleep, pain, fear, coercion, resources and practice.[3][4]

Self-management is the point at which the argument leaves the treatment room and enters ordinary life. The test is no longer whether the person can talk about recovery. It is whether they can live. Can they get up, work, rest, budget, maintain a home, tolerate an argument, ask for help, repair a mistake, choose friends, sustain a family relationship, manage a difficult day and still remain recognisably the author of their own life? A treatment system that creates dependence on itself has failed the deepest test. A treatment system that makes itself progressively less necessary has done something more ambitious.

The sequence therefore is not a ladder that a person climbs once. It is a developmental logic. Admittance makes safety possible because reality can be named. Safety makes awakening possible because the nervous system no longer has to spend all of its energy defending itself. Awakening makes presence possible because attention returns to the current moment. Presence makes awareness possible because perception becomes available. Awareness

makes agency possible because alternatives become visible. Agency makes self-management possible because choices can be practised in the world rather than merely discussed in therapy.

The argument can be challenged at every point. That is a feature, not a defect. A medical emergency can take precedence over reflective work. Some people may need strong structure before they can make meaningful use of autonomy. Some may genuinely experience surrender, spiritual language or a permanent recovery identity as liberating. The model survives these objections by refusing to become a religion of its own. Its proposition is about a direction: create the conditions in which a person can progressively become more capable of participating in their own life.

Admittance: The Door Opens Inward

Admittance is easily confused with confession. Confession says, in effect, that I must tell you what is wrong with me so that you can decide what to do with me. Admittance, as used here, is different. It is the act of allowing reality to become visible to oneself. It can be quiet. It can take the form of a sentence spoken alone in a kitchen. It can be the first honest conversation with a partner. It can be an appointment made after years of postponement. It can even be an internal contradiction finally tolerated long enough to be understood: I love what this gives me and I hate what it is costing me.

This matters because substance use frequently survives in a divided field. One part of the person wants relief, sleep, confidence, numbness or escape. Another part knows the consequences. One part says it is under control. Another knows that the rules are being changed every night to pre-

serve the behaviour. One part wants help. Another expects humiliation if help is accepted. When those parts are forced into a single moral story - weak, dishonest, powerless, defective - the complexity that might have opened the problem can disappear.

Admittance does not have to mean accepting every interpretation offered by a treatment system. A resident can admit that their drinking is harming their life while declining the claim that they are permanently incapable of judgement. A person can admit dependence while resisting a lifelong identity. A person can admit having hurt someone while refusing the proposition that they are irredeemably bad. This distinction allows truth to be more precise.

The first question, then, is not "What is wrong with you?" It is "What is true enough to be said now?" That question leaves room for facts, uncertainty, ambivalence and context. It also creates a foundation for shared decision-making. Patient-centred care in substance-use treatment is repeatedly organised around therapeutic alliance, individualised care and shared decision-making, with the literature suggesting generally positive relationships between these principles and engagement or outcomes.[3][4]

The point of admittance is therefore not to make the person smaller before treatment begins. It is to enlarge reality enough that treatment has somewhere honest to begin.

Safety: The Present Must Become Different

Safety is often spoken about as though it were a building specification: locked doors, medication storage, staffing ratios, emergency procedures. Those things matter. But they are not the whole meaning of safety in this argument. A person can be in a physically secure building and still feel

watched, trapped, ridiculed or socially exposed. Conversely, a person can live in an ordinary room and experience profound safety because the relationships around them are trustworthy.

The useful distinction is between external safety and felt safety. External safety prevents actual danger. Felt safety changes the expectation of danger. Trauma-informed guidance defines safety in both physical and psychological terms and places it alongside trustworthiness, peer support, collaboration, and voice and choice.[1][2] This is remarkably close to the philosophical move made by Updown: the person needs evidence that the present no longer requires the same defensive arrangement as the past.

This is where the proposal for a single room becomes more than a matter of comfort. In a residential programme, a personal room is a retreat point. It is a place where the person can close a door without disappearing from care. It provides a controllable boundary. It makes decompression possible after difficult interpersonal work. It allows sleep, solitude, writing, crying, silence and ordinary thought without an audience. It also means that participation in community can become a choice rather than an unavoidable condition of being housed. A single room does not mean the person should be allowed to isolate indefinitely; it means that withdrawal has a safe, supervised alternative to social saturation.

The importance of this becomes clearer when group environments are considered. If every moment outside therapy becomes social, the resident may never get to discover whether they can regulate themselves alone. The very thing intended to produce connection can become another source of vigilance. A safe room creates a small piece of sovereignty inside the larger institution.

Safety also means predictable rules. A resident should know what is prohibited, why it is prohibited, what will happen if the rule is broken, and what routes exist for appeal or discussion. Rules that protect others are legitimate. Rules that exist mainly to demonstrate who has authority should be viewed with suspicion. Transparency is part of safety because unpredictability is itself a form of stress.

Safety is therefore not indulgence. It is an investment in cognitive bandwidth. When the person does not have to spend every moment anticipating humiliation, threat, intrusion or social manoeuvring, more attention becomes available for reflection. That is not the same as saying safety automatically causes recovery. It is to say that safety may change the conditions under which recovery becomes thinkable.

A further implication follows. If safety is partly relational, then a treatment centre cannot create it once and assume the job is finished. Safety has to be continually renewed. A staff member can destroy it in a minute by humiliating a resident in front of the group. A peer can destroy it by weaponising a disclosure. A discharge threat can destroy it if it is used as a routine instrument of compliance rather than a clear response to risk. Conversely, a consistent pattern of small trustworthy acts can build something that no single therapy session can manufacture.

The phrase "absolute safety" is best retained only as an experiential ideal. Nobody can promise that a residential setting will be free of every uncertainty or disappointment. The promise that matters is narrower and more honest: while you are here, we will work to make the environment safe enough that you no longer have to live as though the past is occurring again.

Awakening, Presence and Awareness

Awakening is the point at which recovery becomes experiential. A person can possess information without inhabiting it. They can know the textbook explanation for their behaviour while remaining detached from the actual sequence by which it happens. They can recite the language of insight and still be surprised by themselves. The difference between information and awakening is attention.

What is attention doing? It is selecting. It is deciding what enters the foreground and what remains background. Under chronic threat, attention becomes narrow and anticipatory. Under intoxication, exhaustion or severe distress, the field of possible action can contract. Under relative safety, the field can begin to widen. The importance of this for the present argument is not that safety "turns on" a magic brain switch. It is that the felt conditions of experience influence what can be noticed and therefore what can be acted upon.

Presence is the first consequence. Being present does not mean enjoying every moment. It means that the current moment becomes available for participation. The past may still be remembered. The future may still be anticipated. But neither completely captures consciousness. The person can notice: this is a memory, not an event occurring now; this is an urge, not an instruction; this is a fear, not necessarily a forecast.

That distinction is central to addiction because compulsive behaviour often feels inevitable precisely when the person is inside the momentum of the behaviour. Awareness introduces a fraction of distance. The urge is still there. The thought is still there. The craving may still be powerful. But the relationship to the experience has changed. Mindfulness-based approaches have been studied in substance-misuse populations, with systematic reviews

suggesting potential benefits across craving, emotion regulation and substance-use outcomes, although the quality and consistency of evidence vary.[5][6]

Awareness then expands from the internal to the interpersonal. I am not only aware of what I feel; I notice what happens to another person when I speak. I notice whether a conversation is becoming defensive. I notice the effect of withdrawing from a family member. I notice that my behaviour at work changes when I am frightened. I notice that I am more social on some days and nearly invisible on others. This is where awareness becomes what the argument calls the spirit sense.

"Spirit" here does not require supernatural certainty. It is the felt recognition that consciousness can become larger than immediate appetite. It is the capacity to experience oneself as connected to something that cannot be reduced to the next drink, the next argument, the next threat or the next hour. For one person that may be religion. For another it may be nature, art, love, music, service, philosophical reflection, creativity or simply the astonishing experience of being alive and paying attention to it. The spiritual significance lies in the widening of the field, not in agreement about metaphysics.

This is also where presence becomes social visibility. A person can be physically present and socially absent. They can sit in a room while avoiding all genuine participation. They can speak only the safe sentences. They can become skilled at being unnoticeable. Conversely, a person can make a decision to become socially present: to look at another person, answer a question honestly, tolerate being misunderstood, disclose something without performing, say no without disappearing, or simply remain in the room when the old impulse would have been to escape.

That transition matters because recovery ultimately happens in a social world. Work is social. Family is social. Friendship is social. Money is social. Parenting is social. Even solitude acquires meaning partly in relation to the people to whom we return. A person who learns presence only inside therapy has learned something incomplete. The aim is to carry presence into ordinary encounters.

This gives us a more concise way to understand the awareness -> presence transition. Awareness is noticing that I am here. Presence is choosing to participate in being here with other people. The distinction is subtle but powerful. A person can become highly self-aware while remaining socially invisible. The next developmental step is not more introspection for its own sake; it is participation.

Non-time-mandated treatment becomes important at precisely this point. If a person knows that they will be discharged on day twentyeight regardless of whether they can tolerate social life again, the clock can become a hidden pressure. A developmental model instead asks what capacities have emerged. Can the person spend an afternoon outside without collapsing into the old pattern? Can they work a shift? Can they make a phone call? Can they be around family without immediately retreating into old defences? Can they tolerate an ordinary evening?

The answer may take longer than a calendar allows. Or, for some people, it may take less. Time is not the medicine. The changing capacity is the medicine. Time is simply one of the conditions in which change can occur.

Agency: From Awareness to Choice

Agency is often presented as an internal possession: the person either has willpower or they do not. The evidence and or-

dinary experience make that picture difficult to sustain. People choose differently when exhausted, frightened, hungry, intoxicated, lonely, well supported, financially secure or socially threatened. It is more useful to think of agency as a capacity that operates within conditions.

That proposition does not excuse behaviour. It makes responsibility more exact. Suppose a person steals money to buy alcohol. The act has consequences. But understanding what conditions made the act likely can help determine what needs to change: access to money, craving, housing instability, shame, relationship conflict, impulsivity, fear, opportunity, social network, untreated trauma or all of these together. Responsibility becomes the work of altering the conditions of the next action rather than the ritual of declaring the person bad.

This is why the old phrase "You chose it. You can unchoose it" is useful only when spoken carefully. The first half is not always literally true in the sense of unrestricted freedom. Dependence narrows options. Conditioning narrows attention. Withdrawal can overwhelm judgement. Coercion can narrow the field further. Yet there is another truth inside the phrase: the behaviour usually has a function, and discovering that function can reopen the possibility of choosing something else.

Motivational interviewing is relevant here because it treats ambivalence as something to explore rather than crush. A 2017 meta-analysis found that both motivational interviewing and contingency management could reduce substance use at follow-up, with motivational interviewing showing some smaller but more durable effects and contingency management showing stronger effects at some shorter follow-up points.[7] The implication for Updown is not that one technique is the answer. It is that intrinsic

motivation can be cultivated without requiring humiliation.

Agency also depends on recognition. A person repeatedly treated as incapable may stop bringing decisions to the surface. A person who is routinely expected to "prove" insight may become more concerned with producing the correct answer than with discovering their own answer. A person who is invited to make bounded choices can practise authorship while still receiving structure.

A residential centre could therefore build agency deliberately. Let the resident choose among acceptable schedules. Let them manage a small budget. Let them decide whether to attend an optional group. Let them plan a weekend activity. Let them negotiate a boundary. Let them make a mistake inside a setting where the consequences can be discussed without catastrophe. Let them hear the difference between "that was a poor decision" and "you are a poor person."

The objective is not to maximise freedom. It is to build usable freedom. Freedom that the person can actually carry into Monday morning when the phone rings, the boss is difficult, the child is demanding, the rent is due and somebody says something that activates an old wound.

Agency finally becomes self-trust. Not blind confidence, but the knowledge that I can notice, pause, choose, act, review and choose again. That is a very different psychological object from the demand to believe that I am permanently powerless or permanently invulnerable. It leaves room for error without turning error into destiny.

Self-Management: Recovery Enters Ordinary Life

Self-management is where the grand language of recovery is tested by boring Tuesday. Can the person cook? Can they sleep? Can they answer an email before it becomes a crisis? Can they pay a bill? Can they get to work? Can they tell the truth when telling the truth is inconvenient? Can they disagree without turning the disagreement into a referendum on their worth? Can they recognise when they need help without handing their entire life to the person who offers it?

These are not secondary achievements. They are the substance of recovery. The literature on recovery capital makes a similar point from another direction: long-term recovery is shaped by resources in the person's social and material environment, not only by internal motivation. In a one-year longitudinal study of adult drug-treatment-court clients, changes in recovery capital were associated with concurrent changes in substance use, illustrating how recovery resources can vary within people over time.[8]

That is why treatment should teach the person to manage a life rather than simply manage symptoms. If the substance disappears but the person cannot tolerate ordinary demands, the system has created a fragile form of recovery. The person may be abstinent and still be psychologically dependent on the treatment environment. The deeper goal is transfer.

Work is an obvious arena. A person may need to learn how to handle authority without either submitting completely or fighting automatically. They may need to rediscover the difference between a bad day and a bad life. They may need practical support to find employment, training or education. The Glen's transition model is interesting in this respect because it explicitly connects

recovery to employment, education, finances, housing and community re-entry rather than treating those matters as afterthoughts.[9]

Family is another arena. Recovery cannot mean simply becoming easier to manage. The person needs to become more available as a human being. That may involve boundaries, apologies, restitution, parenting skills, or acceptance that some relationships cannot safely return to their previous form. Self-management includes knowing when to repair, when to step back and when to ask another person what they experienced rather than assuming one's own account is complete.

Social life matters too. A person who has spent years using a substance to regulate social anxiety may suddenly discover that ordinary conversation requires tolerance of uncertainty. The answer is not to force socialisation. It is to create graded opportunities for presence: a coffee with one person, a walk, a small group, a class, a volunteer activity, a shift at work, a family meal, a difficult phone call. Each successful encounter becomes evidence that social existence can be survived without the old armour.

This is the practical meaning of "socially visible". It is not extroversion. It is participation. The person can be quiet and still be present. They can be anxious and still be present. They can leave a room when needed and return later. The point is that disappearance is no longer the only available strategy.

A treatment system should therefore assess progress through capacity rather than compliance. Attendance matters. Abstinence may matter. Medication adherence may matter. But the richer questions are: Is the person more able to handle money? More able to regulate emotion? More able to ask for help? More able to tolerate disagreement?

More able to work? More able to care for others? More able to enjoy life without needing to escape from it? More able to live without the institution remaining the centre of gravity?

When self-management becomes real, recovery stops being a special state. It becomes ordinary competence.

What the Evidence Actually Supports

A book making a strong proposal needs to be honest about what evidence can and cannot do. There is no single body of research that proves the exact seven-stage sequence proposed here. There should not be. The sequence is a synthesis - a hypothesis about order and conditions - assembled from several areas of evidence.

The first area is trauma-informed care. Contemporary guidance frames trauma-informed practice around safety, trustworthiness and transparency, peer support, collaboration and mutuality, and empowerment, voice and choice.[1][2] A recent systematic review of trauma-informed care in substance-use settings found the implementation literature promising but uneven in quality, which is important. It supports the relevance of the idea without giving permission to oversell it.[10]

The second area is patient-centred care. A large scoping review of substance-use treatment literature found therapeutic alliance, shared decision-making, individualised care and holistic care recurring across the field.[3][4] A more recent review also found associations between patient-centred care dimensions and outcomes, while emphasising that the evidence remains uneven and that few studies test how the dimensions interact.[4]

The third area concerns motivation and autonomy. Motivational interviewing is explicitly designed to work with

ambivalence and strengthen motivation rather than rely on coercive persuasion. Meta-analytic research has found that motivational interventions can produce small but durable benefits for several substances, while contingency management often has stronger short-term effects.[7] The model does not interpret this as a victory of "intrinsic motivation" over structure. Instead it suggests that good treatment may need both: external scaffolding and an internal sense of authorship.

The fourth area is natural or self-initiated recovery. Research has documented recovery outside formal treatment, including studies of people who reduced or stopped problematic drinking without treatment. A classic natural-recovery literature and more recent qualitative work complicate the assumption that formal treatment is the only route by which substantial change occurs.[12][13] A 2026 study of adults with resolved alcohol use disorder who had not received treatment found that some participants described nonabstinent recovery in terms of strong self-awareness, confidence in limits and deliberate self-management, while abstinent participants often described different experiences, including recognition that controlled drinking remained unsafe for them.[14] This does not validate moderation as a universal solution; it demonstrates heterogeneity.

The fifth area is mindfulness and present-focused awareness. Systematic reviews suggest that mindfulness-based interventions can have benefits in substance-use treatment, though effects and study quality vary.[5][6] That is compatible with the Updown claim that awareness can change the relationship to craving, emotion and impulse. Again, compatibility is not proof of causation for the full model.

The sixth area is the therapeutic relationship. Research with people in residential treatment has found that stronger

therapeutic alliance is associated with greater reductions in distress and improvements in treatment processes.[15] The relationship between therapist and resident therefore cannot be treated as a polite backdrop. It is part of the treatment environment.

Taken together, these strands support a modest but meaningful conclusion: treatment is likely to work better when it creates conditions under which people can become engaged, recognised, psychologically safer, motivated, supported and increasingly capable. The leap from that conclusion to the exact Updown sequence remains a hypothesis. That is precisely where the argument should remain intellectually honest.

The strongest evidence-based claim is therefore not that one sequence has been scientifically proven. It is that several wellsupported principles converge on a similar direction: safety matters; therapeutic alliance matters; person-centred and collaborative care matter; motivation matters; social and material resources matter; present-focused awareness may matter; and recovery can occur through multiple pathways.

Updown's innovation is to arrange these principles into a developmental order and ask whether that order changes what becomes possible.

The Group and the Island

Any serious treatment model must solve the problem of the group. Community can be medicine. It can also become the problem it is supposed to treat.

The warning can be found in a novel rather than a clinical manual: William Golding's Lord of the Flies. The boys on the island are not an exact model of addiction treatment,

and the analogy should not be stretched into a claim about human nature. Its value is simpler. Remove adult containment, allow a group to organise itself around fear, status and competing interpretations of reality, and the social environment can become more powerful than the original problem.

That is the lesson for therapeutic communities. A community of vulnerable people is not automatically therapeutic simply because the participants share a problem. A group carries hierarchy, charisma, alliances, resentment, imitation, competition and the desire to belong. If staff assume that peer confrontation is inherently therapeutic, they may inadvertently create a miniature political system in which social survival becomes the real curriculum.

This does not mean that therapeutic communities are bad. WHOS, for example, has operated a therapeutic-community model in Australia since 1972 and describes self-help, peer support, structured living and responsibility as central to its approach.[16][17] The Buttery likewise operates a long-standing therapeutic community in the Byron Bay hinterland.[18] The point is that such models depend on careful selection, strong boundaries, skilled supervision and a culture that does not confuse pressure with transformation.

The crucial principle is selection before social immersion. Who is admitted to a particular community? What are their immediate risks? How stable are they? Are they capable of tolerating other people's vulnerability? What happens if they become predatory, manipulative, intimidating or simply too dysregulated for the group? A community cannot be safer than its weakest unmanaged dynamic.

This is why small groups make intuitive sense, though no magic number can be prescribed for everyone. Updown therefore proposes groups of roughly four to six as a design hypothesis, not as a scientifically established optimum.

Smaller groups may allow more individual attention and fewer competing social signals, while still creating familiarity without producing a miniature crowd. Larger gatherings may still be useful, but not every therapeutic act needs to happen in public.

The group should also have an exit door. A resident should be able to say: I cannot do this session today; I need ten minutes alone; I do not agree with that interpretation; I want to speak privately; I am becoming overwhelmed. A community that permits no retreat eventually turns vulnerability into coercion.

The island metaphor therefore becomes a warning against unsupervised social reality. The institution's responsibility is not to eliminate community but to make community safe enough that human beings do not have to compete for psychological territory. Adults must remain adults. Professionals must remain accountable. Peer workers can contribute enormously without becoming unregulated quasi-clinicians. Residents can support one another without becoming judges of one another.

A healthy therapeutic community is not a tribe. It is a temporary social ecology designed to help people return to the larger world with more capacity than they arrived with.

The Ideal Rehab: Utopian, Perhaps; Useless, No

It would be hard to build the perfect rehabilitation centre. I admit that plainly. What I imagine is idealistic, almost utopian. It would be expensive. It would require more staff, more space, more time, more clinical flexibility, more single rooms, more training and a willingness to let people develop at different speeds. It would probably fail in some cases. There would be arguments about who should be admitted.

There would be questions about capacity, public funding, safety, privacy, medication, visitors, smoking, phones, family access and discharge. There would be trade-offs everywhere.

But the fact that perfection is impossible does not make the attempt foolish. We should never stop trying to create a better world simply because the perfect world cannot be built. The purpose of an ideal is not to be mistaken for reality. It is to give reality somewhere to move.

The ideal centre imagined here would therefore have a few stubborn principles. First, it would separate immediate medical stabilisation from longer psychological development without pretending the two are unrelated. Alcohol withdrawal and other acute risks would be managed medically where necessary. WHO guidance supports combined psychosocial and pharmacological treatment for adults with alcohol dependence and recommends evidence-based approaches to withdrawal and relapse prevention.[19][20]

Second, the centre would be genuinely trauma-informed. Not just in brochures, but in architecture, staff behaviour, admissions, complaints procedures and daily routines. It would ask what practices might retraumatise people and remove unnecessary exposure to them.

Third, the centre would provide single rooms as the default where resources permit. This is a design proposition, not a claim that shared rooms are always harmful. Some programmes deliberately use shared rooms to reduce isolation and foster community; South Pacific Private openly describes this rationale.[21] But the Updown model values the room as a refuge and therefore reaches the opposite design conclusion. A person needs somewhere private to retreat to precisely because participation in community should be sustainable rather than compulsory.

Fourth, the centre would use small, carefully composed groups. It would not assume that everyone admitted belongs together merely because they share a diagnostic category. Legal coercion, acute psychiatric instability, predatory behaviour, severe cognitive impairment and other factors may require different pathways.

Fifth, it would make time responsive to development. The question would not be "Have you completed twenty-eight days?" but "What can you do now that you could not safely do before?" Some people might need three weeks. Some three months. Some longer. Some less. The system would be measured by outcomes, not by the convenience of a standard calendar.

Sixth, it would build ordinary life into treatment. Work trials. Budgeting. Cooking. Community outings. Appointments. Public transport. Family conversations. Exercise. Creative projects. Quiet mornings. Boring afternoons. The ordinary is where recovery becomes believable.

Seventh, it would maintain an open door to different philosophies. Twelve-step participation could be available. Secular approaches could be available. Spiritual practices could be available. Harmreduction pathways could exist. Abstinence could be the goal when medically and personally appropriate. The institution would support informed choice without pretending all choices carry the same risk.

Finally, the centre would measure itself by disappearance. The best sign that treatment is working would be that the person needs the centre less. This is the opposite of institutional self-preservation. The programme should want to become unnecessary.

Australian Rehab Models: A Living Comparison

Australia does not have one rehabilitation model. It has a landscape of different philosophies, populations, funding structures and levels of medical intensity. Looking closely at that landscape is useful because it reveals that the argument is not a choice between "rehab" and "no rehab". The real question is which kinds of environment produce which kinds of opportunity.

WHOS - therapeutic community and self-help. WHOS (We Help Ourselves) has operated since 1972 and describes itself as a large Australian non-government provider using therapeutic-community models. Its current programme landscape includes gender-specific and mixed-gender residential therapeutic communities, opioid stabilisation and reduction services, day programmes and transitional supports.[16][17] The emphasis is structured community, self-help, responsibility and peer support.

From the Updown perspective, WHOS is an interesting counterexample to simplistic descriptions of therapeutic communities as purely coercive: its name and philosophy explicitly centre helping oneself. The question is not whether community is legitimate; it is whether the community remains sufficiently safe and individually responsive.

Odyssey House NSW - structured residential care with multiple pathways. Odyssey describes its residential programme as a safe and structured environment with 24-hour staffing and personalised treatment, and it also operates a medically assisted withdrawal unit. Its current service model includes residential, community, family and culturally responsive programmes.[22][23] From the Updown perspective, Odyssey demonstrates that structure and personalisation need not be opposites. Its language of

recovering "at your own pace" sits comfortably alongside the Updown argument for development rather than arbitrary speed, even while the institutional structure remains substantial.

William Booth House - withdrawal and post-detox rehabilitation. The Salvation Army's William Booth House has historically combined withdrawal management and rehabilitation. Current information notes a 10-bed withdrawal unit for mild-to-moderate withdrawal in a 24-hour supported residential setting, with rehabilitation temporarily relocated during building renovations.[24] This model illustrates an important distinction in the model: acute medical and withdrawal care should not be confused with the later developmental work of recovery. A person may need containment first because the body requires it. That does not settle what the subsequent psychological and social process should look like.

Jarrah House - women, children and trauma-informed care. Jarrah House offers a distinctive women-centred model. It is a voluntary residential service for women and women with children, with a ten-week trauma-informed programme drawing on Dialectical Behaviour Therapy, individual counselling, psychoeducation, parenting, art, poetry, yoga and neuroscience education.[25][26] Its emphasis on empowerment and the woman's right to choose how change is made is especially relevant to the agency argument here. It also demonstrates why "the rehab model" must never be discussed as though gender, parenting and family circumstances were incidental.

The Glen Centre - residential rehabilitation plus transition. The Glen operates a 12-week residential programme for men and women, with one-on-one and group counselling, trauma and grief work, financial support, life skills,

community engagement, work and education. Crucially, its transition programme explicitly supports employment, education, finances, housing, transport, culture and family restoration.[27][28] This is close to the model's concept of self-management: recovery is not complete when the resident can talk about addiction; it is strengthened when they can function in the social world into which they are returning.

South Pacific Private - intensive private hospital model. South Pacific Private represents a much more clinically intensive, privately funded setting. Its Core programme includes a three-week inpatient stage and medically supervised detoxification where needed, followed by transition and supported-living options.[29][30] Its accommodation philosophy is deliberately communal: shared rooms are generally preferred, with private rooms allocated for clinical reasons; the organisation explicitly argues that shared accommodation reduces isolation and encourages engagement with therapeutic community.[21] This is an instructive philosophical disagreement with Updown. The two models value community, but they disagree about whether private retreat strengthens or weakens participation. Updown argues that a safe private room can make participation more voluntary and therefore more genuine.

The Sydney Clinic - private inpatient mental health and addiction care. The Sydney Clinic provides inpatient care for adults with mental health and substance-use conditions, including dual-diagnosis presentations. Its model emphasises round-theclock care, distance from the usual environment, psychiatric and therapeutic support, and an intensive inpatient setting.[31] The relevance to Updown lies in the recognition that addiction rarely lives in isolation from mental health, trauma, mood, anxiety or relational difficulties.

At the same time, a hospital model naturally places more emphasis on clinical containment than a community residential model does.

The Buttery - the special case. The Buttery sits in a different symbolic landscape. Its residential therapeutic community is located in the Byron Bay hinterland and uses staged programmes, group therapy, counselling, education, coping and awareness work, with some participants able to move into transitional housing after completion.[18][32] The programme literature also describes mindfulness, yoga, exercise, nutrition and other approaches connected to stress regulation. The Buttery is therefore useful as a bridge between a classic therapeutic community and the wider recovery ecology imagined here.

Seen together, these programmes reveal a continuum rather than a single system. At one end is acute medical withdrawal and hospital care. At another is long-duration therapeutic community. Between them are specialised women-and-children services, transition programmes, structured residential settings and private integrated treatment. The lesson is not that one should replace all the others. The lesson is that different stages of need may require different environments.

The Updown proposal sits across the continuum. It asks each model the same questions: How does a person enter? What is expected to be admitted? How safe does the environment feel? How much privacy exists? What choices can the resident practise? Who gets admitted into the community? What does the programme do when someone disagrees with the official interpretation? How is progress measured? And what exactly happens when the person walks out?

Those questions are more useful than declaring one model good and another bad. They allow a treatment

system to be judged by what capacities it helps to create.

The Buttery: Why the Special Case Matters

The Buttery deserves separate attention because it illustrates the complexity of the rehabilitation question unusually well. It is not a hospital in the same sense as a private psychiatric clinic, yet it is not simply an informal peer-support house. It is a therapeutic community in the Byron Bay hinterland, with staged residential programmes, group therapy, counselling, education and pathways toward transitional housing.[18][32]

That setting matters symbolically as well as practically. Geography can change the social field. A residential environment away from the routines, people and cues of everyday life creates a temporary world in which different behaviour is easier to practise. But the same separation can become a problem if the new world becomes so psychologically complete that ordinary life feels alien afterwards.

The Buttery's staged structure therefore raises an important Updown question: when does a person become ready to move from communal protection to autonomous participation? The answer should not be hidden inside a calendar. A stage should represent a change in capacity.

The programme also illustrates the value of variety within a structured setting. Its materials describe group work alongside individual counselling and a range of practices including mindfulness, yoga, exercise and stress-management activities.[32] None of those techniques is uniquely sufficient. Their value may lie in allowing different people to discover different routes into attention and selfregulation.

Yet the therapeutic community remains a community.

That means all the strengths and risks discussed earlier remain present. Peer support can create belonging, normalise honesty and reduce isolation. Peer status can also become another hierarchy. A person can learn to perform the language of recovery. A carefully supervised group can become a laboratory for social presence; an unmanaged group can become a theatre in which people compete for legitimacy.

The Buttery therefore functions here less as a recommendation than as a test case. It demonstrates that an environment can be structured, communal and long enough to allow development, while still bringing us back to the central question: what is the person able to do in the wider world when the programme has finished?

Personal Recovery Stories: Evidence of Possibility

Recovery research contains a category of evidence that large quantitative studies cannot fully replace: the first-person account. People describe turning points. They describe boredom, fear, relief, spiritual experiences, relationships that changed, jobs that returned, children who came back into their lives, or the quiet disappearance of a substance from the centre of attention. These stories should not be mistaken for scientific proof. They should be treated as evidence about what humans report experiencing.

Natural-recovery studies are especially relevant to the present argument because they show that people sometimes change without the formal structures traditionally regarded as necessary. Research on self-initiated remission from problematic drinking has described people who stopped or reduced use through changes in motivation, environment,

self-concept and everyday routine.[12][13]

The more recent 2026 qualitative study is particularly interesting because it does not flatten recovery into one outcome. Participants who chose non-abstinent recovery described self-awareness and confidence in their ability to maintain limits, while those choosing abstinence often described a recognition that attempts at controlled drinking were unsafe or ineffective for them.[14] The most important fact here is not that moderation "works". It is that people arrive at different relationships to alcohol and that recovery pathways can diverge.

This fits the Updown model because it is not trying to prove that a particular outcome must occur after agency is restored. It is interested in the process by which the person becomes capable of choosing a course deliberately. For one person that course will be abstinence. For another it may begin with harm reduction and later become abstinence. For another it may involve medication, structured care, mutual aid, or combinations of approaches.

The red-wine story that gave rise to the Updown model belongs in the same category. It is not a clinical trial. It is not proof that one person can safely drink their way into sobriety, and it should never be used as such. Its value is that it revealed a mechanism worth investigating: a change in the relationship to the behaviour preceded a change in the behaviour itself.

The story can therefore be read through several lenses. Perhaps safety reduced chronic stress. Perhaps earlier therapy changed the underlying problem. Perhaps shame had been consuming attention that later became available for observation. Perhaps age, circumstance and development played a role. Perhaps the person simply changed. The most scientifically respectable conclusion is not to choose

one explanation prematurely.

What can be transferred from a first-person story is not its exact route. It is the invitation to ask better questions: What became newly possible? What changed in the person's social environment? What happened to attention? What happened to identity? What happened to perceived options? What practical resources appeared? What relationships changed?

In other words, a personal story can be the first observation in a future research programme.

The Philosophical Consequence: A Wider Consciousness

If awareness is more than self-monitoring, then recovery has a philosophical dimension. The person begins with a narrow field organised around survival or relief. Awareness expands the field. Other people become visible. Time becomes visible. Consequences become visible. Possibilities become visible. The self becomes visible as something that can be observed rather than simply obeyed.

This is the beginning of what the argument calls an expanded consciousness. The phrase should not be confused with a claim about paranormal states. It describes a change in the number and quality of things that can be held in awareness at once.

A person who is frightened may see threat everywhere. A person who is ashamed may see evidence of defect everywhere. A person who is compelled by craving may see the substance as the most important fact in the universe. Awareness does not necessarily remove any of those experiences. It changes their monopoly.

That is why present-moment awareness matters so much.

The present is where alternatives become available. Memory can tell us what happened. Prediction can tell us what might happen. But action occurs now. A person can only choose a different response in the moment in which the response is being generated.

The spirit sense enters here as an experience of significance. Why does anything matter? Why should I care about tomorrow? Why should another person's experience matter? Why should I preserve a relationship, create a piece of music, walk in a forest, learn something difficult or make amends to someone who may never forgive me? These are not questions answered by detoxification. They are questions of meaning.

Meaning is also where recovery becomes larger than addiction. If every conversation remains about substance use, the person can remain trapped in the substance even while abstinent. The field must widen: work, friendship, humour, sexuality, family, curiosity, beauty, responsibility, grief, pleasure and contribution. The broader the field becomes, the less one object can dominate it.

This is perhaps the most hopeful part of the model. Recovery is not only the reduction of something. It is the expansion of what else can be lived.

A Practical Architecture for the Updown Centre

If the seven-movement sequence is taken seriously, the architecture of a treatment centre should tell the same story as the therapy. The building should communicate: you are protected here; you have a door you can close; you can ask questions; you can disagree; you will not be humiliated for being human; and you will gradually be asked to carry more of your own life.

The first zone should be admission and medical assessment. Here, safety is literal. Withdrawal risk, medication, psychiatric instability, acute intoxication and other medical needs have to be addressed by appropriately qualified services. This is where the idealism of the model must yield to clinical reality. No philosophical sequence overrides medical danger.

The second zone should be decompression. The new resident has just crossed a threshold. The centre should resist the temptation to make the first hours an information assault. Give the person a room. Give them a meal. Let them sleep. Explain what will happen. Tell them who is responsible for what. Let them know how to complain. Let them know that disagreement is possible.

The third zone should be small-group engagement. Participation grows gradually. A resident may first speak to one clinician, then one peer, then a small group. The aim is not to manufacture vulnerability but to create conditions in which vulnerability becomes voluntarily survivable.

The fourth zone is active awareness work. This includes psychotherapy, trauma-focused treatment where appropriate, mindfulness, body awareness, psychoeducation, practical reflection and the slow reconstruction of meaning. Different modalities can coexist. NSW Health's psychosocial guidance explicitly presents an evidence-informed menu of interventions rather than a single doctrine.[19]

The fifth zone is agency practice. This is where residents begin managing parts of daily life. They make choices, take responsibility for tasks, practise budgeting, plan activities, negotiate conflict and make decisions with consequences. Staff observe rather than micromanage.

The sixth zone is community participation outside the centre. Work placements, education, family contact,

appointments, public transport, recreation and ordinary social life are reintroduced. The centre becomes a base, not a universe.

The seventh zone is transition. The person should know where they are going, who they will contact, how they will manage a difficult day and what happens if they stumble. Transitional housing can be useful because it reduces the discontinuity between institutional safety and ordinary life; The Glen and South Pacific Private both illustrate versions of this staged re-entry.[9][30]

The final zone is disappearance. At some point the person stops thinking about the centre every morning. That is success. The institution becomes a memory of a period in life rather than the permanent organising principle of the self.

Responsibility Without Shame, and Without Escape

The danger in writing about compassion is that compassion can be misunderstood as softness. It is not. A person can be understood deeply and still be required to stop hurting people. A treatment centre can respect a resident and still remove them from a programme when they threaten others. A trauma history can explain behaviour without making the behaviour harmless.

The opposite danger is equally serious: responsibility can become a ritual of degradation. When the person is made to prove their badness before they can move forward, the institution may accidentally confuse shame with accountability.

The better distinction is between consequence and condemnation. Consequence is specific. You broke trust. You lost money. You frightened someone. You missed work. You drove while impaired. You lied. A consequence says some-

thing about an event. Condemnation turns the event into an essence: therefore you are a liar, an addict, a failure, a danger, a hopeless case.

Updown is interested in the space between those statements. A person needs enough continuity of self to own what happened, but enough openness to believe that what happens next can be different. This is not philosophical decoration. Without that space, repair becomes almost impossible. Why repair a relationship if the self is already declared irredeemable?

Responsibility is therefore a practice of returning to relationship with reality. Sometimes that means apologising. Sometimes paying money back. Sometimes accepting a boundary. Sometimes going to prison. Sometimes leaving a family home because another person is unsafe. Sometimes it means simply not doing the same thing again.

A humane treatment system should not protect a resident from the consequences of their behaviour. It should help them encounter those consequences without collapsing into permanent self-hatred.

What the Model Cannot Promise

The model cannot promise that awareness will produce abstinence. It cannot promise that safety will heal trauma. It cannot promise that every person who is treated with respect will respond with honesty. It cannot promise that private rooms will always help. It cannot promise that a person who regains agency will make safe decisions. It cannot promise that every therapeutic community will become a Lord of the Flies scenario, or that every confrontation is harmful.

It can, however, specify what would count as evidence

against it. If carefully implemented safety consistently produced poorer outcomes than comparable alternatives, the model would need to change. If agency-building increased harmful substance use without improving functioning, the model would need to change. If permanent recovery identity routinely produced better long-term outcomes for a population, the critique of identity would need to become more nuanced. If shared rooms reliably produced better long-term social functioning than private rooms in well-controlled comparisons, the architectural proposal would need revision.

This is the advantage of turning a manifesto into a researchable proposition. The model can be wrong about mechanisms and still preserve the ethical principles that motivated it. It can also be right about some mechanisms and wrong about their universality.

The position therefore ends: not at certainty, but at a stronger question.

Part VI - The Human Mechanisms

Trauma Without Reduction

The phrase "trauma is the root" is powerful, but it becomes dangerous when it is turned into a universal key that is expected to unlock every case. Addiction is not one thing, and the histories that precede it are not one thing. Some people carry childhood trauma. Some experience adult violence, loss, neglect, migration, humiliation, chronic insecurity or prolonged social stress. Some do not identify with trauma at all. Some have apparently supportive histories and still develop severe substance-use problems. A serious model has to be able to hold all of this without forcing the person into a story they do not recognise.

The more defensible position is that trauma and adversity can shape the conditions in which substance use becomes compelling. They can alter expectations about safety, trust, belonging, threat and relief. A person may learn that being vigilant is safer than relaxing. They may become exquisitely sensitive to rejection. They may struggle to distinguish a present disagreement from an earlier danger. They may discover that a substance changes an internal state quickly and reliably.

This is enough to matter. We do not need to claim that ev-

ery addiction is hidden trauma in order to ask what function a behaviour serves. The useful clinical question is functional: what is happening immediately before the behaviour, what internal or external state follows it, and what is the person gaining and losing over time?

Trauma-informed care begins from precisely this kind of humility. SAMHSA's current guidance treats trauma-informed practice as an organisational stance: recognise the effects of trauma, notice how they may present, design systems that reduce retraumatisation, and build safety, trust, collaboration and choice.[1][2] The implication for Updown is profound because it moves trauma out of the therapist's office and into the design of the institution itself.

If a person with a history of humiliation is repeatedly humiliated in treatment, the institution is reproducing the very condition it claims to heal. If a person with a history of coercion is routinely denied explanation or choice, the institution may be teaching the nervous system that coercion remains the basic structure of the world. Traumainformed care therefore cannot be a list of therapeutic techniques. It has to be visible in the atmosphere.

The Updown proposition is consequently narrower and stronger: do not assume the same explanation for every person; do assume that the person's history of safety and danger matters enough to investigate. That investigation should be collaborative. The person should be able to say, "That is not how it feels to me," and the clinician should be able to remain interested rather than defensive.

The result is an understanding of trauma that does not swallow the person. Trauma becomes one important dimension of a larger human field: body, substance, relationships, meaning, social conditions, temperament, learning, opportunity, culture and time.

The Nervous System and the Return of Choice

People sometimes talk about the brain as though one part is the rational self and another part is the primitive enemy. Real nervous systems are more complicated. Regulation is distributed. Attention, memory, reward, threat detection, habit and social cognition interact continuously. A person does not become a different species when distressed; they become differently organised.

This matters because the felt experience of choice can change with arousal. Under acute threat, a person may become rapidly actionoriented. Under exhaustion, they may have less patience and poorer inhibition. Under intoxication, judgement and motor coordination may be impaired. Under chronic stress, the world may be interpreted through an expectation that danger is likely. None of these statements abolishes responsibility. They explain why responsibility cannot be separated from conditions.

The Updown sequence can therefore be reinterpreted as a sequence of increasing bandwidth. Admittance opens attention by owning the choice without guilt. Getting to safety reduces the need to allocate every resource to defence. Awakening brings the process itself into awareness. Becoming present anchors attention in the current moment. Awareness enlarges what can be noticed. Regaining and establishing agency uses that enlarged field to select among possibilities. Learning to manage yourself carries the capacity into ordinary life.

This is not a claim about a simple neurological switch. It is a developmental metaphor grounded in ordinary observation and partially supported by the wider evidence base on stress, trauma, mindfulness, motivation and therapeutic relationships. The exact mechanisms vary between people.

What is especially important is that the model does not

place all responsibility on the individual. If a centre says, "You need better self-control," it has not yet asked whether the resident has been given conditions in which self-control can be practised. Are they sleeping? Are they eating? Is the environment predictable? Do they have privacy? Do they understand what is happening? Can they ask for help? Are they being provoked? Is there a safe route out of a deteriorating interaction?

Agency grows in contexts where action has consequences that can be understood. This is why practice matters. A person can understand responsibility intellectually and still have no practical experience of it. Giving them a small decision and allowing them to experience the result can be more educational than another lecture about accountability.

The nervous system does not have to become perfectly calm before a person can choose. Recovery is not the achievement of permanent regulation. It is the growing ability to notice dysregulation and respond without immediately handing the steering wheel to an old pattern.

That distinction becomes crucial outside treatment. The goal is not to create a person who never gets angry, frightened or overwhelmed. The goal is to create a person who can experience anger, fear or overwhelm without automatically turning those states into commands.

Craving Is Not an Order

One of the most useful consequences of awareness is a change in the meaning of craving. Before awareness, an urge can feel like a message from the future: this must happen. After awareness develops, the urge can become an event in consciousness: there is a desire here.

That change may look trivial from the outside. It is

not. The content of the urge can remain identical while the person's relationship to it changes. The distinction resembles the difference between hearing a thought and obeying a thought. A thought can be loud without being authoritative.

Mindfulness research in substance-use treatment is relevant because many interventions explicitly train this relationship between sensation, thought, emotion and action.[5][6] The evidence is not a perfect proof of the sequence, but it provides a plausible mechanism for the awareness stage. Attention can be trained. People can become more capable of noticing urges without immediately translating them into behaviour.

This also changes the moral language of relapse and temptation. If a person experiences a craving, the fact of craving is not yet the fact of action. A treatment culture that treats every desire as evidence of failure may teach the person to conceal the desire. A better culture can ask what the craving is pointing to. Is the person tired? Lonely? Angry? Reward deprived? Triggered by a smell? Replaying a memory? Bored? Celebrating? Wanting permission to stop thinking?

The question is not "What is wrong with you for wanting this?" It is "What is happening in you right now?"

That question preserves the dignity of the person without pretending the craving is harmless. Some cravings carry serious risk. Some people need immediate protective action. Some need medication. Some need to remove themselves from the situation. Awareness is not a substitute for action. It is a better basis for action.

The larger point is that the person learns a new sequence: sensation -> observation -> interpretation -> choice -> action. The old sequence may have been sensation -> automatic behaviour. The space between experience and action

is where agency lives.

Time, Development and the Problem of Twenty-Eight Days

The calendar is one of the most powerful invisible structures in residential rehabilitation. A programme has an opening date, a discharge date, an occupancy target and a budget. The human being has none of these naturally.

There is nothing wrong with a twenty-eight-day programme when it is appropriate to a person's needs. The problem arises when the calendar silently becomes the theory of recovery. If the date on the wall is treated as the date on which the person should be ready, then a developmental process is being compressed to fit an administrative convenience.

The question proposed by Updown is different: what has changed? What can the person now do? Can they tolerate a difficult conversation? Can they travel across town? Can they attend work without using? Can they spend an evening alone? Can they handle a family visit? Can they manage money? Can they sleep? Can they recognise an escalating situation before it becomes a crisis?

This is one reason transitional programmes are so important. The Glen, for example, explicitly links residential care to a transition pathway involving employment, education, housing, finances, transport and family restoration.[9] South Pacific Private similarly offers a post-inpatient Transitions pathway and supported living.[30]

The broader principle is simple: if the target is ordinary life, some ordinary life needs to appear before discharge. A person cannot be expected to prove their readiness for a world they have not yet been allowed to re-enter.

A non-time-mandated system need not mean indefinite residence. It means that time becomes a tool rather than a verdict. Some residents may move quickly. Others may need repetition. A person may appear highly stable until an outside-world demand reveals a gap. The programme can then respond to the gap rather than declaring the person a failure.

There is also a philosophical benefit. When the clock stops defining worth, the person can stop performing progress for the calendar. They can say, honestly, "I am not ready for that yet," and that sentence becomes useful information rather than evidence of noncompliance.

The Single Room: A Door Between Self and World

A single room deserves more attention than a footnote because it represents a philosophical principle in physical form. It establishes that the person has a private territory inside the institution.

The argument is not that shared rooms are intrinsically bad. South Pacific Private deliberately uses shared accommodation in its inpatient programme and explains that it sees this as a way of reducing isolation and encouraging engagement with the therapeutic community.[21] That is a coherent philosophy.

Updown begins from the opposite concern. If a person is learning to become socially present, then social presence has to be voluntary enough to be real. A person should be able to close a door, regulate, think, sleep and return. Privacy becomes a resource for participation.

A single room is especially relevant for people whose histories include boundary violation, chronic surveillance, do-

mestic conflict or social exhaustion. The room is not an escape hatch from treatment. It is a controlled boundary inside treatment.

This creates an important distinction between solitude and isolation. Isolation is disconnection that narrows the person's world. Solitude can be a chosen interval that restores the person's capacity to re-enter the world. A good residential design should make that distinction possible.

There is also a practical advantage. If every emotional state becomes visible to peers, residents may learn to perform wellness. A private room gives the person a place where the performance can stop. Staff can still monitor safety appropriately, but the person is not required to live continuously in an audience.

The architectural message is therefore subtle: we want you to participate, but we do not own your interior life.

Voluntary Disarmament

A treatment system often tries to remove defences by force. It calls this breaking denial. But a defence that is forcibly removed can be replaced by another defence: compliance.

Voluntary disarmament is different. It means the person gradually discovers that some defences are no longer necessary. They learn that the staff member keeps confidences. They learn that disagreement does not automatically trigger punishment. They learn that they can say no to a conversation and return to it later. They learn that other residents are not waiting to use every disclosure against them.

Over time, the person may stop scanning the room so carefully. They may stop rehearsing every answer. They may stop trying to appear invulnerable. The armour is not torn away. It is set down.

This is why trust has to be enacted repeatedly. Trust is not a speech delivered on admission day. It is the accumulated experience of what happens when a person is honest.

The implications for staff training are substantial. Staff have to be able to receive difficult disclosures without becoming punitive, fascinated, dismissive or overconfident. They have to know when to act, when to listen and when to say, "I don't know." They also have to understand that the authority attached to their role changes the meaning of ordinary interactions.

A resident may experience a casual correction from staff as a threat. Another may experience silence as rejection. Another may interpret a change of room as punishment. Good care does not eliminate these interpretations; it makes them discussable.

Voluntary disarmament is therefore less a technique than a relationship strategy. It is the gradual accumulation of evidence that the environment can be trusted.

Family: The First Social Test

Family is often the first place where recovery becomes difficult. In treatment, the person may learn new language and new skills. At home, old roles return almost instantly. The partner remembers the lies. The child remembers the absences. The parent remembers the crisis call. The person in recovery may want to move forward while the family is still living inside the old story.

Updown cannot resolve this by declaring that the family needs to forgive. Forgiveness is not an entitlement. Nor can it demand that the recovering person simply accept their previous identity forever. What it can do is create a space in which both history and change can coexist.

The first step is often specificity. What happened? What harm was done? What does the other person need now? What can realistically be repaired? Which boundaries are necessary?

This is responsibility without identity collapse in its most practical form. The person does not have to say, "I am terrible." They have to say, "I did this, and I understand why it hurt you."

Family work can also widen the model beyond the individual. If the home environment is chaotic, violent, or saturated with substance use, an individualised treatment plan may have little chance of surviving contact with reality. Recovery capital is partly relational and material. The conditions around the person matter.[8]

The social-presence concept becomes useful here. Recovery is not only becoming aware of oneself. It is becoming capable of being present with another person when the conversation is uncomfortable. It is listening without immediately defending. It is staying in the room. It is making a promise cautiously enough that it can actually be kept.

Work, Money and the Rebuilding of Ordinary Competence

Employment is often treated as a discharge-planning detail. It should be much more important. Work gives time structure, social contact, purpose, income, status and opportunities for competence. It also generates stress, criticism, deadlines and uncertainty.

A person who has spent years using alcohol or drugs to regulate internal states may discover that work activates the very states they have been avoiding. The solution cannot simply be "get a job." It has to involve graded exposure to

responsibility.

The same is true of money. Budgeting is an embodied form of self-management. It turns abstract intentions into decisions. What do

I spend? What do I save? What happens when I want something now but need something later?

Treatment that never allows the resident to handle real money may inadvertently preserve dependence. A safe environment can allow small financial decisions and discuss their consequences. The person begins to experience themselves as someone who can manage resources rather than someone who must be managed.

The Glen's transition programme is valuable as an illustration because it treats employment, finances, housing and education as part of recovery rather than as unrelated administrative problems.[28] That is the direction Updown wants to extend.

A broader principle emerges: recovery becomes durable when the capacities practised in treatment resemble the capacities required in life.

Social Visibility

The phrase "socially visible" deserves to become one of the central ideas of the model. A person can be intensely self-aware and still socially absent. They may understand their own history, journal extensively and think constantly about recovery while avoiding real participation with other people.

Social visibility means choosing to be present in relationships. It means allowing another person to see you while you remain capable of disagreement. It means not hiding behind a treatment identity, but not pretending your history

does not matter either.

This is why small social experiments can be so powerful. A coffee with one person. A walk in public. A family meal. A short work shift. A conversation with a stranger. A class. A volunteering session. Each is an opportunity to discover that being seen does not necessarily lead to attack.

Social visibility is therefore a practical bridge between awareness and agency. Awareness says, "I notice myself." Social presence says, "I choose to participate with you."

That is the point at which a person starts to inhabit ordinary citizenship again.

Relapse as Information, Not Metaphysics

Relapse can be serious without being a revelation of essence. If a person returns to a substance, something has happened. The response has to take the risk seriously. But the event does not answer the question, "What are you really?"

A more useful response asks what changed. What happened immediately before the return? What conditions narrowed the person's options? Was there an interpersonal rupture? Loss of work? Sleep deprivation? Pain? Isolation? Exposure to a cue? Overconfidence? A change in medication? A new relationship? A family crisis?

These questions are not excuses. They are maps.

Relapse can also reveal a weakness in the treatment system. Perhaps the person never practised enough social exposure. Perhaps discharge happened before self-management was established. Perhaps the aftercare plan was unrealistic. Perhaps the person had no safe place to live. Perhaps the institution taught them how to function in treatment rather than in life.

An institution that responds to every relapse by repeating

the same programme may be failing to learn. An institution that treats relapse as information can change the plan.

Coercion and the Limits of Choice

Any serious model must discuss coercion. Some people enter treatment because a court orders it. Some because a partner says the relationship is over. Some because their employer threatens dismissal. Some because their body has reached a dangerous point.

Choice is rarely all-or-nothing. A person can have constrained choice and still have meaningful choices. The goal is not to pretend coercion is absent. It is to create as much genuine agency as the circumstances allow.

This is where Updown can coexist with protective action. A person may be too intoxicated or medically unstable to make complex decisions. A person may be a danger to themselves or others. In such moments, safety may require temporary limits. The ethical question is what happens afterwards. Does the institution return agency as soon as possible? Does it explain the decision? Does it distinguish temporary protection from a permanent theory of the person's incapacity?

An open treatment system can say, "We had to do this because the immediate risk was high," without saying, "Therefore you are permanently incapable of governing your life."

Harm Reduction Without Moral Confusion

Harm reduction is often treated as the opposite of recovery. That is too simple. Harm reduction can be a way of keeping a person alive, engaged and capable of reaching a later decision.

At the same time, harm reduction should not become a

euphemism for ignoring danger. Different substances have different risks. Different patterns of use have different consequences. Medical withdrawal can be dangerous. The ethical task is to reduce harm while preserving the person's capacity to move toward whatever recovery goal is realistic.

The Updown model therefore rejects moral purity. A person may need nicotine replacement. They may require medication. They may not be ready for abstinence. They may need supervised withdrawal. They may need a medically supported pathway toward abstinence. The relevant question is not "Does this look pure?" but "What does this intervention make possible next?"

WHO guidance supports combined psychosocial and pharmacological approaches for alcohol dependence, and NSW Health provides evidence-informed psychosocial guidance rather than a single ideological approach.[19][20]

Spirituality Without a Required Religion

The word spirit can frighten a scientific reader and reassure a religious one. The term is used here in a more open sense.

The spirit sense begins when a person experiences life as larger than the immediate management of pain. They notice beauty, responsibility, connection, curiosity, love or mystery. They may discover that they care about something they cannot measure.

This is relevant to addiction because a life that contains no meaning is easily organised around relief. A substance offers an immediate and reliable purpose: change the state. Recovery needs alternatives that are not simply prohibitions.

For some, spirituality will mean faith. For others it will mean nature, music, creativity, philosophy, friendship or service. A good treatment system should provide room for

all of these without requiring metaphysical agreement.

Measuring What Matters

The most important design question may be the simplest: what counts as success?

If the answer is attendance, compliance and correct language, the institution will optimise those things. If the answer is increased capacity, the institution will have to observe different outcomes.

Consider a capability scorecard: housing stability, financial competence, employment or education, emotional regulation, relationship repair, social participation, health management, help-seeking, boundary setting, ability to experience craving without automatic action, and the ability to live without the programme as the centre of identity.

Substance use itself remains important. It cannot be ignored. But it should be one dimension of a wider picture.

This fits the recovery-capital literature, which emphasises the accumulation of resources that support sustainable recovery.[8] It also aligns with patient-centred care research emphasising therapeutic alliance, shared decision-making and individualised care.[3][4]

A Research Programme for Updown

The strongest future for this model is not a manifesto that grows louder. It is a research programme.

One study could compare residential settings with and without routine access to private rooms, measuring privacy, sleep, distress, group participation, length of stay and longer-term outcomes. Another could compare fixed-duration residential programmes with developmentally

timed pathways. Another could examine whether residents who practise more autonomous decisions during treatment show better post-discharge functioning.

A further line of research could test the awareness -> social presence transition. Does deliberate training in present-moment awareness predict improved interpersonal functioning? Can social visibility be operationalised? Can clinicians reliably measure whether a person is becoming more able to remain present during conflict?

The research could also test the darker possibilities. When does autonomy fail? Who benefits from stronger external structure? Are there populations for whom a permanent recovery identity is helpful? When does group exposure outperform privacy?

The point is not to build evidence that agrees with Updown. The point is to discover where it works.

Staff as the Environmental Nervous System

A treatment centre can have beautiful architecture and still feel unsafe if the staff are unpredictable. Residents learn the environment partly through the behaviour of staff.

Staff therefore become, in a sense, the environmental nervous system. They communicate whether the institution is calm or chaotic, predictable or arbitrary, curious or judgemental.

This makes staff selection and training as important as the programme manual. Clinicians need technical competence, but they also need emotional discipline. They must be able to sit with disagreement. They must know the difference between a safety boundary and a control preference. They must not require residents to like them.

The therapeutic alliance literature suggests that the qual-

ity of the relationship matters in treatment.[15] A treatment model that treats staff relationships as secondary is therefore undermining one of its own most important mechanisms.

Admission as the First Act of Treatment

Admission is usually treated as administration: forms, history, belongings, consent, medication, rules. Updown would treat admission itself as the first therapeutic event.

What does the person experience when they cross the threshold? Is the first message, "You are under our control," or "We need to understand what you need"? Is the person shown where they can be alone? Do they know who to call at night? Do they know what the rules mean? Are they invited to describe what makes them feel unsafe?

The first hour becomes the prototype for the next month. If the institution begins with dignity, the resident has evidence that dignity is possible here. If it begins with suspicion, every later interaction has to climb uphill against that first impression.

Selection: Who Belongs in the Community?

The more strongly a centre relies on community, the more important admission criteria become. A group is a social ecosystem. One person's instability can affect everyone.

Selection does not mean creating a population of easy people. It means assessing whether people can safely participate together. Severe behavioural volatility, predatory conduct, unmanaged violence, acute psychosis, high medical risk and other conditions may require different levels of care.

The Lord of the Flies analogy returns here as a warning: a community cannot be expected to supervise itself. Adults

have to remain responsible for safety. Peer support can be powerful, but peer authority must have boundaries.

Leaving: The Final Test of the Institution

A resident should not leave treatment thinking, "I have graduated from being an addict." They should leave thinking, "I know more about how to live my life."

The final weeks should therefore focus less on ceremonial completion and more on transfer. What happens on a bad Tuesday? Who will they call? Where will they sleep? How will they get to work? What will they do if an old friend invites them to use? How will they handle a family argument? What is their plan for money?

What is their plan for boredom?

A good discharge is not an ending. It is the point at which the person's life becomes more important than the institution.

Part VII - Extending the Argument

The Difference Between Knowing and Noticing

A great deal of conventional treatment begins with information. The person is taught about tolerance, withdrawal, triggers, relapse, consequences, brain chemistry and behavioural patterns. This information can be valuable. But knowing a fact is not the same as seeing the fact operating in oneself.

Someone can know that alcohol affects sleep and still drink. Someone can know that conflict triggers them and still walk straight into the same conflict. Someone can know that they become isolated when ashamed and still disappear for days. Knowledge can remain abstract while behaviour remains embodied.

Awareness is the bridge between those levels. To notice is to catch the process while it is happening. I am becoming tense. I am interpreting that look as rejection. I am beginning to rehearse an argument. I am wanting to escape. I am telling myself that one drink will settle the evening. That sentence is not yet a solution, but it is a point of contact with reality.

The value of awareness is that it changes the timing of choice. It moves recognition closer to the moment at which

behaviour is generated. This is why presence is so important. A retrospective account after the event can be insightful; the more difficult achievement is to notice the process before the action is complete.

The seven-stage model can therefore be understood as a movement from retrospective knowledge toward immediate participation. Admittance says, "This is happening." Safety says, "I can stay here long enough to look." Awakening says, "I can see the pattern." Presence says, "I am here while it is happening." Awareness says, "I can notice what the moment contains." Agency says, "There is something I can do next." Self-management says, "I can repeat that capacity tomorrow."

This is also why the model is not simply another philosophy of positive thinking. Positive thinking can be a way of avoiding information. Awareness is the opposite. It may reveal things that are painful and inconvenient. It can show that a relationship is unsafe. It can show that a job is unsustainable. It can show that a cherished belief is false. It can show that the person is not yet ready for something they want.

In this sense awareness is morally neutral but practically demanding. It does not tell the person what to choose. It makes it harder not to notice what the choice involves.

The Present Moment Is Not a Tiny Point in Time

"Be present" is often offered as advice in a way that makes the present sound like a small dot between the past and future. Human presence is larger than that. It includes memory, prediction, bodily sensation, other people, place, language and expectation. The present moment is where these layers meet.

A person sitting at a kitchen table may simultaneously remember yesterday's argument, predict tomorrow's disappointment, feel a tightening in the stomach, notice the partner washing dishes and imagine reaching for a bottle. All of these are occurring in the present as experiences, even though some refer to the past and future.

Presence therefore does not mean pretending the past does not exist. It means noticing the difference between remembering an event and being inside it again. It means recognising that a prediction is not yet a fact. It means noticing that an urge is an event in the present rather than a command issued by the future.

This distinction is central to trauma. When the nervous system expects danger, old learning can colour the present so strongly that the current context becomes difficult to perceive. A trauma-informed environment attempts to make the present different enough that new learning is possible.[1][2]

The architectural environment matters because perception is never completely detached from place. A loud corridor is different from a quiet one. A door that can be locked is different from a door that cannot. Knowing where the staff office is changes uncertainty. Knowing how to leave a group safely changes the meaning of entering the group.

The present moment therefore includes the physical and social environment. This is another reason why the Updown model refuses to locate recovery entirely inside the person's head.

Why a Person May Resist Being Seen

Social visibility can sound simple until we ask why someone would choose invisibility. Sometimes invisibility protects dignity. Sometimes it protects safety. Sometimes it avoids conflict. Sometimes it avoids shame. Sometimes it allows a person to maintain an identity that would collapse under another person's gaze.

A good recovery environment cannot demand visibility as proof of recovery. The person needs to be able to decide when and how to become more visible.

This is particularly important with disclosure. Forced disclosure is often mistaken for honesty. Yet disclosure made under threat is not necessarily the same as genuine openness. The person may tell the staff exactly what they want to hear while keeping the most important material hidden.

A better sequence is trust -> selective disclosure -> increased visibility -> deeper relationship. The person decides that the other person is safe enough to know more.

Social presence is therefore partly a negotiated achievement. The person is not merely exposing themselves. Another human being is receiving them. The receiver's response becomes part of the meaning of the disclosure.

This is where the therapeutic alliance becomes so important. Research in residential SUD treatment suggests stronger alliances are associated with reduced distress and improvements in treatment processes.[15] The relationship is not an optional atmosphere surrounding the "real" treatment. It is one of the contexts in which the person learns whether being seen is survivable.

The Institution as a Temporary World

Every residential programme creates a temporary world. It has its own language, schedules, meals, rituals, permissions, punishments, friendships, status structures and myths about what counts as success.

The temporary world can be useful because it provides distance from the old world. But it can also become too complete. A person may learn to be successful inside the programme while remaining unprepared outside it.

This problem is not solved by making the programme less structured. It is solved by making the structure point outward.

The schedule should therefore contain ordinary-world rehearsals. Make a phone call. Cook a meal. Catch a bus. Attend a medical appointment. Buy groceries. Manage a small sum of money. Deal with a disagreement. Go to a public place. Return and discuss what happened.

This is where the distinction between institutional success and recovery becomes visible. Institutional success is doing what the programme rewards. Recovery is becoming capable of functioning when the programme is absent.

The Economics of Safety

An ideal treatment model is expensive partly because safety costs money. Single rooms require space. Smaller groups require more staff. Longer stays require resources. Transition programmes require housing and workers. Medical supervision requires clinicians. Individualised care requires time.

This does not make the proposal unrealistic in a philosophical sense. It makes the political question unavoidable. What are we willing to pay for rehabilitation?

There is also an economic argument for investing in ca-

pacity. If a person repeatedly cycles through short treatment episodes without rebuilding housing, employment, relationships and self-management, the system may spend money repeatedly without changing the conditions that bring the person back.

A longer, more developmental pathway could cost more per episode and less over a lifetime. That proposition requires rigorous economic evaluation rather than assumption. But the question deserves to be asked.

The same is true for privacy. A single room may appear to be an indulgence until privacy improves sleep, reduces conflict, allows emotional decompression and increases the person's willingness to participate in groups by making participation voluntary. None of these effects should be assumed without evidence. They should be measured.

The Problem of Purity

Treatment systems can become attached to purity: pure abstinence, pure compliance, pure motivation, pure honesty, pure diagnosis, pure doctrine. Human beings are rarely pure in this sense.

A person can want to stop drinking and still miss it. They can believe treatment will help and still resent being there. They can value a spiritual practice and reject organised religion. They can want independence and ask for help. They can take medication and prefer a non-medical understanding of their recovery.

A mature model should not be threatened by this complexity. Ambivalence is information.

The person who says, "Part of me wants to drink," has given treatment something useful. The person who says, "I do not believe I am powerless," has given treatment useful

information too. The correct response is not automatic agreement; it is curiosity followed by clinically grounded judgement where safety requires it.

Learning to Live Without the Centre of the Story

At the beginning of treatment, addiction can be the centre of the story. Every event is interpreted through it. The person enters a room as an addict, meets other people as an addict, explains their history as an addict and imagines the future as a recovery project.

A temporary focus on addiction may be necessary. But a healthy ending should involve decentralisation. The person becomes more interested in their work than their diagnosis, in their children than their treatment schedule, in music than their relapse risk, in an ordinary argument with a friend than in whether the argument represents a pathological pattern.

This does not mean the problem disappears from memory. It becomes one part of the person's biography rather than the organising principle of every moment.

This is perhaps the deepest meaning of the phrase "the institution becomes less necessary." The centre of gravity moves.

What Different Recovery Philosophies Can Borrow From One Another

The inquiry began by questioning the dominance of one particular order. It should not replace that dominance with another.

A person who finds twelve-step fellowship meaningful should be able to use it. A person who wants medication should be able to discuss it with a clinician. A person who

wants a secular programme should not be required to pretend to believe something they do not. A person who values community should have access to one. A person who needs solitude should not be treated as defective for needing it.

The common ground is not ideology. It is function. Does the approach help the person live? Does it increase capacity? Does it reduce harm? Does it create useful relationships? Does it support sustained participation in life?

A pluralistic recovery system could therefore contain multiple pathways while maintaining common safety standards.

Why the Seven Movements Are Better Seen as Conditions Than Rules

The sequence can be read too rigidly. If so, it becomes another programme: now everyone must pass through the seven doors in exactly the prescribed order. That would contradict the model's own philosophical development.

The better reading is conditional. Each movement creates conditions for the next.

Admittance creates contact with reality. Safety makes that contact tolerable. Awakening turns contact into reflective insight. Presence makes insight available in real time. Awareness enlarges the field of perception. Agency converts perception into action. Selfmanagement makes action sustainable.

People may move backward. A crisis may require renewed safety. A relationship rupture may reduce presence. Grief may overwhelm awareness. A return to substance use may narrow agency. The sequence can be revisited without treating revisiting as failure.

The Question of Identity After Recovery

What does a person call themselves after the problem is no longer central?

The answer belongs to them. Some may retain "in recovery" as an important identity. Some may say "former drinker". Some may simply say their name.

The philosophical point is not that one label is correct. It is that the label should remain useful rather than compulsory.

Identity is part of agency because people need the right to describe themselves while also remaining accountable to facts. A person can say, "I am not an addict," while still needing to acknowledge a serious history of dependence. Another can say, "I am an alcoholic," and find the term stabilising. Neither statement should automatically settle the metaphysical question of what the person is.

The Larger Social World

Recovery does not occur in a vacuum because neither addiction nor ordinary life occurs there. Housing markets, employment conditions, family relationships, poverty, discrimination, access to healthcare, transport, social connection and cultural belonging all shape the range of available choices.

The language of personal responsibility can become cruel when it ignores these conditions. Equally, the language of social determinants can become paralysing if it leaves the individual with no meaningful place from which to act.

The most useful position is reciprocal. People act within circumstances, and people also alter circumstances. A person can apply for a job. A system can provide training. A person can set a boundary. A community can respect it. A person can seek housing. A government can decide what housing exists.

The Updown model therefore points beyond the treatment centre toward public life. If we want people to manage their lives, society has to provide lives that can be managed.

The Ethical Test

Every treatment philosophy ultimately faces an ethical test: what kind of human being does it assume is standing in front of it?

If the answer is "a defective object that must be repaired," the person will be handled accordingly. If the answer is "a sovereign individual who should simply exercise willpower," the person's constraints will be ignored. If the answer is "a relational human being whose capacities can expand under better conditions," a different form of care becomes possible.

That final description is still a hypothesis. But it is a productive one because it changes what the institution looks for. Instead of searching only for symptoms, it searches for capacities. Instead of asking only what the person has done, it asks what they might learn to do. Instead of asking only whether the person has complied, it asks whether the person has become more capable.

The Measure of a Better Future

The final measure is ordinary and demanding.

Can the person wake up without immediately needing to escape? Can they tolerate a difficult afternoon? Can they work? Can they love? Can they rest? Can they be alone without becoming lost? Can they be with other people without becoming invisible? Can they make a bad decision without turning it into a biography? Can they ask for help

without surrendering themselves? Can they experience pleasure without turning pleasure into permission for selfdestruction?

These are not glamorous outcomes. They are the stuff of a life.

The success of recovery is therefore not measured by how impressive the treatment experience was. It is measured by how ordinary life becomes possible afterwards.

Part VIII - Making the Idea Concrete

The Admission Interview

Imagine the first clinical interview not as an interrogation but as a map-making exercise. The clinician still needs the facts: substances used, quantity, frequency, withdrawal history, medical conditions, psychiatric history, medications, previous treatment, current risks, housing, family and practical circumstances. But the order and tone of the questions can communicate something equally important.

"What brings you here?" is different from "Why can't you control yourself?" The first opens a field. The second begins with a verdict.

The admission interview should therefore ask three kinds of questions. First, what is dangerous right now? That includes immediate medical and psychiatric risk. Second, what is happening in the person's life? That includes relationships, work, housing, sleep, money and social environment. Third, what does the person think they need?

The third question matters because it establishes the resident as a source of knowledge. Their account may be incomplete. It may conflict with other evidence. But it exists, and treatment should begin by hearing it.

This is consistent with patient-centred approaches, which

emphasise therapeutic alliance, shared decision-making, individualisation and holistic care.[3][4] It also reflects the broader trauma-informed principle that voice and choice should be part of organisational practice rather than reserved for special occasions.[1][2]

The interview should end with something concrete: here is what we know, here is what we do not yet know, here is what we need to protect against, here are your options, and here is what will happen next. Predictability is not bureaucracy. It is part of safety.

The Quiet Architecture of Recovery

Much of treatment happens when nothing dramatic is occurring. A person wakes up. They shower. They eat breakfast. They walk outside. They sit alone. They read. They make a phone call. They become bored. They notice that boredom is no longer unbearable.

The ordinary moments are easily overlooked because programmes naturally advertise what happens in therapy. But recovery is built in the spaces between formal interventions.

This is one reason the physical environment matters. Light, noise, circulation, privacy, outdoor access, meal routines and opportunities for solitude all become part of the social field. The centre should not feel like a hospital unless hospital-level care is actually what is needed. Nor should it imitate a holiday resort. It should feel like a stable temporary home in which the person is being asked to become more capable.

Single rooms become especially important in this quiet architecture. The room provides a place where an intense day can settle. It allows a person to discover what they feel when nobody is asking a question. It makes journalling possible.

It makes sleep more likely. It gives the resident a physical boundary that belongs to them.

A private room can also make group participation more honest. If the person knows they can return to a private place afterwards, they may be more willing to enter a difficult conversation. The paradox is that privacy can support connection.

Choice Needs Consequences

Agency without consequence is not really agency. If every decision is reversed by staff, the resident learns that choices are ceremonial. If every mistake produces punishment, the resident learns that risk is dangerous. A mature programme creates an intermediate space where choices have proportionate consequences and can therefore become educational.

Suppose a resident spends too much of their discretionary money early in the week. The response need not be a moral lecture. The programme can allow the consequences to become visible while making sure basic needs remain protected. The person experiences the relationship between decision and result.

Suppose a resident repeatedly avoids a task. Instead of immediately labelling the behaviour resistance, staff can ask what the avoidance is protecting them from. Perhaps the task activates shame. Perhaps the person does not understand how to begin. Perhaps they are exhausted. Perhaps the task genuinely does not fit their goals.

The final decision may still be that the task must be completed. The difference is that the resident remains a participant in understanding the problem.

This is how responsibility becomes practical. It is not a feeling produced by guilt. It is a learned relationship be-

tween intention, action and consequence.

Community as a Social Laboratory

The best group is not a place where everybody tells their deepest secrets. It is a place where people can practise being human with other people.

That may include listening. It may include disagreement. It may include humour. It may include saying, "I don't want to talk about that." It may include apologising. It may include discovering that another resident's story is very different from one's own.

A small group is valuable because it lets interpersonal patterns become visible without turning the room into an audience. A therapist can notice how a resident responds to disagreement. A peer can notice how another person withdraws when embarrassed. The resident can begin to notice these patterns themselves.

But the group must remain a laboratory, not a court. Peer judgement should not be the final authority. Staff have to protect the perimeter. There must be ways to report intimidation. There must be clear rules against harassment and predation. The group should never be allowed to punish a member through social exclusion.

This is where the Lord of the Flies analogy retains its force. A group of vulnerable people left to regulate one another can quickly create informal hierarchies. The warning is not that human communities are inevitably savage. It is that power structures emerge whether or not adults acknowledge them.

Good treatment therefore uses community deliberately. It creates enough contact to reduce isolation and develop social competence, while preserving enough private territory that no person has to live permanently inside the gaze of oth-

ers.

From Residential Safety to the Street Outside

The transition home should begin long before discharge day. The person needs opportunities to practise ordinary life while the treatment centre remains available as a base.

A useful sequence might begin with a short walk outside alone or with one support person. Then a public transport trip. Then a coffee. Then an appointment. Then a family visit. Then a half-day work or education activity. Each step reveals something.

The objective is not to make the resident "pass" a test. It is to discover where support is needed.

A person may find that the sound of a particular neighbourhood is triggering. Another may discover that being alone at lunchtime is difficult. Another may cope well until a family member becomes critical. Another may suddenly discover that returning to work creates enormous satisfaction and that work itself has become a recovery resource.

The process is iterative. Experience produces information; information changes the plan; the plan creates another experience.

That is the living form of the relativist insight. The person is not simply revealing a fixed trait. Different environments bring different capacities into view.

A Pluralist Clinical Ethic

A pluralist treatment system needs a common ethic even when it allows different therapies and philosophies. The common ethic can be built around a few principles: protect life, reduce preventable harm, respect the person, tell the

truth, explain the reasons for intervention, preserve choice wherever possible, and revise the plan when evidence changes.

Those principles are strong enough to support clinical decisions while leaving room for different interpretations of recovery.

A person may choose abstinence. Another may choose harm reduction. A clinician may recommend medication. Another clinician may emphasise psychotherapy. A peer worker may offer livedexperience support. A family may need separate treatment. The centre does not have to make all these approaches identical.

What matters is whether the person is becoming more capable, more informed and more able to live safely.

Beyond the Binary of Disease and Willpower

The familiar debate between "addiction is a disease" and "addiction is a choice" can become a trap because each side can describe something real.

Dependence involves biological adaptation and can radically alter behaviour. At the same time, people make meaning, form intentions, negotiate environments and sometimes change in ways that are not captured by a purely disease-centred description.

The Updown model does not need to settle the metaphysical argument. It asks a more practical question: what description helps us act responsibly and effectively in this situation?

A medical model can be useful for withdrawal, medication and risk. A psychological model can be useful for learning and emotion. A relational model can be useful for understanding family and alliance. A social model can be useful

for housing and employment. A spiritual model can be useful for meaning. None needs to own the entire person.

The Recovery Self as a Moving Centre of Gravity

The self after recovery may not be a replacement self. It may be the same life reorganised around different priorities.

The person still has memories. The same personality traits may remain. The same vulnerabilities may remain. But the centre of gravity can move.

At one time, alcohol may have been at the centre. Later, work may become central. Then family. Then creativity. Then physical health. Then a relationship. The person is not erasing the old life. They are reallocating attention.

This is why awareness matters. Attention is one of the ways a human being decides what counts as important.

The Final Reversal

The original inversion was simple: perhaps recovery has been approached in the wrong order.

The final reversal is deeper. Perhaps the purpose of treatment is not to produce a better patient. Perhaps it is to produce a person for whom being a patient is no longer the central identity.

That changes the standard of success. The resident who remembers every lesson but cannot live outside the programme has not reached the destination. The resident who forgets half the terminology but can work, love, budget, repair, rest, ask for help and remain present through difficulty may be further along than the programme realises.

The institution should therefore be humble enough to celebrate its own disappearance.

Final Synthesis: Admittance -> Get to Safety -> Awakening -> Become Present -> Awareness -> Regain and Establish Agency -> Learn to Manage Yourself

We can now state the model without mystifying it.

Admittance is the first act of authorship. The person says what is true about the behaviour without guilt and without surrendering the decision to an external power: I did it because I wanted the effect; I liked what it gave me; I kept choosing it because I kept choosing it. Admittance is not an admission of powerlessness. It is the recognition that the person is the prime decision-maker in the relationship, even when dependence, craving, conditioning or circumstance narrow the available choices.

Get to safety. The person moves into conditions in which the truth can be tolerated and the nervous system can stop treating the present as another emergency. Physical protection, felt safety, predictability, privacy and trustworthy relationships become the ground on which further change can occur.

Awakening is the shift from knowing something conceptually to recognising it while it is happening. The person begins to see the pattern itself: the feeling, the desire, the action, the relief, the consequence and the possibility of something else.

Become present. The person returns to the room, the body and the moment. The past can still be present as memory, but it no longer has to dictate every immediate response.

Awareness expands the field. The person notices body, emotion, thought, environment, other people, consequences, desire and possibility. Consciousness becomes interested in itself rather than simply obeying the next urge.

Regain and establish agency. The person begins to act from the awareness they have recovered. Agency is not imagined as perfect freedom. It is practised within real constraints: making decisions, setting boundaries, asking for help, tolerating consequences and discovering that choice can have more than one direction.

Learn to manage yourself. Recovery enters ordinary life. Work, family, money, housing, health, friendship, conflict and pleasure become the arena in which the restored capacity is tested. The goal is not to become permanently managed. It is to become increasingly capable of managing a life.

Seen this way, the seven movements are not a doctrine of how all human beings must recover. They are a proposed architecture for how capacity might become possible.

The strongest evidence around the model lies not in proof of the exact sequence but in the convergence of several fields: trauma-informed care emphasises safety, trust and empowerment; patient-centred SUD research emphasises alliance, collaboration and individualisation; motivational approaches support autonomy

FINAL SYNTHESIS: ADMITTANCE -> SAFETY -> AWAKENING -> PRESENCE and change; mindfulness research suggests benefits from presentfocused awareness; natural-recovery research demonstrates that substantial change can occur outside formal treatment; and Australian rehabilitation services already display a wide variety of approaches that can be compared rather than treated as one system.[1][3][5][7][12][14][16][18][19]

The argument therefore ends not with certainty but with a practical invitation: design treatment so that every stage increases the person's ability to inhabit the next.

Part IX - The World After Rehab

A Recovery Plan That Looks Like a Life

A recovery plan can be written as a list of risks, appointments and prohibitions. It can also be written as a description of a life worth returning to. The second approach is not less clinical. It simply starts farther downstream.

Imagine a person leaving residential treatment on a Monday morning. Their plan might include a doctor, a therapist, a meeting, medication, a support person and emergency contacts. All of that may be necessary. But it still does not tell us what the person will do at three in the afternoon when nothing is scheduled and the old urge arrives.

A fuller plan begins with structure but ends with meaning. Where will the person live? What will they do with their mornings? Who will they see? What work will they attempt? What will give them pleasure? What will they do when they are lonely? What will they do when they are proud of themselves? What will they do when a day is ordinary and there is no crisis to organise their attention around?

The final question is more important than it first appears. Some people become used to crisis. Crisis creates urgency, adrenaline and a clear identity. Ordinary life can initially feel empty. The person therefore needs not only protection from the old behaviour but opportunities to discover the attractiveness of the ordinary.

This is where hobbies, work, family, exercise, art, reading, cooking, music, walking and friendship cease to be "extras". They become competitors for attention. A substance loses some of its power when the person's life contains other things that are genuinely interesting.

This is not a naive substitution theory. No hobby can simply replace severe dependence. But a wider life changes the opportunity structure of behaviour. When more of life is available, fewer experiences have to carry the entire burden of comfort, excitement and meaning.

The Ordinary Evening

A great deal of recovery is decided after dinner.

The day is over. There is nothing left to accomplish. The person is alone or with family. Their body remembers the old routine. The old hour appears. The glass, the pill, the pipe, the message, the ritual - whatever once marked the transition from effort to relief - becomes visible in imagination.

An institution cannot accompany the person into every ordinary evening. This is why awareness and self-management matter. The person has to be able to notice the arrival of the old sequence without treating it as fate.

What matters may be surprisingly mundane. Eat something. Have a shower. Call someone. Go outside. Delay the decision. Notice what the body is doing. Ask what the urge is promising. Ask what it is likely to cost. Remember that an urge rises and falls. Decide what happens next.

These actions are not glamorous. They are the small mechanics of agency.

The treatment centre should practise them while the person is still inside. The final phase of care should include or-

dinary evenings, not only therapeutic ones. Let the person experience boredom safely. Let them notice loneliness without immediately filling it. Let them discover that silence can be tolerated.

The Recovery of Time

People often think of addiction in terms of substances, but the deeper disruption can be temporal. Life becomes organised around anticipation and relief: when can I have it, how much is left, when can I stop working, when can I start again, how long until the next opportunity?

Recovery gradually returns time to the person.

Morning can become morning rather than the aftermath of yesterday. The afternoon can become a place for work rather than waiting for evening. The evening can become a social or reflective period rather than the beginning of an automatic ritual.

This change is part of self-management because time is one of the resources a person learns to govern.

The Recovery of Attention

Attention is another resource that can return.

When a substance dominates the person's life, attention repeatedly curves toward it. How much? When? Where? What happened last night? How will I get more? Who knows? What did I say? Can I hide this?

When those questions no longer dominate, attention becomes available for other things. That availability is a form of freedom.

It can be used for work. For family. For creativity. For learning. For noticing the weather. For listening properly to

another person. For reading a difficult book and remembering what it said. For having a conversation without simultaneously planning an escape.

This is another way to understand expanded consciousness. The world has not necessarily changed. The field of attention has.

What a Better Society Would Ask

A treatment system can do only so much if the surrounding society is organised in ways that make recovery difficult. Housing instability, unemployment, isolation, poor access to healthcare and family violence all shape the conditions under which a person attempts to live differently.

The model does not propose that social conditions excuse harmful behaviour. It proposes that a realistic account of responsibility includes the environment in which responsibility must operate.

We should therefore ask social questions alongside clinical ones. Can people afford to recover? Do they have somewhere safe to live? Is there meaningful work available? Can they access mental health care? Can families receive support? Is transport reliable? Are there places where sober social life is possible?

Recovery is easier to sustain when the world contains places for recovered people to live as ordinary adults.

The Final Word Is Not Abstinence or Moderation

The argument should not end in a debate about whether abstinence or moderation is morally superior. The answer depends on the person, the substance, the history and the risk.

The deeper question is whether the person has become

capable of making that question consciously, honestly and safely.

For one person the answer will be no alcohol at all. For another, early harm reduction may be the bridge to later abstinence. For another, a medication-assisted pathway will be central. For another, mutual aid will become the most stable support. For another, formal treatment will never be necessary again.

The diversity of pathways is not evidence that recovery is meaningless. It is evidence that the human problem is more complex than one ritual.

A Closing Image

Imagine two people leaving treatment.

The first can recite every principle in the programme. They know the language. They can explain their disease, their triggers, their defects and their recovery identity. They leave with a thick folder and a calendar of meetings. But they are frightened of making decisions without permission.

The second knows less terminology. They have disagreements with parts of the programme. They are not certain what label they prefer. But they can manage a budget. They can ask for help. They can tolerate an ordinary evening. They can notice a craving without obeying it. They can call their family. They can work. They can admit a mistake without collapsing. They know when they are becoming overwhelmed and what to do next.

Which person is more recovered?

The answer, although not a mathematical one. The second person appears closer to the purpose of treatment because the purpose of treatment is not to create a successful resident. It is to create the conditions for a person to live.

That is the final turn in Updown.

The aim is not to produce dependence on recovery. It is to make recovery unnecessary as a separate category of existence.

A person simply lives.

And that, finally, is the point.

It Is Enough

And it remains open. A person may have been traumatised. They may have used alcohol or drugs for relief. They may have become dependent. They may have harmed other people. They may have been harmed by treatment. They may have found a treatment that saved their life. All of these things can be true at once.

The argument of this approach remains firm about one thing: sequence matters. Admittance matters because reality has to be faced. Safety matters because a frightened person has difficulty expanding their world. Awakening matters because automatic living cannot easily become deliberate living. Presence matters

because the present moment is where choice occurs. Awareness matters because a person has to see the relationship between states, meanings and behaviour. Agency matters because responsibility without authorship becomes another form of control. Self-management matters because the destination is an ordinary life. The later parts of the approach complicate all of this without cancelling it. Language matters. Institutions matter. Relationships matter. Bodies matter. Social identities matter. The ontology of the person may be more relational than everyday language suggests. Evidence may confirm parts of the model while challenging others. Existing Australian services already contain pieces

of what Updown proposes. The deepest lesson is therefore not that there is one correct rehabilitation programme. It is that treatment should create more possible futures rather than fewer. The person does not need to remain a permanent patient in order to remain a responsible human being. The institution does not have to become the centre of life in order to save a life. Community does not have to become coercion in order to become connection. Spiritual meaning does not have to become doctrine. Medical treatment does not have to become surrender. Responsibility does not have to become shame. The sequence is simple enough to remember: **Admittance -> Get to Safety -> Awakening -> Become Present -> Awareness -> Regain and Establish Agency -> Learn to Manage Yourself.** And then something else has to happen.

The person has to go and live. That is why the best treatment system is not the one that keeps a person inside it forever. It is the one that makes itself less necessary. Enough suffering. Enough war. Enough of confusing the cup with what was inside it. The cup of suffering can be set down. The wine can become ordinary. The institution can become unnecessary. Ordinary life can become compelling again. It is enough. And it remains open.

The Sequence Reconsidered

A practical synthesis. **Admittance** is not admission to powerlessness. It is the Updown act of owning the choice without guilt: I did it because I wanted the effect; I liked what it gave me; I kept choosing it because I kept choosing it. Get to safety. Make the present physically and psychologically different enough from danger that defence can begin to soften. Awakening. Notice that automatic reaction is a

pattern, not a destiny. Become present. Remain in the room, in the body and in the relationship rather than disappearing into avoidance or performance. Awareness. See the links among feeling, memory, desire, behaviour, meaning, other people and consequences. Regain and establish agency. Practise authorship within real constraints; acknowledge both choice and limitation. Learn to manage yourself. Carry the capacities into money, work, family, health, community, conflict and ordinary life. The sequence is not a rigid protocol. Medical emergencies, severe withdrawal, acute psychiatric symptoms and serious threats to safety may require immediate protective intervention. Nor does the sequence imply that every person should reject spiritual practice, twelve-step recovery, medication, abstinence, harm reduction or therapeutic community. It says only that such elements work inside human relationships and therefore their meaning depends partly on how they are introduced, experienced and integrated. A useful treatment system can therefore be both structured and open, both clinically serious and respectful of agency. It can say no to harmful behaviour while refusing to say that the behaviour is the whole person. It can make strong decisions while remaining honest about uncertainty. It can measure outcomes while remembering that the life being measured is larger than the programme. The ultimate test is outward: can the person live more of their life? That question is deliberately larger than "Did they stop using?" Abstinence may be essential for one person and not the only useful outcome for another, but in either case the surrounding life remains the field in

which the result has meaning. A treatment that produces abstinence alongside despair, isolation and complete dependence on institutional approval has solved one problem while potentially creating others. A treatment that helps a

person regain relationships, purpose, health, competence and the capacity to recognise danger has done something broader. The argument therefore leaves us with a standard rather than a commandment. Build conditions in which reality can be admitted. Build enough safety for defences to soften. Make room for awakening. Help the person become present. Widen awareness until the substance is no longer the entire horizon. Practise agency without pretending that constraints do not exist. Carry that agency into self-management and ordinary life. Then keep looking at what happens. That is the point of keeping the argument open. The future should contain more possibilities than the past, and the treatment system should be judged partly by whether it helps make those possibilities real.

Afterword - The World We Are Building

There is a temptation, after thinking about rehabilitation for long enough, to imagine that the answer must be a perfect programme: the perfect building, the perfect group size, the perfect sequence, the perfect therapist, the perfect medication, the perfect discharge plan. I do not believe such perfection exists.

People are too variable. Circumstances change. New evidence arrives. Institutions become tired. Staff have difficult days. Residents bring histories that cannot be predicted from a form. Families change their minds. Bodies behave unpredictably. A model that refuses all of this will eventually become another kind of prison.

The ambition, then, is different. Build systems capable of learning.

A learning system can have firm boundaries without turning boundaries into metaphysics. It can protect people from violence without declaring that the protected person is permanently dangerous. It can use medical treatment without reducing a human life to a diagnosis. It can value abstinence without treating every person who needs another path as morally inferior. It can offer community without making solitude suspicious. It can invite disclosure without demanding confession.

Above all, it can keep the future open.

That may be the single most important thing treatment can give a person: not optimism, not certainty, not a guarantee, but the sense that there are still futures available.

The world outside a treatment centre will never be perfectly safe. Neither will the person leaving it. The point of safety was never to create a world without risk. It was to create enough security for the person to develop the capacities required to meet risk without surrendering to the old pattern.

That is why the sequence matters.

Admittance makes reality speakable. Safety makes it survivable. Awakening makes the pattern visible. Presence makes the current moment available. Awareness makes more of the world perceivable. Agency makes choice possible. Self-management makes choice durable.

Then the institution steps back.

What remains is a human being in the middle of ordinary life.

That human being may still become frightened. They may still grieve. They may still make mistakes. They may still need help. But the defining difference is that the future is no longer organised entirely around the problem.

This is the world envisioned here: a world in which recovery means becoming more present to life, more visible in relationship, more capable of choice, and more able to manage the ordinary complexity of being alive.

It is an idealistic vision. Perhaps it is utopian. That is all right.

We should never stop trying to build a better world merely because we know perfection cannot be reached.

Perhaps the most radical thing a treatment centre can do is to believe that the person will eventually become ordinary

again. Not ordinary in the sense of untouched by history. Ordinary in the sense of belonging to the same world as everyone else: the world of work, love, frustration, comedy, responsibility, ageing, friendship, illness, music, family and unexpected mornings.

A person does not need to be permanently inspirational to remain in recovery. They need to be able to live. They need enough awareness to notice when life is narrowing, enough presence to stay with the moment, enough agency to choose a different response, and enough self-management to turn that response into a pattern. The rest is human variation.

This is why the language of awakening should ultimately lead back to the ordinary rather than away from it. The awakened life is not necessarily dramatic. It may look like making lunch, turning up for work, listening to a child, paying a bill, walking home, declining a drink, apologising after an argument, sleeping when tired, asking for help before a crisis and enjoying a song without needing it to change one's consciousness.

Those acts can seem insignificant beside the scale of addiction. They are not insignificant. They are the fabric of a life becoming manageable again.

The best rehabilitation programme would therefore teach people to notice the small. It would not be ashamed of boring success. It would celebrate the first ordinary week in which nothing catastrophic happened. It would recognise that the absence of drama can itself be a form of healing.

And perhaps that is where the original question finally lands. What if recovery begins in the wrong place? Perhaps it begins when we ask a different question entirely: what would have to become possible for this person to want their life back?

The answer will never be identical for everyone. But the

asking matters.

Build the safety. Create the conditions. Let the person become present. Let awareness widen. Let agency grow. Practise the ordinary. Then step back.

Let life take over.

Selected Sources and Further Reading

1. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). "Trauma-Informed Approaches and Programs." Updated 8 February 2026. https://www.samhsa.gov/mental-health/trauma-violence/trauma-informed-approaches-programs
2. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). "Interagency Task Force on Trauma-Informed Care." Updated 9 February 2026. https://www.samhsa.gov/mental-health/trauma-violence/trauma-informed-care
3. Marchand, K., Beaumont, S., Westfall, J., MacDonald, S., Harrison, S., Marsh, D. C., Schechter, M. T., & Oviedo-Joekes, E. "Conceptualizing patient-centered care for substance use disorder treatment: findings from a systematic scoping review." *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy*, 14, 37 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13011-019-0227-0
4. Myers, B., Da Silva, N., McLaughlin, S., Purnomo, J., Shumskaya, D., Koume, K., Suhartono, S., Campello, G., & Busse, A. "The relationship between patient-centred care for substance use disorders and patient outcomes: A scoping review." *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 139, 104770 (2025).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2025.104770

5. Li, W., Howard, M. O., Garland, E. L., McGovern, P., & Lazar, M. "Mindfulness treatment for substance misuse: A systematic review and meta-analysis." *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 75, 62-96 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2017.01.008
6. Félix-Junior, I. J., Donate, A. P. G., Noto, A. R., Galduróz, J. C. F., Simionato, N. M., & Opaleye, E. S. "Mindfulness-based interventions in inpatient treatment for Substance Use Disorders: A systematic review." *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 16, 100467 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.abrep.2022.100467
7. Sayegh, C. S., Huey, S. J., Zara, E. J., & Jhaveri, K. "Follow-up treatment effects of contingency management and motivational interviewing on substance use: A meta-analysis." *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 31(4), 403-414 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1037/adb0000277
8. Knapp, K. S., Kulak, J. A., Homish, D. L., Granfield, R., Homish, G. G., & Kahn, L. S. "Longitudinal trajectories in recovery capital and associations with substance use among adult drug treatment court clients." *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 260, 111343 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2024.111343
9. The Glen Centre. *The Glen and Transition Program*. Current programme information, 2026.
10. Mahon, D. "A Systematic Review of Trauma Informed Care in Substance Use Settings." *Community Mental Health Journal*, 61(4), 734-753 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-024-01395-z
11. Alcoholics Anonymous. "The Twelve Steps." Official Alcoholics Anonymous website. Accessed 2026. https://www.aa.org/the-twelve-steps
12. Humphreys, K., Moos, R. H., & Cohen, C. "Social

and community resources and long-term recovery from treated and untreated alcoholism." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 58(3), 231-238 (1997). https://doi.org/10.15288/jsa.1997.58.231

13. Russell, M., Peirce, R. S., Chan, A. W. K., Wieczorek, W. F., Moscato, B. S., & Nochajski, T. H. "Natural recovery in a community-based sample of alcoholics: study design and descriptive data." *Substance Use & Misuse*, 36(11), 1417-1441 (2001). https://doi.org/10.1081/JA-100106958
14. Gilbert, P. A., Soweid, L., Maharjan, G., & Mulia, N. "Choosing and Managing Non-Abstinent Recovery: Experiences of Adults in Untreated Recovery From Alcohol Use Disorder." *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 45(2), e70103 (2026). https://doi.org/10.1111/dar.70103
15. Urbanoski, K. A., Kelly, J. F., Hoeppner, B. B., & Slaymaker, V. "The role of therapeutic alliance in substance use disorder treatment for young adults." *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 43(3), 344-351 (2012). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2011.12.013
16. WHOS (We Help Ourselves). Current organisational and programme information, 2026.
17. NSW Government. Alcohol and other drug services: We Help Ourselves (WHOS). Current service information.
18. The Buttery. Drug & Alcohol Services and residential programme materials. Current information, 2026.
19. NSW Health. *Alcohol and Other Drugs Psychosocial Interventions Practice Guide*. Published 7 February 2024.
20. World Health Organization. *Combined psychosocial and pharmacological interventions for adults with alcohol dependence*. Updated recommendation, 2023.
21. South Pacific Private. Current accommodation and

FAQ material describing shared accommodation, private rooms for clinical reasons, and therapeutic-community rationale.
22. Odyssey House NSW. Current residential programme information, 2026.
23. Odyssey House NSW. Current overview and residential programme materials.
24. The Salvation Army Australia. Current New South Wales alcohol and other drug service information, including William Booth House withdrawal and rehabilitation services.
25. Jarrah House. Current treatment programme information, including 10-week voluntary trauma-informed residential care for women and women with children.
26. Jarrah House. Current FAQ and programme information.
27. The Glen Centre. Current residential programme information, 2026.
28. The Glen Centre. Current transition-programme information, 2026.
29. South Pacific Private. *Core Program*. Current information.
30. South Pacific Private. Current inpatient and transitions information.
31. The Sydney Clinic. Current inpatient-programme information, 2026.
32. The Buttery. Current residential-programme brochure and treatment information.
33. Mylet, J. "Magic Cures and their Discontents: The Belladonna Treatment in the Early Twentieth Century." *Points*, 7 January 2020 (updated 29 August 2023).