The Disease of Addiction

The disease, the disorder, and the deeper truth.

Austan Sloan • Recover-You

A note before you begin. This guide examines whether the disease model of addiction still serves people well. If that label is what lifted your shame and got you into treatment, keep it. The argument here isn't that it's wrong. It's that it's incomplete, and that the vocabulary matters far less than whether the care behind it reaches the root.

Feeling overwhelmed by what you're reading? Support is here. Call or text 988, Canada's 24/7 Suicide Crisis Helpline • In Alberta, call or text 211 for community, social, health, and government services • In Edmonton and area, call the 24/7 Distress Line at 780-482-HELP (4357) • Call 911 in an emergency.

The Disease Evolution of Addiction

The word disease didn't arrive attached to addiction by accident. It arrived because every generation looks at human suffering through the lens of what it currently understands, and then builds a model around that understanding. Sometimes the model helps. Sometimes it calcifies into doctrine long after the evidence has moved on.

What we've called addiction has shifted dramatically across history. Not because the experience changed, but because our tools for understanding it did. Each new framework was the best available answer to the same ancient question: why do people keep doing things that are destroying them?

> *The model changed. The person didn't.*

The Architecture of Understanding

1700s–1920s — The Moral Model: "The Sinner." Guided by religious doctrine and the Temperance Movement, addiction was a failure of will, a vice, or a sin. The cures were punishment, imprisonment, or prayer. The person was the problem. Full stop.

1880s–1940s — The Hereditary Model: "The Defect." At the height of the eugenics era, addiction became bad stock: a genetic curse rather than a moral failing. No longer a choice, but still something to be managed or eliminated. The shame didn't disappear. It just changed its justification.

1930s–1960s — The Psychological Era: "The Symptom." With the rise of psychoanalysis, addiction became a manifestation of arrested development or an addictive personality. The conversation shifted from bloodlines to the mind, but still circled back to something being fundamentally wrong with the person.

1956–present — The Disease Model: "The Patient." In 1956, the American Medical Association declared alcoholism a disease. This reduced shame, medicalized treatment, and gave people a framework that didn't require them to simply try harder. A genuine step forward. Also, as it turned out, an incomplete one.

1998–present — The Trauma-Informed Model: "The Survivor." Sparked by the ACE Study, we began to understand that addiction is often not the problem. It's the solution to a problem that came first: a physiological adaptation to a nervous system that learned, for very

good reasons, that the world wasn't safe. We're not treating a broken brain. We're working with one that did exactly what it was built to do.

The Next Evolution: Precision, Not Dogma

This site leans heavily into the trauma model, and deliberately so. For decades the trauma connection was ignored, minimized, or dismissed entirely. Leaning hard into it now is an intentional correction for a long history of looking the other way.

But history also shows that once we find a new hammer, everything starts to look like a nail. The trauma-addiction link is massive, but it isn't absolute. Looking for trauma where none exists, what I'd call ghost hunting, sends you chasing phantoms instead of the actual problem. Not every addiction story starts with trauma. Enough do that we can't afford to keep ignoring it. Not so many that we should stop looking for other explanations.

A more grounded way to understand recovery. Two broad paths, not one. The organic path is for the dopamine hijack: the brain that needs retraining. The trauma path is for the survival adaptation: the nervous system that needs healing. Ask where yours began. In overwhelm, in conditioning, in repetition, or in something that happened long before substances were ever part of the picture? That starting point isn't a diagnosis. It's a direction, and it can clarify what kind of care is actually going to work rather than treating the surface while the root keeps feeding it.

The Power and Peril of a Label

The debate over disease versus disorder can become its own distraction. The vocabulary matters far less than whether the label actually moves us toward the right kind of care. A word that opens a door is useful. A word that closes one is not, regardless of how clinically precise it sounds.

> *The real question isn't what we call it. The real question is: does the label empower you, or does it shrink you?*

For some people, the disease label is genuinely liberating. It lifts shame, reframes addiction as something treatable, and removes the demand to simply try harder against something that was never a willpower problem. That matters.

For others, the same label quietly installs a ceiling. Well, if it's a disease, maybe there's nothing I can do about it. The condition stays identical. The story changes. And the story is what determines whether recovery feels possible or pointless.

Which brings us to the real problem with the disease framing. If we're going to call addiction a disease, then the care around it needs to actually behave like it is one. It needs to address root causes, not just symptoms. It needs to demand more than abstinence and a handshake. Otherwise the language is purely symbolic, and we could rename it Chronic Bad Idea Syndrome without changing a single thing about the biology, the suffering, or the failure rate.

Mistaking the Solution for the Problem

When we treat addiction as the whole story, we risk mistaking a diagnosis for an explanation. Addiction produces measurable changes in reward, stress, learning, and control systems. Those changes may sit downstream from trauma, pain, psychiatric illness, genetics, social conditions,

repeated exposure, or several forces at once. Sometimes there is an older wound. Sometimes the addiction itself becomes the wound. Either way, stopping at the label is not enough.

If you've gotten sober and discovered that life felt worse, that the raw anxiety, the shame, the hollow feeling underneath were more terrifying than the substance ever was, you already understand this. You removed the coping tool. The thing it was coping with didn't go anywhere. It just lost its cover. The fire is out. The alarm is still going. No smoke, no flames, just a nervous system that never got the memo that the emergency is over. That's not a character flaw. That's what untreated trauma looks like in a sober body.

> *Addiction wasn't the root problem. It was the desperate solution to one, formed under duress, in the absence of anything better.*

For many people, the problem addiction was trying to solve already has a name: complex PTSD. Not every addiction story starts there. But enough do that treating the substance without asking what the substance was managing isn't just incomplete. It's how people end up cycling through the same doors for years without ever understanding why nothing holds.

If Brain Changes Define a Disease, C-PTSD Is the Prototype

The core argument for calling addiction a disease is that it produces persistent dysfunction in brain and behaviour. Fair enough. Complex trauma can also produce severe, measurable changes in stress regulation, memory, identity, and relationships. Neuroimaging finds group-level differences associated with PTSD and childhood adversity, but those differences are not diagnostic scars and cannot tell us what happened to one person. The injury is real without pretending the scan can read the story.

For some people, trauma-related symptoms come first: hypervigilance, shame, disconnection, poor regulation, and a nervous system trained to expect threat. For others, addiction develops through different routes. None of these guarantee addiction. But when trauma is present, it can build exactly the kind of internal landscape where substances take root fast, go deep, and feel like the only thing working.

Threat networks, including the amygdala: more reactive to danger cues in many people with PTSD, contributing to hypervigilance and anxiety.

Prefrontal regulation: can lose influence under threat, making impulse control, emotional regulation, and deliberate choice harder when the system is activated.

Hippocampal and memory systems: PTSD is associated with differences in contextual learning and, at the group level, hippocampal volume. That can make past danger easier to reactivate in the present; it does not mean every traumatized person's hippocampus shrank.

Self-related networks, including the default mode network: studies find altered connectivity in some trauma-related conditions. These findings may help explain dissociation and disrupted self-experience, but 'the network fractures' is metaphor, not a clinical measurement.

> *Addiction rewires systems. C-PTSD rewrites the operating system. Addiction hijacks the brain's motivation system; C-PTSD hijacks the brain's survival system. One is a siege on your life. The other is a siege on your self.*

By the time substances enter the picture, the architecture has often already shifted. Addiction doesn't arrive as the origin point. It arrives as the body's attempt to regulate what trauma already destabilized. This is where the confusion compounds. Addiction becomes the visible crisis, the thing everyone sees, labels, and tries to treat. Trauma runs underneath it, doing most of the driving while nobody looks.

So here's the argument turned back on itself: brain change alone cannot settle what deserves the word disease. Trauma may precede addiction, shape it, or make the first relief feel overwhelmingly rational. In other cases it does not. The honest model has room for both truths: addiction has its own biology, and its origins still matter.

The Autoimmune Analogy

This isn't about which condition is worse. It's about understanding the order of injury. If addiction is like an infection, something triggered by exposure to an external agent, then C-PTSD is closer to an autoimmune disorder of the psyche. The survival system, conditioned by years of threat, begins to turn inward. It attacks the very capacities meant to protect you: emotional regulation, secure attachment, the ability to feel safe in your own skin. The defence becomes the damage.

And addiction, in this analogy, often functions like a secondary infection on an already weakened system. Trauma primes the ground, distorts the defences, and creates the exact conditions where substances can take hold. What looks like the disease is often just the visible symptom of a deeper autoimmune-style breakdown.

Why This Distinction Is Everything

This isn't just an academic exercise. It is the difference between treating the substance and understanding the person using it. For trauma-driven addiction, 'just don't use' leaves the wound untouched. For addiction driven by other forces, different questions may matter more. The disease label can open a door. It cannot tell you which room the fire started in.

It shifts the focus: from "what is wrong with me?" to "what happened to me?" That's not a small linguistic shift. It's the difference between shame and understanding, and understanding is where the actual work begins.

It validates the struggle: it explains why sobriety alone can feel unbearable, and why removing the substance sometimes makes everything worse before it gets better. Willpower was never the variable. It was never a fair fight.

It exposes what's actually driving it: addiction was the visible costume. Trauma was wearing it. Until the wound underneath gets treated, the cycle doesn't end. It just restarts with a different substance or a different behaviour and the same root cause.

It restores real agency: you aren't defective. You were injured. And injuries, unlike character flaws, can actually be treated. That reframe is more than compassionate. It's the most accurate description of what happened.

Before You Go

Calling addiction a disease was a milestone. It reduced shame, opened treatment doors, and gave people a framework that didn't demand they simply want it more. That mattered. It still matters. But a stepping stone is not a destination, and treating it like one has cost us decades of more precise, more effective care.

If the disease label is what got you through the door and keeps you honest about vulnerability, nothing here asks you to give it up. The test isn't whether the word is technically correct. It's whether it's expanding what you believe is possible or quietly capping it. Only you can answer that.

And the opposite caution applies to the trauma frame too. Not all addiction is rooted in trauma, and going looking for a wound that isn't there is its own kind of detour. The point isn't to swap one universal explanation for another. It's to find out which story is actually yours.

> *The most honest thing we can say right now is: this model was the best we had, and it has to keep getting better.*

The real work isn't just removing the substance. It's understanding what the substance was doing there in the first place. What it was managing. What it was masking. What it was trying to make bearable. That's where the actual recovery begins. Not at the symptom. At the source.

Feeling overwhelmed by what you're reading? Support is here. Call or text 988, Canada's 24/7 Suicide Crisis Helpline • In Alberta, call or text 211 for community, social, health, and government services • In Edmonton and area, call the 24/7 Distress Line at 780-482-HELP (4357) • Call 911 in an emergency.

Sources & Further Reading

These sources reflect the historical, neurological, and trauma-informed perspectives explored here, including the strongest arguments for the disease model and the strongest arguments against it.

American Medical Association. (1956). Hospitalization of patients with alcoholism. JAMA, 162(8), 750. Also: Jellinek, E. M. (1960). The Disease Concept of Alcoholism. Hillhouse Press. *The 1956 AMA report formally recognized alcoholism as a disease requiring medical treatment: the institutional turning point away from purely moral framing. Jellinek's text provided the scientific scaffold that underpins the disease model to this day.*

American Society of Addiction Medicine. (2019). Definition of Addiction. *Characterizes addiction as a primary, chronic disease of brain reward, motivation, memory, and related circuitry, explicitly recognizing genetic, psychosocial, and environmental factors. The institutional basis for the brain disease model discussed here.*

Volkow, N. D., Koob, G. F., & McLellan, A. T. (2016). Neurobiologic advances from the brain disease model of addiction. New England Journal of Medicine, 374(4), 363–371. *Core review of the biological underpinnings of addiction, providing the neurological rationale for the disease model while also illustrating its limitations when the trauma dimension is absent.*

Heyman, G. M. (2013). Addiction: A Disorder of Choice. Harvard University Press. *Challenges the strict disease framework, arguing that context, learning, and voluntary control play a greater role than the biological model acknowledges. Included because the argument against the disease model deserves its strongest advocate.*

Lewis, M. (2015). The Biology of Desire: Why Addiction Is Not a Disease. PublicAffairs. *A neuropsychologist's argument that addiction is a deeply learned adaptation shaped by neuroplastic change rather than a discrete pathology, emphasizing that the same brain mechanisms driving addiction also drive recovery.*

Khantzian, E. J. (1997). The self-medication hypothesis of substance use disorders. Harvard Review of Psychiatry, 4(5), 231–244. *Foundational paper proposing that substance use is motivated primarily by the need to regulate distress rooted in trauma, and that treating addiction without addressing this underlying pain leaves the root cause intact.*

McEwen, B. S., & Morrison, J. H. (2013). The brain on stress: vulnerability and plasticity of the prefrontal cortex over the life course. Neuron, 79(1), 16–29. *Explains how chronic stress reshapes brain systems central to addiction, impairing impulse regulation in ways that increase vulnerability to compulsive use and make standard behavioural interventions less effective without addressing the stress biology.*

Koob, G. F., & Schulkin, J. (2019). Addiction and stress: an allostatic view. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 106, 245–262. *Reviews how repeated stress produces allostatic load affecting all three stages of the addiction cycle, explaining why dysregulated stress neurocircuitry is a core mechanism in the transition from voluntary use to compulsion.*

Van der Kolk, B. A. (2014). The Body Keeps the Score. Viking Press. *Connects trauma's imprint on the brain and body with addiction, dissociation, and the failure of purely abstinence-based models.*

Maté, G. (2008). In the Realm of Hungry Ghosts. Knopf Canada. *Reframes addiction as an adaptive coping mechanism shaped by early adversity and unmet attachment needs, arguing that the disease model, while useful, is incomplete without that developmental and relational context.*

Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., et al. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 14(4), 245–258. *The ACE Study that opened the trauma-informed era described in the timeline above.*