

Review of: "A Philosophical Analysis of the Foundational Suppositions in Harm Reduction Theory and Practice"

Nicolas Brault

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

It is a really interesting article, rather well written, which raises several issues (which I was not aware of) concerning drugs, addiction and harm-reduction theory. I however a few comments about it.

First, the reference to "critical hermeneutics" in the introduction does not seem justified: there are no references to this approach in the text, except in the conclusion where is mentionned an "existential phenomenological perspective" which is not the same as critical hermeneutics and brings nothing (to my opinion) to the main arguments given by the author. This dimension of phenomenology or hermerneutics shoud thus be more developed in the text or purely abandonned, as it brings nothing and could even be a source of confusion. This is to my opinion the main problem of this text.

Concerning now the main arguments about relativism, collectivism and determinism, I find them quite convincing, though most of the time obvious. For example, the debate about determinism and free will, or about the social factors determining addiction versus an approach that defends the freedom and "agency" of individuals appears caricatural: it is quite clear that there are both socail factors and individual factors. The problem is that, as the author says rightly, it is very important to distinguish between drugs and addiction. It is highly probable that though drugs are used by all social classes, there is a highest probability of becoming addicted to a drug when you come from lower social classes. Besides, the drugs used are not the same according to social classes.

In conclusion, I enjoyed reading this article and became aware, thanks to the author, that there were very interesting philosophical debates behind some public health approaches regarding drugs, addiction and so on.