

Review of: "Addiction as a Loss of Inner Freedom"

Peter Eng

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper is a difficult read. It is highly philosophical in tone and, in order to prepare the reader from the onset, the first sentence abstract should make it clear that the aim of this paper is to present “the addiction phenomenon as a loss of inner freedom (the freedom of making a decision)” **and also**, the loss of a sense of one’s very existence.

Grammatically, there are innumerable run-on sentences that are extremely difficult and painful to follow. For example, this sentence, preceded by another lengthy sentence, contains over ninety words: “When the addict loses his or her privileges and accepts it, he or she confronts the changes of perception that are caused by the inversion in which the biochemical and psychological machinery of an addict’s brain unnaturally penetrate into the foreground, and his or her personality and the concept of universality of logical and fair action stay in the background, and starts to recover and to build the inner freedom in acting outward (morality) within the expected and universal rules - which means that, in the concept of realizing one’s personality, the subject becomes free.”

While the style of writing is poetic, there are many flowery sentences in the paper wherein the meaning may be apparent only to the writers (e.g., “It disappeared with the dullness of the brain as an organ that gives an inadequate response to a stimulant from the mind, that in turn is seeking a path to the lost and unrepeatable beauty of an event it had disappeared in the final body, only to appear in pure thought, in religion, in silence, as impotence, as the negation of everything that we perceive to be important in reality and that is determining.”)

Ultimately, the paper presents a descriptive, existential explanation for the phenomenon of addiction but is deficient in this regard: it offers no attempt to concretize solutions for “the recovery of an addict who wants to build a logical system of opinion to make a balance between psycho-biological needs on one side, and heterogeneous possibilities of freedom through the categorical norms of mind on the opposite.” The authors assert that the conclusions come from years of observing clients. Yet, they offer no real-life examples to anchor their ideas.