

From incarceration to recovery: Can the justice system support addiction treatment?

Claudio Rago*

Department of Time-dependent Unit, University Hospital “Federico II”, Naples, Italy

Introduction

The intersection of addiction and the criminal justice system is a complex issue that affects millions of individuals worldwide. Many incarcerated individuals struggle with substance use disorders (SUDs), yet traditional punitive approaches often fail to address the root causes of their addiction. This article examines the potential of the justice system to support addiction treatment, exploring existing programs, challenges, and future recommendations [1].

According to the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), approximately 65% of the U.S. prison population has an active substance use disorder, and another 20% were under the influence of drugs or alcohol when committing their offenses. However, only a small percentage receive adequate treatment while incarcerated, leading to high relapse and recidivism rates post-release [2].

These specialized courts provide non-violent offenders with the opportunity to undergo supervised treatment instead of serving traditional prison sentences. Studies suggest that drug courts significantly reduce recidivism and improve recovery outcomes [3].

Some correctional facilities have begun offering MAT programs, including methadone, buprenorphine, and naltrexone, to help manage withdrawal symptoms and reduce cravings. Transitional services such as counseling, peer support groups, and housing assistance help individuals reintegrate into society while maintaining sobriety [4].

Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT), 12-step programs, and vocational training offer incarcerated individuals the tools needed for long-term recovery. Challenges in Implementing Addiction Treatment in the Justice System Despite promising initiatives, several barriers hinder the effectiveness of addiction treatment in the justice system [5].

Many prisons and jails lack the resources to implement comprehensive treatment programs. There remains a strong societal and institutional belief in punishment over rehabilitation, preventing widespread adoption of treatment-focused approaches. Many individuals struggle to access treatment post-release, increasing the risk of relapse and overdose [6].

The Road to a More Supportive Justice System For the justice system to effectively support addiction treatment, several

reforms should be considered: Correctional facilities should integrate comprehensive treatment programs, including MAT and behavioral therapies [7].

Strengthening reentry services, such as employment programs and continued medical care, can reduce relapse rates. Policies should prioritize treatment over incarceration for non-violent drug offenders. Educating law enforcement, correctional officers, and judges about addiction as a medical condition can reduce stigma and promote treatment-focused approaches [8].

Restrictions on medications like methadone and buprenorphine in correctional settings limit treatment options for incarcerated individuals. The Link Between Incarceration and Addiction Studies indicate that a significant proportion of incarcerated individuals suffer from substance abuse issues [9].

Current Efforts in the Justice System Recognizing the limitations of punitive measures, many jurisdictions have introduced rehabilitative programs aimed at treating addiction within the justice system. Some of the most notable efforts include:

Conclusion

The justice system has the potential to play a pivotal role in supporting addiction recovery, but significant changes are needed to ensure effective treatment for incarcerated individuals. By expanding access to evidence-based interventions, enhancing reentry services, and prioritizing rehabilitation over punishment, the justice system can contribute to breaking the cycle of addiction and criminal behavior. A shift towards a more compassionate and treatment-oriented approach can improve public health outcomes and reduce recidivism, ultimately benefiting both individuals and society as a whole.

References

1. Kuehn S, Ridener RJ, Scott PW. Do criminology classes make a difference? Changes in perceptions of punishment over time. *J Crim Justice Educ*. 2018; 29(1):1-7.
2. Beirne P. Adolphe Quetelet and the origins of positivist criminology. *Am J Sociol*. 1987; 92(5):1140-69.
3. Braithwaite J. Beyond positivism: Learning from contextual integrated strategies. *J Res Crime Delinq*. 1993; 30(4):383-99.

*Correspondence to: Claudio Rago, Department of Time-dependent Unit, University Hospital “Federico II”, Naples, Italy. E-mail: claudio.ra@unina.it

Received: 03-Mar-2025, Manuscript No. AARA-25- 163808; Editor assigned: 04-Mar-2025, PreQC No. AARA-25- 163808 (PQ); Reviewed: 18-Mar-2025, QC No. AARA-25- 163808; Revised: 23-Mar-2025, Manuscript No. AARA-25- 163808 (R); Published: 30-Mar-2025, DOI: 10.35841/aara-8.2.259

4. Agnew R. Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminol.* 1992; 30(1):47-88.
5. Costello BJ, Vowell PR. Testing control theory and differential association: A reanalysis of the Richmond Youth Project data. *Criminol.* 1999; 37(4):815-42.
6. Olsen CM. Natural rewards, neuroplasticity, and non-drug addictions. *Neuropharmacol.* 2011;61(7):1109-22.
7. Perry CJ, Zbukvic I, Kim JH, et al. Role of cues and contexts on drug-seeking behaviour. *Br J Pharmacol.* 2014;171(20):4636-72.
8. James J. Dealing with drug seeking behaviours. *Aust Prescr.* 2016;39(3):96.
9. Gerrits MA, Petromilli P, Westenberg HG, et al. Decrease in basal dopamine levels in the nucleus accumbens shell during daily drug-seeking behaviour in rats. *Brain Res.* 2002;924(2):141-50.
10. Hogarth L, Dickinson A, Hutton SB, et al. Drug expectancy is necessary for stimulus control of human attention, instrumental drug-seeking behaviour and subjective pleasure. *Psychopharmacol.* 2006;185:495-504.