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Chapter 1 I Must Be High

1.1 Introduction

This research argues that heroin addiction, as presented in biomedicine and science, does not exist. The pharmacological focus on heroin overlooks the positive effects of heroin and exaggerates the harms caused by heroin use. Strong social forces and environmental factors induce "junkie" behavior, rather than the drug itself. Through an examination of aging individuals with long-term heroin use, heroin addiction can be better understood as a product of cultural, political, and economic factors rather than one of biology. Viewing heroin from a perspective different from biomedicine enables health and social workers to approach drug users as individuals and not addicts. A medical anthropological perspective is paramount to conducting research that benefits the people receiving health programs more than the people who create them.

My interest in University of Amsterdam's Medical Anthropology Master's program started from my desire to integrate biomedicine with other cultural systems of thought. Science contributes to the advancement of technology and medicine in improving health, but its dominant role in health interventions often obscures the cultural, historical, economic, and political differences surrounding behavior, choice, and abilities. Anne Fadiman's *The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down* is one example of how miscommunication between doctors and patients can lead to devastating results. Fadiman recounts a true story of one Hmong family's battle to maintain their child's (Lia's) health condition as a potential shaman while at the same time local doctors fight to medicate her severe epilepsy. The negotiation of power and notions of authority prevented both sides from understanding how the other was trying to help Lia. Amidst the breakdown of communication, Lia suffered irreparable brain damage.

In *Doctor-Patient Communication: A Review of the Literature*, L.M. Ong et al. said, "In order to fulfill doctors' and patients' needs, both alternate between information-giving and information-seeking (1995: 904). In the case of Lia, her doctors focused on the seizures and compliance with treatments while her parents worked to save Lia's connection with her family and community. Although both sides strived to help Lia, their opposing ideologies created frustration and
mistrust. This coming to understand doctor/patient or biomedicine/layperson relations emerged in my own research on needle exchange, a public health initiative to prevent HIV/AIDS among injection drug users where used needles are exchanged for sterile ones.

Initially I did not consider the needle exchange clients' desires from their perspective. My decision to work as a researcher for University of Illinois at Chicago's Community Outreach Intervention Projects' needle exchange programs arose from my general interest in preventing HIV/AIDS. I assumed that preventing HIV was a top priority for the drug users as well. Since needle exchange is a harm reduction initiative, where high-risk behaviors are reduced when all other initiatives have failed (Des Jarlais & Friedman, 1993: 63), I viewed the public health community as beneficent lobbyists who worked on the behalf of injection drug users. As a result, my concern was overshadowed by the public health officials' definition of effectiveness: finding ways to make needle exchange more accessible and acceptable by the community members and policy makers.

The research I undertook compared two NEP models, motorhome (mobile vans) and storefront (permanent buildings) needle exchanges, by measuring the frequency of visits, length of visits, and utilization of other social and health services. There were four different storefront needle exchange sites and three motorhome sites, all of which were located in low-income neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois. During my fieldwork, however, I became increasingly attuned to the interactions between needle exchange educators and clients. The increase of suburban white youth at the needle exchanges, which were in ethnic neighborhoods and run almost entirely by non-white volunteers, raised questions about social distance and perceptions of "injection drug users."

Even though these needle exchanges operated under the Indigenous Leadership Outreach Model, where people indigenous to the communities they sought to serve delivered health and social services, the interactions between the workers and clients were brief and clients rarely spoke about their problems in-depth. In order to improve these Chicago needle exchange programs, I sought to compare them with those in Amsterdam, because that was where needle exchange was first launched. Cognizant of the fact that the Netherlands had a low HIV/AIDS rate as well as a
stabilized injection drug using community, I believed that studying the efficacy of Amsterdam needle exchanges could serve as a role model for those in Chicago. In addition, by incorporating a medical anthropological perspective, I could potentially analyze the relations between workers and clients.

Research plans, however, do not always go according to the plan. As a Fulbright scholar, I intended to do a comparison of needle exchanges between Amsterdam and Chicago as a way of promoting international exchange in addition to improving their programs. I had failed to recognize the historical, cultural, economic, and social factors that would play a larger role in determining the success of needle exchange in the Netherlands than in the U.S. Furthermore, heroin use had faded and injection drug use was no longer a popular trend in Amsterdam (van Brussell, 1995: 2). Despite the fact that the topic I planned to pursue was no longer a high priority for the Amsterdam public health community (GG& GD), there were still areas in which the health-seeking experiences and treatment of drug users could be improved both in Amsterdam and in the U.S.

As I adopted more medical anthropological methodologies, I began to view needle exchange from a more emic, or local, perspective. I became concerned with the clients' perceptions of needle exchange services. From a public health perspective, the focus of developing programs addressing drug use is motivated by general threats to the community at large rather than improving the well-being of drug users. I wanted to develop research from the point of view of the drug users, rather than approaching them as receivers of the public health community's goodwill. Interviewing clients about the quality of services of needle exchange still did not address what they believed their needs to be and what kind of support they sought from institutions. Thus, I wanted to focus on the drug users without the affiliation of public health or needle exchange. I needed, however, a way of narrowing my sampling and a guiding purpose for attaining their point of view.

It occurred to me early in the fieldwork process that I had made several postulations that proved to be problematic. The first one was my assumption that IDUs was in fact a real category of people, as if there was a collective of injection drug users to interview. The second was that
most or all injectors were injecting heroin. In order to resolve these obstacles, I chose to focus on people who use heroin alone or in combination with other drugs for a long period of time. How a drug user chose to inject drugs was not a differentiating marker within the drug community; it served as a targeted behavior for public health officials preventing blood borne diseases. Having narrowed down my research group to heroin users, I had to return to my original inquiry of discovering how heroin users perceived any harms caused by the drug, and their perceptions of problems they faced as a heroin user. Since most programs directed toward heroin users are abstinence-oriented, there is little attention paid toward services that aid individuals to improve their lifestyle with continued heroin use.

Heroin is commonly perceived as the most addictive drug that wreaks havoc in people’s lives. There is little room to discuss the positive effects of heroin when so much of the focus is on the physical dependence aspects of heroin. This research questions the biomedical understanding of heroin and its detrimental effects on people who use heroin. I conducted eight in-depth interviews, five of which were long-term heroin users who could speak about their ability to live inside a lifestyle that contained heroin use, and the remaining three with advocates for drug users, in hopes of improving our understanding of “harms” caused by heroin and the biomedical focus on addiction.

1.2 Background

The current Dutch health care system is funded both by government and private sources, mainly due to the historical divisions between religious and ideological groups in Dutch society (Van der Veen, 1997: 1). When Calvinist Protestants became the legally dominant group in 1851, they also heavily influenced the way in which health services were provided (Ibid). They emphasized the role of local communities in being responsible for public hygiene as well as for the sick and the poor (Ibid). During the 19th century, Europe experienced various epidemics including cholera, typhoid, and other infectious diseases that many scholars believe helped spur public health responsibility (Brunt & Ronden, 1991:83; Evans, 1995:152). Since local authorities are able to wield authority upon their own structure of public health services, municipal health
services differ throughout the Netherlands. The Amsterdam Municipal Health Services (GG &GD), however, became the leading example for preventative medicine as well as environmental and occupational hygiene in the Netherlands (Van der Veen, 1997: 2). As one of the major and most populated cities, Amsterdam continues to have one of the most comprehensive health care systems.

Thus, it is no surprise that the Amsterdam GG & GD took the lead in providing health services for drug users as well. Drug addiction was viewed as a sickness and was treated as a medical problem (Korf & Riper, 1999: 2). The medical community was able to assist drug users since drug policies dating as early as 1920 made a distinction between those who trafficked, produced, or dealt drugs from people who simply used drugs. In the case of heroin users specifically, the GG & GD based their programs on their interpretation of harm reduction after abstinence measures failed: “that if it is impossible to cure a drug addict one should at least try to create a situation that greatly reduces the risk that the addict harms himself or his environment” (Buning et al., 1986: 1435). They adopted this pragmatic and less moralistic approach after drug-free treatments failed. Needle exchange was one instance in which the GG & GD conformed to practices that originated outside of the public health community. It was the hard drug users union in Amsterdam who first provided free needles and syringes to injection drug users in 1983 to prevent a potential hepatitis B outbreak when pharmacies stopped selling injection equipment (Coutinho, 1995: 1490). Due to parallel fears of blood borne diseases such as hepatitis, tuberculosis and HIV transmission, the Drug department of the Municipal Health Service took over the needle exchange in 1985 as the need grew beyond the capabilities of the hard drug users union (Ibid).

Needle exchange, however, was not the only strategy to “cure” heroin users. Methadone has been available on a wide-scale to heroin users since 1981 (Van Brussell, 1995:1). For drug use and addiction, there is a three-tier system provided by the GG & GD. Heroin users who seek low threshold treatment most frequently begin by visiting a general practitioner who either oversees methadone treatment for regular, stabilized users or refers the more “difficult” cases to the GG &
GD, which has several drug programs. The third option is for heroin users who are abstinence motivated and involves the Jellinek Center. Since the GP system is premised on the fact that they mostly serve “healthy” people, there are basic social regulations expected of heroin using patients: medical insurance, housing, stable income situation through work or welfare payments, the ability to attend appointments, the ability to manage with weekly provision of methadone, and minimal use of other drugs (Van Brussell, 1995: 4). Other preventative strategies employed by public health services for injection drug users included stabilization of drug use through methadone and medical check-ups and urging drug users to maintain attention toward social circumstances, such as “housing, money, and social relationships” (Buning, 1986: 1435). Amsterdam’s public health community garnered attention both nationally and internationally for their pragmatic innovations (Coutinho, 2000: 1387; Korf & Riper, 1999: 1).

All of these services geared toward heroin users are considered to be successful by the fact that the population of heroin users has stabilized. Historically, heroin use in Amsterdam began in 1972 by anti Vietnam War deserters (Van Brussell, 1995: 2). These deserters and holidaying U.S. soldiers taught local opium smokers to use heroin after the Amsterdam police severed the Chinese drug connection (Cohen, personal interview, July 25, 2003). After 1972, heroin use became prevalent among immigrants and local Dutch youth (Ibid). In 1984 the heroin using population stopped growing and current estimates divide the heroin using population as 40% white Dutch, 30% ethnic minorities, mostly Surinamese and Moroccan, and 30% foreigners (Van Brusell, 1995: 2). It was not only the goal for the public health community to reach as many drug users as possible, but there were heavy amounts of research conducted on heroin users. Throughout the 1980s, most qualitative drug studies focused on heroin or poly-drug users (Korf & Blanken, 2001: 4). There were several national surveys about the public support for mandatory treatment for heroin users as well as medical prescription of heroin that was comparable to other European cities (Korf & Riper, 1999: 6). More than the medical beliefs of harm and physical dependence of heroin, the general public and policy officials were concerned

\[1\] GPs refer clients to the GG & GD usually for one of the following reasons: “coming too early for a prescription, with vague, often creative excuses, asking for benzodiazepines with a high abuse potential, unkempt appearance, complaints of family members and significant others, and a police report of selling methadone on the street” (van Brussell, 1995: 4).

\[2\] In 1992, 75% supported mandatory treatment and about 56-64% of the Amsterdam population supported heroin prescription (Korf, 1999: 6).
with how heroin addiction causes social problems like nuisance and criminality (Korf & Riper, 1999:6). Although heroin users were not the biggest drug-using population, there was a lot of attention paid toward them because of their highly visible deviance, which enabled them to turn to more criminal activities to get their kick. Today there is less focus on heroin users since the heroin using population did not regenerate itself with new users, but stayed the same, only growing older (Van Brussell, 1995: 1). The remaining concerns of the public health community are now more directed toward the fact that as the heroin users age, the more susceptible they are to infirmity and illness (2).

1.3 Problem Statement

It is assumed that individuals who engage in prolonged heroin use will face health problems, whether due to the pharmacological makeup of the substance or lifestyle factors related to drug dependency (Korf & Riper: 1999:5; Australian Drug Foundation, URL, July 13, 2003). According to the National Institute of Drug Abuse, “heroin abuse is associated with serious health conditions, including fatal overdose, spontaneous abortion, collapsed veins, and infectious diseases, including HIV/AIDS and hepatitis” (URL, July 5, 2003). One drug treatment center in the U.S., Spencer Recovery Centers, Inc. explains the process heroin upon drug users:

Heroin effects attack the body, the mind, and the spirit. The body will begin to atrophy, and the user will not be able to ingest or digest food correctly. The mind will no longer function properly; the user will no longer make clear decision. The inner peace of the heroin user will quickly slip through their fingers as they reach for more heroin... Towards the final stages of heroin addiction on the mind is so immersed in the addiction that the user can no longer tell right from wrong (URL, July 7, 2003).

Although this description is more dramatic than others, it is not far from the common perceptions of heroin use. There are numerous clinical trials and biological studies that state the physiological effects heroin has upon the body, one of which is physical dependence, and are used to explain why individuals neglect other social aspects of their lives for heroin. As a result, much of the focus centers upon the physical addiction as demonstrated by methadone treatments. Medical workers treat heroin users as sick patients in need of chemical treatments and, in some cases, psychological counseling. Their addiction is what drives them to engage in criminal
activities; the need for heroin is so overpowering that they go to extreme lengths to have their kick. Heroin is regarded as the most dangerous drug because of its notorious and well-known addictive qualities.

Yet, how heroin users themselves speak about their heroin use may differ from those in the public health service. The compulsion to engage in criminal behavior because of their uncontrollable drive to score another hit does not necessarily hold true for all heroin users. Treating heroin users as “sick patients,” however, may be the only way to gain social and health services. Perhaps “addiction” serves as an excuse for recurring or relapses into continued heroin use. By conducting in-depth interviews with long-term heroin users, I intend to question the “harms” caused by heroin and perceptions of addiction through their life choices and drug use history.

1.4 Do Public Health Officials and Drug Users Share the Same Definition of Health?

Health is often conceived through biomedicine and science within the Western culture, and is sometimes linked or opposed to holistic or individual models of health (Blaxter, 1984: 26). Medical anthropology in a general sense strives to combine biological and sociocultural aspects in the study of health and disease (Foster & Anderson, 1998: 4). Several distinctions are made to better understand the nuances of health through concepts such as: disease and health; curing and healing; and body and mind (Strathern & Stewart, 1999: 6).

Disease plays a central role in health because its absence defines good health (Blaxter, 1984: 28). Consequently individuals enforce virtuous behavior such as eating well, exercising, and not drinking, since “bad habits” like smoking “cause” disease. This approach to health partly explains the heavy emphasis upon the physiological effects of heroin on the body. Heroin is deemed a dangerous drug because of the dependency it allegedly causes. In other words, it ensures a bad habit: “With regular heroin use, tolerance develops. This means the abuser must use heroin to achieve the same intensity or effect. As higher doses are used over time, physical dependence and addiction develop” (NIDA URL, July 7, 2003). Ideas of what is considered to
be healthy behavior are culturally relative and socially constructed. When behaviors that are socially regarded to be harmful are repeated, individuals are no longer practicing “rationality” since dualistic ideas of “good” and “bad” are perceived to be universal. Thus, ideas of addiction are created to justify deviant actions, since it is difficult to accept that individuals are consciously using heroin.

What are not present in literature describing heroin, however, are the positive influences of using heroin. There is acknowledgement of the intense “rush” but it is seen a deceptive lure:

Heroin first attacks the users’ brain by killing large amounts of neuron transmitters. It then will begin to affect the person’s vital organs. Heroin is a poison and the body treats it that way... Unfortunately the addict desires one of the main reactions. This reaction is the euphoric effect that addict craves. This feeling deceives the addict into thinking that nothing negative is happening to the body or the soul of the person...Heroin is a slow suicide, which is performed more than likely subconsciously (Spencer Recovery Centers, Inc. URL, July 9, 2003).

Even from a purely biological and scientific perspective, it is difficult to show that heroin has severe detrimental effects upon the body. In terms of quality of life, heroin can improve an individual’s life, because it can ease stress, worry, and produce ecstatic dreams. Heroin users, I contest, do not view heroin in the same light as medical people. Instead, using the drug can provide an array of experiences, self-medication, or simply pleasure. Health can be defined more in terms of the mental and emotional well-being. Job Arnold of the Hard Drug Users Union makes a distinction between the drug and socioeconomic factors on health:

Heroin has what doctors call the preserving effect. The helmet shields you from stress. You don’t stress as much because you’re not worried as much. Less worries, less wrinkles, people look young. If they live an otherwise quote, unquote normal life. If they live their lives on the streets with malnutrition, that’s a different story. Because in a marginalized lifestyle, people age faster. Just heroin is not what makes you grow old...In terms of quality of life, people are always willing to make sacrifices. Sacrifice their health for enjoyment or pleasure. To behave in a risky way in order to gain something extra they seek in life.

Cultural notions of what is “right” and “wrong” also shape perceptions of heroin. In Writing at the Margin, Arthur Kleinman argues that monotheism influences and ultimately shapes the idea

---

3 If pure heroin is used, it is relatively non-toxic to the body, causing little damage to body tissue and other organs (Australian Drug Foundation URL, July 13, 2003).
of a single, universal truth in the Western culture that is eventually translated into the biomedical views of disease and treatment (1997: 27). Differing versions of the body, disease and treatment fundamentally run against the mono perspective, therefore, rendering all alternative views to be either lacking or illegitimate. How drug users define health and perceive heroin is secondary to biomedical interpretations. In addition, how dominant authorities perceive heroin also makes the drug users' perspective tertiary to biomedicine. Furthermore, many drug users may not share the same negative, physiological terms as some doctors and public health workers.

1.5 Aging and Heroin Use

Partly due to trend changes but also to low expectations of long-term survival for heroin users the services for aging drug users are nil. And if drug users did grow old, they were considered to be in poor health and socially isolated. Just as health can be considered in biomedical terms or holistic ones, aging can be defined through specific health terms or individualistic ones. Since the interviewees interviewed are long-term users, concepts of aging must be introduced. Traditionally studies on the elderly rate “successful” aging through scales delineating physical deterioration, illnesses, and basic life events (Berkman, et al., 1993; Reed et al., 1998; Folstein MF & Folstein SE, 1975; Yessavage, et al., 1982; Smits, Deeg, & Bosscher, 1995). In a study by Strawbridge et al., predictors of successful aging were defined by “needing no assistance nor having difficulty on any 13 activity/mobility measures plus little or no difficulty on five physical performance measures” (1996: 135). As a secondary adjustment to the study, factors such as depression, close personal contacts, and walks for exercise were included. Despite the addition of behavioral and psychosocial predictors, their research continues to assume that aging can be measured objectively to determine how successful someone has aged. Roos and Havens conducted a 12-year study on Manitoba elderly in Canada where they defined successful aging by longevity, pre-defined life events, and having no institutional support (1991: 63-65). Another study measured the difference between “usual” and “successful” aging by measuring lifestyle or extrinsic factors (Rowe & Kahn, 1987).
In a study by Margaret von Faber et al., successful aging was studied through qualitative interviews with elderly persons who were also studied in a previous quantitative study. There were two main measurements of successful aging: a condition objectively measured and a process of continual adaptation (Von Faber et al., 2001: 2694). Successful aging is more than the absence of disease and infirmity, and previous measurements of good health condition reflect the preferences and opinions of scientists. Studying aging should also incorporate the gains due to aging and not just losses. By measuring successful aging in a more fluid and holistic manner, researchers allow individuals to set the standard in which they are to be measured. The priorities of what is most essential to their health and well-being may change over a life span. Individuals may weigh different domains in their life differently than they do in biomedicine (Von Faber, et al., 2001: 2699). Elderly heroin users who stay at home may value the blissful dreams from heroin to end their boredom more than maintaining what biomedicine defines as optimal physical health. Heroin is seen to quicken the aging process due to ideas of health, but heroin users may view their aging process in a different perspective than public health officials do as well as what is considered to be “successful aging.”

1.6 Two Guiding Theories on Drug Use and Addiction

One of the most often cited authors in drug policy research is Norman Zinberg, because he not only considers the pharmacological aspects of drugs, but also the mindset of the person and the physical and social setting within which the drug use occurs. All three concepts of “drug, set, and setting” configure into how researchers construct their drug studies. For instance, some types of drugs are classified as “soft” (marijuana) while others are considered “hard” (cocaine). The types of people who use also affect the experience, whether it is a group of women using heroin or teenagers experimenting with LSD and XTC. Lastly, the conditions in which people live and use drugs: private business parties as opposed to living on the streets affect a person’s experience with heroin. Zinberg challenges the notion of heroin as a highly addictive drug that causes physical and psychological dependency to the extent that the drug user no longer possesses control. Instead he argues that drug use is a form of social learning and can be done with control, consciousness, and regularity. Individuals make choices in deciding whether or not
to use, when, with whom, and how much (Zinberg, 1984: 7). Furthermore, Zinberg opposes the word “abuse” in reference to drugs because it implies that anything but abstinence is morally wrong. In face, he argues that drug policies ignore those who responsibly use drugs: “Since it is the moderate, occasional users who develop controlling sanctions and rituals, the policy whose goals is to minimize the number of dysfunctional users may actually be leading to a relative increase in the number of such users” (Zinberg, 1984: 159). The segment of users that the public is exposed to is those who are chronic users, while the drug users who put forth a “functioning” face to society go unnoticed. As a result, the image of drug users is solely based upon the sector of dysfunctional users rather than one of functional users.

Drug debates are usually strictly dichotomous; one is either for or against. Suggesting that drugs can be used in moderation or have benefits is considered to be a vacuity of liberal thinking. This moralistic stance has made it difficult to see heroin other than a highly addictive drugs that ends in destructive behavior. In Western cultures, illegal drugs are symbols of moral failings. In an ideal world drugs would not exist, because the biological effects of drugs cause societal problems. Peter Cohen questions this line of reasoning by reminding us about the social construction of drugs: “We are so conditioned by medicine to think in terms of the pharmacological effects of a substance that drug use related behaviors are automatically associated with the substance” (1990: 4). Cohen believes that it is not a drug that determines the type of person or “junkie” but that the environment forces individuals who use drugs regularly to adapt to social exclusion and labels of “deviancy.” Reasons for why an individual would choose to subscribe to a “deviant” culture and desire the positive gains from heroin are often dismissed by those concentrating on the addiction or the physical effects of heroin. Placing both of these authors as the theoretical grounding for this research is paramount to establishing the importance of social, cultural, and political economic factors surrounding drug use.

1.7 Drugs in Other Cultures

The way drugs are presented and labeled varies in different cultures. While illegal drugs, particularly “hard” drugs such as heroin and cocaine, carry negative connotations in Western
society, drug use as a morally wrong activity is socially constructed. Alcohol and cigarettes are to a degree socially approved drugs and there are societal spaces in which people can drink or smoke without heavy stigmas. On the other hand, substances outside social and legal sanctions are deemed extremely harmful or imminently addictive. These ideas of drugs, however, are not universal.

Coca leaves, which cocaine is derived from, grows naturally in mountainous areas of South America. Many people in Colombia where the majority of coca plants are found chew the leaves of one species with alkali, lime, to release the drug cocaine. In low doses, the drug acts as a stimulant that enables workers to endure hard labor and depresses appetites for those traveling far into the mountains (The Columbia Encyclopedia, 2003: 65). Coca leaves are also considered a “nutritious and energizing way to induce healthy mood with causing an unsustainable high” and counteracts symptoms of mountain sickness (Cocaine Organization URL, July 9, 2003). Some traditional tribes in South America smoke coca leaves to induce trance like states for shamans (Ibid). Despite their beneficial and spiritual uses, the United States “war on drugs” not only bans the use but also works to ban the growth of coca leaves in Columbia (Ibid).

For many Native American Indians, the use of peyote, a cactus that contains 9 alkaloids and produces sensory and psychic hallucinations, is both historical and spiritual in their Peyote religion (Yuen, 2003:1). Groups including the Huichol and Tarahumura use peyote for religious rituals (Nanda & Warms, 1998: 297). The deification of peyote by these groups of people is estimated to be more than 10,000 years old (Fikes, 1996: 2). Even though several Native American tribes continue to use peyote, they are restricted to reservations and discouraged by the U.S. government (Evans Schultes & Hoffman, 1992: 1). Many religions utilize some kind of tradition to communicate with God, either through fasting, repetitive prayer, or self-torture, and they are accepted inside specific cultural contexts and admonished in others. Drug use, a long-standing traditional practice in some cultures, is seen as a destructive activity in others.

---

4 The author would like to note that more people die each year from alcohol and cigarettes than from heroin (Illinois Tabacco Prevention and Education URL, July 14, 2003; W2-K Reaction URL, July 14, 2003).
There are several examples of different drug norms such as age and gender, but what is more emphasized here is how drugs are conceived is relative, depending upon the historical and cultural uses and ideas of varying substances. "Over the counter" medicines in the U.S. can be seen as toxic chemicals compared to natural herbs in China, just as Mru children smoking cigars is offensive to Americans. Smoking opium is a widespread practice in several Central Asian countries, and was historically prevalent among the British former colonies. Drugs have long been a part of human history, and its value does not only vary across cultures but also throughout time (Prinz, 1997: 373).
Chapter 2  Copping My Works

2.1 Objectives

The foci of this study are to examine how the biomedical construction of addiction affects the way in which the public health community structures health and social services toward heroin users and how long-term heroin users question ideas of harm caused by their drug use. This research is an attempt to introduce an alternative construction of heroin other than the one presented by scientific and medical communities. By interviewing long-term heroin users, I will compare how they view heroin with how it is presented conventionally.

2.2 Research Questions

1. How does viewing heroin users as “sick patients” determine what is seen as “drug treatment”?
2. How are some heroin users able to manage long-term drug use and others not able to use heroin without facing severely negative consequences (death or terrible living conditions)?
3. How would a drug user’s perspective toward social and health services change the types of institutional support offered to heroin users?

2.3 Methodology

A critical medical anthropology analyzes the relations between power, politics, and the body “as illness representations are actually misrepresentations which serve the interests of those in power, be they colonial powers, elites within a society, dominant economic arrangements, the
medical profession or empowered men” (Good, 1994:57). I argue that heroin addiction is a misrepresentation of heroin in order to prevent individuals from engaging in a lifestyle that is in conflict with dominant morals of society. A common theme expressed by the interviewees is their ideological opposition to mainstream society and other dominant ways of viewing the world: “The individual body should be seen as the most immediate, the proximate terrain where social truths and social contradictions are played out, as well as the locus of personal and social resistance, creativity, and struggle (Scheper-Hughes & Lock, 1998: 368). If their bodies are a text in which to express their beliefs, then choosing to use heroin is an explicit act against societal values and morals.

Political and economic forces elucidate how much drug users are impacted by heroin versus access to health services, financial support, housing, and nutrition. One of the strongest aspects of this theoretical orientation is its ability to go beyond the individual and question the larger social forces, such as discrimination, economic inequality, and poverty. The macro-level factors are integral to our understanding of the individual experience. Political economic analyses tell us that outside forces influence the health of a person. Thus, it is not the heroin that causes one to become a “junkie” but rather that heroin is part and parcel of a larger framework of legal, social, and cultural factors. Once heroin is taken out of its cultural context, it simply becomes a naked chemical drug stripped of everything but its molecular structure.

Most relevant to this research is the cognitive or symbolic perspective because I seek to complicate how we understand “harm” and “addiction” attributed to heroin. The process of distinguishing the “rational” from “abnormal” behavior is closely related to how we view drug use as a deviation from “normal” civilized society. Ruth Benedict, one of the earlier critics of the empirical approach to studying culture, said: “It is as it is in ethics: all of our local conventions of moral behavior and of immoral are without absolute validity, and yet it is quite possible that a modicum of what is considered right and wrong could be disentangled that is shared by the whole human race” (cited in Good, 1994: 33). In tandem with classical medical anthropological critiques, this study is an attempt to question scientific views on heroin:

As confidence in the medical profession erodes and medical authority is increasingly challenged with lawsuits and alternative approaches to health, descriptions of medical knowledge, and
interactions as ‘discourse’ suggest an emphasis on professional practice as a distinctly social and conventional production, rather than as some sort of utilitarianism dispensation of unmediated, determinate wisdom and disinterested scientific truths (Kuipers, 1998:80).

Through analysis of the body and concepts of health and moral behavior, I will “re-position” heroin back into its cultural context. Perceptions of heroin are not completely based upon its pharmacological qualities, but rather cultural ideas of drugs, health, and individual choice. The moral opposition to heroin use is based upon biological arguments; living a “normal” life with heroin is deemed impossible regardless of an individual’s willpower. The interviewees presented here disprove this myth because they have been able to use heroin over a long period of time while accomplishing other things in their life. Readers may regard this research as overly optimistic or exceptional, but these individuals demonstrate that their personas are not ultimately destroyed by their heroin use. It is believed within mainstream society that the absence of regulations against heroin, be it legal or social, then all people would use heroin and destroy their own lives, and thus, causing the society to collapse.

If I am to question the medical views toward the consequences of heroin on people’s lives, then I must approach the interviewees as people free of “disease” or “addiction.” Treating them with respect gives them the opportunity to speak about their lives apart from dominant cultural attitudes toward heroin use. Individuals who use heroin most likely will not discuss openly and honestly about heroin to someone who is predisposed to negative conceptions of heroin and heroin users. A researcher willing to understand drug use from the perspective of the drug user is better able to explore the advantages and disadvantages of heroin. The “contradictions” in the interviewees’ statements about the “good” and “bad” characterizations of heroin demonstrates that they are presenting a fuller picture of their drug use. These individuals—however marginalized—still operate under the same cultural ideas and language, which inevitably influence some of their worldviews and the ways in which they speak about heroin. I present a positive perspective because there are few discussions on how heroin improves the quality of life, and to confront the ideology that presenting heroin other than being harmful is detrimental to current political and medical ideologies toward heroin. Negative conceptions of drugs are heavily ingrained in Western culture to the extent that discussions on the advantages and
manageability of heroin are ignored. This research moves beyond the traditional views on heroin and reveals the cultural specificity of heroin.

2.4 Type of Study

Descriptive studies are a "systematic collection and presentation of data to give a clear picture of a particular situation" (Hardon et al., 2001: 179). In this research, I challenge mainstream and biomedical views of heroin, heroin use, and heroin users, by conducting in-depth interviews with long-term heroin users to enrich our understanding of heroin use and heroin treatment. I contend that the current ideas surrounding heroin in Amsterdam, and perhaps several other advanced industrialized societies, are only a small part of a much wider and diverse population of heroin users. The tension between social values between the dominant culture and the drug users is one that is historical and culturally specific; thus, narrative interviews will convey a particular "vision of history" (Chanfault-Duchet, 1991:85).

2.5 Data Collection Techniques

In addition to my own research on the current literature on heroin and heroin use, I also conducted expert interviews to attain a better understanding of the drug use in the Netherlands as well as their perceptions of heroin use. I spent time socializing with heroin users on the streets, homes, and the Hard Drug Users Union to become more familiar with the lifestyle of different drug users. The main source of data is the in-depth interviews with long-term older heroin users.

Since there is a power imbalance in controlling medical/health/drug knowledge between lay individuals and doctors/scientists, I approached my interviewees with respect and without intentions of trying to change their lifestyle choices, as I would treat a doctor. There were no major or minor obstacles in accessing my interviewees through my two key informants. Settings of the interviews varied, but the sociability was always strong and amiable. The first interview was held during one of the "open-nights" at the Hard Drug User's Union, where members can
use their drugs in a large room, while drinking coffee and eating various snacks provided by the union. Although there were others in the room during the interview, the interviewee was comfortable talking about personal issues openly. Conversely, two other interviewees preferred to meet in a private office of Basisgeraad rather than their own homes or a public space. Both were familiar with the area and were thus comfortable spending time there. During both interviews, we drank coffee and tea. Another two interviews were conducted in the interviewees’ respective homes, where I was able to witness first hand how they lived. Both resided in nice, middle to high-income areas of Amsterdam. The different locations did not play a significant role in determining the atmosphere; each setting had a relaxed atmosphere. While some might suspect that the drug users’ friendliness was due to their loneliness, all of them had established social networks with family or close friends.

Since I was more concerned with the age and the long-term usage of heroin, the gender factor was not emphasized. Thus, I ended up with all male interviewees. While it is possible to seek out female participants, it was decided that doing so would force a social network into a direction I steered rather than my key informants. The lack of female interviewees does not mean, however, that there are no women who use heroin. Perhaps there is more pressure for women to hide their drug use (ie: if they are mothers) or have stopped using heroin at an earlier age. Although a gender analysis would deepen the discussion on the diverse experiences of heroin users, this research focuses on theories of addiction and cultural specificity of heroin perceptions.

In order to protect the identities of my interviewees, I used false names and changed salient markers or events that could be easily used to identify them. All participants signed a consent form detailing the purpose of this study, their rights, and potential harms and benefits from participating. Upon the completion each participant will receive a copy of this research. In order to increase the accessibility of the work to the research participants, I will also present my work to members of the Hard Drug Users Union, since some have difficulty reading English. This dialogue will not only enable me to share the research, but also give drug users a chance to criticize and comment on the work as well.
2.6 Access to the field

Through two key informants, whom I also interviewed as experts, I gained access to five individuals to speak about their long-term heroin use, perceptions of harm and health, and personal background. In Amsterdam, Job Arnold the head and formal spokesperson of the Hard Drug Users Union (MDHG), introduced me to various members. Three of them were formally interviewed. The other key informant in Rotterdam, Hanneke Oberman, works with an organization for the mentally ill called Basisgeraad. Along with her colleague, John Kruysbergen, Hanneke heads a new department as a street advocate for people who use drugs or homeless. She specializes in people who use drugs as a former drug user; John works closely with homeless people after living on the streets for a large part of his life. Their specializations, however, intertwine blurring the lines between the two groups. Hanneke arranged two meetings with two long-term heroin users.

I will refer to these key informants as well as the heroin users by their first names. Although it was not intended as a politically conscious decision to place everyone upon an equal level, removing titles or specific identity markers does subconsciously remove social stratification between drug user and non-drug user.

2.7 Interviewees

Older Individuals with a long-term heroin history

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gabe</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bastian</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 The key informants granted me permission to use their real names.
Contrary to popular beliefs, these individuals who have been interviewed do not have an affinity toward each other simply because all of them use heroin. There are several movements in the United States to mobilize injection drug users into a political group where the harm reduction movement is akin to a social movement (Friedman, 1998: S101). The major flaw behind this political mobilization is that heroin users/injection drug users are not a unified group. A vision of a specific kind of drugs users forming a vanguard is assuming that all heroin users are in the same social, economic, and political position. The range of heroin users is much wider than commonly perceived. There are professors, business people, and doctors who use heroin, but their status goes unnoticed because what is presented in public is more germane to society. As long as a person is able to function in public, they are accepted members of society, provided that their illegal activities are kept private. These individuals are not represented because they have no incentive to publicize their drug use due to stigmas. Those with financial means to support their heroin use are also the ones who probably do not use public health services should they need medical attention. Furthermore, those who are able to quit heroin on their own are not recorded in clinical studies or seen by the medical community. As a result, ideas of heroin addiction are based upon one sector of heroin users. Michael Gazzaniga, a professor of psychiatry at Dartmouth Medical School, counters the common perception of heavy drug users repeatedly using chemical substances as proof of addiction. In his book, *Mind Matters,* Gazzaniga highlights Columbia University professor Stanley Schacter's study on why it was so difficult for some people to stop smoking. Schacter observed rehabilitation centers as well as a community of smokers and non-smokers in Long Island, New York and discovered that the ability to quit was not based on nicotine. Gazzaniga argues that specific populations of drug users skew our ideas of addiction:

They don't need treatment programs, support groups, therapeutic drugs—nothing. People who have been smoking for years on a daily basis abruptly quit. This suggested that the rehab centers were attracting only those people who were unable to stop. As a consequence, the rehab patients are not a random sampling of the population with an addiction. They are a subculture that cannot easily give up their addictions. Yet it is the patients from these centers who make up most of the studies about addiction and how hard it is to kick the drug habit” (1988: 140).

The interviewees in this research were not selectively chosen from rehabilitation centers, but were accessed through two key informants. Although it is not entirely random, it is also not
filtered in the sense that I chose them to present a particular view of heroin use. The only requirement was a history of long-term heroin use and to be at least 50 years of age.

Each interviewee challenged stereotypes of heroin users, because all of them have homes, work experience, and social contacts. In addition, all of them had separate interests apart from heroin. Even though some of the interviewees knew each other, they did not necessarily form a community. Adam and Jonah had once spent a lot of time together in the same music, writing, and art scene when they were younger, but they rarely see each other now and spend the majority of their time taking care of their parents. Adam leads a private life and does less writings and music making as he used to, but continues to pursue intellectual interests. Although Adam describes his life as being adventurous and positive, the death of his long-term partner had a heavy impact on his level of happiness. Adam’s girlfriend was an established German painter, but died from cancer four years ago.

Jonah’s older brother, whom he was close to, also died from cancer and left behind a young daughter. Jonah and his sister often spend time with their niece. After publishing a magazine for several years and making demos on the guitar, Jonah now works for the city government and supports his parents financially. In an effort to take care of his parents and remain alone, Jonah puts his energies in his work and his family. However, he remains close with his three ex-girlfriends who continue to frequently visit him and celebrate family birthdays. None of Jonah’s girlfriends are drug users, but he maintained long-term relationships with each of them.

Bastian, Gabe, and Syd all belong to the Hard Drug Users Union, but lead different lifestyles. Out of the three of them, Bastian faced the most instability early in life. He grew up in a children’s home most of his life after being put up for adoption and returned to the orphanage by his foster parents. When he was 21 years old, he started work on a ship and traveled extensively. He was married for 15 years, but continues to meet his wife since their divorce. Bastian now lives in a house he is slowly renovating and hopes to meet a partner to share his home with.

Gabe grew up in a heavily religious home and is the son of two immigrants from St. Lucia. After graduation from high school, he worked for a Dutch political party, but began using drugs
as a way of dealing with his sense of disillusionment with politics. In addition, he was curious to understand the drug users’ life after helping them attain housing. According to Gabe, “you have to be smart to be a drug user.” Gabe has five children and two ex-wives; he currently lives with a girlfriend in Amsterdam.

Syd is no longer a heroin user, but works as a volunteer at the Hard Drug Users Union doing research and writing short articles. Upon our first meeting, I was able to view some of his photography taken in India. As a professional photographer, Syd supported himself, his wife and children, and travels. Originally intending to work as a naval officer, Syd witnessed unnecessary brutality by American soldiers in Korea and began apprenticing with a well-known photographer in Amsterdam. Even though most of his friends are gone, Syd considers himself to be happy with his grandchildren and photography.

All of the interviews were conducted in English, since all of the participants were fluent in at least two or three languages. For the most part, they are directly quoted verbatim from the interviews, but minor grammatical changes were made, and Dutch words translated into English. Their narratives and perspectives toward heroin use will be compared to the biomedical ideas of heroin. Yet, these five individuals certainly do not constitute a ‘discourse,’ nor could any large amount of heroin users. Without unity, it is difficult to establish a public discourse.

The public health system in Amsterdam is exemplary as a whole and drug users face the least repressive measures compared to other European countries (Prinz, 1997: 380). This research attempts to show that the way we perceive heroin users reflects cultural conceptions of health, well-being, and moral behavior, and that only by presenting views from heroin users can we reveal the subjectivity of these conceptions.
3.1 What is “Addiction”?  

The type of “addiction” discussed in this research is the one typically attributed to heroin, a biological or chemical imbalance in which the individual is forced to maintain a constant drug intake, lest he/she suffer from intense withdrawal. Heroin addiction is distinguished, arbitrarily, from other types of “addictive” behavior. The type of addiction politicians and doctors refer to is one based on physical dependence. The de-contextualization of heroin takes away the individual actor and leaves only the chemical properties that act upon the individual. Set routines are ubiquitous; it is considered normal, and even healthy, when people establish a sense of regularity. When we spend most of our entire life with one other person, drink a cup of coffee every morning for several years, or attend the same fitness class every week, we do not necessarily consider them as “addictions” even though they are examples of repeated behavior that would lead to conflict if they are suddenly disrupted. The main difference between these types of addictions and heroin addiction is that one is socially approved while the other is medicalized.

There is an implicit understanding that “normal” addictions are easier to quit than heroin, because they do not cause heavy withdrawal symptoms. This line of reasoning, however, is flawed. The degree to which a person suffers depends upon whether or not the person had a choice, who they are surrounded by, and the context in which the change takes place. A person who willingly decides to quit an activity among family and friends will face a different withdrawal period than someone who is forced to quit and socially ostracized. In addition, there is more tolerance given toward coffee drinkers than to heroin users. A person struggling to cut down on caffeine is given more sympathy than someone who starts using heroin again. The social objections to heroin use make it difficult to conceive why certain individuals would actively choose to use heroin. Thus, we turn to a physiological or scientific explanation that focuses on the addiction and withdrawal process.
Scientific explanations are more concrete and tangible when trying to rationalize repeated heroin use in spite of moral condemnation or perceived harms associated with heroin. Explaining why individuals continue to use heroin is difficult because articulating the complexities of feelings is limited by our language. Heroin users seek an emotion of satisfaction or bliss that others seek out in other ways. The appeal of heroin is derived from cultural notions of pleasure and pain. Heroin is an escape from pain, boredom, or stress. Heroin use essentially evokes powerful feelings, emotions, dreams, and a sense of spirituality—all of which are central to the human experience. Just as many other cultures use psycho-active drugs for religious or cultural rituals, perhaps drug users use heroin to reach a spiritual or metaphysical experience. For instance, one interviewee, Syd, discusses heroin use as the easy way of reaching spirituality, but the hardest kind to maintain:

I seen it in India, they use bangla, concentrated marijuana—people who never smoke. But they go to monk stations, they smoke bangla. And they become ecstatic because their conscience all their life was for this god or goddess. And then you cannot always live life perfectly, because you have to work hard in many ways. Then once a year you have this kind of ecstasy, so everybody dances for nine nights and they take everything and do everything in excess as much as possible and then go to the temple and cleanse themselves. But with heroin, that is not possible because if you go there, the only way there is heroin. Through meditation you can go into a state of deep consciousness and stay there. And it’s in your head, so you don’t need any drugs. You abstain from any drugs. Coffee, tea, cigarettes. They really have to prove to yourself that you can even kill your own mother. You cannot waver when things are [placed] in front of you. So when people come and put in front of you heroin, or a nice Rolls Royce, you do not waver. If you are in a state of super consciousness, it is a state of bliss. Pure bliss. I have experienced it. But it was the trick of my guru. He said, “I’ll show you bliss and now it’s up to you to follow it.” I simulate it but if you don’t do that, then you go out of the ashram and go to the nearest pharmacy and get a needle. But that is the easy way, and that is the most difficult...When you use drugs, then you feel bliss also, but you have to come back to this world and you have to care for your body.

The pursuit of bliss is hard to sympathize with when language fails to describe its importance. Emotions are underestimated when viewing bodies because of our inability to textualize them. “The language of the body, whether expressed in gesture or ritual or articulated in symptomatology (the language of the organs) is vastly more ambiguous and overdetermined than speech” (Scheper-Hughes & Lock, 1998:367). Biomedicine is limited in its understanding the language-less parts of heroin use. What the individual seeks is beyond what language and biomedicine can comprehend. Maybe heroin users are trying to attain what they need after traveling; they want to produce something intangible. They do not meditate because they are not
in a culture that practices it as a norm or live in a culture where “hard” drugs are incorporated into society.

3.2 The Role of Biology

The biological underpinnings of heroin are the main crux of anti-drug arguments. By emphasizing the physical or scientific effects of heroin, biomedicine effectively overrides the individual preference for heroin. The physical addiction no longer makes it a choice, because the chemical is seen to have more power than the mind. Yet, heroin users are the only ones who can make the decision to enroll in a methadone program and stop using, not methadone. The biological process or addiction of heroin is not only recognized by the medical community, but also by the heroin users themselves and people working on behalf of drug users. While this may seem contradictory, it is actually consistent with how cultural conceptions shape the way we approach heroin. For instance, Hanneke argues against the complete social construction of heroin use because she does not believe it is a decision to be a drug user: “It’s not a decision to be a drop out of society. It isn’t a decision to have no food, to have no social contacts, to be lonely... [M]ost drug users are lonely and not happy. And that’s no choice.” Currently heroin users are regarded as sick patients; heroin causes individuals to lose things because of their addiction. Hanneke criticizes the conditions in which some heroin users live, but she does not necessarily blame the drug as much as she does the lack of housing, insurance, and social respect. Arriving at the stereotypical junkie state may have more to do with social interaction than with the chemical:

By forcing heavy users of heroin in severely ostracized and asocial situations, their ways of relating to the social world around them will change. One of the consequences of ostracism is that many users are no longer seen as normal persons towards whom normal behavior is required. In their turn, heavy users will experience that if they behave normally this has little effect on the way they are treated. Their behavior is met with enormous mistrust. Ergo, users will say goodbye to the old rules of behavior because these rules are not productive for them. Abiding or not abiding to basic social rules will make little difference on their being seen as outcasts (Cohen, 1992: 8).
What I attempt to prove in this research is that biological explanations of heroin and the construction of addiction are a way of evading the fact that individuals choose to use heroin and take on lifestyles and behaviors that are a combination of their own free will and results in being socially ostracized. For if we are to argue that these individuals are making an active choice, it becomes difficult for those who cannot balance their life with heroin to seek social services, like alcoholics, and even more difficult for people to accept a way of life that is antithetical to their own sets of morals and values.

3.3 Choice

The defining characteristic of heroin from other drugs is said to be its addictiveness. As a result, people who use heroin are seen as victims of the drugs, rather than as people making conscious choices to use heroin. The interviewees, however, present a different perspective.

I can imagine that different people have different reasons but the common factor is that they want to express a certain respect for their habit, for what is the conscience of their habit...I used to think that I may have a more intimate relationship with nature by way of taking opium than by smelling roses because I make marriage with my body and the dope, and in fact you do that with a rose and that is also intimate and I don't think you can consider that as nothing because it means a lot. You do not only choose to use it because you get sick after not using it, I use it by way of preference. I prefer to feel under the influence and that is not a strong influence but it is an accent that makes my life easier. And it probably has to do with the fact that many aspects of life are not enjoyable and you try to dampen a little the input of the world (Adam).

I used (heroin) for 20 years and never tried stop using because everything went fine. I was satisfied with the way I was living. It sounds incredible but I was...But at the moment I thought I wanted to do something else, I was already 44, after 6 weeks, I was clean...(Jonah).

I do not have to go to the clinic to stop with the dope. If I want to stop with the dope, I do it for myself. When I go to the clinic or talk to a GP, I am scared that they can tell me on or off something, and I have to fight all my life for what I want to do with my life. Nobody always listens to me, because I was a fucking boy from the children’s house and was always in trouble (Bastian).

Western society upholds individual autonomy as one of the greatest morals to defend and represent because of its implications on freedom and individual rights. This individuality, however, is restricted by societal and cultural morals within a particular historical moment in
time. It is hardly surprising that the choice of heroin users to continue their drug use is acknowledged to the same extent as the physical processes that take place upon chemical consumption. The central issue is control. Heroin users are resisting cultural norms and their "deviant" behavior is unacceptable. Acknowledging the autonomy of an individual to choose a life is threatening when it is opposed to societal values, and the most effective way of dealing with this moral dilemma is by blaming the drug, rather than the individual's conscious decision. Making heroin the culprit detracts from the differences in values between non-drug users and drug users. It is difficult for people to accept that heroin users are actively using because it is a direct assault on their dominant cultural values.

3.4 Mind/Set/Setting

"To admit the 'as-ifness' of our ethnoepistemology is to court a Cartesian anxiety—the fear that in the absence of a sure, objective foundation for knowledge we would fall into the void, into the chaos of absolute relativism and subjectivity" (Geertz in Schepers-Hughes & Lock, 1998: 368).

Arguing that heroin use is a choice and that addiction is a tool for medical people to exert control immediately draws rebuttals, because of the need to distinguish what is "right" or "wrong" and "healthy" or "unhealthy," etc. These dichotomies make the range of acceptable behavior more limited; any action differing from what is understood as "right" or "healthy" is immediately disapproved by society. Opponents would point toward heroin users who want to quit, but cannot, or heroin users who are obviously struggling to make ends meet, hardly rendering their drug use as an appealing choice to continue their lifestyle.

This is not an attempt to deny the biological aspects, but to analyze how the biological process is interpreted to fit certain social values. Rather, I put forth once again Zinberg's theory of mind, set, and setting. All three of these elements determine a person's ability to both use and not use. Each person has a particular type of personality that makes that person "unique." Furthermore, not every individual reacts to heroin in the same emotional, physical, or mental manner. Some have positive experiences, others harrowing. Some people desire another hit, while others move on. Charles Winick in the New England Journal of Medicine, argues that "Some people can
regularly use [illicit] drugs without harming themselves or inflicting harm losses on others. Most who try them stop, and among those who continue, recent studies suggest, controlled use may be the norm, even for cocaine and heroin" (1994: 749). The individual's motivation for using is different, as well as their motivation to stop. It is not just a person's willpower, however much Alcoholics Anonymous wants to tell us. My mentioning of drug use in different cultures returns to this triangular facet of heroin use.

The "set" or group/population of the people using certainly affects their ability to lead a lifestyle of drug use. A mother with children who uses heroin will not only face different social circumstances, but also social responses from outsiders than a father who uses heroin would. Someone who holds a high socioeconomic position and is from a wealthy background is regarded differently than someone who is homeless and hungry on the streets, and is able to lead a "normal" life than someone who is socially ostracized. People are often judged by whom they associate with in society. People also have a tendency to associate themselves with people who are willing to accept them. Three of the interviewees used to be strongly connected to the artistic/music scene and all traveled to Paris (separately) to pursue their writing, music and photography. Within this scene it is acceptable to use, because it can either enable their art or because it is a social norm within their cultural standards.

The scene is what you made of people who stopped using who died from AIDS and some people who became successful like Joel Vendel and Quart van Del, people who died now, people who are famous in Rotterdam, famous in Holland in fact. There's a creative segment...I was part of the segment which was always playing around... making music, making drawings, writing things, writing poems, year after year... There were people who did everything wrong and had to make money through criminal acts and took their shots by using water from the streets... Then there were the people who were very ambitious and made it in poetry and in writing and in painting, and are accepted in Dutch society. People know they are shooting dope but it is expected because you become a success. There is a scene like Jules Deelder and Cornelius Bastiaan Vaandrager and Herman Brood...(Adam).

My friends, they're all musicians or painters. Mostly painters. We came back from Paris. We came here but we had no room. So we hang around the same neighborhood here. You know, the red light district. Day and night open. We sit there. We started to see these people. American militaries who came from Germany. They had a couple of weeks staying over here in Amsterdam and they brought the coke. Because there was no coke in Amsterdam, there was grass and pills, of course. Coke was for the rich people and heroin was for the poor people. But people who want to get stoned don't want to get heroin because it's the most powerful kick. You can never get off. If you have taken it, stoned on heroin then you cannot stop it. It's finished.
You have to die on this kind of trip. It don’t work because you’re too high out. Even if you drink a bottle of black label, you don’t have a high. So, if you cannot find your dealer you drink two bottles and you die. And the conditions were the most nasty, they were struggling, and HIV also...And they want to find cheap dope, so they want to go to another country. Turkey, so I followed them because first of all they were my friends, and secondly, we had nothing in common, only to be friends. They were on heroin—needle. And I was just traveling and making pictures. I used heroin, but I was never hooked (Syd).

Really, if you cannot put your creativity into art or into music, then you just don’t belong to society. If you are doing something weird in the art world, then people think it’s cool. You are able to do weird if you’re an artist because it’s normal, or, well, accepted. But if you’re not living as a musician or an artist, then it’s going to be a problem” (John).

But it is just within the artistic scene where heroin use is accepted. Bastian talks about the normality of heroin use within the context of growing up in a children’s home and working on a ship:

I think there are two reasons. The first reason is that a lot of people working on ships were growing up in children’s houses, broken families, you know? Of these guys it was too hard to handle. And then children houses you learn a lot about dope. You know that is a lot of the reason for why we were taking dope before being a sailor. Two, a lot of sailors were traveling and getting drugs in Malaysia, Indonesia, Turkey. When you’re in the position then you get it. Why does so many people work on the ship and taking dope? That is the same with children houses, a lot of people taking dope they are sitting always in children’s houses. They want to see the world. Some people want a house, wife, and kids, and others want something alternative (Bastian).

The particular kinds of social groups in which these individuals spent their time probably enabled them to use drugs as its use was social acceptable within that social circle. But what brought them together was not the drugs, but the music, art, or traveling. Thus, the unity of people is not based on drugs but on personal interests, which makes the “set” a relevant factor in understanding the varying experiences of leading a lifestyle with heroin.

The third determinant of pattern use and consequence is “setting,” or the context in which individuals use drugs. During the Vietnam War, many U.S. soldiers used heroin and President Nixon took the accusation that all returning soldiers were junkies seriously. In 1971, Nixon commissioned Lee Robins to conduct a study on the returning soldiers’ drug use (Robins, 1974, 99). Robins’ research findings proved to be surprising since 92% of those who were confirmed drug users through urine tests were also the same ones who tested negative for drug user six to
eight months after their return home (Gazzaniga, 1988: 140). There were several reasons for their discontinued use. Lee Robins describes how the context in which one took heroin was different in the U.S. from Vietnam, and that this difference influenced the soldiers’ decision to quit: “One said heroin in the U.S. was terrible. The heroin in Vietnam was 95 percent pure, and in the U.S., not more than 8 to 10 percent. And they said it was much too expensive. In Vietnam you could be an addict on $6 a day. And finally, they said their girlfriends and their parents didn’t like it, so they quit” (American Radio Work URL, July 14, 2003). Another reason could be that once removed from the violent war scene, they no longer needed to use heroin.

The solution of removing soldiers from war zones, however, was probably not in the best interest for the U.S. military. A heroin user who is homeless, socially ostracized, and hungry seeking to quit heroin but cannot is not a sign of severe addiction, but rather a consequence of his/her surrounding context. If that individual were placed in a new environment that includes respect, then the chances of not using would probably be quite different. Syd says that he was able to stop using heroin because of his experience meeting a guru in India, as well as having grandchildren. Both of these factors changed the context he was living in.

I went from Amsterdam to India and there was a guru. And he said, “You know heroin is like a gate opener, like when you do meditation but it is the wrong way. Heroin is the gate opener, but when the heroin wears off, the gate closes again. And you fall back again, but deeper and deeper. Because you come back deeper and deeper and you don’t look after your environment. When you come back you find yourself in a hell. I just don’t use it.

Syd recognizes that his ability to travel and immerse himself in an entirely new environment enabled him to quit using heroin, whereas others who face dismal social conditions find it extremely difficult to find a replacement for the comforts provided by heroin.

If your friends aren’t coming anymore, then you go search for them. You go hang on the bell. You go walk the streets. You go to the places where they used to be before. And then you go kind of down. Heroin does that. And then you lose your cause and it is not possible anymore. And then you become real on the streets, sleeping on the streets. And if all that is not effective, your conscious, the, you know, you get more into heroin because you say, “If I don’t use heroin, I cannot survive living on the street and eating out of the trash can.” I mean that becomes natural. So, you need more heroin, day and night. You don’t sleep anymore. You only drink coffee and what you can claw at the supermarket. So you become a problem and then they put you in jail and they give you methadone. You become a psych. If I swallow industrial alcohol, I become very sick and go to the hospital. But if you take an overdose or a high does of heroin, no one is
going to help you come off. I mean they put you in the hospital for a couple of weeks, and then they throw you back on the streets.

The contradictions of the heroin causing the damage and the lifestyle are resolved by blaming the drug, because it is the only way in which individuals can seek help. Heroin users themselves use that language because they are still part of a culture that views drugs in certain ways and cultures teach people how to view the world. The language is limited to how science speaks about heroin, just as it is difficult for me to write without making a distinction between the mind and the body.

The interactions between mind, set, and setting are what enable some individuals to engage in long-term heroin use. When asked about the difference between them and people who were not successful living a lifestyle with heroin use, they did not discuss the biological or chemical aspects of the drug, but rather the mental attitude, social contacts, and living situation.

There's a psychedelic aspect of taking dope...And there is something fascinating in this world of fantasy. And the people who go crazy are the ones who cannot live without this fantasy. They cling to their fantasy and it also makes them crazy because they refuse to make a difference between reality and fantasy because fantasy is bringing the joy and adventure in their life. So that was especially with my girlfriend Cornell; she was not able to let it loose, because then she would lose everything that was interesting, because it was frightening...Maybe some people, I suppose are more lucky and they find alliterations and the charming aspects of spiritual life more easily... (Adam).

Because they have no children or grandchildren. I stopped because of my children and grandchildren. I could not face them when I was stoned. I knew that my son with his—my grandchildren would receive me and he would have me spend time with them. So I kicked...Junkies are in a high atmosphere—spiritual or mental, and they have to come back to our world and I stand on the backside of the lower world. And then when they come back to the lower world, there is nothing for them. There is nothing—no food, there is no dope...You can knock on the door of ashram, of the holy spiritual thing. Or they can knock on the door of the church, but you have to follow the church—you have to go to their meetings but not everybody accept that though...If I come home to my wife and children I feel warmth and everything I need in life. When these people come back from their trip, their heroin trip, they come back to nobody. He goes to Hell. There are negative influences. People think that they are all thieves and criminals—no, they are not. Because we alienate them from the real world, they become like that (Syd).

Well, I think it's really because of my family...I have always had good contacts with my parents. And, they're still alive 80 and 83. And they are really happy that I am working now. And I'm really repaying them for the way they treated me. I just brought them a television for my mother and a car for my father...But also I see people shooting up and really going over the edge. That's
something I never did. Although I did it for 25 years now. I never went so far as I see from other people. Maybe I don't have to because it's easier. Because it's hard to find your veins, the technique...I don't want to say I'm a clever user, but you just don't go on. You stop (Jonah).

These statements support Cohen's interpretation of Zinberg's theory that junkie behavior is not caused by pathological traits, but rather from "stimuli deprivation" or "strong environmental forces which exclude people from standard forms of social relations by labeling them as extremely deviant or dangerous" (1990: 5). Adam is clear in his articulation of bordering the fine line between reality and fantasy—an act also common to non-drug users, and the pursuit of fulfillment and happiness. Syd's desire to hold onto his family ties is an example of environmental forces impacting his decision to stop using heroin. As is the case with Jonah as well, who is extremely close to his immediate family, but hides his heroin use from them. His success in hiding his heroin use is by his moderate and controlled use of it. In addition, none of his co-workers are aware of his drug use. Perhaps the psychological and biological explanations for continued use or disuse are overlooking the more compelling reasons that motivate heroin users.

3.5 Conflict of Values

In Western industrial society, values of youth, productivity, individualism, autonomy, and self-control prevail and give way to social status (Helman, 2000: 7). Heroin users are deplored because of their public image—one that disregards these societal values. They are seen to age fast because of drug use, waste their life away on nothing, depend on the mercy of public health and social workers, and fall prey to the drug's addiction, which has taken away their sense of freewill and freedom. Their flagrant opposition to societal values causes a rift in how people should behave and act according to cultural morals. Hanneke and John speak about the separation of two worldviews:

There are two different worlds. There's the world where the people are homeless, drug users, illegal, whatever. There is a whole world of people that are not living like those in the other world. I was talking about living in society but on the sideline—there are people who are not even part of society. That's the way institutions speak about it. They always talk about going back into society. So now you are not part of society—(John).
And they make it very clear to you, that you are not a part. Even if you are not feeling alienated yet, they will make it very clear to you that you are not part of society, and that society has different rules, and that you have to live according to those rules (Hanneke).

Even as harm reduction seeks to accept that drug users will not stop, they are not in full acceptance of the drug use.

They (public health/doctors) will change their angle for the acceptance of drug use; it’s very fashionable as such. But there’s a difference between coming to understand intellectually and really facing the consequences of accepting users and their drug use... We do not promote drug use but we do enjoy an individual’s right to make a choice for themselves. To have control over your own brain and explore the many ways in which your brain functions. The many ways you can explore the state of consciousness. I think this is a right that we do not compromise on something—an inalienable right (Job).

The public health community in Amsterdam avoids debating whose morals and which morals are subject to scrutiny. Their approach is more “pragmatic” which translates into having a heavier focus is on the drug, rather than the person. Although I would admit that the “pragmatic” approach creates a better environment for drug users than the moralistic approach in the U.S., there is still a battle of morals at play.

What shadows the conflict of morals is the fact that it is not a dialectic between the mainstream and the subculture, but that the nuances of social relations and rules bend and change. Not every public health official or social worker disapproves of heroin users, and not every heroin user objects to societal values. Yet, the public opposition to these values is what is contested. There are some heroin users that are accepted in society—those who work. Earlier Adam spoke about which artists were accepted in society and which were not. Those who did not become famous were seen as junkies, whereas the famous artists became not only well-known, but excused from their drug use. There is a wide range of different types of people who use heroin. The ones who are accepted are the ones whose drug use are not publicly known and are able to present a productive face and conform to “normal” social interactions.

I was looking to get crazy. I was really looking for it. What is the frontier of where do you get crazy and where not? And I told you I had the feeling of invincibility, and remained invincible, and maybe people will tell you that I became crazy, but I am still able to behave like a normal
person when I am with normal people... I use one day of the week to going to into a café and meet people who are completely different than me and I have no problem with nobody (Adam).

We have somebody who used to work here as a volunteer after mainly being a mother for her child for 10 or 11 years. And it was time for her to start working again, so she started here as a volunteer and then moved on to a full time job with an organization that is looking after drug users called Rainbow. And she’s concerned with the women for that organization. After they noticed her activities here they said that they would like to fulfill the vacancy. Unknown to her employer and most of the people around her is her daily consumption of heroin. And her past, before having her child, which is not as normal or stabilized as after her birth of her son (Job).

The ones who are ostracized are the ones who live on the streets and are most likely the same ones who use the public health services. Thus, the majority of heroin users the public health community sees are the dispossessed. Although Adam, Syd, and Jonah are clear examples of people who are able to function despite long periods of heroin use, they are considered to be anomalies. Whereas Bastian and Gabe edge more toward stereotypical images of heroin users, because of Bastian’s troubled background and Gabe’s heavy presence on the streets. Yet, all five of them contradict in some form or another the current ideas of heroin users since they all have worked or continue to work, traveled extensively, and defended their life decisions. Among the five of them, they have held jobs in writing, photography, government, social services, shipping, and other service sector jobs.

For these five individuals, heroin was used for different reasons—whether to counteract the effects of amphetamines or as a way of seeking a new experience.

I had a lot of trouble with my boss who worked for the political party VVD. She gave me an order to go on the street and check all the people who sleep on street, try to take people who were using drugs their names and everything, and bring it to her, who will bring it to the register. But you know politics is very dirty. If you see politicians stray, they will put you in the mouth. I left and began taking drugs at 31 or 32 to understand them. I do nothing, how do you fight them? I know I can’t win because I’ll get mad. Everything when I stand up I try to make something of mine. Because nobody going to do that for you (Gabe).

I think it has something to do with concentration. You know people who have ADHD? Because I am still interested, I can still sit and read with much pleasure. But to sit down and writing something takes a lot of energy...I published some things in magazines, wrote poetry and stories. In my magazine, I published his (Allen Ginsberg’s) things (Jonah).

Life is a drag. There were no opportunities. And on the top, there are always people imposing on you, what you should do. It’s like small children want to grow up and you grow up. So most
people on the corner go to the cinema or the bar. And then you find some other people say, “Oh, we know of a way to get out of here.” They can get it. So then people start heroin. I mean not all begin this way... My start was in the army for three months... They also have photography service but they didn’t put me there. They put me to dig holes and throw bombs in there... So, then I quit. I said, “No I don’t want to serve.” There is no future in throwing bombs in holes. They said, “No, you have to serve, every boy your age has to serve.” So, then I quit, I stopped moving out of bed and I dropped pills... (Syd).

The scene I was living all used amphetamines and used heroin to dampen the exaggerated excitement. I started living the moment I took amphetamine. Like I was not really alive. I always experienced it this way. When I think about my period of youth, it was dull, music coming out of the box, there were only 4 stations, and having parents who were always behind a newspaper in the kitchen and stones in the street. And nothing. I bored myself to death until I started taking amphetamines (Adam).

I shoot heroin, coke, and amphetamine. But the best is cocaine. You know the heroin giving you body flash and when you take it longer the sickness is away. And the amphetamine gave no flash. It is more running on time and when you have to do something that take a long time of the same thing. If you have to do one hour to put something in box, and take some amphetamine and you can do it. With coke you think nice books, and dreaming more. When you take heroin one time in a couple of weeks so your body do not need, it can be nice and give you a lot of experience and a lot of visions, if you want it. But you have to put yourself inside. Lie on your bed and put some music on and that is easy... I wanted to know what it did to you (Bastian).

It is also crucial to point out that their interests and values are not entirely based around heroin. For instance, speaking about Syd’s favorite subjects in photography (shadows) and admiring the photographs taken during his career as photographer illustrated where his primary interests lied. Jonah’s long time collaboration with poet Allen Ginsberg and numerous publications, including a magazine, revealed an established and dedicated writer. Adam’s paper maiche models of polymers and ruminations on 20th century history highlight his intellectual curiosity. Bastian’s remodeling jobs in his home, including wallpapering and refurnishing, prove his aspirations in “making his house into a palace and finding a nice girl.” I witnessed Gabe’s emphasis on “health and friends” through his interactions with people and lack of physical damages despite his absence of medical interactions for the past 20 years. These people are more than just heroin users. Although interviewees are always in a sense performing or presenting their life in a particular point of view, their credibility is lent by their ability to produce facts from their past and confirmations made by the key informants and peers.
3.6 The Real Problem

The physiological or pharmacological effects of heroin are real, but are not emphasized by the interviewees to the same degree as science or medicine would present. If the problems attributed to using heroin, such as unkempt appearance, thefts, and prostitution, are caused by a need for more heroin, then making the drug “more available on a regular basis supervised by responsible people” would in effect lower these social offenses (Cohen, 1992: 3).

Some of the interviewees also saw this as the key factor in disabling them from living an optimal lifestyle:

It is easier to do it the right way when you have an authority to trust and it has never been like that. So when you use clean stuff in a clean environment, and also not all your money—when all of your money is going into dope, nothing remains for your health or for your status, you cannot go to a cafe for a drink and have contact—you’re social status, you’re outlawed for your use. And that has an incredible impact on your health, on you life, it makes or breaks you, this difference...It’s not cheap for everybody. There are people who cannot get it. Well, it depends. If you do not want in from the street, in the street you are at risk of having a bad deal. So there is people who prefer to stay with a house dealer with someone they know and you always have to pay twice as more than in the street. Then I do the same because I am sure of the quality. There is a big difference in quality. As soon as you are dependent on the street, you lose quality because there is always people who want to make money out of it. They buy something and they cut into it and add something that is not working and make some money...(Adam).

Heroin is bad. They cut it up too much. And you become weak and weak. And they manipulate you. You become a slave of the dealer. And the dealer makes out if you get good or not good stuff. Giving out junkies chemicals...There are some people who could have distanced themselves from bad dope. Rather than have good dope than be impatient and get bad dope (Syd).

The stress on quality of heroin is notable because “in its pure form, heroin is relatively non-toxic to the body, causing little damage to body tissue and other organs (Australian Drug Association URL, July 12, 2003). According to the Harm Reduction Coalition, heroin “does not cause serious, long-term health problems for the generally healthy person,” but it is the “practice of injecting and the fact that people don’t know what they’re getting when they buy street drugs that present significant short and long term health risks” (Ibid). Thus, individuals are able to lead long lives free of any major health problems if they have access to a non-diluted or cut heroin.

The distribution and cost of drugs is key to creating an environment in which individuals are able to use heroin in a regular and moderate manner:
Doing drugs did not make me unhealthy, but the way I was forced to use it, the quality I got, the way of life that was forced upon me because I preferred to spend my money on dope, and that is what I blame the government for, that I was not able to get my dope at the price that nature would demand of me. Because it is available, it cost nothing, it does not cost anything to anybody to have me have my dope, then I could become a useful member of society, when I wouldn’t have to give everything I got to get to this state... I don’t want to say that I am disappointed, but in fact I should say that I learn in a soft way because I had a lot of fun and interesting time in my life. But it brought about a lot of damage and that is what I am sorry about. But I want to say especially that the damage is from the repressive policies, from the authorities (Adam).

Other critiques of drug economies are more political and removed:

Cocaine and heroin. You get a lot of contradictions. The economy from the countries like Peru, Bolivia, Guatemala, Columbia, all those countries, the economies has dropped. At the moment, how much do you think you pay for a barrel of oil? Let us say 20 dollars for one gram of coke in the moment you pay 15 dollars for oil. They can tell you anything on to the street for coke; they can say 6 or 60. What is more expensive at this moment, and nobody can stop it. It’s a war. You can’t stop that because a lot of people in poor country can only eat by growing the drugs. Like in the 1967 to the farmers, they stopped the planting of coca that gives dollars. 1960 to 1970, ten years the farmers say that is their land. “Fuck you! We are going to start planting again because every month you give us a dollar? But no bread in the house, how do we get children into school? (Gabe).

The affordability of heroin remains a central issue for individuals to support a lifestyle that they choose. While traditionally critics of heroin argue that the inaccessibility is attributed to drug users’ insatiable appetite to score another rush, these people would argue that the social structure, rules, and unauthorized distribution of high quality of heroin are the reasons for lowered standards of living.

Although Amsterdam has a reputation for having the least repressive approach to drug users (Prinz, 1997: 379), one of the legal practices enacts a cycle of poverty. The major problem is the use of bans and requires a lengthy explanation of its history and current practice in order to understand how it relates to problems drug users face in supporting a stable life environment in Amsterdam:

There’s has been more focus on public order and new residents. New residents area, it used to be a run down rickety dangerous area but now it’s become class 2 real estate with really rich people with no concern for beggars in the streets...It is what they called the emergency area which is the inner city of Amsterdam, around the red light district and the quarters around it like the central station. Parts of the subway system and the south east are designated as state of emergency areas. It means that considering the events the drugs and dealers there are special authorities and police
to attack this situation. When this started in 1986 and 1987 there was really a pretty bizarre situation of herds of a lot of injecting drug users at the time because there were a lot of foreigners because Amsterdam had a reputation. All in all it was not very nice and the mayor said this is a state of emergency and the police will be given the right to disperse any crowd more than 4 when it is drug related to remove people from the area for 8 hours when caught red handed with user items visibly at hand, or smoking, or dealing, or drinking or a knife. It started with having a knife in this area, which all users have knives to cut up their dope. So we banned the knives we ban the users. Then we ban any sharp items. Nail clippers. Some of them have two lighters. So, let's ban two lighters. Some of them pick ashes from the trees and banned them for that. Because the 8 hour ban is, it had evolved but today you get 8 hour ban for minor things such as trespassing, two lighters, a nail clipper and or, 8 hour ban you are banned from the area that is very high in all sorts of drug services. So you are banned from these services like needle exchange, shelters, night shelters, your social workers, city hall is even there, the church. All of these facilities, you are banned. Persona Non Grata for 8 hours. They have to make their money, sell their dope, see so and so, see their social worker, but a lot of people will ignore and usually they get another one, and if you get 4 within 6 months or year...and every ban is a subpoena. It is a court order. So you are not only banned but you are also to appear before the judge and hear the prosecutor who asks for a fine. It depends on whether you show up in court or not and it costs from 90 to 120-190 Euros. Sometimes it’s even higher. But by going there you can take off one day in jail actually because most of these people don’t pay these fines and end up doing jail time...One time there were 4 people talking to me and I was number 5, so this was a crowd, and one of them was chasing the dragon, she was not involved in the talk but was within 2 meters, it was a deserted square in central station after the last tram and buses have gone. There was nobody but the police saw this as a public nuisance. So they were given fines because they were there with you. How do they know it’s 5 drug users? Because they known them for years, so that’s a selective way of tackling the problem. So if you don’t show up in court, it’s 120 Euros fine, and end up doing 3 days in jail. You get 4 of these 8 hour ban then you get an extra warning saying that another one would not be 8 hours but 14 days. And 14 days ban you better not show up or else if you are caught you are arrested and get either 6 weeks to 3 months. This is for having a beer or sleeping in the street. They have to sleep somewhere. I have this guy here who spent 6 or 7 months in jail because he got 8 hour bans just for sleeping.

This lengthy explanation of bans is tantamount to understanding how drug users end up in jail. When a drug user enters into jail, a series of setbacks unleash that cause a person to lose his or her stable living circumstances. As established earlier, it is difficult for an individual to remain healthy if the lifestyle is poor. When an individual is put into jail for a period of three months, he or she will lose their home, because of a residency law requiring people to occupy a house without being absent for longer than three months. When a person loses a house, it is difficult to receive mail from institutions that individuals must be in contact with, since all individuals must re-register for social services including health care and insurance when they get out of prison. The bureaucratic process of gaining back housing and other provisions is a primary factor in poor living conditions for drug users:
So, they have no money, no insurance, no rights, because you have never subscribed to assistance for looking for a house. You lose everything—if you had a house, and get maybe even a job, when you are in jail because you start to steal, and then you lose your house again, because in 3 months you lose your house. Most of the people who die, they come out of jail and they take the same dose as when they went into jail, and they take the same dose when they come out and it's an overdose. And so they say, "Oh, it's an overdose." (Syd).

You need that address from one institution. You need that address to have somewhere to sleep or you can do things during the daytime. But you have to have an address of some kind of helping institution. But that means if you have a problem then you cannot function with that institution. Then you will be kicked out and normally they suspend (imprisoned) you for a period of time. If that is longer than three months then you are suspended, then you lose your address, that means that you lose your social security money, actually you lose everything. When you have no money, then you have nothing anymore. So, you are back on the street, you don't have shelter anymore, you lose your money. So that's the way they cope with people who really need help because they can't cope with the way institutions work, instead they are looking for another way, they don't want to deal with it, they put them on the street. So most of the people who are suspended for aggression, you take away everything and wait until he explodes (John).

If an individual is not able to gain back what they lost before entering jail, and they are homeless, hungry, and socially ostracized, there is little comfort but what they can get from heroin. It is not necessarily that the drug is overpoweringly addictive, but if the setting, or the context, does not change, it is difficult to maintain a healthy lifestyle. Hanneke helps the section of heroin users who are trying to stop using heroin, mostly ones who are in the position as described above.

While people who have secure housing, family contacts, and a job are able to use heroin in a regulated way, others who are using heroin heavily because they have little else, the cycle of poverty and chronic drug use can be detrimental without health and social services that take into account the surrounding factors and not just the right amount of methadone.

They are only focused on the abstinence, but that is not what is important to you. You have your debts, you have trouble with housing, I mean you don't have no place or enormous debts for rent, your social life is broken, you don’t have a job usually. They don’t pay attention to those things—I mean why did I finally succeed? Well, that has to do with a lot of things, but also I had a filling for my day, because I had a working project straight to the moment I was clean, so I had filling of the day through circumstances that was the end of the tunnel at the moment because of help from other people, and not the care of the institutions. But those kind of things are important. That there is a perspective to a better life. That is something they don't pay attention to. Because what is the use of being clean if your life is one mess and you cannot see a way out? (Hanneke).

How we construct ideas of addiction influences the types of assistance strategies made toward heroin users (Cohen, 1992:4). There are methadone, heroin administered, and behavioral
therapies for heroin users to bring them as close as possible to abstinence. Yet, the real problem lies in the social position of a heroin user. People are more opposed to crime and public nuisance than the actual heroin use, or else people would be hounding down those who use in clandestine ways. Trying to change a person's desire to use heroin is a way of medical and political authorities regulating social norms: "For, is psychotherapy here not the quasi-scientific treatment of the suffering from social prejudice, a prejudice the addict himself has not been able to escape…?" (Cohen, 1990: 8).

3.7 Changing How We See Heroin

Heroin was not always conceived in the way it is today in Amsterdam, because not much was known about it when it was not present in society. The individuals themselves discuss heroin in contradictory terms, acknowledging the dangers yet defending its use.

You can have delirious moments—like with music, literature, enjoying moments. It's hard to explain, but [if I had another chance] I would put it in second place. For me it was always first place. I would like to travel too, you know. Although there are many other things. But when I grew up, I think at least, it was different…Drugs were really hot. It was a hype thing to do (Jonah).

I can imagine that different people have different reasons but the common factor is that they want to express a certain respect for their habit, for what is the conscious of their habit. Kind of like in marriage—faithfulness and especially when it becomes suppressed, when ideas become strong, you try to revolt against the repression. So, maybe your experience becomes more romantic than in reality and that's a kind of defense or unjust opinion by the people who are against it. A lot of people my age started using it in the time that the government or authority didn't make any difference between drugs. And we started using we experienced things that were completely different from what our parents said, from what our teachers on how it was, and so we had absolute no authority on what is meant to be using drugs. So we start to have much more confidence in yourself in what it is all about or how it is or how forbidden it should be. You start relying on your opinion and the problem with heroin, of course, is that it is addictive (Adam).

I argue that the social conditions in which heroin users with low socioeconomic means were forced into put them in a position where they had to accept the conditions the public health community established in order to survive. The dominance of medical knowledge has influenced how drug users discuss and understand heroin. If people become social outcasts for their drugs
use, one way of "elevating" their social status is by becoming a sick patient. As more became known about heroin from a biomedical perspective, the pharmacological aspects were used to explain the repeated use of heroin. The ability for the biomedical community to forge a new explanation of heroin use is time and culture specific. The treatment of heroin users as addicts with a pathological disease was a way for the medical community to justify their treatments and services for drug users. As sick patients, heroin users could not be blamed for their "addictive" behavior, because it was not a fault of them personally, but a chemical imbalance.

If we are to acknowledge that heroin users are not victims of a chemical but autonomous beings making a conscious choice to use, however, it is much more difficult to create support for a deviant group, because it would implicitly improve their lifestyle. In addition, social workers, doctors, public health workers, and even drug users, would ask in exasperation: "What about the people who have tried to quit but can't?" Before addressing these counterarguments, it is essential to reiterate the diversity of the different types of people who use heroin. The people who are able to use while maintaining their health and socioeconomic circumstances are not included in the image of helpless heroin addicts. Those who are able to stop using heroin without institutional help are not the people doctors and GG & GD see in their offices. These people are able to live with heroin use without problems or quit without tortuous withdrawals, because of various factors including the individual's size, health, mood, how the drug was taken and how much, the environment in which the person used heroin (Australian Drug Foundation URL, July 12, 2003). Our ideas of addiction are based upon a particular segment of heroin users: those who are not able to configure the "mind, set, and setting" to help them stop using or use with a balanced lifestyle. Ideas of heroin addiction are formulated with those who were not able to sustain an otherwise "normal" lifestyle. Just as some people are able to socially consume alcohol without disrupting their lives, so can people use heroin without falling into depths of despair. Just as there are alcoholics, there are people who chronically use heroin. It is not simply about the personality of a person or the drug, but also the people they socially interact with, where they live, their job, and the culture they live in.

Having established the fact that not all people who use heroin experience the same social problems, it is still of great import to help those who have trouble supporting a balanced lifestyle.
or stopping heroin use. “Some people can take it without much trouble, and a few people can’t—and it’s those people we need to protect” (Robbins, American Radio Works URL, July 14, 2003).

Again, the construction of addiction and concentration on the biological aspects of heroin impede attempts to effectively help drug users. Even though there are relevant factors involving the pharmacological process of heroin, the behavioral or counseling should not revolve around a psychoanalytic analysis of child abuse, mental disease, or personal weaknesses, but rather on emotional and contextual factors that affect a “normal” person.

The methadone or heroin administered treatments do not take into account the socioeconomic issues for the heroin users who are not able to cope with their living circumstances.

They can give chemicals but they get sick. Most of the people are old junkies, they have no money. So now they got chemical dope, they get really sick. You smoke too much, so they give them three lines of heroin the whole day. So, the junkie needs it every four hours. So in thirty-five minutes you take all three shots. So there is a lot of things to say against this kind of thing. They should put them into a kind of a big, empty flat or something and put social workers there. And give them heroin three times a day. Not in one time, no, three times a day—they do it for the old people here also. They give them their medicines. These are not health workers; they are social workers. But in a big flat they can give them all the care. If they are flipping out, they can press a bell. That is less costly than to have all of these police forces running behind the junkies, sitting in entries of doors or on ships...[I stayed healthy because of] way of life. I was living with my wife and we have a big house. And we were living in the nature. We had a river, garden, a big ground under the stars. You could live like that. If the outside world is living you or you are living in the outside world. I think the outside is in (Syd).

As activists working on behalf of drug users, Job, Hanneke, and John argue for better living conditions for drug users. Even though they would probably describe heroin as being addictive, their concerns are not centered on the best kind of chemical treatment, but rather on respect, insurance, housing, and health care.

You now used the word “respect” and I think that is a very, very important thing, like I already told you before, the regaining of the self-respect, you lose it because first you lose other people’s respect and you feel that, it makes you feel powerless, you lose your self-respect. And it’s so weird because many people have problems with how the world is, so respect is important to them, and that is exactly what you lose—respect, where that was already a problem, people are so respectless towards one another. I think most drug users’ have a view on how they think the world should be (Hanneke).
Living on the streets, it makes you become old real soon. It's so much tougher than living in the house. Living on the street, it's not only having a roof but also not eating okay. A lot of things are part of it (John).

There's a system of complaining, we don't have suing, we can take your complaints to the authority. Like the man I was talking to I have spent 10 hours already working on his homelessness for a special service for HIV positive people where 4 or 5 people live in a house with a lot of independence, and their daily shopping money, medication. They clean and do everything themselves. And he was thrown out and the rent was stopped for stupid reasons—abusive power for one, he was shut out from his room for 2 weeks and couldn't get access to his medication, and his HIV cure was stopped (Job).

Another important issue to keep in mind when trying to aid a heroin user to stop quitting is that it is not only the physical habit they are kicking, but also an entire way of life.

I think the effect of marginalization has so many bad effects. You get isolated and you get used to that culture. You don't just kick the habit, but also those years have become your family and your own culture...There are all sorts of rituals and rules, and you have to kick that as well. It creates its own rules, and indeed you do get a society that is standing apart from normal society and it makes it harder to come back because you're used to a different culture. And you start having a different definition on what is nice...I can talk about that. I don't want to be a part of the drug scene no more, but I am standing close to that, and I don't want to be—I never wanted to part of society as it is. I don't think I would be able to even because I've lived a different kind of life and seen things and lived things are not present, they are put away, they are not a visible presence in society (Hanneke).

Not all heroin users are alienated from society, but the ones who are not living a life interacting with "normal" society are pushed to the fringes of society, where they have to create survival mechanisms that are different or opposed to the ideas of mainstream society. It is therefore more beneficial if doctor-patient conversations revolve around the patient's life circumstances, which may explain "addictive behavior." For instance, out of the five interviewees, Bastian is the only one who explained his drug use as a consequence of a rough childhood rather than as an explicit choice for pleasure or social resistance. If he were to seek help to stop using heroin, then his personal experiences are a reflection of why he uses and continues to use.

I only say about that is that I think when I was growing up in a normal family with a normal mother and father and normal brother and sister, I never go on the dope and I never was unfriendly or something. I don't believe it. Deep inside I don't have it in me...Never in my life I had a father or a mother. Never someone come to me and ask me if I have pain when I fall down. That is the reason I lose something, you know? That is a hole in my life (Bastian).
Having control over decisions is also something that deserves attention. Throughout the interview, Bastian spoke about his freedom and the ability to choose. His reason for working on a ship was because “there was no one from the government houses that could tell [him] to do anything.” Later on he describes his anger at the medical workers for disclosing his HIV status to him when he did want to know. He is upset that he is not able to control whether or not he wanted to know about his HIV status. Bastian is firm on his ability to control his own life and decisions, because of personal experiences. If he enrols in a program, it would help doctors to understand his continued use for reasons due to control issues, rather than not having enough methadone or other pathological problems.
Chapter 4  Kicking an Addiction

4.1 Recommendations

Acknowledging that long-term heroin use is a choice rather than a chemical imbalance not only respects an individual's lifestyle, but it also highlights the fact that not every person who uses heroin faces severe problems in both health and living circumstances. The focus on addiction takes away from the social, cultural, political, and economic factors that affect an individual's ability to use drugs. Thus, for people who are not able to successfully balance a steady life with heroin need help attaining basic assistance to escape poverty or to provide a context in which a person can stop using.

For those heroin users who do need help, there are two changes that are imperative to aiding the individual. Instead of blaming the physical addiction of heroin for repeated criminal or drug behaviors, the process in which drug users face in stabilizing their life should be taken into consideration, especially for those coming out jail.

Last December, a guy 26 years old came from jail for a number of years. This time he really wanted things to go okay, he was in a foster home when he was two years old. All of this time he lived with people like him and all of them are doing the same kind of things, you have to make yourself part of the group. If you are not part of the group then you will be alone, and everyone will shut you up or out. This person he came out of jail—two months before he came out he really started taking care of things, and he wanted this time not to fall back on things he did before, and this time it has to work out okay. So, two months before he came out of jail he had contact with the social service asking what he had to do to get all of those things done. Hoping that the day he got out of jail that he could get all of those things done. Well, they told him when he got out of the jail that the next day that he could come and collect some money. Well, actually now we are more than four months, actually almost five months later, and social services have still not—he's living from 60 euros a week since December and he has nothing. When I met him he walked on shoes that were two sizes too short and only had the clothes he had on. This is what they do to people who have had a long-term in jail. The moment they get out, they open the jail and throw them out. They have him in there for aggressive things, and then you give him nothing. You don't even give him money, you don't give him clothes, you don't tell him the way—he didn't have anything, he didn't even have identification when I met him. (John).

While it may be frustrating for public health workers and doctors attempting to help patients stop using heroin, it is probably equally frustrating for the individual who is trying to put together his/her life while trying to quit a habit that provides him/her happiness, relief, or spirituality.
Taking into account the context may help public health officials and doctors better understand what the individual really needs or their continued drug use.

While the shift from the biological to the more socioeconomic and political factors expands the viewpoint from the specific to the more macro level, the public health community’s approach must move from the general to the individual. What is effective for the public health community is not always the most effective for the drug user. One of the reasons why heroin users attracted attention from the public community was due to the fact that injecting posed a threat of infectious diseases among drug users and more importantly to the surrounding population. Thus, the initiation of services sprang from concerns of the general community rather than of improving the life of drug users.

With needle exchange, it didn’t start because we wanted drug users to have clean needles or *bot* (dull) needles that don’t work anymore, but simply because at a certain point there was a risk with AIDS. For instance, if there was bad teeth among most drug users, if you could catch that—if that was contagious, then all of the sudden they would get dental health care... But also in the politics in addiction care—harm reduction, that’s one of the points in their programs in the things they write. For instance, they started to get ideas of housing, from the idea of harm reduction, to have less trouble on the streets. But it’s a negative point that they start from (Hanneke, personal interview, 4/28/2003).

The concentration was on the different types of infectious diseases that drug users could contract and pass on, as well as constructing “high-risk” groups, such as “IDUs.” The public health perspective is heavily influenced by epidemiology, where disease patterns are sought out with minimal bias or misclassification through their own constructed categories and labels (McCombie, 1999:28). If the public health perspective combines its epidemiology with a more anthropological view on the local level, then services can be better aimed and effective at achieving the results negotiated by both the public health workers and drug users. Including the drug user’s perspective would lead to more effective results, because services would then address the needs of the individual, which can help individuals seeking assistance to quit.

4.2 Conclusion

Viewing heroin users as “sick patients” helps build support for drug treatment among the medical community, because doctors are able to treat drug users under the auspices of medical
ethics. The biomedical focus, however, concentrates solely on the pharmacology of heroin, removing it from its cultural context and enforcing the construction of physical addiction. The heroin users presented in this research contradict perceptions of harm and addiction caused by heroin. They were able to manage long-term drug use and did not suffer huge losses to heroin, because of their social contacts, housing, source of income, work experience, and hobbies. Without a stable environment and social networks, it is difficult for anyone to survive. Those who are not able to “hide” their heroin use also face social stigmas and are pushed into the social role of “junkies.” Heroin users themselves may speak about heroin addiction as it is presented in the medical community, because they, too, are part of the cultural context. They operate under the same culture of language and ideas of body, power, and politics. The public health community, medical workers, policy makers, and politicians dominate the cultural conceptions of heroin and enact their ideas through law enforcement and specific health treatments that are focused on the chemical aspects of heroin. A drug users’ perspective on the type of institutional supports needed would not necessarily mirror those in positions of power. Throughout the interviews, there was no mention of higher requests for methadone treatments, but rather concerns about their living conditions caused by repressive laws and social stigmas. By ensuring high-quality heroin and regulating drug prices, individuals could spend their time and money on other things and maintain a healthier body free from problems caused by impure heroin.

The connections made between the body, representations of the social body, and body politic by Scheper-Hughes and Lock are clearly observed in perceptions of heroin and heroin users. Pathological explanations dominate the medical discussion of heroin, where medical people attribute the social downfall of heroin users to some form of mental pathology and heavy drug use (Cohen, 1992:2). The scientific explanatory model replaces religious authorities in explaining morally reprehensible behavior. Heroin users are not perceived to be in control of their life, resulting in a clash of values and morals: “In our cultural environment of the worldview of the self-steering, independent and entrepreneurial individual, it is the ‘loss of control’ that is the supreme evil that has to be recognizable and exorcisable” (Cohen, 2000:1). More importantly, it is not only the value of “self-control” that is defied, but also of productivity. Western societies are built upon capitalism where citizens must produce something of value. Everyone is expected to work in some form, whether it is being a factory worker or a professor.
Although many individuals who use heroin also hold jobs, heroin users are conceived as dropouts of society who do nothing but seek out another hit. The government, medical, and public health community discourage heroin because its use undermines central morals and values in their culture. Heroin legalization renders little support because people fear a mass epidemic of heroin abuse where large numbers of people who innocently try heroin are hooked and condemned to a life on the streets. This fear is created by biomedical ideas of heroin addiction and harm.

Yet, heroin is not very different from other drugs. Regulate heroin, lower prices, and provide social spaces, and not only would crime decrease, but also the street mafia markets that dominate the drug prices. Just as prohibition failed in the U.S., outlawing heroin only increases the black market. The common argument used against heroin is addiction. Unlike alcohol and cigarettes, heroin is regarded as being the most addictive drug, preventing people from functioning or being productive. Challenging the addiction theory not only means that it is a choice, but it also makes it difficult for the government to take responsibility for the segment of users who are economically and socially disenfranchised. By blaming the drug, they are able to blame the person for his or her socioeconomic circumstances. Change the culture ostracization practices, however, and many problems facing heroin users would probably lessen. If people agree that the lifestyle factor is what determines a person's health, then every member of society—drug user or not—should have access to basic living circumstances. Improving the living conditions for heroin users would produce three positive effects.

First, for those wishing to quit heroin, they would be better able to fit the requirements to meet with a general practitioner. As stated earlier, clients must be able to have medical insurance, housing, stable income, and the ability to attend appointments and manage methadone. If a heroin user is in jail for three months or more, they face the risk of losing their home and job, making their process in registering for insurance more difficult and in financially supporting themselves. Their ability to regularly attend appointments depends on their ability to get their immediate concerns under control, such as where they are going to sleep and what they are going to eat for their next meal. Being able to see a GP is important because it increases an individual’s ability to have privacy, to be treated as a regular client among other patients, and to
speak with a doctor on his or her personal issues that is more common in clinical practice than in public health services. Having normalized services makes heroin users more likely to use them. Reinforcing current services such as dispensing methadone through the pharmacy rather than methadone clinics, for example, improves the overall experience for the individual:

The GG&GD, the health services in Rotterdam, they helped me. They made me able to go the pharmacy to get my methadone instead of going to a methadone program. And now once a week, I go as a normal customer of the pharmacy and they say, “Hello, sir,” and “Goodbye, sir.” And I am a perfectly normal customer and nobody notices anything of my use. I take 6 pills in the morning and nobody sees it. So they have made life more easy in that way (Adam).

A second reason for improving the living standards for heroin users is that it improves the social position of heroin users. Cohen argues that “junky elend” or “junkie misery” is less in the Netherlands compared to other European countries because of more availability of higher purity heroin, methadone, clean injection equipment, basic economic assistance, and social services that support social integration (1992: 59-64). This is not to say that public attitude toward heroin and heroin users is positive, because the stigmas faced by heroin users continues to be a real obstacle in their daily lives (Cohen, 1992: 9; Korf & Riper, 1999: 5). By continuing the positive steps toward normalizing heroin and heroin use as much as possible through social acceptance and attitudes, the negative effects that lead to isolation will lessen, and in effect increase the number of heroin users who lead stable lives. The population of people who are able to use heroin in moderate and regulated ways would increase among the wide range of different heroin users. Thus, the ones who are currently integrated into society but keep their heroin use a secret would become not only more populous, but they would also be able to lead a lifestyle that is not inhibited by fears of being social ostracized.

Lastly, the focus on social assistance rather than psychological and chemical treatments and legal enforcement is actually more economical and practical. It is already an accepted fact that eliminating drug use is unrealistic. Moreover, there will always be people who are able to use responsibly and others who are not. Providing for people who cannot is not a waste of tax payer’s money, because in fact it is a way of neutralizing the cultural forces that cause marginalization. If there is money already allocated for the drug sector, allocating the funds into housing, insurance, medical service rather than prisons would both improve the conditions for
individuals using heroin, as well as give incentives for people seeking abstinence to stop using heroin. If methadone treatments are not enough to stop a person to quit because of the context in which that person is in, then measures need to be taken to incorporate a more holistic approach to treatment.

Arguing to improve the living conditions of heroin users is unique to the Netherlands, and it is only appropriate to recognize the pragmatic/progressive nature of the Amsterdam public health community in providing an extensive array of services to drug users, and their continuance in working with drug users. The initiatives and services of the GG & GD are even more impressive when compared to the U.S.’ “war against drugs.” The political climate makes it almost impossible for drug users to enjoy a social status close to those in Amsterdam, since they are imprisoned for using drugs. Thus, the ability for me to critique the biomedical/scientific perspective is one that is enabled by the current situation of drug users created by Amsterdam’s public health community’s work to integrate drug users into society. Yet, the construction of heroin addiction affects not only the Dutch, but also other cultures that enforce the chemical aspects of heroin. By broadening our vision of heroin beyond its pharmacological qualities, we are also able to become more honest as to why there is so much opposition to heroin use.
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Summary

The biomedical or scientific focus on heroin has led to the ideological construction of "addiction," whereby heroin users become physically dependent upon the drug even to the detriment of their living conditions. Within the Western culture, heroin carries a particular stigma; it offends cultural values of productivity, self-control, and "the healthy body." The addiction ideology created and reinforced by public health officials, medical workers, policy makers, and politicians has shaped the types of health and social services offered to heroin users. Methadone treatments, heroin administered programs, and pathological/behavioral programs center around the drug, as it is viewed as the perpetrator for human weakness. Through a heroin user's perspective, however, we gain insights into different meanings of health and well-being different from biomedicine, and positive aspects of heroin use. By interviewing long-term heroin users, we understand that the range of different types of people who use heroin is diverse, that some individuals are capable of quitting heroin or maintain a normal lifestyle with heroin. Norman Zinberg’s well-known framework of "drug, set, and setting" in understanding the drugs from a pharmacological, cultural, and contextual point of view is combined with Peter Cohen’s contention that drugs are a social construct in order to understand heroin from a more historical, cultural, and political perspective. This research ultimately aims to change the direction of institutional and social support for heroin users by improving living conditions and reducing social stigmas. Doing so would aid the sector of heroin users who seek help in quitting, improve the social position of a marginalize lifestyle, and address the economic and practical concerns sought out by the public health community.