FACING ADDICTION WITH HOPE AND UNDERSTANDING

Craving Is Not Character: What Brain Science Reveals About Compassion, Stress, and Recovery

FAHU Research Desk

September 2026

facingaddictionwithhope.com

All content grounded in peer-reviewed research and clinical evidence.

Craving Is Not Character: What Brain Science Reveals About Compassion, Stress, and Recovery

At two in the morning, it comes down to a choice: do you call, or do you go to sleep? If you have a family member with a substance use disorder, you know this version of the question — the one where the reading you have done has not resolved anything, because half of it says stay connected and the other half says set firm limits and let the consequences fall where they may. The contradiction is not from a lack of information. It comes from a public conversation about addiction that has been shaped, for decades, by intuitions about willpower, character, and moral choice — intuitions that are understandable, that come from love, and that neuroscience is now finding may not track what is actually happening inside the brain.

What is happening in that brain has been imaged, repeatedly, across institutions and continents. The brain of a person with a substance use disorder shows measurable disruptions in the networks governing reward, motivation, and judgment — disruptions that are worsened by chronic stress and buffered by love and connection — making the compassionate family response not just morally defensible but neurobiologically coherent. The following is the evidence, organized around three questions that matter practically: what the addicted brain looks like, what chronic stress does to it, and what love does to it. The strongest objection follows.

THE BRAIN IN QUESTION

Murugan and colleagues — a multidisciplinary team of researchers publishing in *Addictive Behaviors* in 2026 — conducted a systematic review of functional MRI studies examining craving and cue reactivity in

people with methamphetamine use disorder who were abstinent. Functional MRI captures blood-flow changes in the brain as a proxy for neural activity; it is as close as current science can get to watching the brain respond, in real time, to a trigger. Synthesizing task-based and resting-state fMRI studies following PRISMA 2020 guidelines — the methodological gold standard for systematic reviews — Murugan and colleagues found that "MUD is marked by network-level disruption linking reward, salience, and control systems."

That language — *network-level disruption* — is worth sitting with. The brain does not fail in isolated cells. It fails in systems. The reward circuit (centered on dopamine pathways connecting the ventral tegmental area and nucleus accumbens), the salience network (which determines what commands attention), and the frontoparietal network (which governs judgment, planning, and executive control) are, in people with methamphetamine use disorder, measurably out of calibration with each other. When drug-related cues appeared — a smell, a location, a face — task-based studies in the review showed heightened activation across all three networks. The craving is not imagined or performed. It is registered in the brain the way hunger or fear is registered.

Murugan and colleagues also found something worth naming plainly to any family who has been told recovery is impossible: with abstinence, "partial restoration of network integrity emerges." The brain, given time and the absence of the substance, begins to recover. Not completely — resting-state studies in the review showed "persistent imbalances linked to craving and use severity" in abstinent individuals — but measurably. The vulnerability remains. So does the capacity for change.

WHAT STRESS DOES TO A BRAIN ALREADY IN TROUBLE

This is where the family environment becomes directly relevant to the neuroscience — with an important caveat about the nature of that evidence. Revka and colleagues, with Elena Vazey as senior author at the

University of Massachusetts Amherst, published a study in *Alcohol, Clinical and Experimental Research* in 2026 using a mouse model. Translating findings from preclinical animal research to the human brain requires care; what the study offers is a mechanistic hypothesis — a plausible neurobiological account of how combined alcohol and stress exposure affect the brain — rather than a direct demonstration in humans.

The design compared two groups of mice: one exposed to combined chronic intermittent ethanol (CIE) vapor and repeated forced swim stress (FSS), and a control group exposed to neither alcohol nor stress (AIR/NS). After three months of abstinence, the CIE/FSS mice showed lasting neurological disruption centered on the locus coeruleus — a brainstem structure the researchers describe as an area known to mediate cognitive flexibility via its forebrain projections. What did that disruption look like? Revka and colleagues found pathological measures of reduced LC integrity common to dementia-related disorders: elevated markers of oxidative stress, apoptosis, and reduced autoinhibitory function. The mice also showed impaired cognitive flexibility in behavioral testing — measurable deficits in adapting behavior to changing conditions — and these impairments persisted three months into abstinence. The increased alcohol intake seen in CIE/FSS mice also persisted to midlife.

For families, the preclinical mechanism carries real implications even before human replication. The locus coeruleus, already implicated in the neurological burden of addiction, is precisely the structure that guides flexible, adaptive decision-making — the kind recovery requires. A literature suggesting that combined alcohol and chronic stress exposure degrades this system carries weight for how families think about the emotional environment they are building around someone already carrying that burden. It is a hypothesis that warrants attention even as we await direct human studies.

WHAT LOVE ACTUALLY DOES

If the stress research suggests what the compassionate approach may protect against, a 2026 study by Hanson, Cooperman, and Garland — published in the *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs* — shows what it may protect toward. The researchers analyzed survey data from 189 adults receiving methadone treatment for opioid use disorder at community-based programs in New Jersey and Utah. They measured levels of love and empathy alongside opioid use frequency, controlling for pain, anxiety, depression, stigma, and social support.

The central finding was that "higher love and empathy scores were significantly associated with fewer episodes of opioid use," even after adjusting for those covariates. Hanson and colleagues ground this result in the Brain Opioid Theory of Social Attachment — the theoretical framework holding that the brain's endogenous opioid system, the same system that drugs like heroin and oxycodone hijack, is also responsible for the experience of love, bonding, and social connection. The neurobiological pathways that synthetic opioids exploit are, under ordinary circumstances, activated by belonging to other people.

This is not an abstract theory for a family. It suggests that the relationship a person in recovery has with the people who love them is not peripheral comfort. It may be engaging the very circuits that the addiction has claimed. Hanson and colleagues are careful to note the cross-sectional design — the study cannot establish causation — but the association, measured and controlled, points in a direction families should know about.

The study also found that participants in methadone treatment showed "lower levels of love and empathy compared to normative samples." This is not a character judgment. It is a description of what opioid use disorder does to the social-attachment system. Understanding this can help a family stop taking emotional withdrawal personally and start recognizing it as a symptom — one that connection, rather than punishment, is more likely to address.

There is, however, a finding from the same study that deserves honest acknowledgment before the argument proceeds further: social support — a related but distinct construct from love and empathy, measured separately in the same sample — was unexpectedly associated with *greater* opioid use. This complicates any simple equation of connection with protection, and it is engaged directly below.

THE STRONGEST OBJECTION — AND WHAT THE EVIDENCE SAYS ABOUT IT

The sharpest empirical challenge to this article's argument does not come from outside the bibliography. It comes from within it. Hanson and colleagues, in the same study that found love and empathy protective, found that social support was "unexpectedly linked to greater opioid use" among people in methadone treatment. The article cannot suppress this and call itself honest. A family that takes Hanson seriously cannot simply conclude that more connection, more support, more presence is automatically better. The data they produced do not support that conclusion.

What the study's own findings appear to distinguish is the *quality* of the emotional bond from the *availability* of social support. Love and empathy — active prosocial orientations toward the person in recovery — were protective. Broadly measured social support was not. This is a meaningful distinction: the question is not simply whether you are present, but how you are present. A support network that wraps itself around someone in a way that buffers the real costs of active use is not, on these data, the same as a relationship characterized by genuine warmth and empathy. The Hanson finding does not refute the thesis; it sharpens it. The protective factor appears to be the quality of the emotional bond, not proximity or availability alone.

This distinction maps cleanly onto the clinical objection the enabling literature has raised for decades. The argument — which has shaped Al-

Anon's detachment model and dominated family addiction counseling — holds that when families absorb the costs of addiction, they remove the aversive feedback that motivates treatment-seeking. People enter treatment, on this view, when staying sick becomes more painful than getting help. This is not cruelty. It is a reasoned clinical position, articulated by thoughtful practitioners with genuine concern for the person struggling.

The neuroscience and the Hanson data do not argue against consequences. The relevant distinction is between allowing natural consequences — letting someone experience the real results of their own choices — and deploying shame, confrontation, and emotional withdrawal as deliberate instruments designed to inflict sufficient pain that the person changes. The first is accountability. The second, as the preclinical evidence from Revka and colleagues suggests, is chronic stress layered onto a neurological system that is already under strain — a system that, in animals with combined alcohol and stress histories, showed lasting degradation of the brainstem structure most responsible for flexible, adaptive decision-making.

The outcome data make this distinction tangible. Hellum and colleagues, publishing in *BMC Public Health* in 2019, designed a cluster randomized trial comparing family-based approaches to addiction treatment engagement and reviewed the existing evidence in the process. What that evidence showed was that Community Reinforcement and Family Training — CRAFT — a model built on positive reinforcement, communication skills, and sustained connection rather than confrontation, achieved treatment engagement rates two to three times higher than the Johnson Intervention, the confrontational family approach. Families trained in CRAFT engaged their loved ones in treatment at rates ranging from 62 to 67 percent; confrontational approaches reached 23 to 30 percent.

CRAFT is not a permissive approach. It teaches families to reward sober behavior, to allow natural consequences without manufacturing additional punishment, and to improve the quality of communication in the relationship. It asks more of the family, not less. But it keeps the relationship intact — and the *quality* of that relationship, as the Hanson data suggest, is doing work that other levers cannot replicate.

WHAT THE SCIENCE GIVES YOU

Back to the kitchen table at two in the morning. The science does not instruct you to absorb everything and ask for nothing. It gives you something more precise than that. It tells you that the person you are trying to reach has a brain with measurable disruptions in the networks governing reward, motivation, and judgment — disruptions that researchers can now image and quantify. It tells you that combined alcohol and chronic stress exposure, in a preclinical model, produces lasting pathological damage to a brainstem structure central to the kind of flexible decision-making that entering treatment requires. It tells you that love and empathy, measured and controlled in a clinical study of people already in treatment, are associated with fewer episodes of drug use — while also telling you, honestly, that social support more broadly construed did not show the same effect, a finding that sharpens rather than cancels the argument. And it tells you that family approaches built on connection and positive reinforcement engage people in treatment far more often than approaches built on confrontation.

Your warmth is not sentimentality. It is not weakness. It is not, as a clinical matter, the same thing as enabling. It has, as it turns out, a neurobiology — one that researchers are now imaging with enough precision to say something families deserve to hear: compassion, connection, and reinforcement fit what we now know the brain to actually be. Whether that makes it the only defensible response is a moral judgment the evidence cannot finally render — that is a claim we make as a conviction, not a conclusion the data hand us. What the data

do give you is this: the science and the outcome literature point the same direction. At two in the morning, that is not nothing. It is almost everything.

Works Cited

Facing Addiction with Hope and Understanding — facingaddictionwithhope.com
Every source above is listed with a direct link to the original publication.