

**Observations on
Restorative and Rehabilitative Justice**

**The Thurston County
Drug Court Program**

by Dave Olson

Prepared for "Visions of Justice"
The Evergreen State College, Winter 2004

An Overview of the Drug Court Model

The Drug Court program of the Thurston County Superior Court is designed as a rehabilitative program for non-violent drug and related property crime offenders. The program features intensive counseling, strict supervision, payment of treatment fees, and therapy techniques aimed at assisting the successful participant in becoming a responsible community member.

The program relies on a working partnership between prosecutors, assigned defense counsel, sheriff and police departments, and a third-party chemical dependency counseling facility. These entities work together in co-operation with the aim of bringing a disposition that benefits both society, and the offender. With each successful program graduate, society reaps increased public safety as well as economic rewards. Unlike traditional retributive punishments such as incarceration, the successful drug court program client learns the emotional and vocational skills to build a productive life while dealing with chemical addiction problems.

At a Thurston County Chamber of Commerce forum about the Drug Court program and the proposed \$120,000,000 "Regional Justice Facility", I engaged in short discussion with Thurston County Superior Court Judge, Richard A. Strophy. Besides adjudicating his share of cases, he also is the presiding judge for the Drug Court program, he remarked that, "For a quarter of what they want spend on the new jail, we could expand drug court program and we could get by on what we have." He went on to express his opinion that prevention, rehabilitation, and personal responsibility for actions were critical steps in addressing both drug problems and the related crimes which support drug addict's habits, particularly property crimes such as theft, as well as domestic violence.

The need for Drug Court is wrought from the endless cycle of re-offenders who are unable to break their habit and have limited capacity to find adequate resources to help.

As a result, the same drug offenders revolve through the court system causing significant expense both in a jail beds and court costs, but also societal opportunity costs as drug offenses pull money away from public health and prevention programs further exacerbating the situation.

In his book "Reinventing Justice: The American Drug Court Movement," James L Nolan, Jr. puts forth, "The burgeoning drug court movement first developed in response to the growing number of drug cases overcrowding America's criminal court calendars. ... The innovative adjudicative model draws heavily on the American therapeutic idiom to give direction and meaning to its philosophy, forms, and procedures."ⁱⁱ

A study by the Scottish Executive called "International Experience of Drug Courts", points out that, "The main impetus for developing drug courts at a local level came from individual judges who were frustrated at the single 'revolving door' of drugs and crime. Nationally, however, drug courts have come to be seen as a part solution to the United States quadrupling of the national prison population since the 1980s (making it the highest among Western democracies)."ⁱⁱⁱ

The Thurston County Drug Court is not the first nor alone in this progressive foray into alternative justice. As Nolan continues, "Since the first drug course was launched in Dade County, Florida, in 1989, more than eight hundred similar courts have been initiated or are in the planning stages. The model has received almost uniformly positive media coverage and overwhelming support at both the national and local levels. Judges celebrate the drug court as an exciting movement, a new way of justice, even a revolution in American jurisprudence."ⁱⁱⁱ

The Scottish Executive study found that, "Since the first programmes (sic) started in 1998, more than 140,000 drug using offenders have entered comprehensive programmes that include frequent drug testing, supervision, treatment, and judicial monitoring and court-mandated sanctions."^{iv}

The Drug Court provides a process which enables offending members of society to heal themselves and become contributing members of society by offering combination of rehabilitative, restorative justice, as an alternative to (or in combination with), retributive justice methods.

Specifically, the Drug Court states their goals as:

- Reduce the revolving door of crime and drugs by providing treatment to drug-addicted criminal offenders
- Require strict accountability from program participants through frequent in-person court hearings and intensive monitoring
- Abstain from alcohol and drug use
- Reduce emergency room and other medical costs
- Reduce domestic violence
- Reduce property crimes
- Require completion of education
- Require tax-paying employment
- Decrease use of public assistance
- Reduce court, jail, and prison overcrowding and costs^v

But what drugs are Drug Court participants treated for? In my observations, the highly addictive and easily produced drug methamphetamine is the primary substance abuse problem handled by Drug Court program. All cases I observed save two, were for meth related charges. Incidentally, the exceptions were cocaine and prescription pain-pills.

While beyond the scope of this paper, I feel it is worth pointing out that 'drugs' is a somewhat nebulous moniker, which includes myriad illicit substances, which are organized by federal law into 'schedules.'

While the State Board of Pharmacology ostensibly makes decisions for the state pertaining to classification of illegal drugs in the schedules, in reality the federal DEA and FDA (as well as International treaties) dictate policy.

The Washington RCW states that Schedule One drugs:

- (1) have high potential for abuse;
- (2) have no currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States; and
- (3) lack accepted safety for use in treatment under medical supervision^{vi}.

Drugs in this category run a laundry list from heroin, to hallucinogenics, to cannabis. Schedule Two contains opium, cocaine, morphine, methamphetamine, and methadone.

However, cannabis possession under forty grams is a misdemeanor in Washington and offenders are (usually) not referred to Drug Court^{vii}.

Nevertheless, cannabis charges cause a significant strain on the court system as a whole. Indeed in 2000, 730,000 people were charged for some cannabis offense. Approximately 60,000 Americans are in jail for cannabis-related charges, 16,000 of which are simply for possession. Since 1992, the US has increased pot charges laid by 200%,^{viii} a statistic, which calls to question the motives behind society's choice to arrest and punish non-violent offenders.

Judicial Philosophy

Drug Court is an example of a Utilitarian approach to justice. Rather than making the offender “pay” for the crime (addiction) at significant expense, Drug Court seeks to counsel and reduce the opportunity for further harm to society “fixing” the problem when the opportunity arises through an arrest incident.

Besides the program’s emphasis on rehabilitative concepts of justice, there is some amount of restorative justice (improving yourself to be a better member of community) as well as retribution justice through jail time as deterrent/punishment for program infractions.

The Judge constantly emphasizes taking responsibilities for actions, making and keeping promises to self/court/other, discipline and organization – all tools need to contribute positively to society. This includes forming relationships, trusting others, and working in groups in a non-adversarial, results-oriented environment.

The Scottish Executive report found that, “one of the important differences between drug courts and other types of criminal justice based treatment interventions is the unique linkages and partnerships. In addition, drug courts depart from the traditional court structure through its encouragement of a non-adversarial relationship amongst the key players. These qualitative impacts are somewhat difficult to measure and there is no national data that fully explores the impact of this. However, a number of drug court evaluations have sited the successful development and implementation and criminal justice/treatment partnerships and a high degree of satisfaction among drug court staff with the inter-agency relationship.”^{ix}

Drug Court Process

Arraignment

The Drug Court is the first stop for most all felony drug-related offenses in the county which do not have additional aggravating factors (such as assault or weapons charges), and if the accused does not have significant prior convictions.

At this stage of the process, the Drug Court is rather similar to most any other courtroom with a few key differences. At the arraignment hearing, the Judge is joined by the "usual cast" of prosecuting and defense attorneys, clerk, reporter, bailiff, and a jury box with (rather haggard-looking), cuffed prisoners in orange jumpsuits. Additionally, at least in addition to (I believe) Drug Court program administrators, two counselors were in attendance, working closely with the attorneys to determine eligibility for the program, and scheduling Drug Court candidates for intake counseling.

Not all of the arraigned defendants request participation in the Drug Court program, nor would all qualify. Other defendants arraigned pled "not-guilty" with the advice of either a personal attorney or an attorney from the Office of Assigned Counsel. In such cases, a pre-trial and trial date was set along with conditions of release. Also as per usual, in the event of a "no-show", the Judge issues a no-bail warrant.

My observations lead me to believe that the Drug Court team are accustomed to working together and are committed to fairness and respect to the participants who sincerely seek help. There seems to be a somewhat unspoken flow to their process and the atmosphere, while dignified, is much less adversarial than a 'normal' court proceeding.

Eligibility and Admission

The Judge, attorneys and counselors review the defendant's record to ascertain initial eligibility. In each arraignment I observed, the charges were felony possession of methamphetamine though the Drug Court program also accepts non-violent perpetrators

accused of property crimes which are likely associated with substance abuse lifestyle (ie: breaking and entering, theft, vandalism). The Deputy Prosecuting Attorney reviews the case to determine eligibility based on the existence of prior and/or pending charges which would disqualify the defendant.

One example I witnessed during a non-Drug Court arraignment hearing with Judge Casey presiding, a woman (Anderson, Monte Jean vs. State of Wa 2/4/04), was read her charges of felony possession of meth-amphetimine and ephedrine (charges 04-00122-0, 125-4, 178-5, 124-6, 121-1, 154-8). I immediately wondered why she was not a Drug Court candidate, however I realized after the prosecutor pointed out that she had seventeen prior felony convictions for similar charges, that she would not be a candidate for Drug Court.

The Drug Court's eligibility requirements exclude offenders with numerous prior convictions at the discretion of the Prosecutor. Thus, only candidates with a higher chance of success are generally referred to the program. Instead this defendant would likely go to trial (or plea) and, if found guilty, sentenced according to Chapter 9.94A of the RCW Sentencing Reform Act of 1981 and Article IV "Offenses and Penalties" of RCW 69.50.4013 in which possession is usually a Class 'C' felony.

If the prosecutor recommends Drug Court program eligibility, the Office of Assigned Counsel advises the defendant of his/her options. The Judge asks the Defendant if they wish to participate in the Drug Court program. If the Defendant chooses the Drug Court option (instead of going to trial, or pleading guilty), the program administrator then interviews him/her.

Upon acceptance into the program by the program administrator, the candidate is obliged to sign a contract and he/she is given a Program Handbook, and assigned to numerous tasks and appointments required as part of the treatment and restitution process.

Intake

The next step is an appointment to St. Peter's Chemical Dependency Unit for an intake interview with treatment counselors, along with baseline urinalysis testing. After the intake, the participant is assigned to a primary counselor who then works out a treatment schedule and plan addressing the needs of the individual participant.

If the defendant is incarcerated, the Judge issues a furlough order allowing the defendant to travel to the appointment. The Judge carefully informs the defendant of the additional felony charges if the expiration time of the furlough order is not carefully observed.

Treatment and Supervision

Though it is beyond the scope of the paper to tackle the various levels of addiction, suffice to say that the Drug Court program usually takes 12-18 months. On-going throughout the phases of the program, various supervisory and treatment techniques are employed. Specifically:

Random urinalysis for illicit drug and alcohol – UA requirements are very strict and frequent. Missed tests and non-standard test results (ie: too-watery, evidence of tampering, not watery-enough), are considered the same as a "dirty" test result. Such failure results in court-imposed sanctions (usually jail time) and reduction in treatment phase level.

Court progress review – Beginning at once per week in Phase One to once a month in later phases, the Drug Court participant appears before the bench and discusses progress with a Judge and treatment counselors to maintain consistent accountability. Additionally, the Drug Court staff, including the Judge and treatment counselors, meet weekly to discuss participants' progress or problems and bring up topics from their meetings with the participants during their review hearings.

In my observation, the tone of the court progress reviews can perhaps best be described as "parental" though at the same time, the mood is (oddly) casual. The

participants address counselors in a first name basis and ask the Judge, "How ya doing?" Clothes are sometimes grubby, hats not immediately removed, and manners somewhat lacking, but the focus is clearly on real results, not appearances.

Judge Strophy plays his role as a stern, but caring father figure who seeks to help the participant help themselves. He is conversational and sincere, but terse and commanding as needed. He asks about home life situations, jobs, meetings, relationships, kids, significant others and just about anything else.

A sample paraphrasing from his conversation with a 23-year-old white female named April.

Judge: Congratulations, 239 days clean and sober.

(Applause in the crowd)

Judge: So what's been going on in your life?

April: Still under house arrest (from a charge in Lewis county) so I haven't really been going anywhere.

Judge: How are you doing at your Phase three studies?

April: Working on anger management (brief conversation about what she's learned about dealing with anger).

Judge: Sounds like things are going well, congratulations again on your sobriety. How's your living situation?

April: Boyfriend just got out of jail but he went to live with his dad in Lake Havasu Arizona.

Judge: How do you feel about that?

April: Actually glad and relieved.

Judge: What are your plans for your living situation?

April: It is really crowded at my house now so I hope to move once I am off house arrest and on my feet with bills.

Judge: You seem to be making progress. Anything else?

April: Can I go "Clean and Free" on (such and such date)?

Judge: (reviews record) OK (sets stipulation on UA) Anything else?

In another review with a 20-something white male named Jason, the Judge and participant discussed progress with therapy work. Additionally, the Judge admonished the participant to be part of positive change to the community, and to "take life on its own terms," plus learn the tools to cope with the issues and challenges in life. The Judge asked about the participant's father who had recently fallen ill. Jason discussed how his dad had been supportive during recovery and now they are closer than ever.

Jason also related an anecdote about being rear-ended on the highway and how he is able to cope better thanks to his therapy. The Judge remarked how "blessings sometimes come disguised" and scheduled the next court date. He also presented a "purple coin" to commemorate nine months of sobriety and the defendant (rather proudly) announced he had made payment on his fines. The Judge commended him on using his tax return to pay his treatment costs and fines although scoffed somewhat when Jason said that he had paid (only) \$300 out of a \$3500 tax return.

Another progress review featured the Judge getting a bit more stern with a participant who wasn't really "buying into" the program. In fact, the participant had once dropped out of the program before and was given a second chance. The Judge discussed how "change is a process" and then extolled him to "get real," "speak from the heart," "no masking your emotions," "don't manipulate," "dig deeper," "toe the mark," and "decide who you want to be, you are in your thirties, you have to figure it out."

My anecdotal observations of the court proceedings suggest a pattern of additional aggravating factors in offender's lives, notably: challenging domestic situations, trouble at school, adjusting to life after high school, difficulty handling unforeseen stress, and other extenuating lifestyle circumstances, intentional or not.

Meetings – In addition to the court dates, participants are heavily scheduled with meetings and treatment sessions throughout the week. My personal observations noticed one participant reviewing her schedule with a counselor (paraphrasing), "Education session on Saturday, group process on Monday, 3 twelve-step program meetings and 12 more community service hours (to make up for a missed meeting), by next court date on Tuesday."

Participants also must attend a required number of court-approved "12-step" group support meetings. In my observations, the court allowed the participant to attend Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, or Analon. Attendance is supported with

signed logbooks and the participant may attend only once per day (ie: cannot double up on one day and skip the next).

Failure to attend required meetings of any kind results in court-imposed sanction, usually community service, and the participant must take responsibility for failure to attend. In other words, the Judge doesn't want to hear excuses and expects the individual to do whatever it takes to attend. Responsibility is rewarded by permission to attend out of town events.

During a Drug Court progress review session, I observed at least three participants requesting permission to attend an event called, "Clean and Fee." The Judge reviewed their record carefully before granting permission contingent on doing a UA test on the Friday before leaving and again on the following Monday before noon. Failure to perform test would result in revocation of privileges and additional sanctions.

Payment of treatment fees – Drug Court participants pay for their own treatment through Providence St. Peter Chemical Dependency Center. Doing so saves tax dollars for other programs and increases participant's sense of responsibility for personal improvement. Additionally, some participants have punitive fines stemming from other related charge that need to be paid before graduating.

Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT) – While not privy to actual therapy sessions, my understanding is the MRT is a trademarked and copyrighted series of training tools for instructing participants in morals, thinking, attitudes, decision-making, and other characteristics of a "Normal, Ordinary, Responsible Person (NORP)."

In court process review sessions, the Judge frequently asked participants about various concepts discussed in lessons books that are a part of this therapy technique.

A study by the University of Maryland for the Washington State Legislature describes MRT further, "Moral Reconciliation Therapy was developed in the tradition of the moral

development approach as a way of reducing the recidivism by increasing the moral reasoning abilities of offenders. Specifically, the program incorporates seven elements of treatment; confrontation and assessment of self, assessment of current relationships, reinforcement of positive behavior, identity-formation, enhancement of self-concept, decreasing hedonistic orientation and increasing delay of gratification, and development of higher stages of moral reasoning.^{xv}

Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing – EMDR is an innovation technique designed to provide rehabilitation from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder including irrational negative beliefs, unregulated emotions, and trigger responses.

While not used extensively according to St. Peter Chemical Dependency Center counselor, Hollie Christiancy, due to the expense^{xi}, EMDR is basically a therapeutic technique in which the patients move their eyes back and forth while concentrating on the problem. The therapist waves a stick or light in front of the patient and the patient is supposed to follow the moving stick or light with their eyes.^{xii}

Proponents of EMDR (developed by Francine Shapiro) suggest that, “after EMDR processing, clients generally report that the emotional distress related to the memory has been eliminated, or greatly decreased, and that they have gained important cognitive insights.”^{xiii}

Comprehensive Treatment Services – The Drug Court program emphasizes the participant taking responsibility for all aspects of life. This tasks include: gaining employment (complete with W-2); organizing finances and paying fees and fines; rebuilding relationships with family and friends; tending to medical, dental and exercise needs; improving home living situation as needed; and even getting in touch with one’s spirituality.

Phases

The treatment program is divided into three Phases providing obtainable targets to the participant.

Phase One: Orientation/Intake: 3-4 months
Intake, assessment, and treatment plan
Drug and alcohol education
Moral Reconciliation Therapy
Individual and group counseling

Phase Two: Intensive Counseling: 5-8 months
Relapse prevention sessions
Referral to community resources and services
Vocational and educational service referrals

Phase Three: Referral Monitoring: 4-6 months
Individual and group counseling
Completion of individual needs workbook
Completion of personal recovery plan
Community linkages^{xiv}

At each phase-level obtained, and at various sobriety milestones, the Judge in a brief ceremony in the courtroom presents the participant colored, commemorative coins designating achievement. In the event of a transgression, the participant is obliged to return the coins and earn them back through continued sobriety and passing phase requirements.

Graduation

Graduation Requirements

Completion of all three phases of treatment
Six months minimum abstinence
Payment of all fees and fines (if any)
Four months full time employment and/or education
GED or High School diploma^{xv}

Graduation Ceremony

Upon fulfilling the graduation requirements, the participants are feted with at a festive ceremony held right in the Courtroom. Attending the Drug Court graduation is a unique

courtroom experience complete with punch and cookies, applause, embracing, presentation of gifts, crying, cheering and even Judge Strophy “teasing” the participants in his paternal manner by showing their intake “mug shots” to the assembled crowd.

Rather than the usual somber but anxious courtroom atmosphere, the Drug Court graduation crowd is filled with relieved families, beaming spouses, and proud counselors and even a few police officers and curious community members. The mood is akin to an “old time revival” crossed with an “AA” meeting. Each graduate is afforded the full attention of the courtroom while his or her full Drug Court history is read aloud. The narrative report includes a description of the participant’s attitude upon first entering Drug Court and significant events (both positive and negative) throughout their Drug Court supervision period. Plus a complete timeline of their substance abuse history, significant challenges, achievements, personality characteristics, school and work successes and even family matters are discussed on the record.

The graduate’s primary counselor then speaks from a treatment standpoint more about performance during the myriad counseling sessions. The emotion expressed by the counselors clearly shows the difficult yet rewarding bond they develop with the participants. The counselor then presents the graduate with a ceremonial mug filled with various symbolic tokens of encouragement and they share an embrace. Indeed, considering the perseverance required to graduate, the counselor must feel a significant sense of pride and satisfaction with each successful participant.

Next up is the Judge who makes some remarks about the graduate path towards becoming a responsible person in significant detail. In some cases, he described the “vacant spaced out look” when they started the program, or cited a bad attitude or rebellious nature requiring focusing onto positive tasks. Finally, he presents a graduation certificate then poses with the grad for a photo.

At last, the graduate takes the stand to address the crowd and thanks those who supported him/her through the process. Amongst the frequent applause, there are at

least a few tear-jerking moments and tissues are common as the graduates speak with near religious zeal about their life changes and future plans to be a responsible member of society.

Effectiveness

How does one rate the effectiveness of the brand of justice dispensed in the Thurston County Drug Court? I think three factors are crucial to balance both the tangible and intangible integers of success. 1) Recidivism – How many graduates are re-arrested compared with non-participants?; 2) Cost Benefit – How much does it cost to administer the program combined with the savings in related problems caused by drug addiction?; and 3) Societal Gain – Is the benefit of a responsible member of society worth more than the ‘moral satisfaction’ of retributive punishment?

I will address each in turn with a few empirical notes:

First of all, recidivism. The aforementioned Scottish Executives report cites a study by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University which found that in a Delaware Adult Drug Court, 4% were re-arrested during treatment. In Ventura County, California, drug court participants produced a 12% re-arrest rate compared to a 32% re-arrest rate for a comparison group over an eight-month period. In Jackson County (MO?), the study found a 4% re-arrest rate compared to 13% over a six-month period.^{xvi}

Thurston County Drug Court supplied statistics put forth recidivism rates which appear favorable in comparison with other State penal entities. Specifically:

State of Washington Prison: 47%

Thurston County Jail: 72%

Thurston County Drug Court: 6%

The University of Maryland study agrees when discussing MRT’s (the primary therapy technique used by the Drug Court) success rate, saying, “Moral Reconciliation Therapy is effective in reducing the recidivism of offenders. At least five studies of sufficiently rigorous scientific methodology, have found significantly lower recidivism rates between MRT participants and comparison groups on at least some measures of recidivism.”^{xvii}

Second, cost benefit. Again, the Scottish Executive study cites a Multnomah County, Oregon criminal justice system cost savings of \$2,476,795 over a two-year period. After the one million dollars of operating the drug court program. The savings increase to \$10,223,532 over two years when estimated savings in victimization, theft reduction, public assistance and medical costs are added in.^{xviii}

Thurston County Superior Court produced materials also compare average treatment duration and cost per day in various supervisory institutions^{xix}:

State of Washington Prison: \$67 - Average length of supervision/treatment: 76 days

Thurston County Jail: \$54 - Average length of supervision/treatment: 95 days

Thurston County Drug Court: \$14 - Average length of supervision/treatment: 365 days

Finally, the societal benefits. This is the most difficult benefit to gauge since questions of a moral payment of a debt to society clouds the objectivity required to effect a just ruling. All we humans carry unique subjective political and emotional conceptions which color our feelings as to whether the offender has wronged society. The US legal system tries individuals against the State as though society (or one of it's parts) is harmed each time a law is broken. However, in case of a crime when the only victim is the offender herself, the case for a moral payment to society becomes less relevant.

Rather, treating addiction from a harm reduction trajectory - specifically comprehensive treatment supervised by the Courts - serves society's interests better than incarceration because: the offender becomes a contributing member of society (or at least not a perennial drain on government resources); the victim (usually the offender and his/her family) gains a sense of closure and therapeutic healing; and the community as a whole enjoys increased public safety (or at least a reduction in public nuisance), and economically both through decreased criminal justice costs, and the ancillary cost savings (further such savings also provides opportunity for prevention and education programs).

Additionally, I will also contend that society also benefits *morally* by showing empathy in treating and preparing non-violent drug offenders for life in society. The additional negative attributes of incarceration (introduction to more criminal elements, violent society) further supports rehabilitation for non-chronic offenders.

In all, considering whether "Justice is Served," I would suggest, yes.

Endnotes

-
- ⁱ Nolan, James L. Jr., "Reinventing Justice: The American Drug Court Movement," Princeton University Press, 2002. Quoted from <http://pup.princeton.edu/chapters/i7085.html>.
- ⁱⁱ Scottish Executive, "International Experience of Drug Courts," Chapter 1: Background to the US Drug Court System. Quoted from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/cru/kd01/green/courts05.htm>.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Ibid, Nolan.
- ^{iv} Ibid, Scottish Executive.
- ^v Thurston County Superior Court "Drug Court Program" brochure, 2004(?).
- ^{vi} Revised Code of Washington, RCW 69.50.201-212 "Authority to change schedules of controlled substances." ARTICLE II STANDARDS AND SCHEDULES
- ^{vii} RCW 69.50.4014, "Possession of forty grams or less of marihuana -- Penalty."
- ^{viii} Cannabis Culture magazine, Marc Emery Publisher, Vancouver BC, Canada, Feb./March 2004.
- ^{ix} Ibid, Scottish Executive, Chapter 2.
- ^x University of Maryland: Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, "An Examination of the Effectiveness of the Type of Rehabilitation Programs offered by Washington State Department of Corrections," Chapter Six, "Cognitive Behavioral Therapy Programs: Moral Reconation Therapy and What Works In Corrections?" Submitted to the State of Washington Legislature Joint Audit and Review Committee, June 1998.
- ^{xi} Christianity, Hollie, "Personal correspondence with author via e-mail", March, 2004.
- ^{xii} Robert Todd Carroll, "Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing," The Skeptic's Dictionary. Quoted from <http://skepdic.com/emdr.html>.
- ^{xiii} Shapiro, Francine et al, "A Brief Description of EMDR." Quoted from <http://www.emdr.com/briefdes.htm>.
- ^{xiv} Ibid, Thurston County Superior Court.
- ^{xv} Ibid, Thurston County Superior Court.
- ^{xvi} Scottish Executive International Experience of Drug Courts," Chapter 2: Drug Court Evaluation of US Drug Court System. Quoted from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/cru/kd01/green/courts06.htm>.
- ^{xvii} Ibid, University of Maryland.
- ^{xviii} Ibid, Scottish Executive, Chapter 2.
- ^{xix} Ibid, Thurston County Superior Court.