Materialising drugged pleasures: Practice, politics, care

Authors Accepted Manuscript, to be published in *International Journal of Drug Policy* 49 (2017): 86-91.

Themed collection, November 2017: Drugged Pleasures

Editorial

Fay Dennis & Adrian Farrugia

Materialising drugged pleasures: Practice, politics, care

Fay Dennis & Adrian Farrugia

The marginality of pleasure in alcohol and other drug (AOD) policy, related health interventions and public discourse is an ongoing concern for AOD researchers. While this neglect of pleasure is now well documented (e.g. Coveney & Bunton, 2003; Holt & Treloar, 2008; Hunt & Evans, 2008; O'Malley & Valverde, 2004; Moore, 2008), what pleasure *is* and how it emerges has not been a primary analytic focus. Rather, AOD research on pleasure has tended to center on the social, economic and political processes 'driving' or denying pleasure. In this way, the materiality of pleasure itself has often been positioned as a commonsense stable force (e.g. located at the site of the body), or what Bruno Latour (2004) might refer to as a matter of fact. In this collection, however, the contributors delve into the inner social *and* material workings of pleasure as a matter of concern, that is, a precarious 'event' or 'enactment' involving various human and nonhuman actors and forces, which make it vulnerable, contingent and multiple. This begs the question, when recent commentators argue we need to talk about pleasure (Davey, 2015), and ask 'where's the pleasure?' (Ritter, 2014): what pleasure are we talking about? In gathering these articles together in this themed collection we, along with the authors of each contribution, ask what the 'new materialist' turn can tell us about drugged pleasures and what new forms of pleasure can emerge in its presence.

Addressing the neglect of pleasure

Nearly ten years ago Martin Holt and Carla Treloar (2008) edited an important special issue of the *International Journal of Drug Policy* that addressed the neglect of pleasure as an analytical concern in AOD research, policy and intervention practice. Review articles astutely tracked this neglect to neoliberal forms of governance (Moore, 2008), while the empirical material firmly transplanted pleasure back in the picture, as a key part of drug consumption, even those consumption practices often deemed most harmful (e.g. Maclean, 2008; Dwyer, 2008). Crucially, this research explored the political arrangements that shape whose pleasures are constituted as legitimate (valentine & Fraser, 2008).

Since these articles were published, while pleasure continues to be neglected in AOD policy (Ritter, 2014), it has arguably become a more significant focus for many AOD researchers (e.g.

Askew, 2016; Harris & Rhodes, 2012; Hutton, 2012; Lindquist, 2010; Lorvick et al., 2012; McGovern & McGovern, 2011; Pennay, 2012; Järvinen & Østergaard, 2011; Zajdow, 2010). Furthermore, some AOD scholars have begun to critically analyse the forms of pleasure that take shape through different consumption, policy and intervention practices. For example, researchers have criticised dominant notions of AOD pleasures for working within binary logics such as rational/irrational and self-control/addiction (e.g. Moore & Fraser, 2006; Moore & Valverde, 2000; Weinberg, 2013). Yet, it has also been argued that this area of scholarship lacks 'an attempt to offer new formulations of pleasure' (Schuner, 2013: 258), a challenge taken up in this collection.

One important implication of a new materialist analysis of pleasure is the requirement to become attuned to the politics and ethics of how research comes to make drugged pleasures *matter*. In different ways, each piece in this collection identifies a need for more careful and caring forms of pleasure that both seek to include those people and practices whose pleasures are often marginalised, and register forms of pleasure that manifest not only joy but care. Here we argue for a commitment to establish notions of, and approaches to, drugged pleasures that allow for an ethical engagement with the many different ways drugged pleasures are experienced and open up possibilities for greater wellbeing as people encounter drugs. In this way, these studies hope not only to reduce harm but offer expanded notions and practices of living well, or living better.

New materialisms and alcohol and drug research

Qualitative alcohol and other drug researchers have been productively working with concepts drawn from what can be loosely organised as new materialist theories for some time now. New material approaches offer new concepts that affirm matter's immanent vitality and seek to explore how what were previously separated as 'natural' and 'cultural' forces are mutually implicated, the relations of which work to coproduce specific capacities and social formations (Coole & Frost, 2010). Put to work by AOD researchers, new material concepts have been employed to decentre and destabilise the 'drug consumer' and 'drug' in appreciating the co-production of drug consumption, (drug service) practice and policy *events*. This growing area of scholarship inspired mainly by, but no means limited to, Actor Network Theory (Demant, 2009; Duff, 2013; Gomart & Hennion, 1999) and other Science and Technology Studies concepts drawn from John Law and Annemarie Mol (e.g. Fraser, Moore & Keane, 2014),

feminist technoscientist Karen Barad (e.g. Fraser & Moore, 2011; Fraser & valentine, 2008), as well as the French philosopher and psychanalyst team, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (Duff, 2014, Fitzgerald, 1998; Keane, 2002; Malins, 2004), have sought to capture the changing qualities of not only alcohol and other drugs (Duff, 2013; Fraser et al. 2010), but bodies (Malins, 2004; Dennis, 2016), subjectivities (Dilkes-Frayne & Duff, 2017; valentine & Fraser, 2008), space-times (Duff, 2008; Fraser, 2006), and highlight the implications of such approaches for policy (Lancaster et al. 2015), education (Farrugia, 2017; Leahy & Malins, 2015) and intervention (Rhodes et al., 2016). In this collection we sought to continue these conversations by inviting contributors to respond and contribute to these debates by exploring what new materialist modes of inquiry offer the study of AOD pleasures. Although unique in important ways, the theorists and approaches that we gather under the heading of new materialisms share three particularly important implications for this collection: an orientation to an emergent ontology; 'the posthuman'; and the ethics and politics of research.

First, new materialisms foreground matter's processual vitality or emergent nature. This reorientation contrasts with constructivist theories typical of the 'cultural turn', especially discursive forms of constructivism, which fail to delve into the materiality of sociological problems (Fox & Alldred, 2016). Importantly, new materialism places particular emphasis on the flux and dynamism of materiality. For example, Deleuze's ontology of 'becoming', Barad's 'agential realism', Latour's 'Actor Network Theory', and Jane Bennett's 'enchanted materialism' all move beyond notions that reality is a stable matter awaiting discovery and instead explore how materiality is relationally made or takes shape. This approach differs from notions of construction which suggest that social processes produce a singular and terminal object, instead noting that the process of construction or the production of phenomena is always ongoing (e.g. Fraser, 2010). In this process, matter is understood to 'kick back' (Barad, 2007). In this way, matter is not a blank surface awaiting social construction but is also agential, working to co-constitute our 'research data' and 'findings'. Significantly, as part of this emergent ontology, research practices cannot be approached as addressing a pre-existing reality made up of sets of objects and subjects (in this instance, drugs and people), rather, they are understood to play a role in 'inventing' (Lury & Atkins, 2012), 'enacting' (Law & Ruppert, 2013; Law & Urry, 2002), 'speculating' (Wilkie et al., 2017) and 'crafting' (Law, 2004, Coleman & Ringrose, 2013) specific realities.

A second implication shared amongst many new material theories concerns the figure of the human. In understanding ontology as processual and contingent, the human subject is

reconceptualised as always more than human or post-human. This radically reconfigures the subject who has been at the centre of the public health project and much of the 'social science *for* harm reduction' (Rhodes, 2009). Coole and Frost write that an important characteristic of new materialisms is 'their insistence that humans […] be recognised as thoroughly immersed within materiality's productive contingencies' (2010: 7). For our purposes, a posthuman analysis approaches the AOD research 'subject' as emergent, whose form and capacities are co-constituted by assemblages of human and non-human forces, which together shape not so much what a subject 'is' but rather what a subject can 'do' (e.g. Deleuze & Guattari, 1988; Latour, 2004). For the researchers in this collection, it is important to trace how these specific processes work to constitute the qualitative character and agential capabilities of all forces, including humans, and the ways in which these processual relations work to expand or limit what people can do or how they can become-with drugs.

In light of this approach, pleasure is neither of the human nor nonhuman, drug consumer nor drug, or any subject or object (outside of drug use) for that matter, but always 'drugged', part of something more, that is, an assembled array of technological, social and corporeal forces (e.g. Vitellone, 2003). We draw the notion of 'drugged pleasures' from Deleuze (and Guattari)'s figure of the 'drugged body' (see Malins and Bøhling in this collection, c.f. Rosengarten & Michael, 2009) which pays attention to the 'machinic' nature of 'the body without organs', that is, a body that is always living in extension of its biology. In this expanded notion of the body, bodies become knowing and even thinking; bodies 'arouse visceral responses and prompt forms of judgement that do not necessarily pass through conscious awareness' (Coole & Frost, 2010, 20). In this sense, we can listen or become attuned to drugged pleasures in ways that allow us to learn about new and potentially better ways of being-with drugs.

The third contribution that a new materialist focus offers this collection stems from the simultaneous collapse of the separation between politics and ontology. Specifically, this is a concern for how the world we make '*comes to matter'* (Barad, 2003; 2007). This reinvigorates an appreciation for the ethical and political imperative to research, practice and policy, and necessarily emphasises that we are accountable for the worlds we co-produce (Martin et al., 2015). An important part of this process requires an analysis of the conditions of the possibility of care, what can be made to matter, what for and by whom? What is cared for and why? This requires a careful mode of attention or what Barad (2007) terms 'response-ability' – the need to not only accept ethical obligation for our research in producing certain realities known and

effacing others, but the capacity to move and be moved by the realities made. For the current context, this conceptual and ethical orientation requires researchers to make themselves response-able without always having a strong sense of how pleasure will take shape. In this sense, there is always an element of risk and danger that researchers need to be carefully attuned to when they seek to take part in the co-production of AOD pleasures and other realities.

Considering the continued marginalisation of people who consume drugs and the varying degrees to which their rights are violated in different national contexts, it seems questions about how to make drug consumers 'matter' is as relevant as ever. Speaking directly to this need, the collection asks, what other ways of being-with drugs can become imaginable through the study of pleasure? And can these drugged pleasures contribute to novel understandings of drug consumption that reduce harm and perhaps, ambitiously, produce wellbeing?

Experimenting with pleasure: Doing pleasure and what pleasure can do

The collection pursues a theoretical and empirical interest in experimenting with pleasure, as something that is done and doing. Indeed, its potentials emerge through its practice. We learn that pleasure is anything but 'natural' or 'given' – of the body, or innate to the chemical makeup of the drug, or even any simple combination of the two. Each article in their different ways looks to unpick and flesh out these practices; from tripping to injecting, smoking to clubbing, and policy-making to thinking. In order to draw out some of these hidden and precarious practices, they employ a range of new and established methods orientated to the 'new material', attuned to the movement of things, people and forces in materialising pleasure, such as 'thick description', photography, use of the embodied self, drawing, and story-telling. In introducing the collection, we move through each article, paying attention to how pleasure is done and what it is doing – how pleasure is made up of complex assemblages that also allow new subjectivities, bodies, substances and concepts to flow. We try not to be too prescriptive here, and encourage readers to be moved in their own ways, as they progress through the collection. Finally, in line with our analysis of the ethical implications of new material approaches, we explore how the collection works to produce more caring alcohol and other drug realities.

Subjectivities

Using methodologies receptive to 'embodied, performative, situated and affective dimensions of drug use', Duncan et al. map how pleasure is multiply enacted in a drug consumption room

in Frankfurt, Germany. They map how pleasure is made through the clinic – the private injecting room, the café before and after consumption, encounters with the hospitable staff and so on – in contrast to public spaces where people who consume drugs feared public and police scrutiny and stigma. One client discusses being able to 'enjoy being a junkie', emphasising the usual abject 'junkie' subject position as something that emerges in specific sociomaterial assemblages. Specific arrangements and practices make those who consume drugs *matter* in important ways. More than this though, by looking at pleasures as multiple, that is, beyond just the 'kick', Duncan et al. explore how bodies, forces and things coalesce and in each of these moments afford specific acts of care that can potentially produce positive subjectivities, capacities and feeling such as 'conviviality, belonging and comfort'.

In a very different setting, Cañedo and Moral trace how pleasure is made in the club, rave and botelloné in Madrid, Spain. We learn that there is nothing easy about AOD pleasures at all, indeed, they require a sustained effort. Reductive accounts of hedonistic desires do not capture the complexity of the constitution of pleasure in these environments. Importantly, the authors hope to reclaim a certain amount of control or intent evident in the young people's drug consumption. Bringing assemblages to the forefront of an analysis of intentionally-produced pleasures, the authors look closely at the co-production of human agency and drugged pleasures. For Cañedo and Moral, as bodies are implicated in these contexts, their senses converge and any coherent divide between the inner and outer worlds blur – music can be eaten, embodied, and sweated out as heat – bodies take shape in their composition as 'the subject flows', becoming-together-becoming-apart. This connectivity and reliance on others, highlights the precariousness of pleasure, but more than this, the care and connections required for it to emerge (e.g. individual pleasure required the pleasure of the whole group).

Substances

As we have emphasized already, a new materialist account of the drugs involved in drugged pleasures enacts them as unstable forces, the effects of which are co-constituted by assemblages of other forces. The instability that Cañedo and Moral identify of pleasurable events is also reflected in Bundy and Quintero and Lancaster et al.'s articles which point to the instability and productive effects of substances themselves. That is, rather than being solely an effect of a stable chemical compound, drugged pleasures are made in practice. Indeed, both Bundy and Quintero and Lancaster et al., in their very different ways, look at how 'doing pleasure' changes the ontology of the substance itself. Bundy and Quintero look at the ways pharmaceuticals are

made durable through the socio-material 'labours' of their consumption. They depict what could be seen as a becoming-together, in which these young people's 'experiments' work to produce certain effects, make them knowable, repeatable and, finally, pleasurable.

Exploring how substances are enacted in policy, Lancaster et al. look at the ways cannabis emerges in the Victorian (Australia) Law Reform Commission on medical cannabis. They look at 'how "medical cannabis" relies on the "absent presence" of "recreational cannabis"', and how this constrains and enables certain kinds of pleasure. Rather than simply limiting pleasure in its medicalisation, the enactment of medical cannabis through the reforms, they argue, enacts a broader sense of health and wellbeing, which opens up discourses of pleasure. That is, in exploring how medical cannabis is made, the authors seek to open up how it could be 'made otherwise' (Law & Singleton, 2000; Mol 1999). However, they also caution us that this kind of pleasure may be too easily 'stratified' and the pleasures of the medicine too easily 'disciplined' and submitted to public health regimes (Race, 2008). Where Lancaster et al. feel the pursuit is worthwhile, in what it can open up as well as close down, for Malins, writing in this collection, this is a risk too far, and indeed a significant problem of the concept of pleasure itself.

Bodies

Following Gilles Deleuze's famous critique of Michel Foucault's use of pleasure, Malins finds pleasure incompatible with the many ways that drugs can be done. Preferring Deleuze's concept of desire 'as pre-personal energy which flows between bodies, enabling the connections and transformations that are essential to life', Malins looks at pleasure as registering only one of the many ways 'desire moves through us as we connect to the world'. Thus pleasure is only a partial account of the much deeper and more powerful ways that bodies affect and become affected in drugged assemblages. Desire in this sense is much better equipped for dealing with the 'diverse array of motivations, benefits [as well as] dangers associated with drug assemblages'.

Also working with Deleuze, Bøhling, however, arrives at a different conclusion. Rather than an otherwise to desire, he conceptualizes pleasure as affect, and drugged pleasures as extending capacities for life – categorized as feeling, sensing and acting. Using hallucinogens as his case study, Bøhling explores online 'trip reports', mapping how pleasure is done and to what effects. For Bøhling these reports enact caring pleasures that co-constitute ethical possibilities for living that expand the consumers' capacity to act, think and feel in the world. This again

gestures to the caring possibilities of pleasure to be extended below. It also gestures to the potential of thinking differently in drugged pleasures taken up in Race's contribution.

Approaching this matter of concern from a slightly different angle, of the thinker as pleasure-seeker, rather than pleasure-seeker as thinker, Race explores 'thinking with pleasure'. Drawing on Latour's 'ontology of prepositions', Race asks 'what happens when pleasure becomes a constitutive element in the relations of drug and alcohol research?' This is both a provocation and plea to take pleasure seriously, to learn from pleasure in unexpected ways and become response-able to the new 'modes of existence' and 'habits of thought' it opens up. Race asks us to experiment with pleasurable events and drugged pleasures in the hope that it will energize drug policy and research in ways that produce new and 'interesting' realities of drug consumption (Latour, 2004). Race, Malins and Bøhling, therefore, all bring machinic bodies to the fore, and ask how bodies, including those of researchers, are moved with pleasure (or desire), and how they reveal new ways of being-with drugs; ways of being that may work to extend rather than limit bodily capacities for thinking, acting and feeling.

Concepts

In this final grouping of tentative threads, we look at how Dennis and Pedersen et al.'s contributions, again in their different ways, analyse how drug and alcohol consumers conceive of or present pleasure. Following on from a critical notion of 'thinking' in research practice, and also returning to the problematic renderings of pleasure that many of the contributors point to (e.g. Lancaster et al., Race, Cañedo & Moral, Duncan et al.), Dennis explores how participants are drawn into modes of pleasure, modes that Malins argues circulate, dominant and stratify our thinking and ultimately our bodies. Dennis argues that, in trying to conceive of their pleasures, people who inject drugs re-enact concepts of 'pleasure as free' and 'addiction as unfree'. However, by enacting pleasure in tension, the participant's articulations also emphasise the inadequacy of such rigid notions of drugged pleasure. It is in attending to these tensions that Dennis feels more 'problematic' and hidden forms of pleasure can be considered in drug treatment and practice.

This interest in the act of thinking, or reflecting on pleasure, as a matter of socio-material making, also appears in Pedersen et al.'s article. In exploring the 'story telling' element of the 'one-night stand', Pedersen et al. argue that rather than narrating a previous event, the narrating becomes an active part of the pleasures achieved in these events. Importantly, not only are drugged pleasures made through this process, but Pedersen et al. draw attention to the

subjectivities and sexualities made possible through/with these stories. Pleasures emerge as relational, co-constituted matter, and while often felt to be sexually liberating, were often co-produced by troubling gendered dynamics, and thus needed to be attended to with some care from the researchers.

Pleasure as a matter of care: Harm reduction or living better?

> Attention to concerns brings us closer to putting forward the need of a practice of care as something we can *do* as thinkers and knowledge creators, fostering also more awareness about what we care for and about how this contributes to mattering the world. (Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017: 41)

In this final section we focus on the caring potential of pleasure that emerges throughout this collection. Following Maria Puig de la Bellacasa, matters of care prolong matters of concern. In recognising the relationality and sociomaterial work that goes into practicing and holding pleasure together, this collection simultaneously recognises the care embroiled in this work as a vital politics. That is, what realities matter, or are cared for, *matter,* in that they work to shape particular relations with important material implications. In becoming response-able to new forms of drugged pleasures, contributors try to disrupt a focus on harm, but more than this, they seek to disrupt the foundations on which both pleasure and harm exist in current 'matterings' which position the human or individual and drug as primarily responsible for producing pleasure in predictable ways. In following pleasure, contributors have been able to imagine and experiment with possibilities for new and more caring subjectivities, bodies, substances and concepts. In enabling these more caring futures, the contributors call for intervention practices to be based on an emergent ethics rather than stagnant morals, along with new kinds of 'evidence', situated interventions and participatory praxis that decentre harm as the defining analytical category in alcohol and other drug policy.

An ethics of drugged pleasures

The notion of drugged pleasures theorised in this collection de-stabilises essentialist accounts of drugs and associated assertions that their consumption can be judged (or legislated against) independently from their events of consumption. For Bøhling, quoting Deleuze, 'there is no *evil* (in itself), but there is that which is *bad* (for me)' (1988: 33). In the same way that there can no longer be any taken for granted pleasures, there are no taken for granted harms. Drawing

on Deleuze and Guattari, Malins writes ‘some drug assemblages free up desire while others block it; some increase bodily capacities, while others decrease them’. The collection emphasises the limits of approaching alcohol and other drugs as categorically right or wrong, good or bad, rather contributors explore the detailed practices and effects of drug use that are contingent on the coming together of many human and nonhuman forces. Highlighting the importance of being response-able to the politics of mattering, Duncan et al. look at the ways people who inject drugs become subjugated through public injecting, and how a continuation of this, in the absence of well-attuned drug consumption rooms, makes us too (as researchers, the public) complicit in this subjugation. We need wider notions of ‘mattering’ in order to increase our sense of ethical responsibility in dismantling what Malins calls ‘the forms of autonomous, rational neoliberal western subjectivity that dominant discourses and practices of drug prohibition rely on’.

Situated interventions

Working with the dynamic and potentially unpredictable directions drugged assemblages and their pleasures can take requires flexible research and policy approaches that are not dogmatically aligned to one particular reality. As contributors to this issue emphasise, drug issues require carefully considered, situated modes of intervention that work with the micro-processes of drugged assemblages. By looking at the details of drugged pleasure in this way, analysis can also engage with the way flows of affect move in particular directions to produce harm or unethical subjects and bodies. For example, the ‘abject junkie’ (Duncan et al.), the clubber in ‘crisis’ (Canedo & Moral), the ‘weird stuff’ in pharmaceutical use (Bundy & Quintero), or the embarrassment and vulnerability hinted to in Pedersen et al. account of drugged sexualities. For Bundy and Quintero, this means analysis of pharmaceutical use and ‘misuse’ cannot take for granted the pleasure potential of such drugs. Interventions must thus be response-able to the other forces at play in order to understand how pleasure as well as harm, and the bodies and subjectivities they co-produce emerge.

Participatory praxis

Contributors argue for more participatory harm reduction praxis, that is, becoming response-able to the ways people not only reduce harm but consume drugs in ways that contribute to living better (see also Duff, 2015). For example, Bøhling asks us what recreational consumption of psychedelic drugs can teach us about helping people to enhance rather than diminish their mental wellbeing. Lancaster et al. show how the law reform commission enacts

drug consumers as stakeholders, worthy of listening and being responsive to. Importantly, the requirement that people who consume cannabis be enacted as patients before their desires and even pleasures are respond-able to emphasises the ethics and politics of mattering and care, riven as it is with political inequalities and uncertainties. Furthermore, as picked up on briefly in Dennis's article, and expanded in Race's article, this kind of participatory praxis could also involve different kinds of participation, in 'participating' or 'thinking' bodies (see also Greco, 2016; Savransky, 2016). Race develops the notion of 'bodies as thinkers' in relation to research and new kinds of knowing – e.g. 'new concepts of agency and working together'. He encourages researchers to think *with* pleasure, not 'on' or 'of' but with, in opening up and becoming attuned to different ways of being. In an expanded notion of learning from others, which also means learning from ourselves – as the other/outside within – we need a heightened response-ability.

Orientating away from harm

Together the contributors point to the need to focus beyond the management of harm in current drug policy. They argue that by looking at the practices of pleasure, new policy conversations can emerge. For example, Canedo and Moral note how participating on an expert panel on youth alcohol consumption emphasised the need for more nuanced and carefully produced accounts of youth consumption. They note that many of the 'experts' offered de-contextualised understandings of youth AOD consumption that reproduced 'catastrophist' and pathological discourses. Similarly, Bundy and Quintero argue that considering the multiple enactment of pharmaceutical drugs in practice, standard interventions into their 'abuse potential' such as new chemical formulations or the development of tamper resistant drugs do not always productively engage with the actant relationships that produce drug effects. The move away from essentialist accounts of drugs and their consumption requires the development of new forms of evidence able to avoid rigid, moralised accounts of consumption practices and instead work productively with their dynamism. Offering an example of this, rather than working with 'facts', Lancaster et al. look at 'compassion' as a new mode of mattering emerging through the cannabis law reform. A key consideration in the law reform process they analysed was 'the extent to which symptoms of the conditions interfere with patients' ability to *derive enjoyment and fulfilment in their lives*'. Bøhling and Race similarly advocate for learning more about drugs, and what people can do on or with them, indeed, what drugged pleasures can teach us about living better. Pleasure attunes and makes us response-able to the good and positive in life rather than what is 'right', or 'factual'. Significantly, this is not just about problematising

moralist, abstinence-based debates, but also points to the limits of harm reduction technologies and interventions solely concerned with reducing harm and, thus, neglecting the pleasure and practices of drug consumption. Duncan et al, for example, call for drug consumption rooms attuned to pleasure as well as reducing harm. If we want new technologies to be successful we need to listen to what is important for, not only less harmful, but *good* consumption events. This collection contributes to a growing project focussed on reorienting the governance of alcohol and other drugs in ways that can incorporate a critically re-invigorated and extended notion of health or living well (see Duff, 2014).

Conclusion

The study of pleasure that the collection calls for is always drugged, part human, part nonhuman, and, as such, practiced rather than given. For many contributors, a study of pleasure is valuable for what it can do. In employing new materialist theories, contributors have shown how substances, subjects, bodies, objects, space-times are made in practices of pleasure. By exploring 'matter' as emergent, that is, how the world and its forms have to be actively held together, the collection also opens up ways of 'caring' as a vital politics in the pursuit and practice of pleasure. Crucially, this is an ethopolitics that we – as researchers, policy-makers, practitioners – are all involved in as some realities are made to matter more than others. The analyses of pleasure gathered here shifts our attention to an ethics of drug and alcohol consumption over a moralism, to 'good' over evidence, and in this, the need for more situated and careful interventions. The contributors ask us to learn from consumers and ourselves, in Barad's terms, to be response-able to drugged pleasures, in expanded notions of participation, which ultimately requires us to expand our concerns beyond reducing harm towards also living well.

Reference list

Askew, R. (2016). Functional fun: Legitimising adult recreational drug use. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 36, 112-9.

Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs: Journal of women in culture and society*, 28 (3), 801–831.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Coveney, J. & Bunton, R. (2003). In pursuit of the study of pleasure: implications for health research and practice. *Health*, 7 (2), 161-179.

Coleman, R. & Ringrose, J. (2013). *Deleuze and research methodologies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Coole, D. & Frost, S. (eds) (2010). *New materialisms: ontology, agency, and politics*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Davey, M. (2015, March 22). Doctors urged to talk openly with patients about drug-taking for pleasure. *The Guardian.* Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/mar/22/doctors-urged-to-talk-openly-with-patients-about-drug-taking-for-pleasure

Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza: Practical philosophy.* San Francisco: City Lights Books.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Demant, J. (2009). When alcohol acts: An Actor-Network approach to teenagers, alcohol and parties. *Body & Society*, 15 (1), 25-46.

Dennis, F. (2016). Encountering 'triggers': Drug-body-world entanglements of injecting drug use. *Contemporary Drug Problems*, 43 (2), 126-141.

Dilkes-Frayne, E. & Duff, C. (2017) Tendencies and trajectories: The production of subjectivity in an event of drug consumption. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space. DOI: 10.1177/0263775817705660

Duff, C. (2008). The pleasure in context. *International Journal of Drug Policy,* 19 (5), 384-392.

Duff, C. (2013). The social life of drugs. *International Journal of Drug Policy,* 24 (3), 167-172.

Duff, C. (2014). *Assemblages of health: Deleuze's empiricism and the ethology of Life.* New York: Springer.

Duff, C. (2015). Governing drug use otherwise: For an ethics of care. *Journal of Sociology,* 51 (1), 81-96.

Farrugia, A. (2017). Gender, reputation and regret: The ontological politics of Australian drug education. *Gender and education,* 29 (3), 281-298.

Fitzgerald, J. (1998). An assemblage of desire, drugs and techno. *Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities,* 3 (2), 41-57.

Fox, N. & Alldred, P. (2017). Sociology and the new materialism: Theory, research, action. London. Sage Publications.

Fraser, S. (2006). The chronotope of the queue: Methadone maintenance treatment and the production of time, space and subjects. *International Journal of Drug Policy,* 17 (3), 192-202.

Moore, D., & Fraser, S. (2006). Putting at risk what we know: Reflecting on the drug-using subject in harm reduction and its political implications. *Social Science & Medicine,* 62 (12), 3035-47.

Fraser, S. & Moore, D. (eds) (2011). *The drug effect: health, crime and society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fraser, S. & valentine, k. (2008). *Substance and substitution: Methadone subjects in liberal societies.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fraser, S., valentine, k. & Roberts, C. (eds) (2009). Living Drugs. *Science as Culture,* 18 (2), 123-131.

Fraser, S., Moore, D. & Keane, H. (2014). *Habits: Remaking addiction.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gomart, E. & Henion, A. (1999). A sociology of attachment: Music amateurs, drug users. *The Sociological Review,* 47 (1), 220-247.

Greco, M. (2016). Biopolitics, psychosomatics, and participating bodies: An invitation to discussion. (unpublished manuscript).

Harris, M. & Rhodes, T. (2012). Venous access and care: Harnessing pragmatics in harm reduction for people who inject drugs. *Addiction,* 107 (6), 1090-1096.

Hunt, G. & Evans, K. (2008). 'The great unmentionable': Exploring the pleasures and benefits of ecstasy from the perspectives of drug users. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy,* 15 (4), 329- 349.

Holt, M. & Treloar, C. (2008). Pleasure and drugs. *International Journal of Drug Policy,* 19 (5), 349-352.

Hutton, F. (2012). Harm reduction, students and pleasure: An examination of student responses to a binge drinking campaign. *International Journal of Drug Policy,* 23 (3), 229-235.

Järvinen, M. & Østergaard, J. (2011). Dangers and pleasures: Drug attitudes and experiences among young people. *Acta Sociologica,* 54 (4), 333–350.

Keane, H. (2002). *What's wrong with addiction?* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Lancaster, K., Duke, K. & Ritter, A. (2015). Producing the 'problem of drugs': A cross national-comparison of 'recovery' discourse in two Australian and British reports. *International Journal of Drug Policy,* 26 (7), 617-625.

Latour, B. (2004). How to talk about the body? The normative dimension of science studies. *Body & Society,* 10 (2-3), 205-229.

Law, J. (2004). *After method: Mess in social science research.* London & New York: Routledge.

Lindquist, J. (2010). Putting ecstasy to work: Pleasure, prostitution, and inequality in the Indonesian borderlands. *Identities,* 17 (2-3), 280-303.

Lorvick, J., Bourgois, P., Wenger, L.D., Arreola, S.G., Lutnick, A., Wechsberg, W.M. & Kral, A.H. (2012). Sexual pleasure and sexual risk among women who use

methamphetamine: a mixed methods study. *International Journal of Drug Policy,* 23 (5), 385-392.

Lury, C. & Wakeford, N. (eds) (2012). *Inventive methods: The happening of the social.* Abington, Oxon; New York: Routledge.

Law, J., & Ruppert, E. (2013). The social life of methods: Devices. *Journal of Cultural Economy,* 6 (3), 229-240.

Law, J., & Singleton, V. (2000). Performing technology's stories: On social constructivism, performance, and performativity. *Technology and Culture, 41* (4), 765-775.

Law, J. and Urry, J. (2004). Enacting the social. *Economy & Society,* 33 (3), 390-410.

Leahy, D. & Malins, P. (2015). Biopedagogical assemblages: Exploring school drug education in action. *Cultural Studies – Critical Methodologies,* 15 (5), 398-406.

Malins, P. (2004). Machinic assemblages: Deleuze, Guattari and an ethico-aesthetics of drug use. *Janus Head,* 7 (1), 84-104.

Martin, A., Myers, N., &Viseu, A. (2015). The politics of care in technoscience. *Social Studies of Science,* 45 (5), 625-641.

McGovern, R. & McGovern, W. (2011). Voluntary risk-taking and heavy-end crack cocaine use: an edgework perspective. *Health, Risk & Society,* 13 (5), 487-500.

Moore, D. (2008). Erasing pleasure from public discourse on illicit drugs: On the creation and reproduction of an absence. *International Journal of Drug Policy,* 19 (5), 353-358.

Mol, A. (1999). Ontological politics: A word and some questions. In: J. Law. & J. Hassard (eds.) *Actor Network Theory and after* (pp. 74-89). Oxford: Blackwell.

O'Malley, P., & Valverde, M. (2004). Pleasure, freedom and drugs: The uses of 'pleasure' in liberal governance of drug and alcohol consumption. *Sociology,* 38 (25), 25-42.

Pennay, A. (2012). Carnal pleasures and grotesque bodies: regulating the body during a "big night out" of alcohol and party drug use. *Contemporary Drug Problems,* 39, 397-428.

Puig de la Bellacasa, M. (2017). Matters of care: Speculative ethics in more than human worlds. Minnesota; London: University of Minnesota Press.

Rhodes, T. (2009). Risk environments and drug harms: A social science for harm reduction approach. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 20 (3), 193-201.

Rhodes, T., Closson, R., Guise, A. Paparini, S., & Strathdee, S. (2016). Towards 'evidence-making intervention' approaches in the social science of implementation science: The making of methadone in East Africa. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 30, 17-26.

Ritter, A. (2014). Where is the pleasure? *Addiction,* 109 (10), 1587-1588.

Rosengarten, M. & Michael, M. (2009). Rethinking the bioethical enactment of medically drugged bodies: Paradoxes of using anti-HIV drug therapy as a technology for prevention. *Science as Culture*, 18 (2) 183-199.

Savransky, M., (2016). How bodies think. biopolitics and psychosomatics: Participating bodies. University of Cambridge. 8 July 2016 (unpublished conference paper)

Schnuer, G. (2013). Pleasure and excess: Using Georges Bataille to locate an absent pleasure of consumption. *Addiction Research & Theory,* 21 (3), 2582–68.

valentine, k. & Fraser, S. (2008). Trauma, damage and pleasure: Rethinking problematic drug use. *International Journal of Drug Policy,* 19 (5), 410-416.

Vitellone, N. (2003). The rush: Needle fixation or technical materialization? *Journal for Cultural Research,* 7 (2), 165–177.

Weinberg, D. (2013). Post-humanism, addiction and the loss of self-control: Reflections on the missing core in addiction science. *International Journal of Drug Policy,* 24 (3), 123-181.

Wilkie, A., Savransky, M. & Rosengarten, M. (eds) (2017). *Speculative research: The lure of possible futures.* London: Routledge.

Zajdow, G. (2010). 'It blasted me into space': Intoxication and an ethics of pleasure. *Health Sociology Review*, 19 (2), 218-229.