



The Future of Drugs: Recreational Drug use and Sexual Health among Gay and other MSM

Journal:	<i>Sexual Health</i>
Manuscript ID	SH16080
Manuscript Type:	Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-May-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Race, Kane; University of Sydney , Gender & Cultural Studies Lea, Toby; The University of New South Wales, National Centre in HIV Social Research Murphy, Dean; University of New South Wales, National Centre in HIV Social Research; Australian Federation of AIDS Organisations, Piennar, Kiran; Curtin University, National Drug Research Institute
Keyword:	Drug use, Gay men, Sexual practices, Drug addiction, Social exclusion

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Only

The Future of Drugs:

Recreational Drug use and Sexual Health among Gay and other MSM

For millennia humans have used psychoactive drugs to produce transformations and create new possibilities of feeling, acting and relating that are difficult to achieve by other means.¹ In simple terms, drugs have served as one of a number of means through which people have tried to *change their situation*. Sex is no exception to this: In *Macbeth*, Shakespeare wrote of alcohol, “it provokes the desire, but it takes away the performance”.² But for sexual minorities, this relation is reversible. Psychologists have found that drug use can be motivated by “a desire to escape very rigorous norms and standards” since it can enable cognitive disengagement from normative pressures.³ From this perspective, intoxication may provide the incentive, license and fortitude to act on same-sex desires that have been severely socially stigmatized historically – and still are in many contexts.

Drugs emerge here as one way of acting upon sexual desires and activities whose performance is otherwise foreclosed by the normative pressures of heterosexual culture and/or HIV prevention. The drivers of this process are cultural as much as biological (though the point is rarely acknowledged by health scientists). “Because they are commonly believed to be disinhibitive, [alcohol and drugs] may provide socially acceptable excuses for engaging in sexual behaviours in which people may *want* to engage but perhaps know they *should not*.”⁴ In other words, disinhibition circulates as a cultural narrative that has become available to explain the occasional transgression of norms around sex and other behaviours. The sociocultural license that drugs supply for engaging in disapproved activities is evident in cultural representations of gay sex as early as 1970, well before the onset of HIV/AIDS. For example, the gay characters of the film *The Boys in the Band* discuss the “Christ-I-was-drunk-last-night syndrome” as a prevalent “excuse” for homosexual encounters, and simply observe “a lot of guys have to get loaded to have sex”.⁵ From this perspective, the entanglement of sex with substance use is an upshot of the historical pressures of sexual stigma. But these histories do not exhaust the possible ways in which these activities come together: indeed, such histories are still being written and experimented with.

It is often said that drug abuse and addiction “decimate communities”, and no doubt this is true of certain contexts. But it also a matter of historical record that certain communities and social relations have been *brought into being* through drug practices: the use of MDMA or ecstasy within queer culture is a key example.⁶ Drug experiences have sometimes served to multiply and enrich affective bonds between participants in these subcultures, notwithstanding the risks associated.⁷ Since the 1970s, psychoactive drugs have been a significant element in the formation of urban gay communities for the social pleasures they afford as much as the cultural license they supply to act upon stigmatized desires.⁸ From the disco era,⁹ through 1990s dance culture,¹⁰ to the more recent emergence of ‘chemsex’,¹¹ stimulant drugs have participated in the formation of significant social bonds among men who have sex with men, producing a provisional sense of belonging and community that might otherwise not have been available to many participants in these sexual subcultures. In some locations, this sense of community became a vital resource in ‘community responses to HIV/AIDS’ over the 1990s,¹² giving rise to innovations in care, community education and HIV prevention.^{8,13} Indeed, the policing, criminalization, harassment and incarceration of users conducted under the auspices of the War on Drugs has played an equally significant part in the decimation of minoritized communities over the last half century as any of the dangers attributed to illicit substances, as numerous studies have demonstrated.^{14,15,16,17}

Contemporary pharmaceutical markets are increasingly characterized by proximities between personal enhancement, bodily desires and chemical practices.^{18,19, 20} In this respect, the use of illicit drugs for specific purposes finds a mirror in contemporary developments in biomedicine.¹² Since the mid-20th century, sex and sexuality have functioned as key domains for the technical and pharmaceutical modification of the body.^{21,22} Preciado describes postwar pharmaceuticals as “a new set of technologies for producing sexual subjectivity” and situates the invention of the category “gender” as bound up in the “exciting possibility of using technology to modify the deviant body”.²³ From the clinical use of hormones for sex-reassignment surgery and body-modification to the development of blockbuster drugs such as Viagra, the desire to enhance sexual experience and alter sexual functioning have been major factors in the emergence of lucrative pharmaceutical markets.^{21,}
²⁴ (The use of antiretroviral drugs for HIV prevention, which will be discussed below in further detail,

can be considered a further instance of such proximities). Many 'lifestyle drugs' appeal to those for whom a sense of non-normative embodiment has been formative.^{12, 21,25} From this perspective, it is not surprising that illicit drug use is also found to be higher among lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) populations.^{26, 27} Medical and social authorities have long classed the gender and sexual preferences of LGBTQ populations as problematic, pathological and in need of correction.^{28,29,30} Chemical practices have presented one set of possibilities for changing this situation, though not always in terms that conform to medical or social prescription.^{12, 31}

Alongside their perceived benefits, drugs are known to be associated with a range of dangers, including drug interactions and resistance, iatrogenic effects, accident, dependence, overdose, mental illness, hospitalization and death.³² (These dangers are associated equally with the misuse of certain medications, and are not the exclusive province of prohibited substances).^{33,34} Cognisant of these dangers, international agencies and experts are increasingly inclined to call on governments to end the criminalization of illicit drug use and possession^{35,36,37} – though not without encountering local resistance. Promising health outcomes have been achieved in jurisdictions where less punitive policies are implemented,^{38,39} and a range of programs have emerged locally and internationally that seek to provide non-judgmental care and resources to users, including pill testing, syringe provision, peer outreach services and supervised injecting. These services are frequently controversial and precarious however, and vulnerable to political agendas. The effectiveness of peer-driven education and support (among other harm reduction measures) is substantially compromised by the criminalization of drug use.⁴⁰

Given their historical associations with HIV prevention, LGBT community health organisations have long been informed by harm reduction principles and are among the leading proponents of some of these innovations. However, public funding for health education and service-provision within LGBT populations tends to prioritize HIV prevention and sexual health. As a result, alcohol and other drug (AOD) programs tend to be poorly resourced and are difficult to maintain as prominent programs within these organisations. Meanwhile, mainstream AOD services typically presume a heterosexual clientele, and often lack the specialized skills and expertise to handle problems associated with

sexuality-related drug use, with some exceptions. Given the connections between sexual minoritization and desires to chemically alter bodily experience, a key argument of our contribution is that public funding of LGBTQ health should not remain restricted to questions of HIV prevention and sexual health exclusively. As a matter of priority, it should be expanded to support AOD services and harm reduction initiatives within LGBT community health agencies, as well as programs that aim to equip mainstream AOD services with the requisite forms of cultural and sexual literacy that will enable them to work effectively with LGBTQ clients.²⁶ For sexual and gender minorities, drug and alcohol use can be a creative or experimental response to social marginalization – and not necessarily a problematic one in every instance. Rather than seeking to eliminate drug use, or confine themselves narrowly to questions of sexual risk-taking, sexual health programs should therefore seek to counter the material impacts of sexual normalization and sexual stigmatization in general. These processes constitute the conditions in which LGBT drug use emerges as significant for many participants and materially impact whether its consequences are destructive or constructive.⁴¹

Drug Futures

A growing body of work in the AOD field investigates the sociomaterial arrangements in which different drug effects and practices emerge.^{42,43,44} This literature challenges commonplace understandings of drugs as stable entities with fixed chemical properties, demonstrating the action of drugs and their purported effects to be a product of their relations with various other actors, contexts and practices. Here, agency is not equated with the properties of chemical entities or the intentions of human subjects exclusively. Rather, drug effects are brought into being and changed in their encounters with a wide array of phenomena, including informational environments,^{42,43} administration techniques,^{42,45} devices and technologies,^{46,47} social and affective climates,^{46,47} law enforcement practices,^{16,17,48} clinical and public health arrangements,⁴⁹ particular contexts and locations,^{17,46,50} and individual bodies,⁴⁴ among other variables.

Given these contingencies, it is impossible to predict the future of drugs or their impact on sexual health with any degree of certainty. Instead, this article proceeds by outlining some of the conditions that are most likely to mediate such futures in the medium term. These conditions include

contexts of drug consumption (the availability and accessibility of intermediating social and sexual spaces); technological developments (in digital and social media for example); legislative environments and law enforcement practices (the criminal status of drug use and HIV disclosure); the moral status of sex and drug practices (stigmatization); the availability and uptake of HIV biomedical prevention measures; and relevant developments in health and social care arrangements.

One question that is relevant to, but largely beyond the scope of our analysis, is how markets in psychoactive substances will evolve over the medium term, both locally and internationally. While it is impossible to predict drug trends linked to future market developments, it is important to note that these futures are contingent on regulatory environments and drug classification practices. For example, the last two decades have seen a rapid proliferation of new psychoactive substances and 'legal highs' available for purchase and sale on the internet in Europe and internationally.^{54,52} Specialists attribute these developments to the criminalization of once-popular recreational drugs (such as MDMA or ecstasy).⁵³ In order to circumvent regulatory constraints, clandestine laboratories have pursued research and development programs into new psychoactive substances that dodge legislative classifications. But the effects, uses, and impacts of these new substances are generally unknown.⁵⁴ Some of these substances are associated with a range of risks and dangers – including transition to injecting on the part of users in some locations.^{55,56} Market devices such as drug checking technologies,^{57,58} the possibility of legal, regulated psychoactive markets,⁵⁹ or the extension of prohibitionist practices and policies have the potential to ameliorate or exacerbate certain dangers, including the potential contamination of these substances with highly toxic compounds, known to be a feature of unregulated drug markets.⁶⁰

Sexualized Drug Use

The association of stimulant use with sexual risk-taking has dominated concerns around gay men's recreational drug use. A correlation between the two is well established in the scientific literature, though the exact nature of this relation is typically assumed rather than specifically investigated.^{61,62,63,64,65} Common wisdom assumes risk-taking to be a bio-psychological consequence of intoxication. But this explanation uncritically reproduces the cultural notion of 'disinhibition' and

neglects event-level and other analyses that find that people who engage in unprotected sex under the influence of drugs are just as likely to take sexual risks when they have not consumed these substances.^{4,12,66,67,68,69,70,71} Many alternative explanations for the correlation between drug use and sexual risk-taking are possible: Those who engage in the consumption of illicit drugs may simply be more likely to engage in other risky practices (such as unprotected sex); and/or drug use may itself be prompted by shame around unprotected sex. Since both illicit drug use and sex without condoms represent instances of sociomedical noncompliance, those who are led to breach one of these prescriptions may well be inclined to breach the other in certain circumstances, especially when such prescriptions fail to take into account the lived realities and constraints of people's everyday lives and desires.

Whatever the nature of the relation between recreational drug use and risk-taking (and the relation is certainly multiple), numerous studies have found that infection with HIV and other STIs and BBV's is more likely to occur among gay and MSM who consume recreational drugs than those who do not.^{72,73,74} Reasons for this extend beyond straightforward explanations that attribute individual sexual risk-taking to substance use to include a range of contextual factors and cultural variables. For example, the sexual networks of men who use drugs for gay sex are characterized by a higher prevalence of HIV-positive participants and lower rates of condom use (often as a result of attempted sero-sorting).^{66, 69} Lower rates of condom use within this sexual milieu may affect the prevention practices of HIV-negative participants, who may wish to conform to the sexual and social norms they perceive to be operating in those contexts. Meanwhile, stimulants such as methamphetamine are commonly used for 'sex-binges' that involve a higher number of sexual partners and a greater likelihood of anal and other physical abrasions that increase susceptibility to HIV and BBV infection.^{11,75} In general, HIV-negative men who participate in these sexual networks are likely to have a higher number of HIV-positive sexual partners.^{65, 66} The higher prevalence of injecting drug use within these sexual networks increases the risk of exposure to blood-borne viruses such as hepatitis C, which may occur through sharing contaminated drug and/or sex equipment and/or a range of sexual activities.⁷⁶ Precautionary measures that may be effective in other contexts become

more precarious in these conditions, putting those who participate in networks of sexualized drug-use at greater risk of HIV, BBV and STI infection.

Significantly, however, the risks associated with this cluster of practices are variable, contingent, and context-specific. On the basis of clinical trial evidence, community agencies now promote the use of antiretroviral treatment as prevention.^{77,78} Even in the context of “drug-fuelled” multi-partner sex without condoms (as “chemsex” is often sensationally characterized) the risk of HIV infection may be reduced if the viral load of HIV-positive participants is suppressed by the use of antiretroviral therapy,⁷⁹ and/or when HIV-negative participants are using pre-exposure prophylaxis.⁸⁰ With increased rates of HIV testing, early initiation of ARV on the part of HIV-positive individuals, uptake of PREP by at-risk individuals, and effective adherence, the risk of HIV infection can be reduced (though the transmission of other STI will not necessarily be mitigated). Taken together, these developments oblige us to confront what some may consider an equally scandalous but nonetheless recognizable possibility: the prospect of ‘drug-fuelled HIV prevention’.

Sexual Geographies

The emergence of ‘chemsex’ in its present incarnation became possible with the growing popularity of online dating sites and hookup apps among gay and other MSM.^{11, 81, 82} But analyses of chemsex often neglect to account for the simultaneous eradication of other gay social spaces in urban centres over the past decade. A variety of factors have contributed to the erasure of public spaces of gay social life. These include the gentrification of urban centres;^{83, 84} the attraction of wider demographics to queer nightlife precincts and associated increases in homophobic and transphobic violence;⁸ intensified policing of public disorder, drug possession, noise and ‘anti-social behaviour’ in nightlife precincts;^{17, 85} zoning laws and licensing restrictions that affect the commercial viability of bars, dance clubs, sex shops and other social spaces;^{86, 87} and the growing uptake of digital devices that provide other avenues for meeting sexual partners, and may reduce participation in more established gay social spaces. Gay capitals such as Sydney and New York have seen particularly intense governmental assaults on nightlife precincts that were once important scenes of LGBT

socialization.^{8, 17, 87, 88} For some gay men, the result has been “a sense of isolation and diminished expectations for queer life, as well as an attenuated capacity for political community”.⁸⁹

The decline in live scenes of urban sociability impacts gay men’s experience and use of psychoactive substances in material ways. Where gay dance culture was popularly perceived to involve the dispersion of sexual energies to the more diffuse eroticism and communal affection of the dance floor,^{10, 12} the use of digital hookup devices typically locates gay sexual socializing at home,¹¹ and frames sex as the exclusive modus operandi of such encounters.⁹⁰ Associations have been found between social isolation and reliance on hookup devices for sexual and social contact with others.⁹¹ Clinicians providing AOD services to gay men speculate that social isolation is a key factor in problematic drug use and stimulant dependence.⁹² Conversely, those who manage to balance their participation in digitally facilitated sexual encounters with other social activities and forms of pleasure may be less likely to experience such difficulties.⁹⁰ On this argument, the availability of other social outlets that are attractive to gay men and fulfill their complex social and sexual needs may play a part in mitigating problematic patterns of substance use. Where a paucity of such social opportunities exists, gay men may be led into modes of drug dependence, in which stimulant use becomes a primary source of recreational pleasure.¹⁷

The decline in publicly accessible social spaces of LGBTQ life also comes with certain pedagogical losses, since these spaces have served as key sites of LGBTQ community-formation and socialization. In the digital context, gay men are less likely to be personally exposed to a range of experiences of gay life beyond their ‘sexual type’. This reduces possibilities for experiential learning, exposure to socio-sexual difference, and the maintenance of queer cultures of inclusiveness.

Moralism, Policing, Stigma and Surveillance

The past decade has seen the articulation of new desires for sexual citizenship, manifest in an intensified push for marriage equality internationally on the part of gay and lesbian activists. From the perspective of citizenship equality, the denial of same-sex marriage rights is manifestly unjust, and there is even evidence of less demand for mental health services among gay and bisexual men in

locations where such rights are recognized.⁹³ At the same time, political mobilization around this objective has produced new forms of moralism within gay and lesbian communities that create new challenges for public health. The desire for liberal equality has spawned "a homonormative desire to dissociate homosexuality from cultural undesirable practices and experiences such as AIDS, promiscuity, drag, prostitution and drug use".⁹⁴ In this context, it may become less possible to have frank discussions that acknowledge gay men's engagement in these practices and develop appropriate forms of care, education and support for those who do. The contrast with earlier conditions that enabled the emergence of ethical and pragmatic community responses to HIV/AIDS is pertinent and stark. The desire to present a publicly respectable image of gay life increasingly overrides pragmatic, nonjudgmental attention to the needs of such individuals and groups, who find themselves newly stigmatized within gay community discourse.⁹⁵

Vestiges of homonormative discourses are evident in the forms of moralism that characterize some public and community representations of 'chemsex'. The high profile UK documentary Chemsex largely attributed gay men's sexualized drug use to the inherently ill or historically damaged nature of gay sexuality itself.⁹⁶ Meanwhile, popular and self-help discourses addressing chemsex propose normative intimacy as the most assured route to recovery and health, idealized in terms of personal aspirations towards long-term coupledness.⁹⁷ These discourses reproduce moral investments in monogamy and abstinence that, at a population level, have been shown to be ineffective strategies for preventing HIV/AIDS.⁹⁸ Gay culture is characterized by a wide range of intimate relations and socio-sexual arrangements, only some of which align with normative investments in monogamy and marriage.^{88, 90, 95, 99} However useful some gay men may find recovery discourses that stipulate a renunciation of "immoral" activities, such formulations are not realistic or practicable for many others.

The popularization of these discourses in gay culture is likely to have a demoralizing and debilitating impact on those who wish to organize their sexual and intimate lives in alternative ways. Their circulation is likely to exacerbate the already stigmatized status of casual sex and recreational drug use. This in turn may create barriers to prevention and healthcare, since those who are shamed by

moral discourses become less likely to openly discuss disapproved practices with health care professionals or seek support from peers or services should they need it. In this context, finding nonjudgmental ways to acknowledge the validity of a range of sexual and drug using preferences in both clinical practice and community education is necessary. The effectiveness of early community responses to HIV/AIDS was not predicated on moral compliance, but frank acknowledgement of non-normative attachments.^{12, 98} Rather than promoting particular ideals of intimacy, sexual health and drug treatment programs are most effective when they help gay men manage the risks of sex and drug use and maintain their social relations without moral proselytism.

Part of the appeal of online hookup devices is the veil of privacy they appear to confer on queer sexual arrangements. Stigmatizing associations between HIV, casual sex, drug and the use of online hookup devices may incline users towards patterns of secrecy and evasiveness.^{82, 12} However closely users of online hookup devices guard their personal privacy, though, it is clear that this privacy is under threat from other directions. User data is of increasing interest to commercial, public health, law enforcement and security agencies,¹⁰⁰ and there have been documented cases of police using digital interactions to entrap users under HIV disclosure and/or drug enforcement provisions internationally.⁸² The raid of the rentboy.com website (a New York-based gay sex work site), in which Federal officers seized personally-identifying user data and other company files, reveals how activities such as sex work and drug use make gay men newly vulnerable to apprehension on the part of law enforcement agencies.¹⁰¹

The digitalization of clinical records makes clients of sexual health services similarly vulnerable to privacy breaches, whether on the part of law enforcement, online hackers, or as a result of technical accidents.¹⁰² The risk of humiliating public exposure is likely to drive risk practices further underground, or lead to avoidance of care on the part of those who need it – a development all the more probable given the increasing securitization of public health in the digital context. In this context, there is a renewed need to advocate for privacy protections, and bring law enforcement practices into line with public health objectives in this context. Advocacy for the decriminalization of drug use and sex work, in addition to HIV positive sex, becomes an increasingly important objective

for sexual health advocates. Criminalization of these activities is known to work counter to public health are create barriers to engagement in care.^{38, 103, 104}The digital context has only multiplied potentials for the apprehension and surveillance of those who engage in 'illicit activities'. Redressing the moral and legal status of these activities is of utmost importance.

Conclusion

It is impossible to predict the future impact of gay men's recreational drug use on sexual health with any degree of certainty. Instead, we have sought to flag some of the conditions likely to mediate possible futures. In an ideal world, the decriminalization of drug use and widespread access to a range of HIV prevention tools will create conditions in which HIV infections decline and individuals who use drugs will be able to access any care and support they require to live well. Better regulation of drug markets prompted by the decriminalization of drug use will equip users with the tools they need to manage their use and keep themselves relatively safe. The convergence of sexual health services with community outreach programs will enable the timely diagnosis and treatment of HIV and STIs, leading to reductions in serious sexual infections. All of this is predicated, of course, on affordable access to treatments and services for those who need it.

In a more dystopian future, intensified stigma around drug use and casual sex will drive these practices underground. The securitization and privatization of public health will lead to new dangers, avoidance of care, and isolation of those at risk. New HIV prevention tools will fail to reach those who most likely to benefit from them, and undiagnosed infections will proliferate, producing an escalation in HIV and STI infections. The persistence of drug prohibition will result in the emergence of new psychoactive substances that will likely generate new risk practices and unknown dangers. The social isolation of users will compound other harms, including endemic drug dependence, mental illness and incarceration of users.

Given current political climates both locally and internationally, we feel genuinely uncertain about which of these futures will eventuate and where. But in closing we would like to signal some promising convergences between sexual politics and drug politics in recent times. A new wave of

grassroots activism around drug policy is evident in various locations. In Sydney, recent mobilizations have occurred at the intersection of queer community and drug use. Groups such as Unharm have prompted collective discussions that situate the emergence of innovative care practices within cultures of drug use.¹⁰⁵ Informed by histories of sexual community, their activities connect harm reduction to broader questions of access to public space. Their efforts to prevent dangers associated with drug use are characterized by a critique of criminalization, an appreciation of the diversity of bodily experience, and openness about the pleasures some associate with drug use.

Politically significant connections between sexuality and drug use are evident elsewhere. During the UK Psychoactive Substances Bill debate, a conservative MP came out publicly as a user of amyl nitrate, a substance that some gay men use to facilitate receptive anal sex.¹⁰⁶ Though the bill was eventually passed, the MP's admission interfered with its passage and the implementation of the Act has now been postponed indefinitely. This event is suggestive for the affinities it produces between the politics of sexuality and the politics of drugs. We take the MP's speech to amount to a claim on the legitimacy of self-surrender, and believe the popular receptivity surrounding his admission to be a promising development.

As Keane has argued, the dominant discourse of human rights is centred on ideals of autonomy, rationality and sovereign individuality.¹⁰⁷ This can reinforce a model of the 'normal' sovereign individual that has served to pathologise and marginalize drug users historically. While human rights can be effective tools for arguments about public health in some contexts, their prioritization of norms of sovereign individuality is worrisome for drug politics. Hence our interest in this instance, in which self-loss itself constitutes the focus of legitimation. Significantly, public acknowledgement of the intelligibility of human desires for self-surrender is also pertinent to the politics of HIV/AIDS. Bersani has analysed the virulent homophobia that characterized discourses surrounding the early AIDS crisis as a displacement and projection of common human desires for receptivity and self-surrender onto sexual others: gay men and women.¹⁰⁸ Needless to say, such conditions were disastrous for HIV prevention.

As we argued at the outset of this paper, the need to disorganize the self might be regarded as a common human need that people turn to on occasion to produce transformations. In highlighting the proximities between sexual and drug experience, and having this claim acknowledged by many as reasonable, we believe this moment in the Psychoactive Substances Bill debate pushes both sexuality and drug use into more promising political territory.¹⁰⁹ In particular, it might be taken to signal common recognition of a need (that anyone may experience on occasion) to become-other than oneself: a right to self-disruption. Against dominant discourses of sovereign individuality that prescribe self-control and self-same identity as the prerequisite of human intelligibility, recognition of the occasional need – indeed, the right – to produce self-disruptions may generate more inhabitable sexual and social climates for everyone.

References

- ¹ Stengers I, Ralet O. Drugs: Ethical choice or moral consensus? In: Stengers I. Power and invention: Situating science. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press; 1997. p. 213-32.
- ² Shakespeare W. Macbeth. London: Penguin; 2015.
- ³ McKirnan D, Ostrow D, Hope B. Sex, drugs and escape: A psychological model of HIV-related risk behaviours. *AIDS Care* 1996; 8(6): 655-69.
- ⁴ Rhodes T. Culture, drugs and unsafe sex: confusion about causation. *Addiction* 1996; 91(6): 753-58.
- ⁵ Crowley M. The boys in the band. London: Secker & Walburg; 1969.
- ⁶ Buckland F. Impossible dance: club culture and queer world-making. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press; 2002.
- ⁷ Gaissad L. Expending ourselves at 'La Démence?': gay party circuit from consumption to consummation. *Ethnologie française* 2013;43(3):409-16.
- ⁸ Race K. Party animals: the significance of drugs in the materialization of urban gay identity. In: Fraser S, Moore D. The drug effect: health crime and society. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press; 2011. p. 35-56
- ⁹ Lawrence T. Love saves the day: a history of American dance music culture 1970-1979. Durham: Duke University Press.
- ¹⁰ Westhaver R. 'Coming out of your skin': circuit parties, pleasure and the subject. *Sexualities*. 2005; 8(3):347-74.
- ¹¹ Race K. 'Party and Play': Online hook-up devices and the emergence of PNP practices among gay men. *Sexualities* 2015;18(3):253-75.
- ¹² Race K. Pleasure consuming medicine: the queer politics of drugs. Durham: Duke University Press; 2009.
- ¹³ Southgate E, Hopwood M. The role of folk pharmacology and lay experts in harm reduction: Sydney gay drug using networks. *International Journal of Drug Policy* 2001;12: 321-35.
- ¹⁴ Roberts D. Killing the black body: Race, reproduction, and the meaning of liberty. New York: Vintage; 2014.
- ¹⁵ Bourgois P. In search of respect: Selling crack in El Barrio. Cambridge University Press; 2003
- ¹⁶ Maher L, Dixon D. Policing and public health: law enforcement and harm minimization in a street-level drug market. *British Journal of Criminology* 1999;39(4):488-512.
- ¹⁷ Race K. Complex events: drug effects and emergent causality. *Contemporary Drug Problems* 2014;41(3):301-34.
- ¹⁸ Rose N. The politics of life itself. *Theory, culture & society* 2001;18(6):1-30.
- ¹⁹ Conrad P. The medicalization of society: on the transformation of human conditions into treatable disorders. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press; 2008.
- ²⁰ Dumit J. Drugs for life: how pharmaceutical companies define our health. Durham: Duke University Press; 2012.
- ²¹ Tiefer L. The medicalization of sexuality: Conceptual, normative, and professional issues. *Annual Review of Sex Research* 1996;7(1):252-82.
- ²² Irvine JM. Disorders of desire: sexuality and gender in modern American sexology. Temple University Press; 2005.
- ²³ Preciado B. Pharmaco-pornographic politics: towards a new gender ecology. *Parallax* 2008;14(1):105-17.
- ²⁴ Moynihan R, Heath I, Henry D. Selling sickness: the pharmaceutical industry and disease mongering. *British Medical Journal* 2002; 324(7342):886.
- ²⁵ Mamo L, Fishman JR. Potency in all the right places: Viagra as a technology of the gendered body. *Body & Society*. 2001;7(4):13-35.
- ²⁶ Roxburgh A, Lea T, De Wit J, Degenhardt L. Sexual identity and prevalence of alcohol and other drug use among Australians in the general population. *International Journal of Drug Policy* 2015; 28: 76-82.

- 27 Cochran SD, Ackerman D, Mays VM, Ross MW. Prevalence of non-medical drug use and dependence among homosexually active men and women in the US population. *Addiction* 2004; 99(8):989–98.
- 28 Foucault M. *The history of sexuality, volume I: an introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon. 1978.
- 29 Chase C. Hermaphrodites with attitude. *Gay and Lesbian Quarterly* 1998;4(2):189–211.
- 30 Stryker S, Whittle S. *The transgender studies reader*. Taylor & Francis; 2006.
- 31 Foucault M. Sex, power, and the politics of identity. In: *Essential Works of Foucault: Ethics: Subjectivity and truth*. 1997; New York: New Press. p. 163–73.
- 32 Nutt D, King LA, Saulsbury W, Blakemore C. Development of a rational scale to assess the harm of drugs of potential misuse. *The Lancet* 2007;369(9566):1047–53.
- 33 Lazarou J, Pomeranz BH, Corey PN. Incidence of adverse drug reactions in hospitalized patients: a meta-analysis of prospective studies. *JAMA* 1998;279(15):1200–5.
- 34 Mok S, Minson Q. Drug-related problems in hospitalized patients with HIV infection. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy* 2008 Jan 1;65(1).
- 35 Csete J, Kamarulzaman A, Kazatchkine M, Altice F, Balicki M, Buxton J, Cepeda J, Comfort M, Goosby E, Goulão J, Hart C. Public health and international drug policy. *The Lancet* 2016;387(10026):1427–80.
- 36 Beyrer C, Malinowska-Sempruch K, Kamarulzaman A, Kazatchkine M, Sidibe M, Strathdee SA. Time to act: a call for comprehensive responses to HIV in people who use drugs. *The Lancet* 2010; 376(9740):551–63.
- 37 Buse K, Albers E, Phurailatpam S. HIV and drugs: a common, common-sense agenda for 2016. *The Lancet Global Health* 2016;4(5):e292–3.
- 38 Hughes CE, Stevens A. What can we learn from the Portuguese decriminalization of illicit drugs? *British Journal of Criminology* 2010; 50(6):999–1022
- 39 MacCoun RJ, Reuter P. Assessing drug prohibition and its alternatives: A guide for agnostics. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 2011;7:61–78.
- 40 Lancaster K, Seear K, Treloar C. Laws prohibiting peer distribution of injecting equipment in Australia: A critical analysis of their effects. *International Journal of Drug Policy* 2015;26(12):1198–206.
- 41 Lea T, de Wit J, Reynolds R. Minority stress in lesbian, gay, and bisexual young adults in Australia: Associations with psychological distress, suicidality, and substance use. *Archives of sexual behavior* 2014;43(8):1571–8.
- 42 Fraser S, Moore D, editors. *The drug effect: Health, crime and society*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press; 2011.
- 43 Gomart E. Methadone six effects in search of a substance. *Social Studies of Science*. 2002;32(1):93–135.
- 44 Rosengarten M, Michael M. Rethinking the bioethical enactment of medically drugged bodies: Paradoxes of using anti-HIV drug therapy as a technology for prevention. *Science as Culture* 2009;18(2):183–99.
- 45 Keane H. Pleasure and discipline in the uses of Ritalin. *International Journal of Drug Policy* 2008;19(5):401–9.
- 46 Duff C. Accounting for context: Exploring the role of objects and spaces in the consumption of alcohol and other drugs. *Social & Cultural Geography* 2012;13(2):145–59.
- 47 Vitellone N. Just another night in the shooting gallery?: the syringe, space, and affect. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 2010;28(5):867–80.
- 48 Race K. Drug effects, performativity and the law. *International Journal of Drug Policy* 2011;22(6):410–2.
- 49 Race K. Framing responsibility. *Journal of bioethical inquiry* 2012;9(3):327–38.
- 50 Rhodes T. Risk environments and drug harms: a social science for harm reduction approach. *International Journal of Drug Policy* 2009;20(3):193–201.
- 51 Measham F, Wood DM, Dargan PI, Moore K. The rise in legal highs: prevalence and patterns in the use of illegal drugs and first-and second-generation “legal highs” in South London gay dance clubs. *Journal of Substance Use* 2011;16(4):263–72.
- 52 Barratt MJ, Ferris JA, Winstock AR. Use of Silk Road, the online drug marketplace, in the United Kingdom, Australia and the United States. *Addiction* 2014 May 1;109(5):774–83.
- 53 Measham F, Moore K, Newcombe R, Zoë (née Smith). Tweaking, bombing, dabbing and stockpiling: the emergence of mephedrone and the perversity of prohibition. *Drugs and Alcohol Today* 2010;10(1):14–21.
- 54 O'Brien K, Chatwin C, Jenkins C, Measham F. New psychoactive substances and British drug policy: A view from the cyber-psychoanalysts. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*. 2015 May 4;22(3):217–23.
- 55 Kirby T, Thornber-Dunwell M. High-risk drug practices tighten grip on London gay scene. *The Lancet*. 2013 Dec 1;381(9861):101–2.
- 56 Bourne A, Reid D, Hickson F, Torres-Rueda S, Steinberg P, Weatherburn P. “Chemsex” and harm reduction need among gay men in South London. *International Journal of Drug Policy* 2015;26(12):1171–6.
- 57 Butterfield R, Barratt M, Ezard N, Day R. Drug checking to improve monitoring of new psychoactive substances in Australia. *The Medical Journal of Australia* 2016; 204(4):144.
- 58 Spruit IP. Monitoring synthetic drug markets, trends, and public health. *Substance use & misuse* 2001;36(1–2):23–47.
- 59 Ritter A. Illicit drugs policy through the lens of regulation. *International Journal of Drug Policy* 2010;21(4):265–70.
- 60 Cole C, Jones L, McVeigh J, Kicman A, Syed Q, Bellis M. Adulterants in illicit drugs: a review of empirical evidence. *Drug testing and analysis* 2011;3(2):89–96.
- 61 Stall R, Purcell DW. Intertwining epidemics: a review of research on substance use among men who have sex with men and its connection to the AIDS epidemic. *AIDS and Behavior* 2000;4(2):181–92.
- 62 Halkitis PN, Parsons JT, Stirratt MJ. A double epidemic: crystal methamphetamine drug use in relation to HIV transmission. *Journal of Homosexuality* 2001;41(2):17–35.
- 63 Mansergh G, Flores S, Koblin B, Hudson S, McKirnan D, Colfax GN, Project MIX Study Group. Alcohol and drug use in the context of anal sex and other factors associated with sexually transmitted infections: results from a multi-city study of high-risk men who have sex with men in the USA. *Sexually Transmitted Infections* 2008;84(6):509–11.
- 64 Shoptaw S, Reback CJ. Methamphetamine use and infectious disease-related behaviors in men who have sex with men: implications for interventions. *Addiction* 2007;102(s1):130–5.

- ⁶⁵ Lea T, Mao L, Hopwood M, Prestage G, Zablotska I, de Wit J, Holt M. Methamphetamine use among gay and bisexual men in Australia: Trends in recent and regular use from the Gay Community Periodic Surveys. *International Journal of Drug Policy* 2016; 29: 66-72.
- ⁶⁶ Rawstorne P, Digiusto E, Worth H, Zablotska I. Associations between crystal methamphetamine use and potentially unsafe sexual activity among gay men in Australia. *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 2007;36(5):646-54.
- ⁶⁷ Prestage G, Van de Ven P, Mao L, Grulich A, Kippax S, Kaldor J. Contexts for last occasions of unprotected anal intercourse among HIV-negative gay men in Sydney: the Health in Men cohort. *AIDS Care* 2005;17(1):23-32.
- ⁶⁸ Gillmore MR, Morrison DM, Leigh BC, Hoppe MJ, Gaylord J, Rainey DT. Does "high= high risk"? An event-based analysis of the relationship between substance use and unprotected anal sex among gay and bisexual men. *AIDS and Behavior*. 2002 Dec 1;6(4):361-70.
- ⁶⁹ Purcell DW, Moss S, Remien RH, Woods WJ, Parsons JT. Illicit substance use, sexual risk, and HIV-positive gay and bisexual men: differences by serostatus of casual partners. *AIDS* 2005;19:S37-47.
- ⁷⁰ Vosburgh HW, Mansergh G, Sullivan PS, Purcell DW. A review of the literature on event-level substance use and sexual risk behavior among men who have sex with men. *AIDS and Behavior* 2012;16(6):1394-410.
- ⁷¹ Bourne A, Reid D, Hickson F, Torres-Rueda S, Weatherburn P. Illicit drug use in sexual settings ('chemsex') and HIV/STI transmission risk behaviour among gay men in South London: findings from a qualitative study. *Sexually transmitted infections* 2015;91(8):564-8.
- ⁷² Prestage G, Jin F, Kippax S, Zablotska I, Imrie J, Grulich A. Use of illicit drugs and erectile dysfunction medications and subsequent HIV infection among gay men in Sydney, Australia. *The journal of sexual medicine* 2009;6(8):2311-20.
- ⁷³ Drumright LN, Patterson TL, Strathdee SA. Club drugs as causal risk factors for HIV acquisition among men who have sex with men: a review. *Substance use & misuse* 2006;41(10-12):1551-601
- ⁷⁴ Halkitis, P. N., Levy, M. D., Moreira, A. D., & Ferrusi, C. N. (2014). Crystal methamphetamine use and HIV transmission among gay and bisexual men. *Current Addiction Reports* 2014;1(3): 206-213.
- ⁷⁵ Bourne A, Reid D, Hickson F, Torres Rueda S, Weatherburn P. *The Chemsex Study: drug use in sexual settings among gay and bisexual men in Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham*. London: Sigma Research, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine. 2014.
- ⁷⁶ Hopwood M, Lea T, Aggleton P. Drug, sex and sociality: factors associated with the recent sharing of injecting equipment among gay and bisexual men in Australia. *International Journal of Drug Policy* 2015;26(2):210-3.
- ⁷⁷ O'Donnell D, Perche D. Resetting the agenda: the makings of 'A New Era' of HIV policy in NSW. *Sexual Health* 2016 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/SH16010>
- ⁷⁸ Liu A, Cohen S, Follansbee S, Cohan D, Weber S, Sachdev D, Buchbinder S. Early experiences implementing pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) for HIV prevention in San Francisco. *PLoS Med*. 2014;11(3):e1001613.
- ⁷⁹ Muessig KE, Smith MK, Powers KA, Lo Y- R, Burns DN, Grulich AE, et al. Does ART prevent HIV transmission among MSM? *AIDS*. 2012;26(18):2267-73
- ⁸⁰ Baeten JM, Grant R. Use of antiretrovirals for HIV prevention: what do we know and what don't we know?. *Current HIV/AIDS Reports*. 2013;10(2):142-51.
- ⁸¹ Stuart D. Sexualised drug use by MSM: background, current status and response. *HIV Nursing* 2013;13:1-5.
- ⁸² Frederick BJ, Perrone D. "Party N Play" on the Internet: Subcultural Formation, Craigslist, and Escaping from Stigma. *Deviant Behavior*. 2014;35(11):859-84.
- ⁸³ Ghaziani A. *There goes the gayborhood?* Princeton University Press; 2014.
- ⁸⁴ Bell D, Binnie J. Authenticating queer space: citizenship, urbanism and governance. *Urban studies*. 2004;41(9):1807-20.
- ⁸⁵ Hobbs D. *Bouncers: Violence and governance in the night-time economy*. Oxford University Press on Demand; 2003.
- ⁸⁶ Colter EG, editor. *Policing public sex: Queer politics and the future of AIDS activism*. South End Press; 1996.
- ⁸⁷ Delany SR. *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue*. New York: NYU Press; 1999.
- ⁸⁸ Berlant L, Warner M. Sex in public. *Critical inquiry*. 1998;24(2):547-66.
- ⁸⁹ Warner M. *Publics and counterpublics*. New York: Zone Books. p.192
- ⁹⁰ Race K. Speculative pragmatism and intimate arrangements: online hook-up devices in gay life. *Culture, health & sexuality*. 2015;17(4):496-511.
- ⁹¹ McKirnan D, Houston E, Tolou-Shams M. Is the Web the culprit? Cognitive escape and Internet sexual risk among gay and bisexual men. *AIDS and Behavior*. 2007;11(1):151-60.
- ⁹² Pakianathan MR, Lee MJ, Kelly B, Hegazi A. How to assess gay, bisexual and other men who have sex with men for chemsex. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*. 2016 Apr 21;sextrans-2015.
- ⁹³ Hatzenbuehler ML, O'Cleirigh C, Grasso C, Mayer K, Safren S, Bradford J. Effect of same-sex marriage laws on health care use and expenditures in sexual minority men: a quasi-natural experiment. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2012;102(2):285-91.
- ⁹⁴ Liu P. *Queer Marxism in two Chinas*. Durham: Duke University Press. p. 2
- ⁹⁵ Warner M. *The trouble with normal: Sex, politics, and the ethics of queer life*. Harvard University Press; 2000.
- ⁹⁶ Glyde T. Chemsex exposed. *The Lancet*. 2015;386(10010):2243-4.
- ⁹⁷ Fawcett D. *Lust, men and meth: a gay man's guide to sex and recovery*. Florida: Healing Path Press, 2015.
- ⁹⁸ Kippax S, Race K. Sustaining safe practice: twenty years on. *Social science & medicine*. 2003;57(1):1-12.
- ⁹⁹ Nardi PM. *Gay men's friendships: Invincible communities*. University of Chicago Press; 1999.
- ¹⁰⁰ Unicef. *Adolescents under the Radar: In the Asia-Pacific AIDS Response*. eSocialSciences; 2015.
- ¹⁰¹ New York Times Editorial Board. *Homeland Security's peculiar prosecution of Rentboy*. New York Times, 28 August 2015.
- ¹⁰² Halliday J, Campbell D, Elgot J. Inquiry launched after HIV clinic reveals hundreds of patients' identities. *The Guardian*, 3 September 2015.
- ¹⁰³ Arreola S, Santos GM, Beck J, Sundararaj M, Wilson PA, Hebert P, Makofane K, Do TD, Ayala G. Sexual stigma, criminalization, investment, and access to HIV services among men who have sex with men worldwide. *AIDS and Behavior*. 2015;19(2):227-34.
- ¹⁰⁴ Baral SD, Friedman MR, Geibel S, Rebe K, Bozhinov B, Diouf D, Sabin K, Holland CE, Chan R, Cáceres CF. Male sex workers: practices, contexts, and vulnerabilities for HIV acquisition and transmission. *The Lancet*. 2015;385(9964):260-73.

¹⁰⁵ Power, S. Queer chemistry: discussing drugs and Sydney's LGBTI community. *Sydney Star Observer*, 5 April 2016.

¹⁰⁶ Mowlabocus S. Crispin Blunt's poppers speech: a brave acknowledgement of awkward truths. *The Conversation* 22 January 2016.

¹⁰⁷ Keane H. Critiques of harm reduction, morality and the promise of human rights. *International Journal of Drug Policy*. 2003;14(3):227-32.

¹⁰⁸ Bersani L. Is the rectum a grave? *October*. 1987;43:197-222.

¹⁰⁹ Butler J. *Beside oneself: on the limits of sexual autonomy*. In: *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.

For Review Only