Episode 909: What the War on Drugs Really Looks Like, Minus the Propaganda

Guest: Johann Hari

WOODS: I for months had people telling me that I had to have you on for *Chasing the Scream*. Months. And so —

HARI: Oh, but I told my mother to stop stalking radio hosts. You know, what can I do?

WOODS: [laughing] And the way she uses different identities and voices is really quite astonishing.

HARI: I know. Just getting out of control now.

WOODS: So I decided that probably the path of least resistance was to go ahead and get you on here. And I very much enjoyed reading your book. I'm glad people let me know about it. It's a couple years old now, but obviously, if anything, it's much more urgently necessary now in light of trends in the U.S. that are moving in the opposite direction from where they were a couple of years ago and we want to turn things around. I don't want to spend too much time on the origins of the drug war in the U.S., but just simply to say something, if you wouldn't mind, on the absolutely fact-free nature of it. That's really what's most striking when you look at the Harry Anslinger case and you look at his claims of the effects marijuana would be likely to have on you. People who haven't heard this will be quite startled to hear what he thought was likely to happen if you used it.

HARI: Yeah, it was so surprising to me. I spent a lot of time in the archives. Most of the book is about the world now and lots of different places I went to, trying all sorts of different approaches to this, but I wanted to look at how this all began. And I assumed, you know, that drugs were banned for the same reasons then that people listening in the street said, Why do you think drugs should be banned? If they think it should, they'd probably say we don't want kids to use drugs, we don't want people to become addicted. What's so fascinating to me is that stuff barely came up. That is not discussed in the archives. That's not why drugs were banned.

Drugs were banned in the middle of a series of kind of parallel hysterias. One is a racist hysteria. I open *Chasing the Scream* with a story of how Billie Holiday, the great jazz singer, was stalked and killed by this man, Harry Anslinger, the government bureaucrat who invents the modern war on drugs.

And the other one is the one that you allude to, which is this hysteria about drugs themselves and what they could do. And it's kind of — I mean, it's funny when you read it now, but this is the reason why this drug was banned, right? Literally Harry Anslinger announced, having said for years that cannabis was not harmful, suddenly announces that cannabis — well, he latched onto a particular case. A boy in Florida called Victor Licata in 1929 hacked his family to death with an axe. And it's no coincidence this boy was a Latino, by the way. Harry Anslinger was definitely riding fear of Latinos, a lot of parallels with today. And Harry Anslinger announces if you spoke cannabis, you will hack your family to death with an axe. He announces that cannabis makes people murderously psychotic. He said if Frankenstein's monster bumped into cannabis on the stairway, Frankenstein's monster would drop dead of fear. And in the middle of all this hysteria, which he really ramps up with the help of Hearst's newspapers, this is the reason why cannabis was banned.

WOODS: Now, let's go on ahead, because although that is great stuff, what of course is most compelling about your book is the current day and the drug was as we know it and as we experience it and as it endures today. Of course there are chinks in its armor, which we're glad to see, but of course much of it is still very much in force. You at one point in the book cite a researcher who assigned something like a harm number to different kinds of drugs. And it turns out that the highest number, in terms of what this can do to you and does do to people, was assigned to alcohol, and other drugs came a little bit later in the list. But your point in raising this was not to say, Well, therefore other drugs are safe. It was rather to raise the larger question of when we're arguing about the drug war, should we be arguing about, Oh, they've exaggerated the problems with these drugs and it's a lot of propaganda, or should we be arguing the merits of the drug war itself? And it seems to me that's where you're going.

HARI: I think you put that really well, Tom. This was a really personal quest for me. The reason I wrote the book — the reason I started doing the research for the book, which took many years, was because one of my earliest memories is trying to wake up one of my relatives and not being able to, and I didn't understand why then, but as I got older I realized that we had addiction in my family.

And when I started to write the book, I knew that we were coming up to 100 years since drugs were first banned in the U.S. and then across the world. And I kind of realized — I wrote this list of questions for myself that I wanted to answer, like: why did we go to war against drug users and addicts 100 years ago? Why are we continuing when it seems to be such a disaster? What are the actual alternatives like in practice? And what really causes drug use and drug addiction?

And I realized I didn't know the answer to any of these questions, so I realized I had to go on a journey. I ended up going on a very long, 30,000-mile journey to 17 different countries. Now, what I wanted to do was to sit with people whose lives had been changed by the most brutal kind of war on drugs, by the alternatives to the war on drugs, and really see what this means in practice. So I ended up meeting, as you know from the book, a crazy mixture of people. I spent a lot of time with a transgender crack dealer in Brooklyn to a hit man for the deadliest Mexican drug cartel, to the only country that's decriminalized all drugs.

And I think the main thing I realized is partly what you just mentioned, that it's so far removed from looking at evidence, this debate. It's so far removed from looking at the real stories of how people are affected by it. It happens in this weird, abstract realm where we kind of exchange clichés and fears and anxieties. Some of those fears and anxieties are legitimate, but I think it's — I guess I learned from this journey that so much of what we think we know about this subject is wrong. Drugs aren't what we think they are. The war on drugs is not what we think it is. The alternatives to the war on drugs are not what we think they are. Addiction is not what we think it is. It's fascinating to journey into a subject and realize that so many of the premises that we take for granted and many that I believed are so mistaken.

WOODS: Before we get into some of the human interest stories, we might say, the actual cases of real people affected by this, I want to ask you something maybe you've never been asked before. I pride myself on not just asking the same old predictable things. So I don't know if you're familiar with Jacob Sullum's book, *Saying Yes*?

HARI: It's a great book, yeah.

WOODS: Okay, so what he's arguing in there is that there's been this all-or-nothing approach to the way we think about drugs. We tend to think that if somebody's using drugs, there's a good chance the person will become an addict. Like you either have addicts or you have people who abstain altogether. And he's arguing that actually, most people who use drugs manage them perfectly okay. They don't have needles hanging out their arms. They're not in the poorhouse. They're managing their lives quite all right. And so we shouldn't have this puritanical view of drugs. We should say that some people are perfectly capable of enjoying them in a recreational way. And I'm curious to know: is that your view? And secondly, even if it is your view, is that how you would want to argue the case?

HARI: Absolutely. This is something that really surprised me when I did the research for the book. Intuitively we all know this about alcohol. If any of your listeners go into a bar tonight, they'll know that 90% of the people having a drink there are having it because it makes their life better. It's helping them to chill out, it's helping them to flirt with the person they want to flirt with, or you know, a whole range of good reasons why people use alcohol. And they'll also know that there'll be a small minority of people in that bar who might have an alcohol problem who need our love and support.

One of the many things that surprised me in the research is that ratio, 90%/10%, is true for all drugs. Professor Carl Hart at Columbia University, whose work I suspect you know, has done really fascinating research on this. 90% of people who use crack, 90% of people who use meth do not become addicted. And this is very challenging to us. It's very surprising. It was very surprising to me because it was not my family's experience. But what it leads you to ask is, okay — and there's very strong scientific evidence for that. It's even been admitted by the UN Office of Drug Control, who are the main drug war body in the world. Which leads us to ask again: what is going on with the 10% who do have a problem? And what's going on with them is not like, it's not quantity of drug use. Something else is going on.

And this is the thing that most surprised me in the research, and I think it's the thing that most people have picked up from the book and has most resonated, because it's so surprising and yet makes such sense when you hear about it. It's about what causes addiction. If you had said to me seven or eight years ago before I did the research for this book what causes — let's choose heroin addiction — I would have looked at you like you were stupid, and I would have said the clue's in the name. Obviously heroin addiction is caused by heroin. We've been told this story for 100 years and it's become a part of our common sense. It certainly was part of mine. We think if we kidnap the next 20 people to walk past your studio and we forcibly injected them all with heroin for a month, at the end of that month they'd all become heroin addicts for the simple reason that there are chemical hooks in heroin that their bodies would start to desperately physically crave, they'd start to need.

And the first thing that alerted me to the fact that there's something wrong with that is — I'm British, as you can tell from my voice. It was explained to me in Britain if you step out into the street and you get hit by a truck and you break your hip, you'll be taken to hospital and you'll be given a lot of a drug called diamorphine. Diamorphine is heroin. It's the medical name for heroin. Any of your listeners who have a British grandmother, she's had a hip replacement operation, she's taken a lot of heroin. If what we think is right, that the addiction is caused by exposure to the chemical hooks, what should happen to all these people in hospitals in Britain? Significant numbers of them should be becoming addicted. They're being exposed to the same chemical hooks as any street addict you'll ever see. This has been studied very carefully. It virtually never happens.

And when I learned that, it seemed so weird and so contrary to everything I'd been told. I didn't believe it, frankly, until I kept looking at the scientific evidence. And I only really began to understand it when I went to Vancouver in Canada and interviewed an extraordinary professor of psychology called Bruce Alexander who's done this really important experiment that I think has transformed in many places how we think about addiction. Professor Alexander explained to me this theory we've got about chemical hooks comes from a series of experiments that happened earlier in the 20th century. They're really simple. Your listeners can try them themselves at home if they want. You take a rat and you put it in a cage, and you give it two water bottles. One is just water and the other is water laced with either heroin or cocaine. If you do that, the rat will almost always prefer the drugged water and almost always kill itself quite quickly. You might remember the famous Partnership for a Drug-Free America ads in the '80s that showed this experiment, right? And there you go. That totally fits with our story.

But in the '70s, Professor Alexander came along and said hang on a minute. You put the rat alone in an empty cage where it's got nothing to do except use these drugs. What would happen if we did this differently? So he built a cage that he called Rat Park, which is basically like paradise for rats. They've got loads of friends, they could have loads of sex, they've got loads of cheese, they've got loads of colored balls, anything a rat could want. And they've got both the water bottles, the normal water and the drugged water. And of course they tried both. They don't know what's in them. But this is the fascinating thing. In Rat Park, they don't like the drugged water. They don't use it very much. None of them ever use it compulsively. None of them over overdose. So they're more like the people in a nice bar than the people in a dive bar.

Now you've got to ask yourself why is that. And there are many human examples I could talk about I'm sure we'll get to, but what this tells us is the opposite of addiction is not sobriety. The opposite of addiction is connection. It goes back to what you asked me about Jacob Sullum's excellent book. When you see people who have an addiction problem, what you're not seeing is the effect of the drugs. You're seeing the effect of the drugs plus something else. That something else is deep psychological pain that they're trying — If you want to understand why people are taking very powerful anesthetics, you've got to understand the pain they're in.

And you know, I've traveled obviously for the book and subsequently I traveled all across the United States. And the places where addiction is highest are the places where suffering is highest. It's not a coincidence that the current addiction crisis massively spiked after 2008. I don't need to tell your listeners what happened in 2008 that meant a lot more Americans were suffering a lot more and finding it harder to get through life. The core of addiction is trying to avoid pain. It's about trying not to be present in your life because your life is too painful a place to be.

So once you understand that, you see the fundamental errors of the war on drugs. One is the idea that the solution is to get rid of the drug. Well, even if you could do that — and you can't. It's a ridiculous fantasy. We can't even stop drugs from getting into prisons. But even if you could do that, that's not the core of the problem. But secondly, the other thing that the war on drugs does is it says that we stop addiction by inflicting more pain on addicts. In Arizona, I went out with a group of women who were made to go out on a chain gang, wearing T-shirts saying "I was a drug addict," and made to dig graves while members of the public mock them and jeer at them. Once you understand that pain is what's causing addiction, you see that doesn't just fail; that's going to make those women's addictions much worse. Punishment makes suffering worse and therefore makes addiction worse. It's why there's been such a disaster, and it's why the places that have chosen a very different approach have seen very good results.

WOODS: You mentioned Arizona, which reminded me of the case of the woman — I can't remember her last name now. It might have been Powell? I can't remember what.

HARI: Yeah, Marcia Powell, yeah.

WOODS: Yeah, can you just tell that story? She was in 106 degree heat for four hours?

HARI: So this was a story that wasn't very much known about when I started researching it. I went to Arizona because I knew that Sheriff Joe Arpaio, who I'm sure is known to your listeners, he was a personal disciple of Harry Anslinger. And so I thought it was interesting because I also wanted to write about the horrors of many parts of the American prison system. So I went to Arizona, and I just went to meet — there are two people who work on prisoners' rights. One of them, a wonderful person called Donna Leone Hamm. I was just chatting to her, and I said to her the thing I say to lots of people, which is, "Tell me about something that's happened that shocked you." And she went through this big, long list, and on the ninth or tenth item she said, "Oh, and there was the time they put that woman in a cage and cooked her. That was quite bad." And then she carried on, and I said, "Sorry, Donna, can we go back a second?"

WOODS: Yeah, right.

HARI: And there was a woman called Marcia Powell. She kept being arrested either for having crack or meth or for prostituting herself to get crack or meth. And she was taken to a prison in Arizona, and she was put in there, and she was judged by the court to be mentally incompetent. She was very seriously mentally unwell. And one day she woke up in the prison and she was suicidal. She was trying to kill herself. And to stop her doing that, the guards took her and they put her in an outdoor cage. It's literally a cage. It's exposed to the desert sun. And they — well, what happened next is contested. All the other prisoners say that they mocked her, they jeered at her, they made fun of her. The prison guards say they forgot about her, which seems slightly strange to me. The cage is very close to where they are and she was screaming. But anyway, she screamed. She begged for water and she begged for help. They wouldn't give her anything. She collapsed. By the time they called an ambulance, she had been cooked.

Now, the really shocking thing about this is what happened next. No one was ever criminally punished for what happened to Marcia Powell, because we have dehumanized people with addiction problems so deeply that you can brazenly murder someone with an addiction problem and it just doesn't matter. It doesn't get counted. I then went and tracked down the people who've known Marcia Powell. Actually, her life story was heartbreaking and kind of amazing. She'd been thrown out of home when she was 13. She'd been prostituting herself for a really long time to survive. You know, she was someone who needed a lot of help and love and support. And instead, we brutalized her in the most vicious way imaginable. And that's what we're doing to addicts all over the United States and across the world, with a few shining exceptions, which I'm sure we'll get to. We are taking people who are already in deep pain and we're humiliating them even further. And the result is we've got a growing addiction crisis.

WOODS: All right, I've got some really good ones still to come after we thank our sponsor.

[Sponsored content]

All right, I want to ask you what would be probably the most common man-on-the-street objection, which would be: even if I accept your theory of what causes addiction, if something becomes more widely available and less expensive, as we all admit the drugs would be less expensive if decriminalization occurred, there surely will be more people using them. And I've seen a lot of people who favor decriminalization trying to deny that, but that's a basic economic principle. If the price of something goes down, the quantity consumed goes up. So you may well have more people using these drugs. That will be on one side of the ledger.

The other side is you won't have all the negative parts of the drug war. But the concern is, let's say that it's true that people have addiction not so much because of the chemical, the physical aspects, but because of emotional difficulties. Their emotional difficulties are not made better by being addicted to heroin, and if it becomes legal, more people will do it and more people will lead miserable lives as a result, and we want to at least — yep, there's going to be some excesses in the drug

war, but we can certainly try and keep more vulnerable people from falling into this terrible curse of drug addiction. So how would you answer that?

HARI: There's lots of reasonable people who think that, and I think one of the most important things I learned in researching *Chasing the Scream* is that this is not an abstract question. Very often when we talk about decriminalization and legalization, the conversation goes off into how would it work, what would we do. And what they'd say is it's been tried and we can see the results. So everyone, all of your listeners have seen the results of the drug war. And I wanted to go to the places that have tried the alternatives and I want to see for myself and both meet people on the ground and look at the best scientific evidence about what the results were.

So I'll give you two quick examples. In the year 2000, Portugal had one of the worst drug problems in the world. 1% of the population was addicted to heroin, which is extraordinary. And every year they tried the American way more. They arrested more people, they imprisoned more people, and every year, the problem got worse. And one day, the prime minister and the leader of the opposition got together and basically said we can't go on like this, what are we going to do?

So they decided to set up — they decided to use something super radical, something no one had done in the 17 years since the drug war began. They said, Should we like ask some scientists to look at the facts? So they set up a panel led by an amazing man I got to know called Dr. João Goulão. And they said to him, You guys go away, look at the evidence. We've agreed in advance we'll do whatever you recommend. So they went away, they looked at a lot of the science. We're talking about like Rat Park. And they came back and said, Decriminalize all drugs from cannabis to crack, everything. But — and this is the crucial next step — take all the money we currently spend on screwing people's lives up, on punishing them, shaming them, stigmatizing them, and spend it instead on turning their lives around.

And interestingly, it's not really what we think of as drug treatment in the United States. So the do a little bit of residential rehab, they do a little bit of psychological support. There is value in that. The biggest thing they did was a huge program of job creation for people with addiction problems. Say you used to be a mechanic. They go to a garage and they say, If you employ this guy for a year, we'll subsidize half his wages. They set up a huge program of micro-loans so addicts could set up and run small businesses and be supported doing it. The goal was to say to everyone with an addiction problem in Portugal, We love you; we value you; we're on your side; we want you back.

And by the time I went to Portugal, the results were in and they were very clear. You're right. Drug use went up by 6%. So a modest increase. Teenage drug use remained the same. It didn't go up. But addiction massively fell. Addiction fell by 50%. Overdose deaths massively fell. HIV transmission among addicts massively fell. Street crime massively fell because there'd been such a fall in addiction. Burglary massively fell.

One of the ways you know it worked so well is that virtually nobody in Portugal wants to go back. I went and interviewed a man called João Figueira, who at the time of the decriminalization led the opposition in Portugal to it. And he was the top police

chief at the time, drugs police chief. And at the time he said what I'm sure a lot of your listeners are thinking: this is crazy; we're going to have an explosion in drug use and addiction; we're going to have terrible problems. He said to me, "Everything I said would happen didn't happen, and everything the other side said would happen did." And he talked about how he felt really ashamed that he'd spent so many years prior to the decriminalization arresting and punishing people.

And this is the thing that I really saw everywhere I went where they've moved beyond the drug war. At the time, people say exactly the concerns — totally understandably — say the concerns that you offered. And then they see the alternatives in practice. So to talk about another example, Switzerland. Switzerland legalized heroin for addicts more than ten years ago. Doesn't mean you can just go into CVS and buy heroin, obviously; it means if you've got an addiction, you're assigned to a clinic. You go to the clinic, you use your drug there. Since they did that, there have been zero heroin overdose deaths in the legal program. Literally not one. There's been a really big fall in crime. Switzerland is a super conservative country, and yet 70% of people voted in Switzerland to keep heroin legal because they saw the results.

I want to address another thing you said, actually, because it's a really important point, when you said price will fall. So there's two dynamics here. This is a little bit more technical. But so at the moment, there's what's called a huge risk premium when you're selling drugs. If I ask you to carry a bottle of vodka across Miami, you're not going to ask me for a lot of money. If I ask you to carry a bag of coke across Miami, you're going to ask me for a lot more money because there's a much bigger risk for you, right? So prohibition artificially increases the price in that way. That's what you're referring to. You're totally right. So when you legalize, that risk premium goes away. It's just like selling potatoes or alcohol or whatever. So that could cause a fall in price.

But of course, once something's legal, we can tax it. So we can hold the price steady or even increase the price if we want to once it's legal. Now, you're right. We don't want to price to significantly fall because that does incentivize use, obviously. Something's cheaper; more people can buy it. So what I would recommend doing would be holding the price steady with taxation, and then we could use the taxation for all the good things they did in Portugal, for all the good things they did in Switzerland.

WOODS: But if the price is leading people to commit all these crimes, then maybe we do want the price to fall.

HARI: We've got to bear in mind 90% of users for any drug are not addicted. So they're not using it compulsively and they're obviously not committing a crime. For the 10% who do have a problem, the main driver is not price. The main driver is that their lives — that they're in terrible pain. And what they did in Switzerland is deal with that pain. So when you're prescribed the heroin, you're also given loads of support to turn your life around. You're given social support. They give you support for housing.

One of the interesting things about the Swiss heroin program is you can stay on that program for as long as you want. There's never any pressure to reduce your dose or cut back. And yet, when I spent time in that heroin clinic in Geneva, I learned that almost everyone does cut back over time and almost everyone stops. When I was there, it had

been running for more than ten years, and there was nobody still in the program who'd been there at the start. I think there might have been one person, but there was almost nobody. And I said to the psychiatrist who ran it, Rita Manghi, why is that? Because what we believe is the drug takes you over and then if you've had it before, you take it forever. And she said to me, Well, their lives get better. And if your life gets better, you don't want to be anesthetized all the time. You want to be back in the world. Which is such a simple insight, but it's such an important one, I think.

WOODS: Can you take a minute just to explain the difference between decriminalization and legalization?

HARI: Sure. Decriminalization is where you stop punishing drug users and addicts, but they still have to go to armed criminal gangs to get their drug. Legalization is where you open up some legal route for them to get their drug. So decriminalization shuts down *Orange is the New Black*, and legalization shuts down *Breaking Bad*, basically.

And I think what we've talked about so far is the aspect of the drug war that made me first really passionately interested in this, which is what we do to drug users and drug addicts, which is obviously very close to my heart because of my family's experience. But actually, as I did the research and as I've traveled in places like Mexico and Colombia and reported from them, I realized actually the biggest moral issue of the drug war is actually not what we do to people with addiction problems, although I think that's atrocious enough. It's actually the violence caused by prohibition. And this plays out in every city in the United States catastrophically. It will play out tonight.

And it's worth explaining to people how this works. When people hear the phrase "drug-related violence," what they picture is someone going crazy and attacking someone, right? Taking drugs, losing the plot, attacking someone. That does happen sometimes. This has been studied. It's about 3% of what we call drug-related violence.

The vast majority of the rest is something totally different. And it's very easy to understand. If any of your listeners tonight go into a liquor store and try to steal a bottle of vodka and the liquor store catches them, the guy running the liquor store or the woman running the liquor store will call the cops, and the cops will come and take them away. So that liquor store doesn't need to be violent. They don't need to be intimidating. They've got the power of the law to uphold their property rights. But if any of your listeners decide to steal a bag of weed or a bag of coke and the guy selling that catches them, obviously he can't ring the police. The police will come and arrest him. He has to fight you. In fact, he has to establish his place as a dealer through violence and intimidation. The war on drugs creates a war for drugs. Milton Friedman, a Nobel prize-winning economist, calculated there are 10,000 additional murders ever year in the United States as a direct result of that war for drugs.

And if you want to know how to end that, just ask yourself: where are the violent alcohol dealers today? Does the head of Smirnoff go and shoot the head of Heineken in the face? Does your local bar send teenagers to go and kill the people who run the next local bar? No. Exactly that happened under alcohol prohibition. Everyone listening to this knows who Al Capone was. When did that violence end? It ended the day alcohol was legalized again.

Now, this is catastrophic — I learned a lot about this from spending time with a transgender crack dealer in Brooklyn who became a friend of mine, but actually, this plays out most catastrophically on the supply route countries. If I think about, I spent some time getting to know a hit man for the deadliest Mexican drug cartel, Los Zetas, a guy called Rosalio Reta. A slightly weird experience — he's now in prison in Tyler County in Texas, and I remember when I first went to see him, the prison guard said to me on the way in, You know, obviously we can't leave you alone with him because he's like beheaded 70 people. And I said, Oh, thank you, that's good. And then I was about ten minutes into talking to him, and I turned around and realized they just left me with him [laughing]. But anyway, I think his story tells you a lot. That's why I tell that in the book.

But you know, we are creating these enormous amounts of violence. More people have died by some estimates in Mexico and Colombia in this war for drugs than have died in Syria. The other day — well, recently, a few weeks ago, I spent some time in Buenos Aires with Pablo Escobar's son, Sebastian. And he said to me, "The only thing my father feared was legalization." And I think it really tells you something about how we have created these monsters through prohibition, and how everyone was afraid of Al Capone and no one's afraid of Heineken or Coors.

WOODS: One last question: your book is called *Chasing the Scream*. Why?

HARI: It comes from a story. As we talked about at the start, there's this guy called Harry Anslinger who's the most influential person who no one's ever heard of. He's the man who invented the modern war on drugs. He's the guy who stalked and killed Billie Holiday. Way before Nixon and Reagan, he was using the phrase "war on drugs." And one of the things that drove him is that when he was a kid, he had a neighbor who had an addiction problem, and he kept hearing her screams. And he was obsessed with this memory and he was convinced that if only he could get rid of drugs, he would stop these screams. The great tragedy of Harry Anslinger is that he didn't stop those screams for addiction; he made them much worse, and he created a whole load of other screams in its place, and they're kind of echoing out across the world today.

And there are alternatives that we can stop this. I've been to the places that have chosen the alternatives. They're not perfect, but there's a massive reduction in these problems when we do that. There will be people listening to this who have people in their lives who they love who either have addiction problems or who have died from addiction problems. In Portugal and Switzerland, those people would have a really good chance of recovering. And if we move towards those models, those Americans who deserve to have good lives will also have a much better chance of recovering. There are alternatives that work.

WOODS: Well, the book is *Chasing the Scream: The First and Last Days of the War on Drugs*, available at Amazon of course. I'll link to it at TomWoods.com/909, our show notes page for today. But tell us how people can follow you, and I know you have a site for the book.

HARI: Yeah, if people go to www.ChasingtheScream.com, they can take a quiz to see how much they know about the facts about drugs. They can listen to interviews with a

lot of the people we've talked about. It's got a very Facebook page. It's Facebook.com/ChasingtheScream. You know, I did an interview recently where they said to me, "What's your Snapchat?" And I said, "I'm a 38-year-old man. I am not on Snapchat [laughing]." But I'm on Twitter, as well. It's @johannhari101.

WOODS: All right, so I'll put Twitter; I'll put all this stuff at TomWoods.com/909.

HARI: Great.

WOODS: Thanks so much for your time today. And as I was saying to you before, we're going to talk about this enough that people will say, I've got to read this book. Not so much that they say, Oh, I know everything that's in here. No, no, no, I'm telling you. And you know, I've recommended a couple books lately recently where I've said, "This one you really have to read." Forget everything I said about those, because it's this one. All right, even if you went out and bought those, sorry you were a sucker. This is the one you should be buying. *Chasing the Scream*, check it out. Thanks so much, Johann Hari.

HARI: Thank you for engaging with the book so intelligently and the subject so intelligently. I really appreciate that, Tom. Thank you.