

Drugs are definitely horrible. The harder they are, the worse they are for you. Some drugs are in fact so bad that it's asinine and absurd to even think about using them. Yet people do all the time.

Of all these bad horrible drugs, which drug is the worst of the lot? It's hard to say. Although some drugs are definitely bad, they would be disqualified. Only the hardest of the hard would be eligible to win the distinction of worst drug ever.

When I was in college for one year, I had this roommate named Kevin. Kevin was a nice easygoing guy. Once we were talking about roommates, particularly having drug dealers as roommates, I mentioned it would be awful to have a drug dealer as a roommate. Kevin informed me that when he went to school in Buffalo, he indeed had a roommate who was a drug dealer. He said he sold drugs. It did not sound as if either he or his roommate got in any trouble because of it.

I would hate to have that situation. You would have to fear that you could be accused along with your roommate in lieu of your roommate or at least be suspected. All would be unpleasant. Even if you weren't suspected, it still would suck to have to put

up with cops coming over when you're trying to study or having your place thrown apart.

As a person who abstains from alcohol, it was bad enough to have roommates that drank in college. The worst situation that arose was one time somehow in my belongings a couple of wine bottles presented themselves. I'm not sure how they got there exactly. I asked my roommate at the time if they were his. He said "they were not." I didn't know what to do with them. For some odd reason I feared wasting. I didn't know where to dispose of them. I procrastinated. I didn't think much about it. After way too much time I eventually threw them out. In retrospect I wish I would have thrown them out right away. There was no need to worry about wasting alcohol because alcohol is garbage. If that happened to me now I would likely throw them out without a moment's hesitation.

Back then it was just enough to abstain from drinking. Possession itself, although not that desirable, wasn't something that really ate at my soul. It was just not actually drinking it. Nowadays I don't even set foot in taverns or liquor shops.

Since drugs are so very harmful, especially hard drugs being so harmful that it's absurd to use them.

Humorists have made reference to these drugs for purposes of jokes. Al Franken did this in his book *Lies and the Lying Liars Who Tell Them*. He was describing the Bush campaign. In 2000, one issue that arose, as he described, was Bush's alleged cocaine use. Franken described what happened at a campaign stop. Bush answered questions from the audience. Al Franken was a member of the audience. He asked a question along the lines, "Since we're in Iowa, I'll ask you, have you ever manufactured crystal meth?" He said Bush "found humor in that" but did not answer that directly, which was fodder for a Franken joke. Franken did say, "I don't think Bush was manufacturing crystal meth." It is indeed absurd to think someone like Bush would manufacture crystal meth.

Usually, the lumpen lowlifes are those who manufacture crystal meth, not wealthy elites who are connected to power.

My dad told me an interesting story. Part of it was interesting to me personally because of the geographical locations involved. My dad knew this, thus he wanted to tell me about it: "One police officer, Rockford, Illinois, where I went to high school, got hired as a police chief in Stevens Point, Wisconsin, where I went to college." My dad said,

“He hired a couple of movers to move his belongings. As he was being moved, he discovered something very interesting: crystal methamphetamine. So this police officer arrested them very promptly.” There is one series of books which has the motif of dumb criminals. I believe that situation would definitely be fit for inclusion.

I work in this third grade class. One day the teacher was telling the class about drugs. One of the drugs she mentioned was crystal meth. One of the kids then proceeded to tell the class all about it. She asked him “how he knew that”. He quipped, “Let's just say I have a mom who tells me a lot.”

Al Franken's buddy, Michael Moore, also has made references to drugs. But in one big example, it was not for joke's sake, but to make a point to further his argument. In his book *Downsize This*, Michael Moore described this scenario where he was on a plane with a corporate executive. They were talking about what General Motors did in Flint, Michigan. The corporate executive argued “it was perfectly okay to downsize all those workers because it was profitable.” Michael Moore definitely did not buy this logic. In the book, he did a *reductio ad absurdum*. A *reductio ad absurdum* is a philosophical and debate technique where one side

shows how absurd the other side's argument is by taking the logic out as far as it can go.

Since that corporate bigwig said, “if it's profitable it's okay”, Michael Moore then argued “crack is profitable, so General Motors should sell crack.” Michael Moore said, “Our society has made crack illegal, because it believes even though it's profitable, it destroys lives,” Thus, [Michael Moore argues] since what General Motors has done destroys lives, it should also be illegal.

I too have used drugs as reductio ad absurdums. Reductio ad absurdum, again, is Latin for to the point of absurdity. Since using some of these drugs is so absurd, it's great for reductio ad absurdums. Ironically, using hard drugs for reductio ad absurdums is a great way to refute arguments in favor of other drugs.

People have argued, “If you don't try something, you can't criticize it.”, “Once you try anything once”, “moderation in everything. All these are rotten. When a person said I'll try anything once, it sounds open-minded. But in reality, it's just stupid. You'll try anything, absolutely anything, including:

1. Heroin

2. Crystal meth
3. Inhalants
4. Crack

Usually when people say that, they're just suggesting they want to try a lot. Probably not absolutely everything.

I hate when people tell me “because I haven't tried marijuana, I am not in a position to criticize it.” This is utter hogwash. You don't have to try something to realize it's bad. Common sense should enable you to realize something is bad. You don't have to learn the hard way.

Have you ever put a grenade in your mouth and pulled the pin? No? Then you can't say it's wrong. Have you ever been run over by a dump truck? No? Then you can't realize it's wrong. Have you ever had cement poured on top of you? No? Then you can't say it's wrong.

This is garbage. This is stupid. Give people, argue that.

Others have refuted the old “moderation in everything” by saying if “it's moderation in everything, then it's not moderate.” That's a great

point. These people suggest the argument is innately self-contradictory. When you say moderation in everything, you're implying moderation is everything. Everything is a huge category. Thus it includes everything. Every conceivable possibility falls under this category. Why not qualify it?

People often say this to justify alcohol use. People think I'm extreme for demanding total abstinence from alcohol. I don't think so though. If you want moderation in everything, then you need a moderate amount of crystal meth, a moderate amount of heroin, a moderate amount of inhalants.

I don't know who the first person who modified this old saying, but I like the modified version: “moderation in everything normal and healthy, abstinence from everything abnormal and unhealthy.” That's my perspective.

Similarly, people have criticized me for condemning alcohol because these people say, “everything has an effect, therefore alcohol is okay.” These people entirely miss the point. I am not arguing that foods and other substances don't have effects. One person even said, “Spices have an effect, therefore we should avoid spices.” Missing the point.

These people are making what is called a straw person argument. In a straw person argument, you are unfair to your opponent. You make your opponent's argument seem so awful or so simplistic that you can easily knock it down instead of accurately representing it.

The difference between me and other people often is the fact I see the difference between one drug and another as a difference of degree and not of kind. Others have pointed out “it's wrong to say alcohol and other drugs because alcohol is a drug, thus to talk about them separately is to suggest alcohol is not a drug.”

The book *From Chocolate to Morphine* was interesting for among other reasons that people in the book would use one drug but not another: That another person would use the drug the other person avoided but not other drugs.

Most people will avoid drugs like crystal meth and inhalants. Some people would try those but would use heroin. Some people would try heroin but may use cocaine. Some people wouldn't use cocaine but might use mushrooms or LSD. Some people wouldn't use those but would use pot. Some people

wouldn't use pot, but would use alcohol. Some people wouldn't use alcohol, but would use caffeine. Then there's people like me who do not even use caffeine or chocolate.

In fact, the book *From Chocolate to Morphine* inspired me to give up chocolate because that really convinced me that chocolate was just like caffeine. Thus, the difference between me and people who drink is not me being insane arguing that we should avoid all drugs because drugs have an effect just like spices. No. It's a matter of where we draw the line.

I think alcohol is too harmful to use. Other people think I think all calls to harm holding youth. Other people think it's not harmful. We draw the line in different places.

Drugs like crack are almost always portrayed in a negative light. They're rarely glorified or romanticized. It makes sense because crack is so bad. Thus, *The Onion* newspaper romanticized crack to make a humorous article. For example, in the article it said, "This is not a crack house, it is a crack home."

Some drugs were used years ago but aren't used much anymore, or at least you don't hear about them

that much. In years past, opium was used. Opium dens proliferated in certain parts of the world. Opium dens were pretty pathetic. Opium dens existed so old people who had nothing to live for could pay their last bits of money to the opium den for the so-called privilege of smoking opium to their heart's content, like others have noted. Sounds like a waste to me. Yet people did it. I read that even in this day and age, opium still is profitable. I read that in the past, the Taliban regime made lots of money selling opium. Ironically I read, the Taliban, although banning drugs domestically, even including alcohol, would sell drugs to fools worldwide, such as the United States.

I was at this gathering. It was at this progressive housing co-op. I knew the people there because they were fellow activists. Two of them came back from this other gathering. The other gathering involved opium smoking. It was interesting to hear that because you would think people wouldn't smoke opium these days. It's just not that popular of a drug for whatever reason. Smoking that sounds pretty stupid to me, yet people do that. These two people were smarter than average, so it's sad to see them destroy their brains.

In graduate school, for my master's thesis, I studied Alcoholics Anonymous and the Temperance Movement. My thesis was called *From Prohibition Alcohol to Treating Alcoholism: A Comparative Frame Analysis of the Temperance Movement and Alcoholics Anonymous*. That title was thought of by my two committee members and it was a good one.

The books on these alcohol topics are close to books on other drugs. Even though I was involved in this intensive project, I still found time for leisure reading. I found this one drug-related book that interested me. It was called *Crack House*. The name stuck out. One of my graduate peers got a kick out of it. Interestingly enough, this book was sociological. Even though I was reading it for pleasure, it still was sociological. This book used an ethnography research technique to understand a crack house. An ethnography is a type of sociological research where the researcher uses sociological analyses to describe some subculture, phenomenon, group, organization, situation, environment: The researcher may interview participants, may observe, or may even become part of what one is studying. As I recall in this case, the author observed it firsthand and also interviewed those who frequented the crack house. Like one would expect, it was a pretty dismal picture.

Since one of the topics that interested me most is drugs, I have written a lot about drugs. I have written leaflets about:

- Hedonism
- Alcohol
- Tobacco
- Caffeine
- Hard drugs
- Marijuana
- Straight Edge

I've written essays about drug policy. I have given lectures and talks on these same topics. I have given lectures on straight edge. The Federation Without Television even put on the Positive Youth Conference, which tried to discourage youth from taking drugs. A lot of that has been serious, but I have also included humorous bits on drugs in writing and speaking.

April 1st, 2002, was April Fool's Day. That year, even more than the others, I went really wild. I love this day. I played so many jokes that year. I went way, way, way gung-ho. I was in no mood to take anything serious that day. I did have a lecture on hard drugs. Initially, it was supposed to be a serious lecture. I was intending to somehow have enough seriousness in me that day to withhold the joking for a short time

to make the presentation. But then I decided, why not make the lecture into an April Fool's Day joke as well?

That's what I did. Instead of discouraging use of hard drugs, I encouraged it. I said, we need to bring it on to people. If you'd like a copy of this, I'd be happy to give it to you.

My dad let me have one of his really old computers. I also took a lot of the software with it. I was looking around and found this game called *Druglord*. I did not recall ever seeing it before. The point of the game was to pretend you were a drug dealer trying to sell drugs. One time at a Federation Without Television meeting, Phil caused and I played this game. Ironically, we both are straight edge. He got quite a kick out of it.

People often make references to drugs to make fun of people. You may do it in a mean-spirited way or in a fun way. One time that Phil did something silly for Amnesty International, I wrote him and said, "Were you under the influence of heroin when you produced that?" He said, "No, I was under the influence of crack cocaine." If you say something really dumb, someone may say, "What are you smoking?" Or "Are you smoking crack?"

When I was in cross country for high school, if, for example, someone was coughing, breathing hard, or having difficulty getting air, maybe after a hard workout, our coach would quip, "You gotta lay off that crack pipe."

Some say legal drugs are bad even though they're legal. Some say legal drugs sometimes are even worse than illegal drugs. One drug or one type of drug we don't hear enough criticism of is Ritalin. We also include every other psychiatric drug. I think Ritalin is one of the more egregious in my book. Opponents of it say, "It's so dangerous to use even though it supposedly helps with attention." Others say that "ADD and ADHD aren't actual conditions but instead social constructions which psychiatrists and the pharmaceutical industry exploit for profit." I think there's validity in this. I have seen firsthand how terrible these drugs can be.

I work in an elementary school, as I said earlier. There was this one girl who was really depressing to be around. She didn't have much enthusiasm for anything. She was described [by other staff] as being withdrawn, as being reclusive, as being antisocial. She was very listless and apathetic. I knew her all last year like that. It was hard to get any connection with her. Her teacher said, "At the beginning of the

year she was bouncing off of walls.” She also described her “as a tornado.” [by this teacher] She said, “It was unlike anything she ever seen.” I think that sounded cool. That would be awesome to observe that.

A lot of these people don't like ADHD. I don't mind it at all. In fact, I think ADHD kids are exciting to be around. One time this year, I was working with her and she did not have her medicine. It sounded as if she ran out and her mom was waiting to get more. She was indeed in a jokey, silly mood. She was not paying attention, but some would say, so what? I say, right on. She seemed very happy, something which was the exact opposite of what she usually was like. So it was very refreshing.

The one special education teacher wanted her to be back on her medicine. I wanted to keep the one we got off the medicine. The special education teacher said that, “You don't want to take so much medicine that you're lifeless, but you need to concentrate.” [She also commented that you “don't want to kill a kid's will”.] Do you really [need to concentrate]? Some say concentration is overrated. I certainly think it's a costumed bargain to kill your soul just for the purposes of concentration.

There's another kid I work with. In fact, I work with this kid very closely. And there is this big push to drug her. She is a great kid and I hate to see it happen. I hate to see her great qualities go away. Interestingly enough, I'm not now just opposing psychiatric drugs in the abstract. I experience the effects of these so-called disorders firsthand. So if anyone would not want to put up with the behaviors of ADHD, it would be someone like me. I don't want to change that. These kids are fine as they are, as some have said, and I definitely agree.

There's another third grader who was telling us that "she bit her mom." She said, "She bit her mom because her mom was trying to give her medicine, which she did not like to take." She said, "It made it hard for her to swallow."

I asked her about it. She also admitted she didn't like how it made her feel. She said, "Her mother made her take it, because it made her concentrate better." Thus, her mother was forcing her to take this drug. Her mother was pushing this drug on her.

These people are drug dealers just like the drug dealers on the street. In fact, these people are worse. Think about the lowliest crack dealer out there. Would that person force someone to take drugs? I

doubt it. If you're in the wrong neighborhood, a crack dealer may approach you. If you decline purchasing drugs, the crack dealer may be persistent. But if you keep saying no, the crack dealer may just leave you and go to someone else. I believe crack dealers are generally too decent to force people to take crack. The pushers of Ritalin and other similar drugs aren't that decent.

What's the worst drug? Crack kills your mind. Ritalin and other similar drugs kill your soul. Of all the horrible drugs out there, what is the worst?

Drugs are so horrible, it's absurd to even think about taking them. Yet people sadly do. Good evening.