EPISODE 1546

[INTRODUCTION]

[0:00:00]

FT: So Money Episode 1546, Donovan X. Ramsey, author of *When Crack Was King*.

[0:00:08]

ANNOUNCER: You're listening to So Money with award-winning money guru, Farnoosh Torabi. Each day, in a 30-minute dose of financial inspiration from the world's top business minds, authors, influencers, and from Farnoosh herself. Looking for ways to save on gas, or double your double coupons? Sorry, you're in the wrong place. Seeking profound ways to live a richer, happier life. Welcome to So Money.

[0:00:34]

DR: We didn't learn the lessons of the crack era that crack epidemic is something that happened in our country, and it really impacted cities and communities of color in particular. Once it was over, we just moved on. It's because we didn't learn the lessons, and improve our system, that we're still vulnerable to drug epidemics like the opioid epidemic. And why not only are we vulnerable, but we don't have solutions in place to actually help people once they're caught up in whatever their drug of choice is. For me, I really hope that by telling the stories that that we can learn from them. So it was important to not just get the sort of meta history, the rise and fall of crack, but to also tell the stories of individuals impacted. That way, we could look to the ways that they dug themselves out of the epidemic and came out on the other end as survivors.

[0:01:34]

FT: Welcome to So Money, everybody. I'm Farnoosh Torabi. Today, we're going to explore what my guest calls a misunderstood era, the 1980s, and 1990s when the crack epidemic became a

harrowing experience for thousands of Americans. If we care about what's behind existing wealth gaps and opportunity gaps today, history is sometimes our greatest teacher. But chances are, when we think of the crack era, our minds go to how it was depicted in the media, or political campaigns, and policing. Do we really know the people who suffered and what happened to them? While some suffered, others profited. How did the failures of that epidemic haunt and hold back our plight against drugs, as well as social justice, and wealth equality then, and still today.

Donovan X. Ramsey is our guest, and the author of the new book, *When Crack Was King: A People's History of a Misunderstood Era*. The book came out in July, has fast become acclaimed featured everywhere, including a review, a long review in the New York Times. It's kind of an author's dream. The writer says, "Donovan aims to give the story of the crack epidemic a human face, while telling it from start to finish, a Herculean task. By and large, he succeeds."

Fun fact, everybody. Donovan and I go way back. I have goosebumps as I open this episode. I had goosebumps the entire time recording it with him. He was my intern. That makes me sound really, really old. But the fact of the matter is, he and I kind of grew up in the trenches of journalism. I'm a bit further ahead, but he is by and large, a far better writer than I ever will be. His work is making a very important impact. I'm just blown away that I had the opportunity in my lifetime to be able to collaborate with him, and it is with great honor that I bring him on the show. He's been on the show before. This won't be his last. Although we both come quite far in our careers, we begin this episode with the two of us fumbling a bit with our audio, but we got it working. A little behind the scenes for you as we kick things off. Here we go. Here's Donovan X. Ramsey.

[INTERVIEW]

[0:03:55]

FT: Are you good? Or you just let me know when you're ready.

[0:03:57]

DR: This source is my Yeti. Okay.

[0:04:00]

FT: All right.

[0:04:00]

DR: Look at me acting like a pro.

[0:04:02]

FT: You are a pro. Donovan Ramsey, welcome to So Money. Not only are you good at setting up your own audio for a podcast, but you are a masterful writer. I like to say, I knew you when. I knew you when. I knew you when you were a bright-eyed, starry-eyed young man, and you're still a young man, but you had just graduated from Columbia Journalism School where I went. I think it was just an alignment of stars. You were able to work with me as I was also trying to build this ship. Together, we kind of grew up in this world of journalism, and writing, and trying to make a business out of all the things. You always had the highest of intentions and ambitions with your writing and your impact. I am so, so blown away by your first of many books that I'm sure you're going to write.

But this now is called *When Crack Was King*. I'm getting goosebumps because I remember the day you told me about this book, and the deal, and it was before the pandemic. I thought, "Ugh, the world needs this book." Then of course, 2020 happened, and I feel like maybe sometimes it's important to let a book sort of take its process. So glad that you didn't rush to write this book in 2018, that you are now coming out with it now when it is even more relevant, maybe sadly, but more relevant. But *When Crack Was King*, I want to hand you the mic. *A People's History of a Misunderstood Era*, as you have experienced it, as you interviewed four prominent characters in this book, a kaleidoscope of storytelling about this prominent time in our country's history that was so misunderstood, and has implications to this day of how we police or how we think about

equity. Take it away, what prompted you to want to write this, this particular piece of our history and correct the record?

[0:05:59]

DR: Yes. Thank you so much for having me, Farnoosh. We get to talk every now and then on the mic, but I just always liked spending time with you. I had the privilege, for folks that may not know, to assist you for a period when I was out of J school, and to also see you work on your books. That was a part of what really encouraged me to pursue book writing as a part of my career. I got to be on record saying thank you for allowing me to witness that.

[0:06:35]

FT: Well, thank you, Donovan. You were instrumental, and like I say, it was an alignment of stars. I mean, I was not an accident, I think that we met, and that we collaborated, and I don't – I think you're more than just an assistant, you were a collaborator. I so enjoyed mentoring you, and watching you. Anyway, what a joy. I mean, this book, I said to myself, "I hope he's proud of himself." You should be.

[0:07:04]

DR: Yes, I know. I'm super proud because it's the book that I set out to write. I entered journalism wanting to write about black life, and also about the parts of black life that can be not so enjoyable or like glamorous. That includes the criminal legal system, in the ways that black folks get swept up in it. In my experience, writing many of those stories, people would talk about the crack era, but they never talked about it in the same ways or using the same terms. I realized that there was – that like people's memories were inconsistent around what happened.

I set out to find a book that would explain it to me just as a reporter, and I realized that that book doesn't exist. Something that I learned from you on the business side is that, that means that there's probably a market for it, right? People have those questions, and they're talking about it for sure, but the book doesn't exist then. That's the book that you have to write. So that's what I did.

[0:08:14]

FT: And you did it. And more than that, too, it's that, it starts with curiosity. You come to this realization that a lot of people have the same questions, but it's the answers that will make the impact. It's the answers to these questions that might spark change. Why is *when crack was King* so important to read today, in terms of informing us to hopefully create that impact, and change so it's so necessary in our plight for social justice, equity? Which you've been on the show many times, we've talked about these things. Tell us about what you hope will come out of this book.

[0:08:58]

DR: Yes. Well, you know, we didn't learn the lessons of the crack era that crack epidemic is something that happened in our country, and it really impacted cities and communities of color in particular. Once it was over, we just moved on. It's because we didn't learn the lessons, and improve our system, that we're still vulnerable to drug epidemics like the opioid epidemic. And why not only are we vulnerable, but we don't have solutions in place to actually help people once they're caught up in whatever their drug of choice is. For me, I really hope that by telling the stories that that we can learn from them. So it was important to not just get the sort of meta history, the rise and fall of crack, but to also tell the stories of individuals impacted. That way, we could look to the ways that they dug themselves out of the epidemic and came out on the other end as survivors.

[0:09:59]

FT: And you do this through four main characters in your book. You yourself also a main character, of course, the writer is always the main character. But in the introduction, you talked about when you were a child, and sort of when you were first introduced to this epidemic, how it was articulated, how it was talked about was very impactful. Tell us about your choice to tell this through the lens of these four individuals. I just think it was so smart. I mean, first of all, Hollywood, I know we're doing a strike right now, but I anticipate a bidding war for the rights to this book. Because it has clear adaptation potential, and cinematic. I mean, you've already

developed the characters, and they are really people, so there's no imagination there. But tell us why these four particular people were crucial to this 360 that you wanted to provide on looking at the crack epidemic?

[0:10:54]

DR: Yes. One of the things that journalism does not do well is sort of fleshing out the stories of vulnerable people. That too often, we kind of fill those gaps with stereotypes, and then these people that are complex just become these flat caricatures. I realized that the only way to really do the history justice was to add memory to it, that there was the history that was there from official documents and news reports. What that was always missing was this human element of how people were impacted. That's something that you can only really do by harnessing people's memories as sometimes inconsistent and faulty as they can be. That you have to start kind of throwing them in the pot to arrive at a larger truth. That was why I didn't go with just one character, but four characters that offered different perspectives from different cities. That way, readers would have not just that, again, that larger rise and fall, but these narratives that they could compare and contrast.

[0:12:10]

FT: What were some of the patterns? I mean, clearly, differences across four different people of different cities, different life experiences. But were there patterns that you picked up on that then shaped and informed me be like, this is the narrative, this is the narrative about the crack epidemic that we don't hear enough about?

[0:12:29]

DR: Yes, that's a great question. The first thing that I found in my research was that, first, I have to identify which cities were the hardest hit. Because I was doing like – the plan at first was just to focus on one city. I was going to do Washington, DC, and I was interviewing people in DC, and I realized, "Oh, their story is very different from those people in New York, or people in Los Angeles." When I looked at the hardest hit cities, and I saw to the one that they had been these great migration cities, that black folks sort of left the South for in search of like industrial jobs,

and sort of like a working-class life. And that those cities in the seventies, you saw deindustrialization, and what had been working class neighborhoods, people owned houses, and had families, became ghettos because of the concentrated poverty.

Also that, during the sixties and seventies, they were riots cities, like almost to the one. They have been the sites of major riots, usually about policing or housing conditions. What that did was it helped me connect the crack epidemic to these larger forces, and then to also be able to identify disaffection. It's a term that we use today when we talk about people in the Midwest, and the Rust Belt, and the South that are using opioids, that people can become so hopeless, that they want to just check out. But it's not a term that we really apply to folks during the crack epidemic. I was able to identify that this community of people, that they were disaffected, and that's why they wanted to check out with a substance that made them feel good, cocaine.

[0:14:20]

FT: Yes. The role of race in the portrayal of the crack epidemic, and I should say, racism in the crack epidemic. The way that it was communicated and branded in the fear that was sort of surrounded this. When we were talking a long back before – the before times about the genesis of this book, and sort of what you are, the things you weren't picking up on, very early stages. Was just that, law enforcement was leveraging this epidemic to use it as almost like a weapon against black Americans, when in reality, most drug users in this country are white Americans. I thought, "Oh my gosh, that is so true."

Can you talk a little bit more? Because I think that's so important. I mean, when you brought up meth, I thought, the meth epidemic, again, largely a white American crisis. There's so much more empathy around this, I think in our culture about trying to find solutions, and mental health, and getting to the root of it, and why do people do this. It's not that they're just druggies. It's that they just like – they're led to this because – you touched on this. That was not was the narrative, of course, during the crack epidemic. What else did you discover about the role of racism in the portrayal of the crack epidemic?

[0:15:40]

DR: Yes. It's so sad that that we failed to learn the lessons of the crack epidemic, because it was something that we associated with black and Latino people in big cities. That because those were the folks that became the face of crack, the nation kind of just decided, "Oh. Well, that happened to those people, because they're bad people. So we can move on without ever investigating it." What that means is that, that we weren't curious about it, right? I mean, even the fact that I am writing this authoritative history, all these years later and that no one else did it, is because we weren't curious enough about why it happened. That people had just decided, "Oh, that happened to them for the obvious reasons."

The way that it also plays out on a policy level is that we get policies that are race neutral on their face, that they're just about crime, that they're just about drugs, but that those policies are applied unequally. Or sometimes you get racist laws, so you'll get something like – I mean, I would argue a racist law, the 100 to one disparity in sentencing between crack and powder cocaine. Where basically, you would get 100 times, or it took 100 times the amount of powder cocaine to get the same sentence as crack cocaine. Let's say 500 grams of powder cocaine versus – I'm sorry, 100 grams of powder cocaine, versus one gram of crack cocaine. The sentence was five years for each.

Well, the impact of that is that you're going to police people unequally, you're going to arrest black folks, especially for possession of crack. Then those folks not only go to prison, but they stay in prison. That's how we get a situation like mass incarceration. Race is this confusing, distracting factor in American life. That is something that makes otherwise curious, and intelligent people put aside their ability to think, and to embrace fear, and to embrace change. Fear and shame are – just wherever the bad thing happens.

[0:18:14]

FT: It's just like first cousins. Yes, I think one of the references in your introduction is about Whitney Houston, and she was abusing crack cocaine, she denied it. Because part of it was that there was a stigma about like, whoever uses this is poor. It's a poor person's drug. She, of course, didn't want that branding. What are some of the other myths around this drug use, this particular drug use that you found to be pervasive? Again, maybe even intentional branding,

because – or it was false associations that we had. It's just so sad the whole thing, but what else did you discover in that realm?

[0:18:59]

DR: Well, on a topic of Whitney Houston, who I absolutely love, that she did an interview with Oprah when she was in a period of recovery, where she talked about how she smoked base, she called it, with marijuana. Base was one of their original names for crack cocaine. But it was very clear in that interview that I don't even think she knew that she was smoking crack. It's funny how somebody could become vulnerable to crack addiction, through that kind of stigma being associated with crack. Somebody says, "Oh, this isn't crack, this is base." So now you feel free to use it and you ultimately become addicted.

[0:19:43]

FT: Wow.

[0:19:44]

DR: But I'll say in terms of the things that we misunderstand about the myths. First, there was this idea that crack was a super drug, which it was not. The crack is the same substance as powder cocaine. It just simply is consumed differently. Because it was consumed differently, it is metabolized in the body differently. Anything that you smoke goes directly to your brain, and that means that you get immediately high, but that high is short lived. So therefore, it's something that people binge. I would compare for any of our listeners that have used marijuana. It's like when you have an edible, and you think, "Oh, that edible didn't do a thing." Then an hour later, you're high out of your mind for the next 24 hours versus smoking a joint.

[0:20:35]

FT: We are not speaking from experience listeners. That's what we've read in the newspapers.

[0:20:39]

DR: No. I barely drink coffee. Yes, that that is similar. That was a myth. Out of that myth came this idea that like crack addicts were then these like zombies, that there are people that became immediately addicted, and that were a different level of active.

[0:21:01]

FT: And thus, gave police force the authority, and permission, and support to be aggressive and violent against a very specific group of people for their forcefulness to be justified. And yet – obviously that was – I mean, we've done so many pieces on race on this show. And every time, if there's ever a piece of you that wonders, "Oh, maybe it was just all coincidence, or it was just an accidental thing, or they didn't intend." This was by design. This was by design. This was intentional. This was an opportunity they couldn't afford to neglect. They thought, "Oh, we've got something here." This is a pattern in history. The crack epidemic is an example of that. But I saw – is its *13th, The 13th*?

[0:21:52]

DR: Yes, exactly.

[0:21:53]

FT: And the history of police violence, and the continued racism. Like we may have, "freed the slaves." And yet, of course, no. What other moments in our history do you see this being in parallel to, in terms of, here's a cultural phenomenon. This is a drug epidemic in this case, that was used against a group of people. In this case, black Americans, African Americans, but there are other examples of this, of these playing out on other cultures, other races throughout the world, in our country. But in your research, did you find parallels, which would then corroborate even your thesis? This is not a new thing. This is what people do. This is what people in authority positions do to sort of keep their authority.

[0:22:40]

DR: Well, you know, drugs are so interesting in American history, because we've had really drug scares, and drug hysteria, almost as long as we've been a country. There was –

[0:22:56]

FT: A dare program, yes.

[0:22:57]

DR: Oh, my goodness. But before that, you think about something like Reefer Madness, and the Association of Mexican Americans with marijuana, and the policies throughout the Southwest that came out of this idea that, Mexican men hopped up on weed were dangerous. We are a country that prohibited alcohol for a period, which we often forget about thar. That like our country was so on fire about alcohol intoxication, that we completely prohibited it. Still, there are lots of places in the Midwest and in the South where you can buy alcohol on a Sunday. But that's the country that we live in.

With cocaine, specifically, there was a cocaine craze and hysteria around it in the early 1900s, where organizations like the New York Times published articles about Negro cocaine theme, and this idea that black men in particular became impervious to bullets when intoxicated with cocaine. Doctors wrote that in the New York Times. In drugs, I want to say are so interesting, because they are a fact of life, that we are these biological machines that operate on substances. Whether your substance of choice is sugar, or caffeine, or salt, or fat, that it's like how we - how we energize and just move our bodies.

Drugs are a fact of life – substances, I should say, are a fact of life. There are things that you can – and by you, I mean politicians can pick and choose what to criminalize as a political tool, as a way of targeting people when Richard Nixon started the war on drugs in earnest, in the seventies. It was because he wanted to target the anti-war left, and the Black Panther Party. Hippies and Black Panthers were associated with drugs. From the War on Drugs very beginning, it was a political tool. There's one last thing that I want to say on the topic, which is, the way that we have as a nation executed the war on drugs, has almost always been about drug possession, and hardly ever about drug trafficking into the United States.

[0:25:37]

FT: Right. How does it even get here? That was my other question to you way back earlier in the interview. I was like, someone, some group, I'm not going to name names, but they were incentivized to keep this epidemic going. Lot of problems in our country are homegrown, and there's movements to keep the problems persisting, because people are profiting. I don't know enough to know who the who's who are, but you've done the research, and you might have some theories, but tell us about that.

[0:26:05]

DR: Yes. I go all the way back in the book to like the history of cocaine. That cocaine is a substance starts from coca leaves in the Andes, in South and Central America, and people chewing on coca leaves as a way of having energy to climb mountains and to do work. Which sounds familiar as we drink our coffee, that people consume a substance to become more productive. But that substance has high potential for addiction, and abuse. Once it became more popular around the world, that there was an entire industry in South and Central America that grew out of it. So powder cocaine has been a popular substance for over a century now. In the 80s, there were groups in Central America that the US government wanted to support in terms of their political activities. But we did not have approval from Congress to do so, to disrupt foreign governments. It's well documented. I'm not breaking news by saying this, but the US government turned a blind eye, while those groups, namely the Contras in Nicaragua, traffic tons of cocaine into the United States. It is from that lot of cocaine in the seventies and eighties that the crack epidemic was born.

[0:27:38]

FT: Wow. My gosh. We're not conspiracy theorists, y'all. This is, like Donovan said, well, documented. The truth is hard. It's really, really hard to face. Thank you for doing the hard work of bringing the truth to the forefront. What are some of the reactions you're getting from your book? I mean, outside, and let's just say the New York Times, and NPR, and LA Weekly. This book is being celebrated across all the literati. But from everyday folks, I'm sure you're getting a

lot of thank yous, because it was a very traumatic chapter in our history, a lot of lives lost, a lot of lives still affected. I'm sure, to have this now on the record, it feels good. It's like someone's finally paying attention, and listening, and saying, I see you. I know what really happened, and I'm going to tell everybody.

[0:28:30]

DR: Yes. The thank yous are especially nice. People from all walks of life, who send me private DMS, or emails saying, "Hey, this happened to me too." Or I also grew up in this way, or I'm in recovery, and thank you for seeing me, and adding my story to the history. That feels incredible because part of what I wanted to do for the book was reduce or eliminate the stigma around this conversation as much as I could. We kind of talked about it earlier, but I grew up very poor in Columbus, Ohio, raised by a single mother, with two sisters, in a neighborhood that was hard hit by crack. My mom, thank God for her, protected us really, really well, and sheltered us from things happening literally down the street.

But I grew up kind of ashamed of the fact that that's the soil that I was planting in. Because a part of the way that we talked about neighborhoods like mine was that they were irredeemable, and illegitimate in many ways. So it made it difficult to go into the world of journalism, which is very elite, and to say, I too have something to say, when I come from a neighborhood and a community that people don't see any value in. That people would rather turn completely away from.

I know how hard it was for me to tell my own story of having my very first bike stolen by a drug addict, in the way that that shapes you as a child. But I felt like it was so necessary to tell that story so other people could then tell their stories.

[0:30:38]

FT: Right. It's saying, even though you weren't directly impacted by this, you are on the periphery of it, you are indirectly impacted by it. The impact being that you grew up, maybe feeling less than, feeling like your voice wasn't as meaningful as important. Then, where does

that leave the others who were at the center of this epidemic? It just really demonstrates like the scale of this problem, and that history continues to play out in modern times.

[0:31:09]

DR: Yes, absolutely. I think that, we all were impacted in ways that we might not even completely understand. Like just the fear of crime that exist, I think within our society, we are – we live in a very fearful society, that we live with that fear. That fear was really stoked during the eighties and the nineties. That if you were a kid that sat through the very special episodes of your favorite sitcom, which were –

[0:31:45]

FT: Where were the shows, like *Different Strokes*.

[0:31:48]

DR: *Saved by the Bell.*

[0:31:49]

FT: *Saved by the Bell*.

[0:31:51]

DR: *The First Prince of Bel-Air* had an anti-drug episode.

[0:31:53]

FT: Yes, *The Cosby Show*. Yes, yes, yes.

[0:31:55]

DR: Yes, that there was all the episode about drugs, or about guns, and violence.

[0:32:00]

FT: That was one of my other questions for you is that, we've talked about the involvement of law enforcement, and even media, and the medical industry in sort of fueling that fear. But thank you for also bringing up Friday's lineup of television that we all watched, and the after-school specials. Everyone had a hand in this to some extent, whether they were very intentional about it, or just playing that same tune, because that's what was popular, and that was what everybody was buying into this. Let's just keep it going. There was profit to be made when these stories were sensationalized. *Fear Sells*, I mean I read about it in a healthy state of panic. It's like, we are so familiar with fear, not just because it is a natural resource in our bodies, but because the world plays on that, the 24/7 news cycle, marketing. It's like this always the sense of urgency, and crime, and everything is high stakes, and life threatening, and doesn't help.

[0:33:07]

DR: I mean, think about this, like the people that gave us most of our drug messaging in the eighties and nineties was the National Institute for Drug Free America. This was literally a group of marketers, that were funded by the Reagan administration, to create all of those incredibly memorable ads. Like this is your brain on drugs.

[0:33:30]

FT: This is your brain on drugs. Frightening to ourselves.

[0:33:34]

DR Frightening, right. But like, these weren't scientists, these were journalists, these weren't people that were accountable in those kinds of ways to give accurate messaging. They were trying to evoke a feeling, which is what marketing does. That's who we put the messaging around drug abuse, drug dealing, all of that. We'd like put it in their hands in a really funny way

too. I also came across all this great documentation about the Reagans who were entertainers before they were politicians, both Nancy and Ronald Reagan.

[0:34:10]

FT: They know drama.

[0:34:11]

DR: They know drama, and that they literally held meetings with the heads of networks saying, how can we work anti-drug messaging into the show? This is why Nancy Reagan is on in episode of *Different Strokes*. This is why Jessie Spano says, "I'm so excited. I'm so excited. I'm so scared." Because it was literally coordinated messaging about drugs, which on one hand, I think it did terrify a generation of young people, and probably had some impact on them.

[0:34:48]

FT: That's why I didn't want to be Jessie Spano. Kids, when I'm in high school, were taking all sorts of things to help them stay up at night to do their homework, caffeine pills. I was like, "No, that is not how I'm leaving the earth. Like I'm not." Maybe there would be a small percentage chance of that happening, but I was like, that is in my control to choose to take this or not. I saw what happened on Saved by the Bell, I'm not doing it.

[0:35:11]

DR: Same. Terrified of drugs. I think that again, it's probably –

[0:35:14]

FT: People **[inaudible 0:35:15]** in that way.

[0:35:16]

DR: Yes, absolutely.

[0:35:18]

FT: But tell us the other side of it.

[0:35:21]

DR: It's like, you get that effect, but at what cost, which is to create misinformation about drugs, that then adds to additional harm, shame, and stigma. For someone like me growing up in a neighborhood that was hard hit, I didn't want to become an addict, I didn't want to be a dealer. I was afraid of the addicts and the dealers around me. But also, I had to deal with a level of policing in my neighborhood, as a response. I was, from every turn harassed by the police, afraid of the violence in my community. There was just no letting up, and all of that was a byproduct of that fear and hysteria.

[0:36:10]

FT: This is your brain on drugs. Any questions? If you have questions, turn to Donovan Ramsey. He's got answers, the real answers. The book is called *When Crack Was King: A People's History of a Misunderstood Era*. Bryan Stevenson, author of *Just Mercy,* an incredible book. He says, the book is insightful, deeply moving. Donovan Ramsey, thank you so much. What's next?

[0:36:35]

DR: Podcasting, Farnoosh.

[0:36:37]

FR: You're going to start a podcast.

[0:36:38]

DR: I'm going to start a podcast. It's very early on, but I realized during writing this book that I really love interviewing, that I almost write so I can interview. In thinking about how I could move my work forward, I felt like I wanted to incorporate more interviewing. I really feel like there's such a need for experimentation with the black voice, and black vocal expression. There's such an audience again to build for black listeners in the podcasting space.

[0:37:12]

FT: Oh, yes.

[0:37:12]

DR: That's what I want to do.

[0:37:13]

FT: Yes, and please do that. I will help you. The word I was searching for that was on the pages of your book, deeply feeling. Authoritative –

[0:37:23]

DR: That was so nice of them.

[0:37:25]

FT: Yes, authoritative, and deeply feeling. This is from the Oneworld team, your publishers who I think published, President Obama's book,

[0:37:33]

DR: You know what, not Obama, that is Crown.

[0:37:36]

FT: Okay.

[0:37:37]

DR: I will have you know that Crown did make me an offer, Farnoosh.

[0:37:39]

FT: He wanted your book, right. That's where I got confused.

[0:37:44]

DR: And I said, "No, I want to go with Oneworld because they publish Bryan Stevenson, they publish Ta-Nehisi Coates, they publish Nikole Hannah-Jones, and I really knew that they would handle the book well. So I went against my better Farnoosh advice, and I left a little bit of money on the table. But I hope that will pick it up on the backend.

[0:38:05]

FT: No. No. I mean, you do that sometimes because you want the right fit. It's a long journey. Book writing is not a quick race. It is a long, steady marathon and you have won this marathon. Donovan Ramsey, thank you so much. I'll put the link in our show notes. I just I am so in awe of you. Congratulations. What else can I say? I mean, maybe someday, thank you. Maybe there's like a world where we can hug actually, virtually. I can transcend the screen and give you a hug. I know that that is what I really want to do. In absence of that, I'm just going to say, I heart you.

[0:38:40]

DR: Thank you so much, Farnoosh. Wait a minute, have you turned to the acknowledgments of a book yet?

[0:38:44]

FT: Yes, of course. I know **[inaudible 0:38:46]** like, look, everybody. Well, you pointed that out for me. My tendency is to first go to the acknow – I just didn't. Honestly, it didn't even cross my mind that you would thank me.

[0:38:59]

DR: Are you kidding me?

[0:39:00]

FT: But I mean, it makes sense. I appreciate it. Of course, I mean, to think that I had any hand in this masterpiece being completed. Well, I'm going to put that in my LinkedIn profile.

[0:39:16]

DR: Perfect.

[0:39:16]

FT: Acknowledged in *When Crack Was King*, starting in 2023 till present.

[0:39:22]

DR: Yes. Absolutely.

[0:39:26]

FT: That's **[inaudible 0:39:27]** title. That's going to be the **[inaudible 0:39:29]** when I go on like Good Morning America. Joining us now, host of So Money, and credited in the acknowledgments of *When Crack Was King,* Farnoosh Torabi.

[0:39:38]

DR: I can't wait.

[0:39:41]

FT: Okay. Donovan, be well, my friend.

[0:39:44]

DR: All right, you too. We'll talk soon.

[END OF INTERVIEW]

[0:39:49]

FT: Thanks so much to Donovan for joining us. I have the link to his book in our show notes and I will be giving away a copy of this book. If you want it, let me know. Leave a review in our Apple podcast review section, and I might pick you next Friday on Ask Farnoosh. Hope you have a great rest of your Monday, and I'll see you back here soon. I hope your day is So Money.

[END]