Essay

The Contested Domain of Pharmaceutical Knowledge and State Authority - An Introduction to Pharmutopia: How Drug Regulation Fails Patients and What We Can Do About It

Richard Parrish II *

Posted Date: 2 April 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202604.0102.v1

Keywords: autonomy; government regulation; pharmaceutical preparations; personalized medicine; professional practice; surveillance

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0102.v1

Essay

The Contested Domain of Pharmaceutical Knowledge and State Authority—An Introduction to Pharmutopia: How Drug Regulation Fails Patients and What We Can Do About It

Richard Henry Parrish II

Alice L. Walton School of Medicine; richard.parrish@alwmed.org; Tel.: +1 (706) 321-7218

Abstract

This introduction to *Pharmutopia: How Drug Regulation Fails Patients and What We Can Do About It* explores the complex interplay between pharmaceutical knowledge, government regulation, and individual autonomy in the United States. The text argues that Americans' unprecedented consumption of pharmaceuticals is the product of a century-long alliance between medical professionals seeking to eliminate competition and a federal government expanding its regulatory domain. This alliance forged the concepts of "pharmaceutical fact"—the regulatory structures defining drug legitimacy—and "pharmaceuticalization," the process by which increasing aspects of human life are framed as pharmaceutical problems. These frameworks, the author contends, are not neutral but constitute a sociopolitical system that determines who has authority over medical decisions and the limits of personal autonomy. Drawing on the work of Thomas Szasz, the critique highlights the evolution of the "Therapeutic State," where state power and medical authority become inseparably linked, resulting in surveillance, behavioral control, and exclusion from necessary medicines for those outside the system. The book traces how professional organizations, in partnership with federal agencies, used regulation to enforce their definitions of scientific fact, transforming both the nature of medicines and the roles of those who dispense them. Through the lens of Nico Stehr's "knowledge capitalism," the text demonstrates that pharmaceutical knowledge has been turned into monopoly property, enforced through legal and regulatory mechanisms like the FDA and international agreements such as TRIPS. This transformation, the author asserts, underlies the economic and social power of the pharmaceutical industry, shaping access to medicines and the governance of individual bodies. The introduction frames the book's central inquiry: whether the current system serves patients or entrenches a regime of knowledge monopolism and state authority.

Keywords: autonomy; government regulation; pharmaceutical preparations; personalized medicine; professional practice; surveillance

1. Introduction

Americans consume more drugs today than at any point in human history. Understanding how that happened — and whether it is serving us well — is this book's central project.

The short answer is that we got here through a century-long alliance between medical professionals who wanted to eliminate competitors and a federal government that needed institutional partners to enforce its expanding authority. Out of that alliance came what I have called pharmaceutical fact (the regulatory structure) and pharmaceuticalization (the ongoing process by which more and more of human life gets defined as a pharmaceutical problem). These are not neutral scientific concepts. They are a sociopolitical framework that shapes power hierarchies, controls who has authority over your body, and sets the outer limits of your autonomy [1,2].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0102.v1

On their face, neither concept is sinister. Of course, pharmaceutical products should meet quality standards. Of course, some drugs warrant careful handling. The problem is what happens when the regulatory apparatus built around these legitimate concerns grows into something far larger, into what Thomas Szasz called the "Therapeutic State." In Szasz's analysis, the Therapeutic State is a governance paradigm in which medical authority and state coercive power become inseparable, where "coercion as treatment" is not an abuse of the system but the system working as designed [3]. Contemporary scholars continue to find Szasz's critique essential: Over more than fifty years, he maintained "a consistent campaign against the 'Therapeutic State,' challenging the paternalism of coercive psychiatry and defending liberty and autonomy" [4]. Szasz wrote before prescription drug monitoring programs could track every controlled substance you fill, before genomic sequencing could predict your disease risks before symptoms appear, before nanosensors were being developed to monitor your body from the inside. He would have recognized all of it.

The result, empirical research confirms, is "an ever-evolving apparatus of individual and collective oppression" [5]. That is a strong phrase, and I use it deliberately. The therapeutic state does not merely regulate — it governs, meaning it shapes behavior through surveillance, classification, and the threat of exclusion from the benefits that only approved pharmaceutical products and authorized prescribers can provide.

2. How Government Became the Arbiter of Pharmaceutical Fact

Pharmutopia builds on my earlier work Defining Drugs [1], which traced how the American state came to occupy its current role as the ultimate judge of what drugs are, what they do, and who may access them. The state did not seize this role because regulators possessed superior pharmaceutical knowledge. They took it because professional organizations and corporate interests needed an enforcement arm they could not themselves possess under the Constitution [1,6,7].

The mechanism was straightforward. Medical and pharmaceutical leaders formed strategic alliances with federal agencies to give legal teeth to their preferred definitions of scientific fact [8,9]. The American Medical Association established its own "Bureau of Investigation" to identify practitioners it deemed "quacks," then mobilized state power against them. This was professional guild enforcement dressed up as public safety, a pattern that, as a 2025 AMA report tracking more than 150 defeated "scope-creep bills" makes clear, continues today [10,11]. The resulting "medico-legal alliance" fundamentally changed the relationship between citizens and medicines [12-15]. It transformed medicines from things you could choose into things that must be dispensed and transformed the people who dispense them from service providers into licensed gatekeepers.

The fullest sociological account of what this alliance accomplished at a civilizational scale comes from Nico Stehr, whose Knowledge Capitalism (2022) builds on his earlier Knowledge Societies (1994) to argue that the defining feature of contemporary societies is not just the importance of knowledge in the economy but the systematic conversion of knowledge into legally enforced, commercially exploitable property [16,17]. Knowledge, Stehr points out, is in principle non-rival — my using it does not diminish yours — and reproducible at near-zero marginal cost. It becomes a proprietary commodity only through law. The TRIPS agreement, negotiated between 1986 and 1994, was the pivotal moment when this conversion was formalized globally, creating what Stehr calls "knowledge capitalism": A regime in which controlling knowledge flows, rather than owning factories or land, is the primary mechanism of economic power [16]. (I should note that Stehr actually begins with the phrase "knowledge monopoly capitalism" and then drops "monopoly" halfway through the book as "unwieldy" — a concession that matters, because monopolism, not capitalism, is the accurate name for what is happening.)

No industry illustrates Stehr's thesis more starkly than pharmaceuticals. The active ingredients in most drugs could be produced for fractions of a dollar per dose. They are sold for hundreds or thousands of dollars because knowledge about their synthesis, mechanism, and clinical application has been constituted as government-enforced monopoly property. In this light, the FDA is not simply a public health agency. It is, as Stehr's framework reveals, the primary domestic enforcement

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0102.v1

mechanism of pharmaceutical knowledge monopolism. It is the institution through which knowledge about what substances may be manufactured, marketed, and consumed is converted into a legally encoded entitlement that the state enforces on behalf of those who have captured the encoding process [16].

The medico-legal alliance, then, was not merely a regulatory development or a professional boundary dispute. It was the founding moment of pharmaceutical knowledge monopolism in the United States — the establishment of institutional architecture for determining whose pharmaceutical knowledge claims carry legal force and whose do not. That process has since become more elaborate, more globally harmonized through TRIPS, and more deeply embedded in the governance of individual bodies and choices, as the chapters that follow document.

Stehr's own prescriptions, it should be said, are social-democratic in character: Democratic governance of knowledge as a commons, regulatory constraints on the digital monopolies that dominate contemporary knowledge flows. His structural diagnosis carries real authority precisely because it comes from within the mainstream academic tradition, not from any ideological margin. But this book departs from his prescriptions, and for a specific reason. Public choice theory, the economic framework, developed most rigorously by Buchanan and Tullock [18] in The Calculus of Consent, that analyzes how self-interest shapes government behavior, shows that political and regulatory actors are responsive to concentrated organized interests, not to the public good in the abstract. Applied to Stehr's diagnosis, this yields a troubling conclusion: The institutional actors who originally captured the pharmaceutical regulatory apparatus are precisely those best positioned to capture any successor regime designed to govern knowledge in the public interest. Democratic re-regulation does not dissolve the capture dynamic. It relocates it. Stehr correctly identifies the disease; public choice theory gives us grounds to doubt that his preferred medicine will cure it.

The dangerous-drug metaphor, meanwhile, did the rhetorical work of justifying all of this expansion. Through interlocking networks — the United States Pharmacopoeia, the AMA's Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry (now the USAN Council), the FDA, and eventually the DEA — professional leaders established police-enforced pharmaceutical standards that continue to shape every aspect of pharmaceutical regulation. Recent empirical research confirms that this regulatory expansion has produced significant unintended consequences for innovation, access, and individual autonomy [19]. Those consequences extend far beyond the pharmaceutical domain into how individuals understand their relationship to their own bodies.

3. Pharmutopia: Two Possible Futures

The title of this book names both a warning and a hope. Pharmdystopia is where the current trajectory leads: a system in which personalized medicine, rather than expanding individual freedom, becomes the instrument of its most granular suppression. In this future, citizens are sorted into two categories — "incompetent self-medicators" requiring comprehensive state management and "certified self-medicators" granted conditional autonomy under surveillance. Genomic profiling assigns people to risk categories. Bureaucratic algorithms determine their pharmaceutical regimens. Compliance is monitored continuously. The extraordinary promise of precision medicine — treatments tailored to individual biology — is perverted into a system that uses genetic uniqueness as a basis for regulatory classification rather than personal empowerment.

Pharmutopia, the alternative this book argues for, is not a utopia in the sense of a problem-free world. It is a society in which individuals are genuinely free to make their own health decisions, where innovation flourishes because regulatory barriers do not choke it at birth, where safety is achieved through market mechanisms — tort liability, reputation, voluntary certification, insurance — rather than through government premarket prohibition, and where human potential can be expanded through freely chosen enhancement technologies [20,21]. In this world, people have comprehensive information about their health including genetic profiles, disease risks, and likely treatment responses. Pharmacogenomics guides medication selection for everyone, not just those whose physicians order the right tests. Gene therapies correct underlying genetic defects rather than

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0102.v1

managing symptoms for life. Enhancement is available to anyone who wants it, not rationed by regulatory gatekeeping. All of this occurs within a framework of genuine individual choice, not bureaucratic mandate [22].

The choice between these two futures is, at bottom, the choice between freedom and control, between treating adults as autonomous agents and treating them as subjects who require management. That choice is what this book is about.

4. What This Book Examines

Nine chapters examine the interlocking dimensions of the current pharmaceutical governance system, each showing how a different mechanism — constitutional structure, international harmonization, classification schemes, structural access barriers, pricing, surveillance, genomics, nanotechnology, and market alternatives — contributes to the larger pattern. Together they make the case that the system's failures are not incidental but structural, and that structural problems require structural remedies.

Chapter 1: Structural and Institutional Barriers to Pharmaceutical Access examines the concrete, lived reality of access failures: Pharmacy deserts in poor urban and rural communities, geographic maldistribution of prescribers, administrative burdens like prior authorization and formulary restrictions, insurance gaps, and the racial disparities that run through all of the above. These barriers compound each other, and many of them are direct products of government policy rather than market failures.

Chapter 2: Pharmaceutical Pricing Mechanisms, Equity, and Innovation takes on the price problem directly. Patent protection and regulatory exclusivity create temporary monopolies enabling prices far above competitive levels. PBM rebate arrangements add another layer of complexity that often does not serve patients. The chapter surveys the contested evidence on whether price controls harm innovation and reviews alternative financing mechanisms — government R&D, prize systems, advance market commitments — that might decouple pricing from innovation incentives.

Chapter 3: Pharmaceutical Classification Schemes and Access Control traces the prescription requirement from the Durham-Humphrey Amendment onward, arguing it serves professional guild interests as much as patient safety. The Controlled Substances Act scheduling system is analyzed as ideologically rather than scientifically driven — the cannabis/Schedule I contradiction and stark racial disparities in enforcement make this hard to miss. Brand-name/generic distinctions, orphan drug designations, and biosimilar classifications are examined as layered monopoly-building mechanisms.

Chapter 4: Pharmaceutical Surveillance Infrastructures and Privacy documents how prescription drug monitoring programs function as near-real-time government surveillance of controlled substance use, with law enforcement access in most states requiring no warrant. FDA pharmacovigilance systems, electronic health records, and all-payer claims databases form an interconnected surveillance infrastructure. PDMP monitoring, empirical evidence shows, disproportionately harms chronic pain patients, substance use disorder patients, racial minorities, and transgender individuals — in some studies it is associated with increased overdose deaths in Black and Hispanic populations.

Chapter 5: The Relentless Expansion of Federal Dominion Over Pharmaceutical Markets makes the constitutional case. The original Commerce Clause was designed narrowly to facilitate interstate trade, not to authorize comprehensive pharmaceutical prohibition. Post–New Deal jurisprudence (Wickard v. Filburn) fundamentally distorted those limits. The chapter traces how each legislative expansion — the 1906 Pure Food and Drugs Act, the 1938 and 1962 Amendments — was crisis-driven, and how the accumulated result transformed competent adults into wards of a paternalistic regulatory state without any constitutional amendment authorizing it.

Chapter 6: International Pharmaceutical Standards and the Erosion of National Sovereignty examines how ICH technical guidelines, WHO standard-setting, and TRIPS create a transnational governance system that operates largely outside democratic accountability. TRIPS is analyzed as the product of pharmaceutical industry lobbying that imposed uniform patent protection globally —

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0102.v1

with documented consequences including millions of preventable AIDS deaths before affordable generics became available. The chapter proposes voluntary mutual recognition, unilateral pharmaceutical free trade, and competitive private certification as alternatives to coercive harmonization.

Chapter 7: Genomic Medicine — Regulation and Autonomy establishes what makes genetic information genuinely different from other medical data: It is predictive (revealing future disease risks), immutable, shared among biological relatives, and capable of revealing sensitive inferences far beyond health. The chapter surveys the expanding genomic surveillance ecosystem, reviews the inadequacy of GINA and HIPAA protections, and examines how pharmacogenomic integration with PDMPs creates compounded privacy risks that neither framework was designed to address.

Chapter 8: Governing Emerging Nanotechnologies and the Future of Bodily Autonomy examines pharmaceutical governance at its furthest frontier: nanoparticle drug delivery, implantable diagnostics, and therapeutic nanodevices that can monitor your body's interior in real time and transmit what they find. Neural nanotechnology and brain-computer interfaces receive particular attention, with empirical research confirming that EEG/BCI data leaks identity and personal characteristics. The chapter argues for governance through voluntary adoption and market-based safety mechanisms, with absolute protection for bodily autonomy and cognitive liberty.

Chapter 9: Toward a Freer Market in Health brings the analysis together. It demonstrates the consistent pattern across every domain: government regulation delays innovation, increases costs, restricts access, and substitutes bureaucratic judgment for individual choice. It lays out the case for eliminating mandatory premarket approval in favor of voluntary market-based safety incentives and addresses the standard objections.

Epilogue: The Pharmutopian Manifesto calls for a decisive choice between the regulatory paradigm — with its documented morbidity, mortality, and stagnation — and health freedom. The author chooses freedom and invites readers to do the same, along with a phased strategy for building toward it within existing legal and regulatory structures.

5. A Liberty-Centered Alternative

Pharmaceutical policy in a constitutional republic should start from individual autonomy, not from the presumption of incompetence. The empirical case for this is not merely ideological: excessive regulatory interventions generate real harm through reduced innovation incentives, artificial scarcity, diminished patient agency, and elevated costs [23]. These harms fall most heavily on the vulnerable populations that regulation claims to protect.

The reforms this book proposes follow from this starting point:

- Regulatory neutrality toward medication producers, rather than systematically favoring established institutional interests
- Elimination of patent monopolies and definition of robust personal property rights in place of entitlement-based access frameworks
- Removal of the arbitrary barriers that prevent direct consumer-supplier relationships in pharmaceutical markets
- Substantial reduction in required outcome demonstrations for individual medication use decisions
- Explicit recognition of personal possession rights without mandatory third-party authorization
- Clear separation of individual treatment decisions from population-based metrics that may not reflect individual circumstances

Most fundamentally, I endorse and extend Szasz's proposal for a constitutional amendment guaranteeing the free exercise of the healing arts. Comparative constitutional research shows that explicit constitutional protections create enduring safeguards against government overreach in ways ordinary legislation cannot [24]. Legislation can be revised; constitutional protections establish

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0102.v1

structural foundations that transcend shifting political priorities. This is precisely what is needed to check the Therapeutic State's institutional momentum.

Here is where Stehr's framework and the public choice tradition converge on a common diagnosis while diverging on remedy. Stehr's documentation of knowledge monopolism — the systematic conversion of shared knowledge into privately enforced monopoly through state-backed legal mechanisms — provides powerful sociological corroboration for the public choice critique of pharmaceutical governance [25]. Both frameworks identify the same core pathology: Institutional capture of knowledge-encoding mechanisms by organized interests that benefit from the resulting artificial scarcity, regulatory barriers, and surveillance infrastructure. Where they diverge is instructive. Stehr looks toward reformed democratic institutions as the corrective. The public choice framework locates the corrective not in better-intentioned institutions but in structural constraints on institutional power: Constitutional limitations, dispersed decision authority, and market mechanisms that aggregate distributed knowledge without centralizing its governance.

The liberty-centered alternative advanced here is not a rejection of Stehr's analysis but its logical extension. If pharmaceutical knowledge monopolism is the product of legal encoding by captured institutions, then the remedy lies in constitutional limitations on that encoding capacity, not in transferring it to institutions equally susceptible to capture. Pharmutopia is not merely a deregulatory aspiration. It is a structural reconstitution, one that Stehr's own sociology helps theorize, even if his political prescriptions stop short of following his analysis to its most consistent conclusion.

6. Why This Cannot Wait

The costs of the current system are not abstract. Adverse drug reactions kill more than 100,000 Americans every year — one person every six minutes – now the third leading cause of death in the US [26]. This is a fatality rate that exceeds many diseases that generate intense public concern and substantial resource allocation. It receives, by comparison, very little sustained attention, which is itself diagnostic: The harms of drugs that received regulatory approval are visible, but the harms of drugs that were delayed or denied are not.

The dysfunction compounds. Medicare's prescription drug benefit effectively channels substantial taxpayer resources to pharmaceutical companies through a pipeline of direct-to-consumer advertising, physician prescribing, and public subsidy. The COX-2 inhibitor and SSRI scandals showed how this pipeline can promote widespread use of medications whose risk profiles were inadequately disclosed, with regulatory capture at the intersection of commercial incentives and inadequate transparency [27,28]. And as the genomic era advances, the questions become more urgent: What is actually driving America's perceived need for comprehensive pharmaceutical control? How will genomic medicine transform the nature and reach of that control? Can constitutional protections preserve individual sovereignty while allowing genuine therapeutic innovation to flourish?

Without comprehensive reform, the Pharmdystopia scenario is not speculative. It is the direction in which the current trajectory points: Personalized medicine becoming the instrument of increasingly granular control rather than individual empowerment, genetic uniqueness becoming the basis for regulatory classification rather than human flourishing.

I write as a pharmacy practitioner and educator, and I am aware that the argument this book makes is a challenging one for many colleagues in my profession. But I am also aware of what I have observed across decades of practice: A system that consistently prioritizes institutional interests over patient needs, that treats adults as incapable of making their own health decisions, and that measures success by compliance rather than by flourishing. This analysis aims not simply to criticize existing structures but to articulate a coherent alternative grounded in respect for individual autonomy, one that takes genuine public health challenges seriously rather than using them as justifications for control. As Conrad [29] has documented, the continuously expanding definition of "disease" carries profound implications for human autonomy in the genomic age. When state power directs genetic research priorities and therapeutic trajectories, it accelerates the medicalization of society and the

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0102.v1

pathologization of normal human variation for purposes of pharmaceutical intervention and management. This book proposes a different path.

Supplementary Materials: The following supporting information can be downloaded at the website of this paper posted on Preprints.org.

Author Contributions: For research articles with several authors, a short paragraph specifying their individual contributions must be provided. The following statements should be used "Conceptualization, X.X. and Y.Y.; methodology, X.X.; software, X.X.; validation, X.X., Y.Y. and Z.Z.; formal analysis, X.X.; investigation, X.X.; resources, X.X.; data curation, X.X.; writing—original draft preparation, X.X.; writing—review and editing, X.X.; visualization, X.X.; supervision, X.X.; project administration, X.X.; funding acquisition, Y.Y. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript." Please turn to the CRediT taxonomy for the term explanation. Authorship must be limited to those who have contributed substantially to the work reported.

Funding: This research received no external funding

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: The views expressed herein are those of the author and do not represent those of any institution or organization to which the author is associated.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

1. Parrish, R.H., II. Defining Drugs: How Government Became the Arbiter of Pharmaceutical Fact; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2017.
2. Benavides, F.G. Too big to lose weight: How pharmaceuticalization corrupts the right to health. Health Hum. Rights 2025, 27, 203–214.
3. Szasz, T.S. The therapeutic state: The tyranny of pharmacracy. Indep. Rev. 2001, 5, 485–504.
4. Buchanan-Barker, P.; Barker, P. The convenient myth of Thomas Szasz. J. Psychiatr. Ment. Health Nurs. 2009, 16, 87–95.
5. Imber, J.B. Therapeutic Culture: Triumph and Defeat; Transaction Publishers: New Brunswick, NJ, USA, 2004.
6. Bandiera, R. Neoliberalism, State-Corporate Power and Regulatory Failure: The Harms of Prescription and Non-Prescription Medicine Regulation in Australia; Routledge: London, UK, 2025.
7. Vertinsky, L. Pharmaceutical (re)capture. Yale J. Health Policy Law Ethics 2021, 20. Available online: https://yaleconnect.yale.edu/YJHPLE/pharmaceutical-(re)capture/ (accessed on 28 March 2026).
8. Borup, R.; Hoebert, J.; Janknegt, R.; Schellekens, H. Regulatory capture in pharmaceutical policy making: The case of national medicine agencies related to the EU falsified medicines directive. Pharm. Med. 2019, 33, 199–207. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40290-019-00277-0
9. Greene, J.A. Neoliberal technocracy: Explaining how and why the US Food and Drug Administration has championed pharmacogenomics. Soc. Sci. Med. 2015, 131, 255–262.
10. American Medical Association. More than 150 scope-creep bills defeated in 2025. Available online: https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/scope-practice/ (accessed on 28 March 2026).
11. Public Citizen. Ranking of the rate of state medical boards' serious disciplinary actions, 2021–2023. Available online: https://www.citizen.org/ (accessed on 28 March 2026).
12. Abraham, J. Pharmaceuticalization of society. Routledge: London, UK, 2025.
13. Abraham, J.; Lewis, G. Regulating Medicines in Europe: Competition, Expertise and Public Health; Routledge: London, UK, 2000.
14. Collin, J. On social plasticity: The transformative power of pharmaceuticals on health, nature and identity. Sociol. Health Illn. 2016, 38, 73–89.
15. Elbe, S.; Roemer-Mahler, A.; Long, C. Medical countermeasures for national security: A new government role in the pharmaceuticalization of society. Soc. Sci. Med. 2015, 131, 263–271.
16. Stehr, N. Knowledge Societies; Sage Publications: London, UK, 1994.
17. Stehr, N. Knowledge Capitalism; Routledge: London, UK, 2022.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0102.v1

18. Buchanan, J.M.; Tullock, G. The Calculus of Consent: Logical Foundations of Constitutional Democracy; University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor, MI, USA, 1962.
19. Carpenter, D.; Chattopadhyay, R.; Moffitt, S.; Nall, C. The complications of controlling agency time discretion: FDA review deadlines and postmarket drug safety. Am. J. Political Sci. 2021, 65, 848–867.
20. Friedman, M. Capitalism and Freedom; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA, 1962.
21. Rothbard, M.N. The Ethics of Liberty; The ethics of liberty. New York University Press: New York, 1982.
21. Hamburg, M.A.; Collins, F.S. The path to personalized medicine. N. Engl. J. Med. 2010, 363, 301–304.
23. Tabarrok, A.T. Assessing the FDA via the anomaly of off-label drug prescribing. Indep. Rev. 2000, 5, 25–53.
24. Berggren, N.; Karlson, N.; Nergelius, J. Why Constitutions Matter; Routledge: London, UK, 2017.
25. Buchanan, J.M. The Limits of Liberty: Between Anarchy and Leviathan; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA, 1975.
26. Lazarou, J.; Pomeranz, B.H.; Corey, P.N. Incidence of adverse drug reactions in hospitalized patients: A meta-analysis of prospective studies. JAMA 1998, 279, 1200–1205.
27. Angell, M. The Truth About the Drug Companies: How They Deceive Us and What to Do About It; Random House: New York, NY, USA, 2004.
28. Avorn, J. Powerful Medicines: The Benefits, Risks, and Costs of Prescription Drugs; Vintage: New York, NY, USA, 2004.
29. Conrad, P. The Medicalization of Society: On the Transformation of Human Conditions into Treatable Disorders; Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, MD, USA, 2007.