"There is only one thing stronger than all the armies of the world: and that is an idea whose time has come."

- Victor Hugo

WE DO NOT HAVE TOTAL FREEDOM TO CHOOSE, BUT PERHAPS FREEDOM IS AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME.
It is important for us to respect how a society must protect itself from epidemic. This means maybe depriving the rights of freedom of choice of the individual to save the whole. Our society has made a big mistake in dramatically overvaluing the importance of Synthetic drugs. These profit making substances have been over marketed, excessively promoted and hyped to the moon to increase sales.

But what if the SINthetics are not the answer? What if they create more side effect diseases that they cure? What if the hype is all wrong? Then how do we protect our freedom to choose and not to be forced SINthetic medications if we do not want them. These articles explore a range of discussions on our freedom to choose in medicine and to protect our family from harm.
FREEDOM OF CHOICE IS MORE TO BE TREASURED THAN ANY POSSESSION EARTH CAN GIVE.

A Fundamental Right to Freedom of Medical Choice

The Synthetic (SINthetic) companies want to deprive you of any choice in food and medicine. We must fight for our right to choose and to speak.
THERE ARE THOSE WHO WANT TO TAKE YOUR FREEDOM TO CHOOSE AWAY

Police are preparing to put those who refuse \underline{Vaccination into Concentration Camps}

Police are preparing to put those who refuse \underline{Vaccination into Concentration Camps} \underline{Medication}
States have given themselves the power to force tested or untested vaccines and medication onto people under Model State Emergency Health Powers Act.

http://www.rense.com/general16/force.htm

Sandpoint, ID-Attorneys commissioned by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in Atlanta have advanced health policy legislation that dramatically suspends civil rights in case of a declared biological urgency. The "Model State Emergency Health Powers Act," according to the Boston Globe, would give public health officials and states governors the power to arrest, transport, quarantine, drug, and vaccinate anyone suspected of carrying a potentially infectious disease.

The "model legislation," issued on Halloween, is certainly no treat. The Globe reported that authors Lawrence O. Gostin, a professor at Georgetown University Law Center and Director of the Center for Law and the Public’s Health, and James G. Hodge of John Hopkins University worked to balance the need to control disease with protecting individual's civil rights, before the newspaper promptly, and uncustomarily for reasons unknown, removed the article from its website. The Globe report provided conflicting statements concerning the right people had to "appeal states' decisions to quarantine or isolate people against their will. Late in the article, as in the 40-page official document, the law is said to give state public health authorities virtually absolute dictatorial powers, with little chance of legal recourse for interned individuals.

The bill's definition of a "public health emergency" is highly subjective. Under the law, one case of smallpox in a public school could trigger authorities to
urge a governor to declare a state of emergency. Once such is declared, the U.S. Constitution, Bill of Rights, and most cherished civil liberties will be immediately suspended in addition to states declaring ownership of private properties. The controversial legislation, that many feel reflects totalitarianism or fascism, may be downloaded from www.publichealthlaw.net/MSEHPA/MSEHPA.pdf.

Under the "Mandatory Medical Examinations" section (502) of the law, persons refusing to submit to medical examinations and/or testings are liable for misdemeanors and forced isolation. If public health authorities suspect individuals may have been exposed to broadly defined infectious diseases, or otherwise pose a risk to public health, officials may issue detention orders. In the case of an urban attack, or even one suspected, possibly thousands of people could be marshaled into isolation camps, according to the law. In this case, physicians, assisted by police, will be required to perform state medical examinations and tests.

Under the law, "infectious diseases" are very broadly defined. An infectious disease may, or may not, be transmissible from person to person, animal to person, or insect to person.

Isolation regulations in the law provide The State with power to commandeer private properties wherein individuals deemed infected, or exposed, might be housed under quarantine.

Section 504 of the Act details vaccination and treatment protocols. Following these mandates, public health authorities may compel people to be inoculated and/or drugged with any medicaments selected by The State. Individuals refusing to be vaccinated or treated would be liable for a misdemeanor, subject to police arrest, isolation or quarantine.

The "model legislation" exempts The State, its political subdivisions, including the Governor, public health authorities, the police, or other State officials, from liabilities associated with the death or injury to persons, or damage to property, as a result of complying with, or attempting to comply with, the Act.

Furthermore, "Section 807" repeals existing state laws that are in conflict with this Act. [This means that all laws granting medical, religious or philosophical exemptions to immunization would be repealed with the passage of this Act.]

This legislation has been in the works for over a year with many provisions being taken from legislation that has already passed in California and Colorado. Legislation such as the Model Health Emergency Powers Act and other bills being pushed through Congress following the event of September 11, calls into question
just how threatened the powers that be are by the populace waking up enmass. More and more people are saying no to allopathic medicine, vaccines and worthless medical tests. The truth regarding the link between the MMR vaccine and autism; the conflicts of interest within the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices that creates the current vaccine schedule used in all 50 states; and the problems with the current administration of the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program have ALL been the subject of three separate congressional hearings. To date, no legislation has been proposed that addresses the many serious issues raised in these congressional hearings. Instead, we are treated to legislation that would force toxic vaccines and pharmaceutical medications on the populace.

FEAR OF TERRORISM OR EPIDEMIC HAS ALLOWED STATES TO MAKE LAWS TO BE ABLE TO FORCE MEDICATION ONTO PEOPLE, THOSE REFUSING WILL BE SENT TO CONCENTRATION CAMPS

Medical EXPOSE
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When the commissioner or a local public health authority within its jurisdiction determines that either or both of the following measures are necessary to prevent a serious danger to the public health the commissioner or local public health authority may exercise the following authority:

(1) to vaccinate or provide precautionary prophylaxis to individuals as protection against communicable disease and to prevent the spread of communicable or possibly communicable disease, provided that any vaccine to be administered must not be such as is reasonably likely to lead to serious harm to the affected individual; and

(2) to treat individuals exposed to or infected with disease, provided that treatment must not be such as is reasonably likely to lead to serious harm to the affected individual.

An individual who is unable or unwilling to submit to vaccination or treatment shall not be required to submit to such procedures but may be isolated or quarantined.
If a Commissioner or a Local Public Health Authority can be fooled into thinking there is an Emergency and if they can be Fooled Into Thinking SINThetics are equal to Natural Medicines, then you and your family will be forced to take the medications. And if you resist you will be forcibly put into a Concentration Camp. The time to address the issue of SINThetic versus Natural is now, not then.

Medical EXPOSE
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Do Medical Patients Have a Fundamental Right to Choice?

What is the “proper” amount of freedom of choice for patients in medicine?

What if the treatments in question are experimental and come with their own baggage of associated risks, personal costs, and potential costs to society?

More broadly, do patients have a fundamental right to medical choice?

These questions seem particularly appropriate today on a number of fronts including Right To Try laws and vaccines as well as emerging stem cell and other biomedical technologies. The recent measles outbreaks including the one sparked at Disneyland are warning signs of what harm is awaiting us if the choice to opt out of vaccinations continues to be available to the general public.

The California Senate today passed the mandatory vaccination bill. Assembly lawmakers are now weighing the bill.

As we discussed at our recent UCD Stem Cell Ethics Symposium, that phrase “a fundamental right” is very powerful. A potential benefit of medical freedom would be the power to make choices that may benefit oneself or one’s loved ones that otherwise would not be available if solely decided on a collective, governmental level.

For example, there may be a new experimental drug that a doctor and patient together decide is worth the risk to try, but the FDA has not approved it or even given the green light for a clinical trial on it. In principle, that drug might help the patient or it might hurt or even kill the patient. Advocates of medical freedom believe patients should broadly be allowed to evaluate and take such risks with their own personal physician if they so choose. They see the FDA as an obstacle to their freedom.
As someone who has faced a very serious form of prostate cancer, I get the sense that being in a serious medical situation can change one’s views. Everything feels different when you are faced with a potentially lethal medical diagnosis yourself or for a loved one. Sometimes it’s not that simple though.

As individuals our freedom and desire for choices can conflict with a greater good. For example, as a biomedical scientist and parent I do not believe that childhood vaccination should be optional. While there is no compelling evidence that vaccination is harmful beyond for that tiniest fraction of those who have severe reactions or pre-existing immune diseases, there is profound evidence—I would go so far as to say proof—of powerful benefits to both individuals and society as a whole of vaccination.

Some parents feel that the best choice is not to have their kids vaccinated. Should they be allowed that choice? I don’t think so in the sense of the unvaccinated kids still being allowed to go to school where they can interact with and potentially harm other children via infectious diseases. Not being vaccinated also poses risks as an adult for other workers in the workplace.

While some might say that mandatory vaccination is “anti-freedom” and that there are costs to such governmental mandates, from my view the benefits dramatically outweigh those risks. But some argue a libertarian view that there is a price for that in loss of free choice.

Another example of a hotly debated area today that shares some of the same issues is emerging stem cell technology. Some say that patients should be free to entirely make their own choices as to whether to get an experimental, potentially risky stem cell intervention. The argument is also in conjunction often made that patients are in the best position with their doctors to make such decisions. “Get the government out of my doctor’s office”, might be the clarion call for those folks.

These kinds of “freedom-based medical decisions”, as we might call them, have possible societal costs even if they do not involve highly contagious infectious diseases. If companies sell unapproved stem cell treatments, then patients buying those treatments are at the same time as they think they are trying to help themselves, also are undermining the authority of the FDA more generally and in that way indirectly putting future potential patients at risk. As much as I think the community that reads this blog can agree that the FDA is imperfect and could benefit from reforms, the FDA performs a very difficult, complex and crucial mission, without which we’d face medical chaos leading to great harm.
It seems appropriate at this point to also point out that many stem cell clinics also sell these interventions to children. As such, if you believe that people should be allowed to get any stem cell therapy they want, keep in mind that there are possible broader consequences to you making that choice beyond undermining the FDA mission. One might say, for instance, that you are supporting a sketchy company that is putting other people at risk. Some of those other potential patients may not be in the same position as you to make decisions about risks. They may be kids or they may be less educated than you. By giving this stem cell business your money you are enabling them to put others into risky situations.

As much as some people might advocate for specific stem cell clinics selling unapproved stem cell treatments, I’d say that within this community most of us also can point to some clinics and doctors (and fake doctors) that are truly frightening and dangerous. Even if reasonable people can disagree on broader issues regarding the appropriate level of governmental regulation and freedom of choice, relentlessly attacking the FDA for the cause of near universal freedom of medical choice for investigational stem cell treatments poses the risk of giving the wildly dangerous clinics a freer hand. Sometimes what we believe is best for ourselves cannot be viewed only in a bubble.

The bottom line is that freedom of medical choice for an individual is far more complicated than it might seem and it is easy to oversimplify it. The reality is that our medical freedom and decisions have impact on others. I don’t see that we in the America, for example, have a fundamental right to medical choice based on The Constitution. Our medical rights and ability to make health-care related choices change over time too.

Should there be a constitutional amendment for a right to freedom of medical choice? What’s the best goal for these rights (or lack thereof) even if not a constitutional right for the immediate future? How much freedom in this area is best in the longer term?

**FORCED SYNTHETIC MEDICATION WILL BE NEXT**
U.S. Congress, pass the 'Medical Freedom of Choice Bill' and stop the FDA from blocking terminally ill patients-access to experimental drugs

Lili Gil Valletta New York, NY

Did you know that if you are terminally ill and conventional medicine has nothing else to offer to you as a treatment option, that YOU, YOUR FAMILY MEMBER OR FRIEND cannot access experimental drugs? That's right, even experimental drugs that have gone through documented clinical trials are denied to patients due to current processes and the FDA. Sounds like a basic human and freedom right that many American's don't know they lack...

CURRENTLY, THE FDA STANDS BETWEEN TERMINALLY ILL AND EXPERIMENTAL DRUGS IN THE UNITED STATES. A BASIC FREEDOM OF PERSONAL CHOICE THAT PATIENTS AND THEIR FAMILIES CANNOT MAKE DUE TO CURRENT BUREAUCRACIES.
Thanks to the documentary ‘Cut Poison Burn’ a growing following of patients, professionals, advocacy groups and former big-pharma executives have exposed their concerns about the roadblocks imposed on medical innovation for the treatment of chronic diseases like cancer. This issue and years of data and patient cases has sparked the introduction of the ‘Medical Freedom of Choice Bill’ has been introduced by Congressman Ron Paul.

**Dr. Paul has introduced the Freedom of Choice Bill in Congress** to enable terminally ill patients whose physicians have determined that FDA approved treatments are not curative to access experimental drugs upon execution of an informed consent, without need for FDA prior approval.

“It is cruel and nonsensical to deny terminally-ill patients, who have no other treatment options, access to new drugs and devices simply because those treatments have not yet completed the time-consuming Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval process. This is why I will soon introduce the “Compassionate Freedom of Choice Act”. The Compassionate Freedom of Choice Act allows terminal ill patients whose physicians certify they have no other options and who have executed written informed consent that they are aware of any potential risks, to use non-FDA approved drugs, treatments and devices. I hope Congress will pass this bill during the remaining days of the 112 TH Congress and stop placing the procedures of the FDA bureaucracy ahead of the needs of terminally ill patients” says Dr. Paul.

Patient's Freedom of Choice

Access to specialised medical care requires a referral from a doctor at the patient's own basic health care unit, occupational health care or private health center. Patients can choose their own treatment locations together with the referring doctor without any regional limitations from among all municipal specialised medical care units. This freedom of choice applies not only to Finns, but also to the citizens of the EU and EEA Member States, and Switzerland.

Main principles of the freedom of choice

- The treating doctor makes the decision to refer the patient for specialised medical care and assesses the level of care the patient requires. The patient cannot choose the level of the treatment, for example, university hospital level treatment if the illness does not warrant treatment at such a level.

- The referred patient can select the treatment location together with the referring doctor.

- Patients, within reason, have the right to select their doctor or other health care professional. In addition, whenever possible with regard to further treatment, the patient should be directed to the doctor or dentist who treated them previously.

- Customers can select the specialised medical care treatment location from their home country or other EU country but the maximum travel compensation is limited to the cost of travel that would be incurred from the trip to the nearest university hospital.

- Since the beginning of 2014, citizens of other EU countries, EEA states and Switzerland can use Finnish public health care services and must be provided access to treatment in public health care in the same manner as Finnish nationals. Treatment is provided according to Finnish legislation and treatment practices.
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NO FREEDOM OF CHOICE WHEN IT COMES TO HEALTH

WHY CAN'T I HAVE FREEDOM OF CHOICE WHEN IT COMES TO MY OWN HEALTH?

By Chantal Cooke

Natural medicine is continually being attacked and yet the public continues to use it – with more and more converts each year. Currently around 20 million people each year, in the UK, use some form of natural medicine.

If so many people want to use it and claim that it has benefits for their health, why is it that so many in the mainstream medical world are vehemently opposed to it?

No one is forced to use natural medicine but I do feel a though we are being forced to use orthodox medicine. Why, as an individual, can't I be allowed to make my own choices based on my belief systems and my personal experience?

It's sometimes claimed that we need to be protected from our own ignorance and these remedies and treatments can be deadly! That may be true in some cases – although personally I have never come across any evidence of people being killed by the side effects of natural medicine – however it's certainly not true that we all need constant protection from our own ignorance. And its 100% true that the pharmaceutical companies and GPs do not get it right every time. 1200 people in the UK each year are killed as a direct result of the side effects of, or the incorrect prescription of, orthodox drugs. Around 10% of all hospital beds in the UK are being used by people who are there as a result of the ill effects of prescribed drugs. None are being used by people suffering any ill effects of natural medicine.

So as an individual, with rights over my own health and life, why can’t I choose what I want to use without legislation from Europe trying to stop me, without ill informed vested interests shouting at me and without the media trying to scare me to death?

I can practice my chosen faith and sexuality without prejudice in the UK– so why can’t I practice my own health choices without prejudice?
I recently chaired the first "Hygeia Symposium –Towards a Natural Health Service". It was convened by renowned Naturopath Dr Harald Gaier. The panellists alongside Dr Gaier were; Professor George Lewith from the Integrated Medicine Research Group at the University of Southampton; Stan Switala, the MSc research supervisor at the Northern College of Acupuncture, natural medicine practitioner and author; Roger Newman Turner, founding trustee of the Research Council for Complementary Medicine, author and naturopathic practitioner; Chris Burley naturopathic practitioner and a member of the executive council of the General Council and Register of Naturopaths; and Dr Robert Verkerk founder and Executive and Scientific Director of the Alliance for Natural Health.

The presentations from the panellists covered a range of topics with particular emphasis on the research into the evidence for, and the efficacy of, natural medicine. It was a thought provoking discussion and highlighted some of the difficulties of bringing natural medicine into the mainstream. If this is an area that interests you then I would recommend ordering a DVD of the evening. In addition interviews with, and articles by, some of the panellists are available.

Whatever your view of natural medicine it's difficult to argue against freedom of choice. And it's this freedom of choice that the Hygeia Symposium wants to protect.

Sadly the natural medicine community can be its own worst enemy. Like many other diverse groups of people there is in-fighting and disagreement about the way forward, there is a lack of coordinated and clear communication to consumers, and most worrying of all – there is massive apathy. In fairness, most practitioners choose their career because they want to help people, not because they want to fight governments, pharmaceutical companies, orthodox medicine and the media! But if they are to continue helping people and offering patients a choice then there needs to be a coherent front, a clear message and ground swell of action ... before it's too late.

Dr Gaier’s Hygeia Symposium is a fantastic vehicle, Dr Verkerk’s Alliance for Natural Health is doing a sterling job in the courts. So if you believe in freedom of choice then you need to ask yourself "what am I doing to help protect that freedom?"

There are lots of ways you can help...

1) Support the Hygeia Symposium through donation, or offering your time, or by offering to host and promote an event.

2) Donate to the ANH – they need an additional £40k for the current court case

3) Write to your MEP, your MP and the media asking them to protect your freedom of choice

4) If you use Natural Medicine – tell other people about how it helps you. Don't force it on them, just tell them about your personal experiences
Peter Hain MP, when he was Northern Ireland Secretary, ran a trial looking at the impact of incorporating natural medicine into GP practices. The results: 65% of GPs said the health of their patients had improved, the number of recurring visits had dropped, and the use of medication and other NHS services had reduced. So natural medicine saved time, saved money and improved health. So why isn’t it being offered in GP surgeries and NHS hospitals across the UK? (You can read more about this trial)

If I get run over by a car please take me to the nearest hospital of well trained surgeons and doctors. If I get hayfever again this year – please give me my homeopathic remedies and don’t bother offering me an anti-histamine; I won’t need it as my natural medication works just fine thank you!

About the Author:

Chantal Cooke is an award winning journalist and broadcaster with a passion for the planet. In 2002 she co-founded the award winning radio station PASSION for the PLANET and in 2009 Chantal was awarded London Leader in Sustainability status. Chantal also runs a successful communications
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Measles outbreak: Different states, different rules on vaccinations

By Holly Yan, CNN
Updated 2200 GMT (0600 HKT) February 4, 2015

- All the states with measles cases this year allow vaccine exemptions for religious or personal beliefs
- Two states allow exemptions for medical reasons only

Share your message to parents who don't vaccinate on CNN iReport.

(CNN) The rash of measles cases across the country has affected some states more than others. And, not surprisingly, the rules for vaccinating vary wildly from coast to coast.

Take California, for example, where more than 90 people have already been infected with measles this year. As in many states, parents in California don't have to vaccinate their children before kindergarten if they claim a religious or philosophical exemption.

Then there's Mississippi, which allows parents to opt out of vaccines only for medical reasons -- no other exceptions. That state has a 99.7% vaccination rate -- and not a single case of measles this year.

An array of exemptions
Every state requires vaccinations, and every state also allows exemptions for medical reasons, such as if a child has a weakened immune system.

That's where the consensus ends.

In many states, parents have two other ways they can avoid vaccinating children: religious and philosophical reasons.

The vast majority of the country -- 48 states -- allows religious exemptions, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures.

Measles outbreak: How bad can it be?

And 20 of those states also allow philosophical exemptions "for those who object to immunizations because of personal, moral or other beliefs."

The two states with the strictest vaccine requirements? Mississippi and West Virginia, which don't allow religious or philosophical exemptions.
See what exemptions your state has.

The afflicted states
California, the epicenter of the current outbreak, allows exemptions for medical reasons and "personal beliefs." And parents have been using them.

'Ultimately, kids are going to die'
During the last school year, 3.3% of California kindergartners -- about 18,200 -- were allowed to skip vaccinations, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The vast majority of exemptions were due to personal beliefs.

"Schools should maintain an up-to-date list of pupils with exemptions, so they can be excluded quickly if an outbreak occurs," the California Department of Public Health said.
But the number of measles cases in California over the past month -- 92 -- is higher than the median number of cases for the entire country for each year between 2001 and 2011, according to CDC figures.

Dr. Sanjay Gupta answers your questions about measles

Arizona is the next hardest-hit state, with at least seven measles cases already this year. Nearly 5% of Arizona kindergartners were able to skip vaccinations last school year due to medical reasons or, more commonly, their parents' personal beliefs.

New York and Utah each has at least three measles cases this year. New York allows religious exemptions, but not philosophical ones; Utah allows both.

Overall, about 94.7% of kindergartners across the country last year were vaccinated against measles, according to the CDC.

How did the anti-vaccination movement begin?

Mississippi and West Virginia, the two states that allow only medical exemptions to vaccination, have had no measles cases this year.

An incredibly contagious disease

Before the measles vaccine was introduced in the 1960s, many children came down with the disease by age 15. About 3 million to 4 million people got measles each year in the United States. Among them, about 500 people a year died, and 4,000 developed encephalitis, or brain swelling.
Since then, the disease has largely disappeared in the United States. But international travel has spurred sporadic outbreaks in recent years.

Many of the recent measles victims are part of "a large, ongoing multi-state outbreak" linked to Disneyland in California, the CDC said.

The disease is extremely contagious for several reasons:

• An infected person can spread it four days before developing a rash.
• 90% of people who are not immune and are close to someone with measles will also get infected.
• The virus is airborne.
• It can also live on infected surfaces for up to two hours.

What is your message to those who don't vaccinate?

Most, but not all, doctors agree

The overwhelming sentiment from the medical community is that the measles vaccine is safe and effective. But Arizona cardiologist Dr. Jack Wolfson is a rare voice of dissent.

"It's a very unfortunate thing that people die, but unfortunately people die," Wolfson said. "And I'm not going to put my child at risk to save another child."

Those words struck a nerve with Dr. Tim Jacks, a pediatrician whose own daughter has leukemia and, therefore, a weakened immune system.

"I can definitely, wholeheartedly say that the medical community, the medical literature does not support the statements he makes," Jacks told CNN's Anderson Cooper.

"The question I might have for him is, if you were in my situation, and your two children -- who you're doing your best to protect -- if they were suddenly exposed to measles, what would your thoughts be at that point?"
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THERE IS MASSIVE AND EVER MOUNTING EVIDENCE THAT A SYNTHETIC ANYTHING IS AN INSULT TO THE BODY. PLEASE READ AND JUDGE FOR YOURSELF.

SYNTHETIC IS SYNTHETIC

Pharmacology Fact: To Use a SYNTHETIC anything is an Insult to the Body

http://syntheticissinthetic4u.com/

THE SYNTHETICS MAKE PATENTS THAT MAKE MONEY. THUS THE SYNTHETIC DRUG COMPANIES WANT ALL OF US TO NOT BE ABLE TO CHOOSE NATURAL MEDICINE.
1. The Synthetic drug companies do not know how to properly place the electrons around the atoms in making a drug. Nature uses QED via Photosynthesis to put some of the electrons into high energy quantum states. This is how we get energy and life.

2. The Synthetic Drug companies use antiquated outdated reductionism philosophy to assemble and test their drugs. The Fractal Complexity of Nature with it's incredible complexity must be revered rather than ignored. The height of IGNORANCE is to ignore nature. An IGNORANCE that makes money.

3. There is no study known that ever shows a synthetic drug completely equivalent to its natural counterpart. The reductionism studies only measure the required variables. They DO NOT measure side effects. Side effects are observed and often only observed years or decades later. The laws and the FDA protect them.

4. Side Effects dominate and proliferate the Synthetic Drug scene. Look at the Physician Drug Reference and see that all drugs have a list often a long list of side effects. This is not natural. Almost Every year over a hundred drugs are removed from the market because they are hurting people. It's just a matter of time before the hurtful side effects are seen.

5. Our society has now learned conclusively that synthetic foods are incompatible with health. We have now rejected all synthetics and we know that the finest quality comes from the natural. It is the next step of simple human consciousness and thought to see clearly that synthetic drugs are incompatible with the human body.
"There is only one thing stronger than all the armies of the world: and that is an idea whose time has come."

- Victor Hugo