

Destruction of Medicine? A Bill to Allow Prescriptions by AI

Analysis by [Tessa Lena](#)

On September 30, 2021, [David Schweikert](#) (R-Ariz.) introduced a bill ([HR5457](#)) that, if enacted, would **qualify AI as a medical practitioner, eligible to prescribe drugs.**

Whoa there. That puts the conversation about the [professional sovereignty of physicians](#) in a whole different context – and sadly, that reformist context has been there all along. Let's first look at the text of the bill. It says the following:

"To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify that artificial intelligence and machine learning technologies can qualify as a practitioner eligible to prescribe drugs if authorized by the State involved and approved, cleared, or authorized by the Food and Drug Administration, and for other purposes."

The part where it says "for other purposes" is interesting. What if AI determines that something is safe and effective – and it should be mandated? It's hard to debate with AI. The safe and effective thing could be a therapy, a nutritional system to fight climate change, a mental hygiene regime – anything, really. Drug prescription is just a foot in the door but the sky is the limit. And who do we sue?

And who is [David Schweikert](#)? Currently, he is serving his sixth term in the United States Congress. At the moment, he "sits on the Ways and Means Committee, having previously served on the Financial Services Committee.

He also sits on the bicameral Joint Economic Committee, serving as the Senior House Republican Member, Co-Chairs the Valley Fever Task force with House Minority Leader

Kevin McCarthy, is the Republican Co-Chair of the Blockchain Caucus, Co-Chair of the Tunisia Caucus, and Co-Chair of the Tele Health Caucus."

According to his website, he "championed key reforms such as the [Secret Science Reform Act](#), which has passed the House of Representatives." That particular reform was interesting as it used the "good" language of scientific transparency to limit the powers of the already not very useful EPA.

Interestingly, his website also calls him a "national leader on tribal policy," working with Arizona's tribal communities on important priorities. Lots to ponder.

So let's talk about why this bill is significant – regardless of whether it passes or not. The bill serves the obvious practical purpose and a psychological purpose. If it passes and stays, then we can kiss our medical sovereignty goodbye for some time – since arguing with a robot is much harder than arguing with the most menacing and unmovable Soviet cashier of my childhood (a personal memory; I was terrified of cashiers)!

But whether it passes or not, it's a sign of where the wind is blowing and an act of widening of what's psychologically acceptable. In other words, an act of eating at our sanity. And of course, the desire to possibly replace the current medical system with AI and telemedicine predates COVID. Let's go back in time.

The year was 2019. The name of the committee was [National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence \(NSCAI\)](#). The committee, chaired by Eric Schmidt of Google, issued a report called, "[Chinese Tech Landscape Overview](#)."

In that report, obtained by EPIC through a FOIA request, the committee talked about the AI race between the U.S. and China, and what kind of "legacy systems" in the U.S. were in the way of winning. (If you want to see their most recent report – which is very long and, unlike the 2019 FOIA-obtained report, was meant for public display and thus was worded far more diplomatically – you can find it [here](#).)

Now, an important note. I personally believe that the competition between different countries is not what drives this trend – and that Eric Schmidt, out of all people alive

today, is using "international competition" as an excuse to attempt installing his favorite AI on top of the people (but underneath his friends, of course).

Which is not to say that international competition does not exist – of course it does – but the attempted reform that goes under the names of [the Great Reset](#), 4IR, or [Happytalism](#), is supranational, in my opinion. However, using a bogeyman (be it "China," "America," "Russia," or "COVID") is a proven strategy.

(Speaking of using the "crisis mode," here is a very interesting 2015 [paper](#) titled, "Rapid Medical Countermeasure Response to Infectious Diseases: Enabling Sustainable Capabilities Through Ongoing Public- and Private-Sector Partnerships: Workshop Summary." It talks about coronaviruses. This bit below mentions a quote by Peter Daszak talking about the development of pan-influenza and pan-coronavirus vaccines.)

Daszak also shared that during the recent Ebola outbreak, EcoHealth Alliance issued a press release and an analysis predicting which countries would be the first to be infected as a result of global air travel.² The United States was predicted to be one of the top three countries that would receive infected individuals from countries with EVD, and it was predicted the patient would arrive into Dulles, Boston Logan, Newark, and/or JFK airport. They anticipated a lot of attention and coverage, but instead, again, there was very minimal pickup by the media. Daszak reiterated that, until an infectious disease crisis is very real, present, and at an emergency threshold, it is often largely ignored. To sustain the funding base beyond the crisis, he said, we need to increase public understanding of the need for MCMs such as a pan-influenza or pan-coronavirus vaccine. [A key driver is the media, and the economics follow the hype. We need to use that hype to our advantage to get to the real issues. Investors will respond if they see profit at the end of process,](#) Daszak stated.

Going back to the 2019 NSCAI report, the committee, first written about in detail by [Whitney Webb](#) on Last American Vagabond, "was created by the 2018 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) and its official purpose is 'to consider the methods and means necessary to advance the development of artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning, and associated technologies to comprehensively address the national security and defense needs of the United States.'"

To further quote Whitney, who did an outstanding job two years ago covering this development, the report "says that 'creation,' followed by 'adoption' and 'iteration' are the three phases of the 'life cycle of new tech' and asserts that failing to dominate in the

'adoption' stage will allow China to 'leapfrog' the U.S. and dominate AI for the foreseeable future."

Creation, Adoption, Iteration.

- The US leads in the "Creation" stage. Core technology and new user paradigms are still largely invented here.
- But "Adoption" happens far more quickly in China due to structural factors. The most significant of these are...
 1. **Lack of legacy systems** e.g. *lack of credit cards = mobile payment*
 2. **Scale of consumer market** e.g. *extreme urban density = on-demand service adoption*
 3. **Explicit government support** and involvement e.g. *facial recognition deployment*
- **Iteration:** What happens when you have a huge highly receptive user-base to iterate on, and the investment that justifies? Eventually, the resultant experience has evolved so much that it is nearly unrecognizable...

The report mentions that while the United States is leading in the "creation" phase of AI development, China is leading in the "adoption" phase due to specific "structural factors," framed in the report as very advantages to winning the AI race.

To be clear, the report does not directly say anything like, "it would be great if we were a little more like China in terms of those structural factors." It does not say that directly. But it seems to imply it as it describes winning the AI race as absolutely desirable and then lists the American "legacy" systems as obstacles on the way.

The US, has many legacy systems that are "good enough"

- **Retail** - Malls, Walmart
- **Messaging** - Unlimited texting plans
- **Payments** - Credit cards
- **Banking** - Retail banking locations
- **Video** - TV networks
- **Computing** - Widespread use and understanding of the PC

And “good enough” **hinders adoption** of new things
That's why in China...

- E-Commerce **leapfrogs** mass retail
- WeChat **leapfrogs** SMS
- Alipay **leapfrogs** the credit card system
- Mobile banking **leapfrogs** retail banking
- Online video **leapfrogs** TV
- Smartphone **leapfrogs** PC

What does the report says about medicine? It seems to frown at the medicine of today and to favor AI and telemedicine. Please see below:

AI for Medical Diagnosis [Prediction]

1. **Creation:** A new field born from breakthroughs in the West.
2. **Adoption:** But again I would expect these systems to reach mass deployment in China first. There are far too few doctors for the population, increasing the incentive to seek alternative treatment (**Lack of legacy systems**) the government is explicitly supportive, naming Tencent to the National AI team to solve this problem (**Explicit government support**) and they have the authority to quickly **clear regulatory barriers** while American initiatives are mired in HIPPA compliance and FDA approval.
3. **Iteration:** It's possible that the flywheel could start spinning, and China could lead the world in this sector as well. This could lead to them exporting their tech and setting international norms.

Conclusion?

My subjective conclusion is that perhaps putting **AI in charge of medicine** has always been the goal? Perhaps the illogical and abysmal state of "human" medicine in 2021 is not coincidental?

So far, we've seen scientific and medical censorship, unhelpful official protocols, forced closures of hospitals, artificially created staffing shortages – and perhaps at least in part we are seeing it because it helps the advancement of 4IR?

Perhaps?

It looks like the things that we consider generally good for people, such as having in-person access to a caring doctor – or the "regulatory barriers" protecting our privacy – all those natural things are viewed as undesirable by our aspiring masters.

Their proverbial New Normal is not for people. It's for the people's "owners." (By the way, AI is not human or conscious, no matter how hard they spin it. AI is software. Somebody owns the software, including medical software. Somebody pays for it, somebody writes it, somebody patents it, somebody owns it. This whole "AI going conscious" thing is a well-funded con job in my opinion – just like the sale of "immortality" via converting to a data bundle.)

When it comes to medicine, in the New Normal, sovereign physicians (and sovereign patients) are a liability and an inconvenience. The New Normal does not fancy human subjectivity – not philosophically and not economically. The New Normal is about effective asset management, where regular citizens are a class of assets, just like machines or minerals.

Assets are supposed to be useful and are not supposed to think. The entire foundation of the New Normal social system is the denial of free will.

The New Normal does not account for privacy or personal space. It's a new digital order – with citizens united in homogeneity, under AI. It's not about balance or sustainable frolicking in the grass while the robot toils – it's about converting our creative energy into the fuel for the machine. It's essentially anti-life.

Another tangential but very curious window into how the crazies think is this 2001 report titled, "[Future Strategic Issues/Future Warfare \[Circa 2025\]](#)". It has every dystopian trick on the book, even "co-opted insects." And I suppose it's possible to weaponize insects, viruses, or art. It's all been tried. But no matter what the broken ones think or do, their abuse is temporary.

Dysfunction produces pain. Pain produces questions. Questions produces resistance. Resistance produces change. And then it breaks. This time around, too, life will prevail – and that's regardless of what the technocrats desire.

A note: Philosophy and emotions are important at the time of the Great Reset because they remind us of who we are and help us to fight for life. The maniacs can think up a world in which we are soulless assets. They can pass bills in which we report to AI. But if we refuse to shut down our hearts, in the end we win.

I'd like to finish this story with an open question from the beautiful film called "[A Hidden Life](#)." In this film, the protagonist asks a priest, "If our leaders, if they are evil, what does one do?" What does one do? I am thinking, maybe we have a duty to our hearts and the generations past. And maybe this time around, we get to live.