

Would You Take a Pill to Make You More Loving?

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

✓ Fact Checked

July 14, 2022

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › You were designed to own your emotions, thoughts and feelings. But in the last two years, society has undergone massive upheaval prompting researchers to look more closely at drugs that could influence how you feel, potentially making you more cooperative
- › Columnist Mary Harrington proposes the new "love drugs" may have a more nefarious purpose than helping couples. One bioethicist proposes drugs should be used for moral enhancement, the treatment should be compulsory for the world, and you should not be told it's being done to you
- › As governments have proven during the pandemic, medical interventions have happened, and continue to happen, without consent. Is it that difficult to imagine that "experts" would consider chemical interventions to make humanity better and more obedient?
- › Historically, the long-term consequences of covert actions have not been positive, as has been demonstrated by the Tuskegee Study, spraying St. Louis with zinc cadmium sulfide in the 1950s, or the not-so-covert drenching of homes and streets with dangerous disinfectants during lockdown
- › China's social credit system is breeding a generation of compliant people, which would be easier with chemical intervention. Forming a compliant and docile society through covert and compulsory medical intervention plays directly into mass formation psychosis

It wasn't that many years ago when your emotions were something that belonged to you. As we have seen in the last two years, how emotions, thoughts and feelings are

generated is changing, and it appears it will continue to change. According to an Oxford University evolutionary anthropologist Anna Machin, “We now know enough about the neurochemistry of love to enhance your abilities to find love or to ... stay in love when it is getting a bit tricky.”¹

In other words, scientists are on the verge of creating “love drugs” that can tap into the pharmacology of attraction. Machin expects these drugs will be used in couples therapy within the next five years. In November 2021, a review paper² published in *Frontiers in Psychology* looked at MDMA use as a therapeutic catalyst for assisted psychotherapy.

The paper explored the neurochemical and neurobiological effect this could have on a couple and how the drug might raise a couple’s empathy for each other, ability to communicate and openness leading to relational satisfaction.

According to Gallup's 2022 Mood of the Nation survey,³ only 69% of Americans said they were very or somewhat satisfied with their overall quality of life. This is down from 84% in January 2020, just weeks before the pandemic began in earnest. It's safe to say that many people could use a boost in their mood.

But is taking a pill really the answer to improving your overall outlook on life when there are other science-backed ways of doing it without pharmaceutical input?

It's well-known that physical activity influences your mental health through several physiological and biochemical mechanisms and that exercise can positively affect stress, anxiety and depression. Although some may prefer pharmaceutical intervention, the implications are far more nefarious than what immediately comes to mind.

There’s a Pill for That

Columnist Mary Harrington⁴ explores the potential future that love drugs likely have in a world where optional medications are no longer optional but compulsory, and coercive public health measures are used to further mankind. She addresses the use of compulsory psychoactive pills from a recent historical perspective.

For example, during Machin's presentation at the 2022 Cheltenham Science Festival⁵ she suggested that MDMA could be used to enhance partnerships and relationships so that people see the world through their partner's eyes. This means instead of fixating on toothpaste squeezing techniques or raised toilet seats, partners could develop greater empathy and understanding for each other.

However, this is just one way that scientists are interested in using chemicals with a psychological effect on the end-user. Machin also expects that within the next 10 years people will "squirt oxytocin up their nose before they go out on a Saturday night, at the same time as having a glass of prosecco."⁶

Harrington writes, "But if this seems creepily reminiscent of dystopian sci-fi, it also barely scratches the disturbing potential of synthetically-induced human love."⁷ She goes on to explore the ever-increasing potential that while Machin describes using love drugs to feel love, there are others who are seeking a different option on a much greater scale. Take, for example, the bioethicist from Western Michigan University, Parker Crutchfield.⁸

Crutchfield has written a 184-page book⁹ in which he justifies his belief that covert and compulsive use of a "psychoactive pill" will ensure we become better people. The idea is dystopian, dictatorial and diametrically opposed to any idea of freedom. You might believe it couldn't possibly happen.

Should Moral Bioenhancement Be Forced and Covert?

Yet, as we have learned, during the COVID-19 pandemic when public health medical interventions happened, and continue to happen, without individual consent,¹⁰ it is not too hard to imagine that public health "experts" may consider using pharmaceutical interventions aimed at "improving" humanity.

In an article published in 2019 in bioethics, Crutchfield argues that moral bioenhancement should be compulsory and the administration should be covert. He

goes on to write “it is morally preferable for compulsory moral bioenhancement to be administered without the recipients knowing that they are receiving the enhancement.”¹¹

In a twisted turn of logic, he justifies his belief by saying that covertly administering drugs to the entire population promotes “values such as liberty, utility, equality and autonomy better than an overt program does”¹² without acknowledging that administration of any type of compulsory medication is contradictory to the value of liberty and autonomy.

Interestingly, he believes that “humans lack the cognitive and moral capacities to prevent the widespread suffering associated with collective risks,”¹³ all while not including himself in the assessment.

As Crutchfield writes¹⁴ that “moral bioenhancement should be compulsory and covert” as “this not only gives us the best chance of preventing widespread suffering ... it also best promotes liberty, autonomy and equality,” one must ask if Crutchfield has begun this experiment on himself, or is this something he advocates only for others? Is he a better person by taking psychoactive drugs?

Disturbingly Similar to Another Medical Condition

Crutchfield proposed his theory before the pandemic, but took advantage of the situation in 2020 to gain public notoriety. By August 2020¹⁵ Crutchfield began promoting the idea that “morality pills” should be covertly distributed to “alter the behavior of those skeptical of lockdown regulations, suggesting that such drugs could be made compulsory or administered secretly via the water supply.”

Crutchfield’s article first appeared August 10, 2020, in *The Conversation*,¹⁶ in which he wrote that moral bioenhancement should be used on “coronavirus defectors” that would be “like receiving a vaccine to beef up your immune system, people could take a substance to boost their cooperative, pro-social behavior. Could a psychoactive pill be the solution to the pandemic?”

LifeSiteNews¹⁷ wrote to Crutchfield asking whether this proposal was in keeping with the U.S. Constitution but did not receive a response before publication. Harrington writes that “We’ve already accepted that coercive public-health measures may be imposed for the common good.”

Crutchfield’s proposal is disturbingly similar to Munchausen’s by proxy, which is a mental health condition in which a parent purposefully causes an illness in their child to get attention by the medical community. In this case, Crutchfield proposes the government is the parent and U.S. citizens are the children who will be forced to take medication against their will that changes their ability to think for themselves.

Is it hard to imagine that public health “experts” and regulators would take this step, and if they did ... would we know? How far has trust in the system eroded?

Long-Term Consequences of Covert Actions

In a compulsory, but not so covert move, a local beach in southern Spain was sprayed with diluted bleach in April 2020,¹⁸ which the government reportedly used to kill the SARS-CoV-2 virus responsible for COVID-19. The decision incensed environmentalists, especially since it was done when humans had not been allowed on the beach for six weeks.

As The Guardian reported,¹⁹ “One municipal official, Agustín Conejo, said his actions had been motivated solely by a desire to protect children. “I recognize it was an error,” he told the broadcaster Canal Sur. “But it was done with the best of intentions.””

The beach has been a nesting ground for several species of birds. During the lockdown, environmentalists had hoped the number of nests would double. Fumigating the area with bleach in the middle of the breeding season was devastating to invertebrates that support coastal fishing and the nesting birds.

In another compulsory but not covert medical action against the public, China, South Korea, Spain and France also sprayed disinfectant in urban areas, using trucks, robots and drones.²⁰ Drones were used in Indonesia to cover homes with disinfectant. The long-

term consequences of exposing individuals to disinfectants are not known. However, the WHO and biologists have since denounced the practice as a potential health hazard and significant risk to wildlife.

As an analogy to Crutchfield's theory that medical interventions should be compulsory and covert, the U.S. Army sprayed zinc cadmium sulfide across multiple cities in the U.S., many near waterways, to learn how the use of biological weapons might affect communities under different conditions and various environments.²¹

While some cities knew in advance of the planned sprays, residents of others, such as St. Louis, Missouri, where low-income and predominantly black areas were sprayed in the mid-1950s and '60s, say they were never informed beforehand.²² It wasn't until 1994 that the government revealed it was a biological weapons test using U.S. citizens as guinea pigs.

A report in Business Insider²³ highlights the stories of several families who lived in the St. Louis area and who lost multiple family members to cancer. Doris Spates was a baby in 1955 when the powder was initially sprayed over her neighborhood.

Three months after she was born her father died and since then four of her 11 brothers and sisters died from cancer at young ages and she has survived cervical cancer. She said, "When I heard about the testing, I thought, 'Oh my God. If they did that, there's no telling what else they're hiding.'"²⁴

Throughout the '90s, the government held hearings in a handful of cities where residents claimed their cancers were caused by the cadmium drops. After reviewing the claims, the government concluded in 1997 that there was no connection between the Army's tests and the residents' cancers.²⁵

Interestingly, just three years later, the International Agency for Research on Cancer and the National Toxicology Program declared cadmium a carcinogen. In April 2022, the National Cancer Institute declared that cadmium is associated with lung, prostate, kidney, pancreatic, breast and bladder cancers.²⁶ It's also now known that certain

airborne chemicals, including cadmium, put you at higher risk of postmenopausal breast cancer.²⁷

There have been other instances when covert medical intervention has had devastating results, including the infamous Tuskegee Study,²⁸ which was a 40-year human experiment on Black Americans in which doctors did not treat patients with syphilis and ensured they did not get treatment from a private physician.

China's Social Credit System Is Creating Compliant People

China has used a compulsory system of a different sort to create a society of compliant and "better" people. According to one analysis of China's social credit system "The goal of the China social credit system is to provide a holistic assessment of an individual's, or a company's, trustworthiness."²⁹

If the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) does not believe you're trustworthy, they take several steps to punish your behavior. This could include throttled internet speeds, flight bans, missing out on jobs or school, taking away your pets or an inability to use the public transportation system.³⁰ The CCP has been building a moral ranking system for years.

The current social credit system was expected to be fully operational by 2020 but as of July 2022, it is in only an estimated 80% of the country.³¹ The CCP's goal is to create a mandatory system in which every person is given a unique code and social credit score in real-time. Infractions include buying too many video games, posting fake news, smoking in nonsmoking areas or wasting money.

The CCP is also using positive reinforcement for people with good scores such as speeding up travel applications, discounting energy bills or allowing a hotel to be booked without a cash deposit. Yet, despite the obvious oppression, some have been so influenced by the CCP rhetoric they've convinced themselves they are becoming better people because of it.³²

“I feel like in the past six months, people's behavior has gotten better and better. For example, when we drive, now we always stop in front of crosswalks. If you don't stop, you will lose your points. At first, we just worried about losing points, but now we got used to it.”

Is it hard to imagine that a government so intent on controlling behavior that they monitor how long you play video games, would think twice about poisoning the country's water supply with psychoactive drugs to gain greater control over their citizens?

And since water and wastewater know no boundaries, how long will it be before people in countries who do not “treat” the water are affected by the water from countries that do?

Are They Your Thoughts or Theirs?

If you are thinking critically, you are likely asking – why are so many people giving up their freedoms without a fight? Mattias Desmet, professor of clinical psychology at Ghent University in Belgium with a masters in statistics, discussed this topic in an October 2021 podcast.³³

He talked about how he discovered peculiar anomalies in statistical analysis during the COVID pandemic that made him realize that global society is starting to enter a mass formation state.

This is a type of collective hypnosis that is required for the rise of a totalitarian regime. He reviewed the step-by-step formula that results in this collective hypnosis and how it has been deployed on the global population in the past two years. He also warns about continuing down this path and provides solutions that can be taken on an individual and collective basis to prevent the loss of freedom that will surely follow if we do nothing.

Under mass formation psychosis, a population enters the type of hypnotic trance that makes them willing to sacrifice anything, including their lives and their freedom. A key strategy to preventing and breaking mass formation psychosis is to speak out against it.

Forming a compliant, docile and cooperative society through covert and compulsory medical intervention plays directly into mass formation psychosis.

Mass formation psychosis is how the Germans accepted the atrocities the Nazi party put in place in the 1930s and it's an explanation for why so many people support medical apartheid and the destruction of the unvaccinated right now.

In the 13-minute video below, Dr. Robert Malone, the primary inventor of the mRNA technology and advocate for informed consent, explains mass formation psychosis as it relates to the current pandemic and steps we can take individually and as a community to help break this hypnotic trance-like state we find in our friends and family.

Sources and References

- ^{1, 6} [The Times, June 9, 2022](#)
- ² [Frontiers in Psychology, 2021; doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.733456](#)
- ³ [Gallup February 2, 2022](#)
- ^{4, 7} [UnHerd, June 10, 2022](#)
- ⁵ [Cheltenham Science Festival](#)
- ⁸ [Western Michigan University, Parker Crutchfield](#)
- ⁹ [Routledge, Moral Enhancement and the Public Good](#)
- ¹⁰ [Human Rights Watch, September 28, 2021](#)
- ^{11, 12, 13} [Bioethics, 2019;33\(1\)](#)
- ¹⁴ [PhilPapers, Moral Enhancement and the Public Good](#)
- ¹⁵ [LifeSite, August 13, 2020](#)
- ¹⁶ [The Conversation, August 10, 2020](#)
- ¹⁷ [LifeSite, August 13, 2020 2nd to last para](#)
- ^{18, 19} [The Guardian, April 28, 2020](#)
- ²⁰ [National Geographic, August 7, 2020](#)
- ²¹ [NIH. Toxicology Assessment of the Army's Zinc Cadmium Dispersion](#)
- ^{22, 23, 24} [Business Insider, October 4, 2012](#)
- ²⁵ [National Academies. May 14, 1997](#)
- ²⁶ [National Cancer Institute April 2022](#)
- ²⁷ [Epidemiology. 2019 Jan; 30\(1\): 20–28](#)
- ²⁸ [McGill Office for Science and Society, January 25, 2019](#)
- ^{29, 31} [Horizons, July 7, 2022](#)
- ^{30, 32} [Business Insider, December 24, 2021](#)
- ³³ [YouTube, October 20, 2021](#)