

Preface

Jonathan C. Hansen, August, 2025

Introduction

I have enclosed a document that many find very hard to take seriously, because it makes some extreme claims that run counter to most people's pre-existing beliefs that they are "secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures...", as guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment. Nonetheless, to the best of my knowledge these claims are true, and are based on a large number of observations over a period of years. Condensed to a single sentence it is: there is a secret program that uses high-technology to anonymously and undetectably observe citizens, often drug users, in their homes and perform non-consensual medical experiments on them. Of course, this surveillance technology could be used on anyone in other circumstances for a variety of purposes, and is clearly unconstitutional. It is described in more detail in the document itself.

The objective of this preface is to direct attention to how and why these claims are invariably dismissed out-of-hand, in an effort to bring a more rational and conscious process to bear on such decisions.

Primary Reason: No one would ever try to do something so egregiously illegal.

This is usually a personal, off-the-cuff, subjective assessment that nobody or no organization would attempt to implement the program that is described in the document because it is so contrary to law and the Constitution. Not only is it a violation of Fourth Amendment rights, but the notion of non-consensual medical experimentation makes it a double bang, totally off-the-wall allegation. It should be pointed out, however, that essentially the same activities were uncovered by the Church Committee in the 1970s. What has changed since then is the development of virtually undetectable surveillance technology as well as advanced robotics, which allows these activities to be performed remotely, without knowledge of who is performing the surveillance, and without leaving evidence it has occurred. Certainly nobody would attempt this sort of program without great confidence that they would not be detected, and it would have to be run clandestinely.

Technology Precludes Evidence and Relies on Law-Enforcement Investigation

Since the use of this technology also prevents the average citizen from being able to adduce evidence to document it, detection relies on persuading law-enforcement to investigate. Hence, assuming that those running the program are rational actors that want to maintain the program and its secrecy, they will want to minimize the chance of investigation. They already have a leg up in passing that hurdle, because these agencies undoubtedly receive all manner of strange requests from all manner of people, and claims of being under surveillance are very common in people that are mentally ill, and this latter out can be augmented by impugning the target's mental health. Other activities that reduce the chance of investigation would be reducing the credibility of the person, or of the claims being made. All three of these have been applied to me in this program.

Actually, it's very easy to have someone diagnosed with a mental illness if they were to just accurately report this program to a psychiatrist: without getting out of their chair, a psychiatrist will assume the primary rationale mentioned above – nobody would ever attempt such a program – which is undoubtedly the best diagnosis on the basis of *a priori* probabilities. But this process can be enhanced by performing various “dirty tricks” to induce the subject to complain to authorities about some outlandish events, either very improbable or even impossible. In my case, this involved the use of image projections to simulate hallucinations on many occasions, as well as a number of other maneuvers.

Additional Questions: Why Me? Don't They Have Bigger Fish to Fry

People generally want a reason that a particular person has so many resources dedicated to them as targets of surveillance and experimentation. But in situations where research and development is using non-consensual subjects, those subjects are often unaware of why they were selected. That was certainly the case for many in the programs uncovered by the Church Committee. So the short answer to “why me” is that I don't really know. However, assuming rational actors that want to avoid investigation and exposure, there may be a rationale for pursuing me beyond all reason: to reduce my credibility and thus my ability to muster assistance.

Perhaps a more detailed description of the particular circumstances at play here will shed some light on how my credibility and the credibility of the claims may have been reduced by activities of those running the program.

In my case, very early on I became aware of the surveillance when I noticed small, robotic devices with LEDs (Light Emitting Diodes) wandering around my dark living room, and then again later crawling into my attic under some loose flashing. In neither case was I able to capture the devices since the living room was dark, as was the attic, but I spent the good part of a day searching for devices in the attic in the latter case. I speculate that the organization subsequently adopted a strategy concentrating on messing with me beyond all reason, so that when I accurately describe being followed over many years and having experienced persistent ridiculous events without any apparent motivation, it seems absurd. Which it is – it makes no sense. However, rational actors might adopt this strategy, simply because it makes it harder than ever to take the claims seriously, and reduces the chance that anyone would investigate these claims.

Another subjective conclusion that results in dismissing the claims is the assumption that resources are limited, and are used in a rational manner, so the question “Don't they have bigger fish to fry?” is answered affirmatively. It is closely related to “Wouldn't this be an unreasonable amount of time, money and other resources spent on such an insignificant target?” – certainly a reasonable question. However, in a research situation where techniques are being developed and refined, these might be secondary considerations because the actual goal is the development of the system itself, as well as testing and refining it.

Burden of Proof

Generally, our system of justice relies on evidence, and exceptional claims require exceptional evidence for proof. But the use of these technologies enables activities that do not provide evidence of their use, at least to the average citizen. Given the gravity of these claims and implications for Constitutional rights, along with the difficulty of the average citizen to adduce evidence, it might be prudent to investigate to ensure no such activities were occurring. I might go so far as to suggest that the burden of proof should be reversed in this situation, given that historically, agencies with surveillance powers have inevitably abused them, and what they have been working towards and now achieved is the ability to use them in a manner that leaves no evidence that it is being used. Is it really reasonable to assume they would not be used, given how long and hard they have been working on them?

An Unthinkable Possibility

There is, however, another possibility for a lack of interest in taking these claims seriously – that this is a clandestine program that is known behind the scenes, and is condoned and covered for by law enforcement. This is too scary to contemplate, as it would represent a deep corruption of the American Justice system – an abdication of the rule of law with the Constitution as the supreme law of the land.

Final Thoughts

The point of this commentary is to highlight the thought processes at work when the main document is read, emphasizing that the crucial decision is usually made based on subjective evaluation of the credibility of the material, along with some implicit assumptions. It's only natural that the wilder the claims, the less credible it appears.

However, reliance on an off-the-cuff, subjective assessment of the likelihood that someone would perform such activities incentivizes wilder and crazier interventions. The more egregious the activities, the less credible they are, and hence the less likely they are to be investigated. This seems to give a back-wards result, and a free pass for the perpetrators.

If, in the end, it comes down to a personal, subjective assessment of the claims, perhaps one should try answering these questions: "Do you really think someone would come up with these claims pulled from thin air?", and "What motivation would I have to fabricate such an unusual allegation?".

Or, consider that it is probably better that law-enforcement uncovers and investigates any such activities, rather than have external entities eventually reveal this corruption.

In any case, please consider these issues when deciding how to proceed. Thanks for your attention in this matter.

Jonathan C. Hansen