

May 14, 2025

The Honorable Pamela Bondi
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General,

Summary

I am writing to alert you to the existence of a clandestine program of warrantless surveillance associated with Federal law enforcement. It exploits advanced technologies to achieve anonymity while watching and listening to people through the walls of their homes or other structures. This invasive, virtually undetectable surveillance, along with the use of robotics, essentially nullifies the Fourth Amendment: it is tantamount to having surveillance devices inside people's houses. This type of surveillance is rife with potential for abuse, and these same technologies are being used to perform all manner of behavioral control, non-consensual experimentation, and extra-judicial punishment. Besides anonymity, the sophisticated technologies provide an insurmountable technical barrier for the average citizens to adduce evidence that it is occurring, thus preventing enforcement of their Fourth Amendment rights.

The length of time that this program has continued, combined with the unmitigated arrogance with which it operates reveals its protracted lack of oversight and insulation from lawful review; it is a quintessential example of a "deep state" program. The inability of citizens to detect or demonstrate that it is occurring should not mean they have to relinquish their Fourth Amendment rights, but rather that this program must be rooted out internally. If we are indeed a nation of laws, the Fourth Amendment must be enforced as it is a fundamental Constitutional right.

Introduction

To this point in time, most warrantless surveillance has derived from interception of electronic communications, but I have become intimately familiar with whole other arena of far more invasive surveillance. By exploiting advances in technology, anonymous, virtually undetectable surveillance is being performed on people in their homes using through-wall, lens-less imaging, unmanned airborne vehicles (UAVs), and small robotic devices that can enter buildings through even the smallest of cracks or other openings. I have personal experience that not only is warrantless surveillance being performed, but also that the same technologies are being used to perform various nefarious operations. Apparently, the anonymity and wealth of information provided by the use of these newly-developed technologies has spurred the development of a secret program that operates without effective oversight, and a substantial investment in and deployment of this hardware has already occurred. It should not be too outlandish to consider that the technologies used for robotic surgery, repairing nuclear reactors, and the remote exploration of mars might be being applied to more down-to-earth, albeit illegal, activities.

Because this program is clearly unconstitutional, its existence depends on secrecy, and so great effort has been made to maintain that secrecy and prevent its exposure. These efforts include social engineering, exploitation of psychological and perceptual characteristics of cognition and the like, using ruses, mis/disinformation, misdirection etc. In fact, most people are so convinced that no entity would violate the law so blatantly that they dismiss out-of-hand the suggestion that this type of program might exist. Exploitation of this mindset is one of the primary means by which its detection is avoided.

By virtue of having been a target of this surveillance for a number of years, I have had the opportunity to observe these operations and how they have changed as technology has advanced. To prevent this missive from becoming too long, I want to give an overview of my current understanding. Although this explication is essentially conclusory, it is based on a large number of observations and experiments over a long period of time which I would be glad to expand upon, if desired, at any time. But given the protracted period over which it has operated, and the large number of personnel that it entails, substantial evidence of its operation and existence should be available to Federal law-enforcement that has access to records to which citizens do not.

The Technology

This virtually undetectable surveillance relies on the use of cutting-edge, remotely controlled, robotic devices that prevent identification of the operators; most often it involves the use of Unmanned Airborne Vehicles (UAVs), some carrying through-wall imaging technology. Small, ground-traversing are also used that can deliver physical payloads, and can be transported close to their intended ultimate destination by UAVs. These devices must be being operated by a set of trained, highly skilled operators that communicate over a flexible communications network with each other, and by way of radio signals with the devices, as inferred from their capabilities.

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles

The UAVs are varied in size and function, but are clearly designed for stealth. Efforts have been made to reduce noise emissions as well as disguise their visual appearance. Recently, these UAVs have achieved practical invisibility using techniques that have been under development for some time. As is obvious, these devices have considerable military applications in addition to these more nefarious and unconstitutional domestic uses.

After installing video surveillance cameras, at one point I managed to capture some video of one of these UAVs that was using a through-wall imaging system, seen here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VfKg9nL1cX0>

This was taken during the period when the invisibility technology was being developed. As can be seen in the video, it's possible to see through the body of the device but sunlight still reflects off the rotors. The inference that through-wall imaging was being performed derives from the appearance of a dim glow in the shape of a beam emitted by the plaster in my darkened

bedroom at that moment – in fact, that was the reason I looked at that period of time in the continuous video recording.

Through-Wall, Lens-less Imaging

The through-wall imaging technology is amazing and has some astonishing capabilities. It does not employ lenses as cameras do, and is an “active” technique, meaning energy is projected into the imaged area from which a return signal received, thus allowing it to operate in the dark. However, it does not appear to be a radar technique. In ordinary, everyday situations nothing is noticeable, but it is not magic and has a number of physical characteristics that accompany its use. I have been able to deduce some of these properties by means of various observations, and a number of experiments. But rather than get bogged down in the voluminous and intricate details (which I would be glad to expound upon), let me list them briefly:

- It is able to penetrate metallic shielding to some extent, based on observations in two shielded structures.
- It causes materials, including air, to emit very dim light, based on observations in carefully darkened rooms. This is apparently due to ionization of the air as demonstrated using an ion chamber.
- It can be focused so the area of imaging is well inside a building or other structure.
- The imaging excitation energy can be projected and focused from a distance of tens to hundreds of meters.
- The excitation beam is highly energetic, and can cause physical movement of objects.

This last effect, ability to cause slight movements, is meant in a relative sense, and sensitive methods are needed to demonstrate this effect. Objects are not flying across the room here. I was able to detect this by using what is termed a torsion balance, a classic method of detecting small forces. Historically, Coulomb used it to measure electrical forces, as did Cavendish to measure the gravitational constant. I have created a video that demonstrates this effect here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x2X7uyxqM1I>

Perils

The clandestine use of these newly-developed technologies has some pretty scary, horrific ramifications. Unlike electronic communication by telephone or internet which can be intercepted and leaves records of their occurrence, this virtually undetectable surveillance technology does not leave evidence of its occurrence. This places those running it in a position where they could acquire private or secret information anonymously, and without detection. This is a tremendously powerful capability, with a wide range of applications. Consider some of these speculative possibilities:

One is that secret or inside information can be obtained and used for profit, thus enabling "self-funding" - an independent entity entirely immune to oversight by means of funding control.

Perhaps this is the source of the apparently unlimited funding devoted to this project, the alternative being actual tax dollars; neither seems like a desirable possibility.

Another is that secret meetings can be eavesdropped upon and observed without any participant intentionally leaking or otherwise compromising confidentiality. Even encrypted communications can be compromised, as both the encryption keys as well as the unencrypted text can be observed.

With a little thought, other nefarious possibilities easily come to mind. Now consider that it would be essentially impossible to detect, let alone prove, that this theft of information had occurred.

How I Know

On a more concrete level, I have personally experienced non-consensual experimentation, “dirty tricks”, and attempts to alter behavior, perhaps considered as extrajudicial punishment, over a period of years. Evidently, I was selected as a non-consensual subject in what can only be some sort of experimental program and/or “hands-on”, real-life practicum for this “organization” that is using drug users as experimental subjects to develop and test these technologies.

Based on the philosophy that harm caused by drug use deters that use, then more harm should increase deterrence. Subjects are observed using this high-tech surveillance, and when the use of drugs is observed, a deleterious intervention is delivered to produce a spurious correlation between drug use and an unpleasant effect.

For example, early on, before the ubiquitous presence of smart phones with cameras, laser image projections were used to create the impression that the drugs were causing hallucinations. However, more recently the interventions have escalated to the introduction of biological agents into the bodies of drug users that can be activated to cause pain or other physiological dysfunction when drug use is observed.

At first blush, one might infer this is some sort of “demand reduction” research. But it seems more likely that it is experimental and being used to develop technology and/or train agents. This inference arises from the expenditure of inordinate amounts of money, personnel, and other resources on individual drug users; there few other scenarios with foreseeable payoffs for performing these activities in this manner. Although it may masquerade as a “demand reduction” program, it clearly is not a practical way of deterring drug use. The real goal must be the development and testing of the technologies themselves in an environment that does not have to pass review by boards overseeing human experimentation and can evade investigation and oversight. In any case, his area of research is currently highly active, as ways of interfacing current technology with the “wet” physiology of biological organism has all manner of beneficial applications.

However, the use of drug users meshes perfectly with medical experimentation because they are often assumed to be "fried", thought to be paranoid, claim that they are being experimented on, or under surveillance. Hence, their claims can be dismissed out of hand, with the experimenters thus evading investigation, if they dare to contact law enforcement. But contacting authorities is risky, as it entails likely arrest. In addition, any accidental or unexpected effects of the medical interventions can be attributed to drug use.

In any case, constant surveillance of the subject is necessary to know when to deliver the interventions as well as assess their effects. It also allows thwarting attempts by the subject to bring attention to this experimentation by authorities

It's unclear how extensively this program is being used, and certainly need not be restricted to drug users. In my case, it no longer has anything to do with drugs; it's been years since I have used them. Rather, it is now apparently related to my efforts to alert authorities of this program. Its size and persistence suggest that it may be being used more broadly, perhaps as a shared resource, because of the insight and wealth of information it provides. But since it is unconstitutional, it must be kept secret. Any information so obtained cannot be used directly without revealing the existence of the program, hence the use of so-called "parallel constructions" or other subterfuges.

Why It Matters

The use of these technologies in this manner essentially nullifies the Fourth Amendment; it enables the observation of people in their houses as invasively as if there were surveillance devices in those houses, and does so in a manner that prevents adducing any evidence that it is occurring.

This is a subtle but critically important point: because the UAVs are well-disguised or even cloaked, it is not possible to obtain images of them nor observe that they are being used, let alone prove it. And the equipment and technical prowess required to demonstrate the use of through-wall imaging constitute an insurmountable technical barrier to the average citizen. This creates a situation that essentially gives a "free pass" to those employing these technologies in the sense that they are assured of not being held accountable because no one can adduce evidence that they are being employed. This is being deliberately exploited – the program is essentially hidden by the technology.

For this reason alone, allegations of such abuse of surveillance technologies need to be investigated, even if the a-priori probability might seem low. When considered in light of the heinous nature of the non-consensual medical interventions being used, this becomes a very serious matter, and cannot be ignored simply on the basis of an off-the-cuff assessment that a project of this nature would never be attempted because it is so egregious, unethical, and illegal. History proves otherwise, as similar abuses of surveillance technologies as well as medical interventions were discovered in the 1970s by the Church Committee. After those revelations, the offending agencies promised to never again abuse their powers, but apparently

the real message that they took home was that, in the future, they had to be careful not to get caught.

The Fourth Amendment is a foundational right in the Constitution, and needs to be enforced even if modern technology enables its violation in ways that are difficult to detect or prove. There is a legal principle that there is no right without a remedy. Considered in this context, where targets of warrantless surveillance are unable to adduce evidence of its occurrence, the burden of enforcing the law must be carried by law enforcement itself.

In the international arena, the United States claims to be a nation ruled by law, and touts its freedoms and civil rights, especially as enumerated in the Bill of Rights. We routinely sanction other countries because of their abuse of civil liberties. That there are law-enforcement agencies in the United States working hard to evade, bypass and nullify these fundamental rights by using high-technology, secrecy, and anonymity, is deceptive and hypocritical. As a country that talks the talk, it's essential that it also walks the walk. The entrenched belief by citizens that nothing this egregiously contrary to law could ever occur is what opens the door to its existence, and careful exploitation of secrecy, social engineering, and high technology allow it to continue. The use of virtually undetectable surveillance to perform non-consensual medical experiments is even worse, it's absolutely incredible; virtually nobody believes this at first blush. Corruption this deep must be rooted out.

I have made a few previous attempts to alert authorities to the existence of this program; these attempts are documented at an incipient website page:

<http://www.surveillancenation.us/leglappl/index.html>

Please note that this website is in development and most links are not yet populated. However, the "About Me" page is, and contains a brief biography and my educational achievements.

These appeals generally do not elicit responses. However last year I did receive a response from the Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division after sending a letter to Merrick Garland. Apparently, my letter was shuttled to that division, and they stated that this matter "does not appear to be within the jurisdiction of the federal civil rights laws we enforce", and that "Even when the Division has jurisdiction over a particular matter, it is within the Division's discretion to determine whether to pursue a particular matter for various reasons including the availability of evidence, among other considerations."

I'm sure you will agree that this is a serious matter that needs to be dealt with immediately. So, if necessary, I would urge you to relay this missive to the proper division, department, or agency as necessary – certainly the Fourth Amendment is a civil right within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice. I am hoping that this new administration takes the rule of law more seriously than the previous one, and so far, indications point in that direction.

But I think the most likely impediment is that the program is so incredible that no one takes this explication seriously. The tenaciously held, embedded belief of essentially everybody, that such a program would never be attempted, forms the cornerstone of almost all assessments and

decisions regarding this matter. Hence, my main burden is to prevent this missive from being dismissed out-of-hand. Let's think about this a little.

The people running the program know that people hold this preconceived belief and exploit it, relying on this prima facie response as giving them a very low probability of being investigated. This essentially gives them a "free pass", knowing that no one will take seriously its existence.

Alternatively, consider the range of possible statements that could be presented, if the situation is indeed as has been described. Is there anything that could be stated that would lead one to believe it? If not, then a program of this design would be essentially beyond oversight or discovery, thus creating a serious vulnerability for the Fourth Amendment. Another way of saying this is to consider what could or would a person state differently if this were in fact the case, versus if it were not?

Perhaps, rather than looking at this from the point of view of requiring evidence that the average citizen can't supply, instead consider the danger from the existence of such a program versus the benefit of investigating to ensure that no such program has been implemented. Given the history of abuse of surveillance powers by various agencies in the past, such a preventative check would seem warranted.

This program is a quintessential example of a "Deep State" program: clandestine, long-standing, well entrenched, and insulated by personnel willing to participate in keeping it hidden and beyond oversight. Given its size and scope, there is a lot of people with a vested interest in keeping it operating. Hence, it would not be surprising if some efforts were made to prevent this letter from reaching you. For this reason, I would much appreciate it if you could be so kind as to acknowledge the receipt of this letter.

In any case, thank you for your time and attention in this matter. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or for more information. I remain,

Sincerely,

Jonathan C. Hansen, PhD