

Non-Consensual Experimentation on Drug Users

© Nov 2023 Jonathan C. Hansen, PhD

Table of Contents

Overview	1
How It Works: Evading Detection and Investigation	2
Hiding Behind High-Technology: Anonymity and Lack of Attribution	2
Lens-less Imaging Through Walls	3
Unmanned Airborne Vehicles (UAVs)	3
Ground-Traversing Robotic Devices	3
Image Projection Technology	3
Employing Time-Tested Tactics of Misdirection, Infiltration, Disinformation, etc.	4
Reliance on Beliefs Regarding Surveillance, Mental Illness, and Drug Use	5
Mental Illness and Surveillance	5
Mental Competence and Drug Use	5
Domestic Surveillance and the Law	5
Research or Retribution Implied by the Use of Valueless Subjects	6
Employing Interventions with Subjective or Ambiguous Pathology	6
High-Technology Used to Alter, Destroy, or Hide Evidence	7
Difficult to Obtain Compelling Evidence or Instigate Investigation	7
A Single Individual Cannot Be Proficient in Multiple Disciplines	7
Cannot Contact Law-Enforcement Without Risking Arrest	7
Many Private Firms Won't Intervene if Law-Enforcement Suspected	7
Necessity of 24/7 Surveillance of Subjects	8
Ensures Correlation Between Drug Use and Punishing Intervention	8
Provides Data to the Experimenters	8
Allows Thwarting Escape, Documentation, or Alerting of Authorities	8
Essential for LPI/LPD Techniques	8
Prevents Escape from Surveillance	8
Knowledge of Subject Location Allows Safe Trespass Operations	9
Advantages of Performing Experimentation on Drug Users	9
Unexpected Harm Lacks Attribution	9
Possible Use of Unapproved or Unethical Interventions	9
Dangers Inherent in This Program	9
Invasive Surveillance Bypasses Encryption and Detection	10
Undetectable Surveillance Enables Self-Funding and Evasion of Oversight	10
Enables Extrajudicial Punishment and Personal Vendettas	10
The Slippery Slope of Clandestine Behavioral Modification	10
Some Thoughts and Comments	10

Overview

The Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), in conjunction with and One or more Federal agencies, possibly using technology shared by the military, is employing warrantless

surveillance to perform non-consensual medical experimentation and extrajudicial punishment on drug users.

Drug use is an ongoing problem that can cause harm to users as well as others around them. Two major schools of thought have arisen as to how to approach this problem. One is the “harm-reduction” approach, where programs such as needle exchanges and methadone maintenance seek to reduce health risks due to drug use. In contrast, Federal drug enforcement agencies assume that the best way to deter drug use is to ensure that users fully experience the deleterious effects of drug use.

If one accepts the premises of the latter approach, then increasing the harm experienced by drug users (“harm-augmentation”) would be expected to increase deterrence. The warrantless surveillance and non-consensual medical experimentation being performed, at first blush, appears to be an experiment in drug demand reduction by increasing the negative consequences of drug use by drug users.

This experimentation is being performed by observing a targeted drug user using virtually undetectable surveillance techniques, and, whenever drug use is observed, applying interventions to cause pain, interference with body functions, or other deleterious effects in order to create a correlation between drug use and those effects.

Although appearing as an effort to deter drug use, this experimentation also provides an arena for the development and testing of both surveillance technologies as well as clandestine interventions with human biological functions and physiology in a situation that provides plausible deniability and reduced probability of discovery. Only this explanation, developing cutting-edge technologies and testing them in a “proof of concept” on drug users, can really explain the incredible amount of funds, time, personnel, and effort being expended on particular drug users.

How It Works: Evading Detection and Investigation

As this program is clearly unethical and unlawful, great effort has been taken to avoid detection or investigation as well as to ensure the induced harm is attributed to drug use. This effort is comprehensive; it exploits the anonymity of newly-developed technologies, social engineering, vast human and monetary resources, and inability of drug users to contact authorities without risking arrest, as well as other tactics, as follows:

Hiding Behind High-Technology: Anonymity and Lack of Attribution

Technological advances have enabled remote, robotic exploration of Mars, controlled by operators on Earth via radio communications that have improved by thirteen orders of magnitude of signal to noise over what was possible in the 1960s. Likewise, the application of new technologies for surveillance has enabled virtually undetectable tracking and observation of people inside structures as well as out, without any overt human contact. Use of these technologies provides lack of attribution to and identification of the operators, access to areas

inaccessible to humans, remote control using virtually undetectable radio signals, and ability to clandestinely transport objects to and from remote locations. These features are being exploited by those running the experimental program. The ones with which I have first-hand experience are as follows.

Lens-less Imaging Through Walls

One or more techniques that allow observation of the target subject through the walls of structures without their knowledge are being used that are small and light enough to be carried by Unmanned Airborne Vehicles (UAVs). This lens-less imaging technology does not require light, allowing the operators to see in the dark, and can penetrate surfaces, even those of metal. The advantages are clear: neither turning off the lights nor covering oneself provides privacy and allows the operators to see even the most intimate behaviors, especially the use of drugs and sex.

Unmanned Airborne Vehicles (UAVs)

Sophisticated Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) provide an unprecedented ability to track and observe a subject, especially if carrying through-wall imaging equipment. A wide variety of these devices have been developed with varying flying dynamics and features. Lighter-than-air craft can be essentially silent, but are large and slow. Those using rotors have many configurations, including squirrel-cage morphology and some with large, slow-moving rotors to almost eliminate sound emissions. Others employ flapping wings to achieve flight. All can be disguised in many ways, including using nascent invisibility techniques. These UAVs can quickly abscond if in danger of being detected, and defy easy attribution to particular people or organizations even if detected or captured. They can be used to transport yet other devices quickly, including ground based robotic devices.

Ground-Traversing Robotic Devices

Much research and development is going on developing all manner of robotic devices that can roll, crawl, or otherwise travel on solid surfaces, often termed generically remote operated vehicles (ROVs). So, it makes sense that this technology has been adapted to assist in surveillance as well as other remotely controlled operations. Besides the lack of attribution and anonymity they provide, miniature versions are uniquely suited to entering buildings through small cracks, can be disguised in many ways, and can deliver or remove all manner of physical objects from the locale of the target subject without any overt human contact or interaction, including surveillance devices, drugs, or engineered biologics.

Image Projection Technology

Image projection comprises a set of techniques that employ lasers to project both still or moving 3D images into free space as in a hologram, onto partially reflective surfaces such as glass or display screens, or onto opaque surfaces, adding to or pre-empting the normal visual image. These image projection technologies are widely deployed to a number of ends, and produce startlingly realistic images. They can be used both to cause someone to see objects that aren't present in reality, or to cover other objects to disguise them. It is amazing how

effective this technique can be when used for diversions, hoaxes, and other dirty tricks. For example, causing someone to report some apparent event to authorities that clearly can't or didn't happen quickly destroys their credibility.

Particularly widespread is its use on drug users after the use of drugs to induce the notion that drugs are causing hallucinations; this application is highly effective in causing the targeted user to (spuriously) conclude that they are experiencing drug-induced psychosis.

The use of lasers to implement the projection of images allows the equipment to be located hundreds of feet away from where the image appears, making it difficult to determine the location and existence of the projecting equipment, reducing the likelihood that the images will be judged to be artificially produced.

This technology was much more widely used prior to the widespread adoption of smart phones with decent cameras that provide immediate and easy access to video recording, because, in contrast to hallucinations or other mental problems, projected images that can be seen with the eye will be recordable with cameras. However, one popular trick when a camera is present is to project spurious images onto the screen of the camera while a recording is being made so the person making the recording believes some astonishing images are being captured. When the footage is played back, however, none of the externally projected images are present in the recording, as they were actually only being generated at the surface of the display screen during recording and were not present in the light entering the lens.

[Employing Time-Tested Tactics of Misdirection, Infiltration, Disinformation, etc.](#)

The personnel operating this program are clearly very intelligent and well-trained in what must be now considered "classic" methods in clandestine operations. These include diversions, hoaxes, supplying disinformation, and the like, that can be used for many purposes including preventing capture of robotic devices, "dirty tricks" in which the subject is induced to behave badly or develop false ideas about what is occurring, etc.

For example, if the subject moves towards an area where a small robot is located, the operators can create a diversion, perhaps a noise or visual image in another location that draws the attention of the subject, causing movement to that location and allowing the robot to escape and avoid detection or capture.

As another example, if the subject develops a hypothesis about a method by which the surveillance is being performed, the operators will create spurious activities that suggest the hypothesis is incorrect; essentially supplying disinformation that misleads the subject and thus stymies discovering what is in fact occurring as well as causing resources to be wasted on spurious activities.

These techniques are highly effective when used on naïve subjects and are part and parcel of the armamentarium of these well-trained operator/agents.

Reliance on Beliefs Regarding Surveillance, Mental Illness, and Drug Use

In order to deal quickly with events in everyday life, people develop a set of beliefs about how things work. These rules of thumb are on the whole accurate but not inviolable, and can be exploited by those performing this experimentation because the most probable and/or simplest explanation is usually correct. Hence, a drug user or someone alleged to be mentally ill will have claims of surveillance or experimentation attributed to those factors out of hand without much consideration that they might be true. Likewise, beliefs that law-enforcement agencies strictly adhere to the law also work to cause dismissal of such claims without investigation. Nonetheless, some people are indeed surveilled, and some law-enforcement personnel do not always follow the law; the problem with paranoia is that if you are right, it's just "good thinking".

Mental Illness and Surveillance

Many people who are mentally ill exhibit symptoms of paranoia, claiming that they are being watched and/or followed. In fact, stating such to a mental health professional is generally considered a symptom of mental illness unless incontrovertible evidence can be adduced that it is, in fact, occurring. However, few, if any, such professionals will get out of their chair to investigate the veracity of this type of claim. Rather, the standing assumption is that it is not happening, and that it is instead due to a mental disorder.

This belief carries over to the general population, including, in particular, law enforcement personnel; most people when told by someone who states that they are under surveillance "by the Government" assume that that person is mentally ill, and that no further thought or action is required.

In addition, anyone with a previous diagnosis of mental illness loses all credibility with authorities, and often with people in general. Because of this, if the perpetrators of the experimental program can devise a method, usually by using a number of dirty tricks, to obtain a diagnosis of mental illness in a target, serious consideration or investigation of their claims can be avoided.

Mental Competence and Drug Use

Similarly, the selection of drug users as targets reduces the credibility of any complaints of such activities due to the general perception that these individuals are "fried" or unable to think clearly, are paranoid, and subject to hallucinations. This facilitates the dismissal of any allegations as meritless and due to the effects of the drugs being used by the subject. Again, to enhance this perception, various tricks and hoaxes can also be played on the subject in an attempt to cause spurious reports to authorities and thus destroy their credibility.

Domestic Surveillance and the Law

Warrantless surveillance is essentially prohibited by the Fourth Amendment to the US Constitution, with a person's house having the highest level of protection per the US Supreme Court. And, consequent to the discovery by the Church Committee in the 1970s of abuses of

surveillance powers by a number of Government agencies along with subsequent promises that such abuses would not occur again, people generally believe that Government agencies adhere to the law and that they are free from such surveillance in this Country.

The message from the Church Committee was clear; the abuses of surveillance power must stop. Unfortunately, the take-home message heard by some of the government agencies after the Church Committee hearings was not that they had to stop, but rather that they had to be careful not to get caught in the future. Apparently, some agencies have not been able to resist the temptation to use newly developed technologies that are virtually undetectable, contrary to law. However, that these technologies have been developed and are being used is not public knowledge and a well-kept secret, allowing the general public to continue to believe that surveillance abilities are not being abused and thus reject any such claims out-of-hand.

Research or Retribution Implied by the Use of Valueless Subjects

In addition to the laws proscribing “unreasonable searches and seizures”, citizens generally assume that any surveillance is performed in a rational, efficient, and cost-effective manner. That is, high-value targets such as drug kingpins or heads of organized crime receive priority application of funding resources. In response to the proposal that individual drug users might be the subject of surveillance, I have personally heard the retort “they have bigger fish to fry” – an eminently reasonable response. However, from the point of view of evading detection and investigation of illegal applications of surveillance technology, an individual of no particular import subjected to a panoply of interventions in an experimental program is among the least likely to be believed and have any such claims investigated.

Hence the use of subjects of no particular import – those that know no state secrets, are not drug kingpins, or heads of organized crime – not only reduces the chance of investigation but also suggests that the benefit of this experimentation is the knowledge gained from research rather than the gathering of evidence of criminal activity.

Other scenarios, however, are possible explanations for the use of valueless subjects. Since this surveillance is virtually undetectable, the operators may encounter illegal or perhaps even only distasteful activities being performed by the subject, but are unable to bring these to light because the information was obtained illegally. They might decide to take it upon themselves to perform extrajudicial “justice” or retribution, knowing that they will not be caught, hidden by the same technologies that provided the information.

Employing Interventions with Subjective or Ambiguous Pathology

The harm-augmenting, punishing interventions generally involve causing pain and/or interference with body physiology that are difficult to objectively evaluate and rely on verbal reports of perceptions by the subject. Interventions are selected that do not leave lasting or easily detected pathology and have transient, temporary effects. It is unclear exactly how these interventions are implemented. However, what is clear is that some of them entail the introduction of drugs or engineered biologics into the subject’s body, being delivered

clandestinely using small, robotic devices. Also clear is that these interventions are activated by remote control in order to allow the experimenters to establish the false correlation between drug use and punishing, unpleasant consequences.

By employing interventions tailored to duplicate or exacerbate medical conditions that are common to large portions of the general population or have a number of possible causes, it again becomes easy to attribute the pain and loss of function to drug use rather than the seemingly impossibly unlikely explanation that these effects are being deliberately induced.

High-Technology Used to Alter, Destroy, or Hide Evidence

It is easy to understand how robotic devices might be used to physically remove evidence or plant false evidence in almost any location. And, “hacking” of computers to alter, remove or plant programs or files remotely is a common occurrence in daily life nowadays. The ability to produce “deep fakes”, realistic but spurious images and videos provides all manner of opportunities to evade detection. For example, video recordings can be altered by adding ridiculous images not present in the original physical scene which destroys credibility of the recordings without overtly removing or destroying the recording itself.

Difficult to Obtain Compelling Evidence or Instigate Investigation

This program, at its core, pits a single individual in violation of the law against a large, well-funded organization. This situation virtually precludes a targeted subject from exposing its existence or eliciting investigation for a number of reasons, to wit:

A Single Individual Cannot Be Proficient in Multiple Disciplines

The use of cutting-edge technologies spanning many diverse disciplines supported by large monetary and personnel resources make it virtually impossible for any single targeted subject to adduce persuasive evidence that this experimentation is being performed. The variety of high technologies used practically precludes a single individual from being technically proficient in them all, and the sheer volume of evidence that would need to be collected to present a compelling argument is beyond the capabilities of an individual. Furthermore, the cost for the sophisticated instruments needed to gather evidence is beyond the reach of the average citizen.

Cannot Contact Law-Enforcement Without Risking Arrest

Because the use of drugs is unlawful, the targeted subject cannot contact law-enforcement authorities without risk of arrest. This places the subject at a severe disadvantage, because law-enforcement agencies are the primary means by which crimes are investigated.

Many Private Firms Won't Intervene if Law-Enforcement Suspected

There are many independent firms and private investigators that offer services such as Technical Surveillance Counter-Measures (TSCM), or “bug sweeps”. However, many of these are staffed by former law-enforcement personnel and flat-out refuse clients that are being, or suspect they are being, investigated by law-enforcement. This essentially prevents recruiting the needed expertise for detecting and documenting the surveillance.

Necessity of 24/7 Surveillance of Subjects

Continuous 24 hour a day, 7 days a week surveillance of the subject is a *sine qua non* of this experimental program and fulfills a number of functions:

Ensures Correlation Between Drug Use and Punishing Intervention

Constant surveillance is necessary to ensure a tight but spurious correlation between drug use by the subject and the “harm-augmentation” intervention administered in response. If use of drugs by the subject is not quickly followed by the punishing intervention, the attribution of the administered harm could be dissociated from the use of the drugs and demonstrate that they are not the cause.

Provides Data to the Experimenters

Since this experimentation is being performed clandestinely with no direct contact with the subject, surveillance provides the experimenters with information about the effects of the intervention. In all serious research, it is necessary to evaluate the results. And, since this program is being performed clandestinely without the knowledge of or contact with the subject, these results must be obtained by using the virtually undetectable surveillance of the subject.

Allows Thwarting Escape, Documentation, or Alerting of Authorities

Since secrecy and lack of hard evidence of the existence of the program is of paramount importance, constant surveillance of the subject is necessary to allow the experimenters to forestall or thwart attempts by the subject to call attention to the program, obtain evidence, or to escape from observation by the experimenters.

Essential for LPI/LPD Techniques

Low Probability of Interception (LPI) and Low Probability of Detection (LPD) comprise a well-developed set of techniques used in radio transmissions that reduce the chance that signal transmissions will be detected or intercepted. Besides the technical aspects of the signals themselves, such as encoding, frequency-hopping, and the like, observation of the subject is one of the primary means that can be used to prevent the acquisition of evidence. For example, if attempts are being made by the targeted subject to record the signals being used for surveillance, the experimenters can observe this, and temporarily turn off the devices being used so they cannot be detected or recorded while the attempt is being made. This is a highly effective tactic that is quite frustrating.

Prevents Escape from Surveillance

If the targeted subject were to escape from observation, he/she might be able to alert authorities, enlist assistance, or any number of activities that might endanger the program. For this reason, constant surveillance of the subject is necessary. For example, if the subject is at home, but grabs keys and gets into a vehicle, the experimenters must alert and deploy a UAV in order to follow the subject and observe what happens. These types of observations constitute

the nitty-gritty details of the execution of 24/7 surveillance, but can now be performed entirely remotely using the technology described previously, by an operator sitting at a control console miles away.

Knowledge of Subject Location Allows Safe Trespass Operations

By maintaining constant knowledge of the subject's location, accurate estimates can be made of the amount of time required for the subject to travel to any other location. In particular, it provides a time window for safe incursions, whether human or robotic, into a designated area. For example, when the subject is far enough from home, the experimenters have a known amount of time to enter the subject's home to install devices, remove them, copy, alter, or steal documents, or do practically anything without fear of being caught.

Advantages of Performing Experimentation on Drug Users

Certain advantages accrue from performing this clandestine surveillance and non-consensual experimentation on drug users.

For drug law enforcement organizations, this basic strategy kills two birds with one stone: the punishing interventions are attributed to the effects of drugs, thus increasing the public perception of harm and reducing demand, while simultaneously providing an environment where new technologies can be tested non-consensually with a reduced chance of detection.

Unexpected Harm Lacks Attribution

Because the punishing interventions are performed surreptitiously, any unexpected deleterious health effects, regardless of severity, escape attribution to those that deliberately induced the harm. Any unexpected side effects or health problems will not be attributed to the experimenters, but rather the use of drugs or other reasons. Claiming to a physician that a health problem is the result of non-consensual medical experimentation will most likely lead to a referral to a psychiatrist even in the face of organic pathology. Furthermore, any physician who accepts the possibility of such a cause will have no guidelines or experience in how to treat the problem.

Possible Use of Unapproved or Unethical Interventions

Again, as these interventions are surreptitious, they do not adhere to 21 CFR 50, the "common rule" for experimentation using human subjects. It is thus possible to apply unethical interventions that would never be approved by oversight boards for human experimentation or consented to by the subjects.

Dangers Inherent in This Program

This program is such an egregious violation of law and civil rights, to say nothing of the waste and misuse of funds, that it must be brought to light. It obviously is occurring in an environment lacking any effective oversight or transparency. The dangers inherent in both the

surveillance technology as well as the biological interventions in this environment are both extensive and chilling.

[Invasive Surveillance Bypasses Encryption and Detection](#)

First, the use of virtually undetectable technology to observe people inside their home or office is a much more invasive arena of surveillance than the interception of electronic communications. When a target can be observed in this way, the protection afforded by encryption and secret keys or passwords is bypassed, as one can observe the entry of those keys as well as the unencrypted text itself into a computer. Furthermore, there would be no trail of evidence that the information had been stolen as is present when electronic transmissions are intercepted, and the target would not even be aware that the information had been compromised. With no transmission or communication of information to another party, there would be no clues or evidence that the information had been stolen.

[Undetectable Surveillance Enables Self-Funding and Evasion of Oversight](#)

Hence, second, this undetectable surveillance provides those employing it the possibility to escape control or oversight by means of funding limits, as it would be easy to obtain inside information from propitious targets that could be used to finance the program. Clearly, the advantages that inside information affords those in the financial markets are well known; it requires little in the way of imagination to concoct schemes where inside information in other contexts can produce large and fast monetary returns. If the surveillance program was funded or even just supplemented in this manner, control and oversight could be avoided.

[Enables Extrajudicial Punishment and Personal Vendettas](#)

Third, it provides an environment where extrajudicial punishment can be applied without fear of discovery or retribution. Operators might observe activities that are illegal or perhaps even only distasteful to them and, realizing that there is no way to obtain evidence of the activities in a legal manner, might be tempted to take it upon themselves to become judge, jury, and executioner. I believe this is already happening.

[The Slippery Slope of Clandestine Behavioral Modification](#)

Finally, the use of robotic devices to interfere with a target's environment and even deliver drugs or engineered biologics into their body is truly frightening, but relatively easy to accomplish using this panoply of modern high technology.

While drug users are not very sympathetic subjects and many people might agree with this use of technology to combat drug use, it is undeniably a slippery slope that could easily devolve into its use to control other behaviors deemed undesirable. Again, it doesn't take a vivid imagination to envision the multitude of application possibilities for this paradigm.

[Some Thoughts and Comments](#)

This experimental program is clearly being executed by a large, well-funded organization with lots of feet on the ground. This is almost certainly the DEA, or perhaps a multi-agency

consortium with ties to the DEA as well as the military, as many similar law-enforcement agencies could benefit greatly from the inside information that this type of surveillance can supply.

The unmitigated arrogance with which the unconstitutional surveillance and unethical interventions are performed indicate that those running the program are confident these activities will not be investigated, and may suggest that they are obtaining protection from upper-level administrators and/or other agencies.

That illegal means are being used in other contexts to obtain information is implicit in the concept of “parallel construction”, wherein a fabricated set of events are proffered in legal proceedings to avoid revealing the true manner in which the information was obtained. This notion of parallel construction has come to light, and is known in legal circles. Information obtained using the technology discussed in this document could be used in a similar manner, with similar questionable legality.

Over this time, the types of interventions and surveillance methods being used have changed as new technology has become available. But they have in common the goal of engendering a false correlation between drug use and deleterious effects. In the early 2000s, laser image projection techniques were used to cause the target subjects to conclude that drug use was causing hallucinations, among other uses. These operations declined with the advent of smart phones with cameras that were becoming widely adopted. Subsequently, projecting subsonic sound or high-powered microwaves to cause pain and malaise came into vogue.

However, more recently experimental devices have been developed and deployed that enable the experimenters to cause pain and specific pathologies in the subject’s body, by remote control, as punishing interventions whenever drugs are used. The detailed mechanism of these devices is not clear; what is clear is that they require introduction into the subject’s body to produce the very specific effects obtained, and that they are delivered to the subject using small robotic devices without the knowledge or consent of the target subject. The development of these types of intracorporeal devices is a current hot topic in bioengineering, as they have all manner of applications, both beneficial and nefarious. Using drug users as nonconsenting test subjects, clandestinely, has many advantages as described above.

I realize that this summary explication sounds incredible and reads like a science fiction story, but it must be considered in the context of the long history of non-consensual experimentation and abuses of surveillance powers by various government agencies. Sometimes, the truth is stranger than fiction. Also, although the statements herein are conclusory, they are all based on observations and evidence collected over a period of over a decade. I am prepared and willing to flesh out these allegations with the experiences and observations that support them.

Incredible claims require serious evidence and support. Other Federal agencies may have relevant information: for example, the FAA undoubtedly has records of the use of the many

UAVs in this endeavor. Given the persistence of this program over many years, a large number of personnel have participated over that span, so it should not be difficult to find first-hand witnesses to these operations.

And, even if one considers the a priori probability of these claims to be miniscule, given their tremendous importance, any rational decision-making process compels further investigation.