

Oct 11, 2023

Michael Horowitz  
Office of the Inspector General  
U.S. Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Ave NW  
Washington D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Horowitz,

I was pleasantly surprised that you are entertaining the possibility that there might be something to my cover letter and essay entitled "Warrantless Surveillance and Non-consensual Experimentation on Drug Users", having been contacted by a Mr Corey Zavela from the DEA. I spoke with him at some length on September 13th by phone. However, I am unsure of the upshot of that conversation, and feel that there may be an aspect of the fox guarding the hen house in this approach. It's clear to me that the unmitigated arrogance of those performing the experimentation and surveillance indicate they feel well-covered and easily able to evade investigation.

I got the impression the Mr Zavela was looking for definitive evidence that rules in the DEA in this matter, which I cannot supply. Although I don't have any direct evidence that the DEA is responsible, I came to that inference based on a totality of a multitude of clues and observations over a long period of time. Many of the difficulties an average citizen would encounter attempting to adduce evidence regarding this experimental program are described in the essay itself, and noted in the original cover letter.

However, setting that issue aside for a moment, this matter is a very serious one, and requires investigation regardless of the provenance of the organization that is responsible.

There is no doubt that this is a Federal agency, or has ties to one. For example, Unmanned Airborne Vehicles (UAVs) are used to track and follow me, and can be seen as dots of light that make circular and zig-zag motions above my house. These have been seen by individuals besides myself - if they could be bothered to look. As I live within a nautical mile of the tower at Lindberg field (SAN), this places those devices within controlled airspace. At one time early on I consulted with an official from the FAA who advised me that only the military or certain Federal agencies could fly such devices in that airspace.

I am not a lawyer, but rather a former scientist and I realize that legal inference can be different from how a scientist rejects hypotheses by ruling out those inconsistent with replicable observations and data. I have a large number of these observations and clues which, if fleshed out and investigated, would undoubtedly identify the organization or agencies responsible. So, although I have no definitive evidence that rules in the DEA, neither do I have any that rules them out. And, there are many good reasons to believe they are involved.

Failure to delve deeper into this matter allows those responsible to evade accountability and essentially nullifies the Fourth Amendment; their ability to exploit anonymity using high technology and use stolen information to forestall investigation has all manner of dangerous implications - many of which, again, were described in the essay.

If you feel that this matter is not worthy of further investigation, any suggestions you might have as to how I could proceed in an effort to expose this clandestine operation would be welcome and very much appreciated. In any case, I ask that you be so kind as to respond and let me know the status of this complaint.

Thanks for your time and attention in this matter. I remain

Sincerely,

---

Jonathan C. Hansen, PhD