

Malcolm Peterson Scott

Post-graduate Researcher, University of Canterbury
malcolmpetersonscott@gmail.com

Copy: To interested parties, for consultation and purposes of informed research.

5 April 2016

Vicky Robertson

Chief Executive & Secretary for the Environment

Ministry for the Environment

cc. Staff of the Directorate for Climate Change; Minister for the Environment; Minister for Climate Change Issues.

RE: Request for destruction of document – OIA Memo 16-D-00142

Dear Vicky

Further to a request I received on 11 March from a staff member of the Ministry for the Environment (MfE), asking me to destroy a document I had been sent in reply to an OIA request submitted to the MfE. The document concerns my enquiries about reports of chemical aerosol spraying from aircraft at high altitude over New Zealand for the purpose of geoengineering (often referred to as ‘aerosol forcing’ or ‘chemtrials’).

I have taken the request seriously and consulted with members of senior management at the University of Canterbury, and with other interested parties external to the University. I have considered two main features of the document:

1. Security level: ‘In Confidence’ a low level classification which poses no risk or threat to national security.
2. The document contents: Entirely related to my research enquires with significant reference to information about myself.

On the basis of these points I would be entitled to release of this document under the Privacy Act, so I therefore request you confirm the release of this document to me.

Analysis of content

The document raises a number of concerns, so I’ll take this opportunity to raise these with you. There is repeated reference to risk assessment of release of information, and it is clear from the contents that MfE staff are actively monitoring public and media attention to reports of aerosol forcing operations. This seems unusual given that MfE officials have repeatedly denied any ‘awareness’ of aerosol forcing operations, and repeatedly claimed there is ‘no evidence’ of aerosol forcing operations in New Zealand. The document also specifically refers to ‘some groups’ who believe aerosol forcing operations are occurring.

The document states: New Zealand is not involved in any programme of geoengineering or atmospheric aerosol solar radiation management.

My informed opinion is that **this statement is both incorrect and deliberately misleading**. The MfE cannot credibly make this assurance given that since 2010 it has received numerous enquiries/reports about aerosol forcing/chemtrails, but has no written procedures for investigation; and, “*has not investigated reports of aerosol SRM operations*”¹. Without any investigation how would MfE officials know if there is an operation in New Zealand or not?

It is my view that certain MfE officials are in fact conversant with the aerosol forcing operations underway in New Zealand. It is likely selected MfE officials have been briefed about the operation, its security classifications, and its purpose in general terms. However, there are some things about these operations MfE staff will not have been informed about:

1. Toxic effects of aerosol chemicals; some of this analysis has been recently published².
2. A classified WHO report³ that estimates global mortality from aerosol geoengineering induced respiratory illness of up to two billion over six decades with the elderly and the very young being most vulnerable. Respiratory disease mortality rates have been rising in the US for the last three decades, which coincides with US aerosol forcing operations commencing in the 1990’s and escalating to full scale around 1998. It is reasonable to anticipate that the year-on-year rate of mortality will increase as the level of toxicity in the air (and water, soils, and food chain) becomes increasingly concentrated. Clearly the public health implications are horrendous.
3. Biological agents in aerosol chemicals specifically targeted at human populations. Many people would find this difficult to accept, but there is extensive evidence of this in the US aerosol geoengineering programmes⁴. With the EPA claiming ‘no evidence’⁵ of aerosol forcing in NZ there is no publicly visible regulatory oversight to ensure NZ aerosol supplies do not contain hazardous biological substances.

Aerosol Operation Security

Since commencing my enquiries on this subject I have reason to believe information about myself and my research has been forwarded to the NZ Security Intelligence Service (SIS). This is a serious breach of my privacy and I hope you will be of assistance by making internal enquiries at MfE to provide an accurate response to my information request about this.

¹ E-mail from Climate Directorate staff member 20 November 2015.

² Herndon, J. Marvin (2015). Evidence of coal-fly-ash toxic chemical geoengineering in the troposphere: consequences for public health. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 12, 9375-9390. Herndon, J. Marvin (2015). Aluminium poisoning of humanity and Earth’s biota by clandestine geoengineering activity: implications for India. *Current Science*, 108, 12, 2173-2177.

³ Wigington, D. (2015). Deep Shield Interview. geoengineeringwatch.com

⁴ Thomas, W. 2004. Chemtrails Confirmed. Carson City NV: Bridger House Publications. ISBN 1-8931-57-10-5.

Freeland, E. 2014. Chemtrials, HAARP, and the Full Spectrum Dominance of Planet Earth. ISBN 978-9362-3994-8.

⁵ Environmental Protection Authority February/March 2016: OIA replies ENQ-29400-W3K2K9

Psychological Distress

Members of the public reporting aerosol spraying are experiencing psychological distress when their reports or enquires are repeatedly denied or discredited by public authorities such as MfE. In one case a 32 year old male with a history of psychiatric treatment witnessing chemtrail activity was sectioned under the Mental Health Act. His mother reported that he was frightened about chemtrails, and that he believed there was a secret plot to poison the population by spraying chemicals from aircraft into the atmosphere⁶. In this instance this distressed man was at least partially correct: That there was in fact an operation of aerosol forcing underway at that time, and that no public notification was given.

I am concerned for the staff of the Directorate for Climate Change who have been very courteous and helpful with my information requests. They are repeatedly required to reply to reports or information requests, adding significant workload and distracting them from other priorities; from an e-mail I received in December 2015:

Since our discussion on your OIA requesting chemtrail photographs I have had several emails from concerned citizens... These images (some 5MB) are filling my inbox and adding workload at the cost of progressing some critical research.

These staff are carrying the load for MfE in maintaining the ‘perception’ to the public that the MfE is ‘unaware’ of aerosol forcing operations. I would be concerned about the on-going stress this would have on any person required to function under these conditions.

Conclusions and recommendations

For the record, so that MfE staff are no longer ‘unaware’, I can inform you that the aerosol forcing operation underway in NZ is a military coordinated programme at full scale since late 2009. The aircraft used are military, or converted commercial aircraft leased or on loan to the military. On occasion certain civil aircraft are used on regular routes when this is convenient, and the operation works in tandem with operations in other countries to share aircraft and aerosol chemical supply chains. This information can be verified, you just need to talk to the right people some of whom I think would be known to you.

Ministry for the Environment officials and staff have a responsibility to act in the public good, to uphold existing environmental legislation, and to work with other governmental authorities to ensure the legislation is enforced. Failure to do so may result in liability to civil litigation⁷, or under certain circumstances individuals liable to criminal prosecution if their actions, or failure to act, causes harm to the environment or the health or safety of the public.

I think the time is overdue for MfE to step up to these responsibilities in relation to the aerosol forcing operations underway in New Zealand, and show the environmental stewardship and leadership the public expects.

⁶ Scott, M. (2013) Counselling case study.

⁷ There are class action lawsuits in process in Canada (cited: Wigington. D.) and the USA (cited: Murphy, M.J.) against government agencies complicit with covert aerosol geoengineering operations.

These are my recommendations to the Ministry for the Environment:

1. The MfE should distance itself from the current aerosol forcing operations by voluntarily disclosing all information it holds to the public, and launching a Ministerial Inquiry to identify whether the operation complies with existing environmental legislation.
2. All enquiries/reports received from the public since 2010 be re-opened and thoroughly investigated (as they should have been when originally received).
3. An immediate moratorium should be imposed on the current aerosol forcing operations while the Inquiry is commenced.
4. The MfE should share all information it holds and obtains with the EPA and the Ministry of Health, so the MoH can assess the risks to public health.
5. The MfE should take the lead to ensure a robust legislative and regulatory framework is established for the governance of any further proposed geoengineering activities in New Zealand, with appropriate public consultation⁸. This should have happened prior to the current operation commencing, it is now seven years overdue.

These recommendations are for you and the relevant Minister(s) consideration, they provide an expedient political solution to the current situation, and would enable the MfE and the Minister(s) to retain some degree of public confidence and credibility.

Finally, I would again like to convey my thanks to the staff of the Directorate for Climate Change for their on-going assistance with my research.

Thank you for your attention to this extremely important public issue, and I await your confirmation of release of OIA Memo 16-D-00142 to me.

Kind regards,



Malcolm Scott

Disclosure statement: This correspondence is in accordance with the University of Canterbury policy and principles on Academic Freedom. The views and opinions expressed are my own and may not be representative of the University of Canterbury.

⁸ The Oxford Principles – Rayner, S., Heyward, C., Kruger, T., Redgwell, C., Pidgeon, N., Savulescu, J. (2013). The Oxford Principles. Climatic Change doi:10.1007/s10584-012-0675-2.