Dear Marsha,

Frank Press warned me several years ago that Science Magazine was far too conservative to publish truly groundbreaking research. In your editorial of 12 July, 2013, you ask “how much risk can and should a journal tolerate in publishing …. novel findings?” You emphasize that “science moves forward by communicating findings that challenge old ideas and force us to test new theories against the evidence.”

My paper “On the Link Between Ozone Depletion and Global Warming” (Science manuscript 1252585) was rejected this week without review with the standard phrase “we feel that the scope and focus of your paper make it more appropriate for a more specialized journal.”

My paper challenges greenhouse-gas theory and shows that ozone depletion caused by CFCs and volcanism provides a much clearer explanation for reliable observations of global climate change recently and throughout geologic time. I show that there is at least 48 times more energy involved in ultraviolet-B radiation that reaches Earth when ozone is depleted than involved in changes of greenhouse gas concentrations. The root of the problem is that greenhouse-gas theory is quantified assuming energy is proportional to bandwidth, which would be the case if light travels as waves in matter. But there is no matter in space. Energy in radiation is well observed to be proportional to frequency as postulated by Max Planck in 1900, an observation that led to the quantum revolution.

A recent report by the Royal Society and NAS states “climate change is one of the defining issues of our time.” It is at the center of one of the largest battles in human history between scientific reason and belief in order to set public policy. While the regulatory teeth of the EPA are finally beginning to bite in the US, Europe and much of the rest of the world is backing away from carbon commitments for a variety of reasons including the negative effect on their ability to compete in a global economy. The fact that global temperatures have remained relatively constant for the past 16 years has made it more difficult for scientists to be taken seriously. My work shows that limiting CO2 is likely to have little if any effect on global warming.

Life as we know it on Earth would not be possible if the ozone layer did not absorb the highest energy, DNA damaging, solar ultraviolet radiation that reaches the lower atmosphere. What is now clear is that the optical thickness of the ozone layer plays the dominant role in determining surface temperatures on Earth and changes in this optical thickness determine climate change.

The laudable effort of the IPCC to demonstrate consensus among scientists in order to stimulate political action has had the unfortunate side effect of inhibiting scientific debate. Consensus is the stuff of politics; but debate is the stuff of science.

The last thing any climatologist wants to consider right now, especially while under attack from the right, is that there might be any problem with greenhouse-gas theory. I have approached dozens and nearly all will not even consider the issue. This is where science turns into religion as you say was postulated by your mentor. We all have spam filters and disagreement with greenhouse-gas theory is instantly filtered out by most climatologists.

The science of global warming needs to be further developed within the scientific community. I believe the AAAS and Science Magazine are best situated to play a lead role. There is little risk for Science Magazine to put my paper out for thorough review. The difficulty will be sorting out cogent scientific criticism from what you call “preconceived bias” based on common wisdom. There is little risk to Science Magazine for publishing my paper other than to incur the wrath of those wrapped up in defending greenhouse gas theory. There is a major risk to society, however: How long are we going to continue down the mistaken and costly road of reducing CO2 emissions? How long will it take for the scientific process to self-correct?

My 4500-word paper is the tip of an iceberg. I am completing a major scientific website, the equivalent of a large book, explaining most of the observations, theory, and logic behind the ozone depletion theory of climate change. I plan to make this website public when the paper is published. I provide, in the review copy, information for how reviewers can access this website now. I also plan to initiate a Google discussion group upon publication to debate the evidence for and against ozone depletion theory. I have also prepared a summary for the intelligent public accessible from the homepage of the website. And I am working on a more detailed paper presenting a fully deterministic view of electromagnetic radiation and its very substantial implications.

In hindsight, the ozone depletion theory of climate change seems obvious because the theory is so straight forward and the data are so clear. We measure daily the changes in energy very precisely from the stratosphere to the ocean. They show clearly why global temperatures have risen very little since 1998, why ocean heat content continues to climb, why heat and drought were so severe in North America in 2012-2013 while floods drowned Western Europe, why arctic amplification exists, etc. The observations also suggest a much tighter link between climate and weather driven primarily by volcanism, even quietly degassing volcanoes.

Please reconsider submitting this paper for review.

Sincerely,
Peter