

## Response to Stephen Musolino

*Dear Editors:*

The authors agree that publication in a journal such as the *Journal of Geophysical Research* would have been appropriate. We attempted to publish a different version of the paper in the *Journal of Geophysical Research*, but it is our understanding that the Journal could find only one willing reviewer; that individual provided a review that showed little evidence that he/she had read the paper in any detail, providing no useful information by which we could judge the legitimacy of what we had done. It is difficult to have an open and useful discussion when the proponents of the established viewpoint often appear recalcitrant in their willingness to consider an alternative view.

Regarding the complications of recycling among reservoirs, we noted in our paper that our results were grounded in annual mean values of the  $D^{14}C$  quantities; thus, we were

looking only at annual means that would have incorporated into them all the effects of recycling. Lastly, as we noted in the paper, we recognized the significance of bomb-induced  $^{14}C$ , which had disappeared from the atmosphere by absorption into carbon reservoirs, especially the oceans, but we believed that the small fraction this represented of the total  $^{14}C$  would result in a negligibly small impact on the specific activities of interest as a consequence of release from the reservoirs.

KENNETH SKRABLE  
GEORGE CHABOT  
CLAYTON FRENCH

*University of Massachusetts Lowell  
Lowell, MA*

■ ■