

The Clouds of Venus¹

ANDREW T. YOUNG

Department of Physics, Texas A&M University, College Station 77843

(Manuscript received 25 November 1974, in revised form 11 February 1975)

ABSTRACT

The physical and chemical properties of the clouds of Venus are reviewed, with special emphasis on data that are related to cloud dynamics. None of the currently popular interpretations of cloud phenomena on Venus is consistent with all the data. Either a considerable fraction of the observational evidence is faulty or has been misinterpreted, or the clouds of Venus are much more complex than the current simplistic models. Several lines of attack are suggested to resolve some of the contradictions. A sound understanding of the clouds appears to be several years in the future.

1. Introduction

The visible "surface" of Venus is formed by an optically thick, unbroken cloud cover. The major constituent of these clouds has only recently been discovered to be sulfuric acid, and the exact composition is still uncertain. The approximate depth of the cloud-filled region has been revealed by Venera 8 data (Marov *et al.*, 1973), but even these are not capable of a unique interpretation (Lacis and Hansen, 1974). Furthermore, photographs taken in near-ultraviolet light show cloud features that change markedly from day to day (Ross, 1928), due to some as-yet unidentified absorber. Finally, there is conflicting evidence about the cloud motions and the general atmospheric circulation (Young, 1975).

Because so much remains unknown or in doubt about the clouds of Venus, it is impossible to give a unified interpretation of the observational data. The best that can be done at present is to review the observational evidence, and show what can and what cannot be inferred from it. A few conceptual models can also be compared with the data, and the numerous conflicts pointed out.

2. Relatively "hard facts"

The general chemical composition of the Venus atmosphere has been reviewed by L. Young (1972). Over 90% of the atmosphere is CO₂. The only uniformly mixed minor constituent is CO, with a mixing ratio of 5.1×10^{-5} . Water vapor is known to be variable, typically in the range 10^{-5} – 10^{-6} , corresponding to about 1% relative humidity at the mean temperature of the absorbing gas (250 ± 10 K). HCl appears to be concentrated within the lower part of the cloudy region,

and the same is probably true of HF; typical mixing ratios in the region we can observe are roughly 4×10^{-7} for HCl and 10^{-8} for HF, but these are derived from a single spectrum and the actual amounts may vary as much as water does. Upper limits for various other gases are given by Owen and Sagan (1972); these are on the order of 10^{-7} for NH₃ and for the sulfur-bearing gases H₂S and COS, 10^{-8} for SO₂, and 3×10^{-9} for ozone. According to Traub and Carleton (1972), the upper limit for the O₂ mixing ratio is 5×10^{-6} . If O₂ and CO were produced by photodissociation of CO₂, we should observe at least 5 times more oxygen than this upper limit.

Notice that HCl is about 40 times as abundant as HF, although these two halogens have similar cosmic abundances. Furthermore, the sum of the upper limits for sulfur-bearing gases is lower than the HCl abundance, although sulfur is about 60 times as abundant as chlorine in general. I shall return to these points later.

Let us now turn to the cloud particles themselves. The bulk of what we know about the clouds has been found by Hansen and his associates from a very detailed analysis of very extensive and accurate polarization observations made by several other workers. The definitive results of Hansen and Hovenier (1974) are that (i) the particles are spherical, and hence probably liquid; (ii) the visual refractive index is 1.44 ± 0.015 , with a normal dispersion curve; and (iii) the effective radius of the size distribution is 1.05 ± 0.10 μm , with a small effective variance (0.07 ± 0.02). Furthermore, from the small amount of Rayleigh scattering observed, they find that the average "cloud-top" pressure (i.e., the pressure at unit optical depth in the cloud) is 50 mb, in good agreement with L. Young's (1972) value of 30–60 mb for the pressure of CO₂ line formation.


¹ Presented at the Conference on the Atmosphere of Venus, Goddard Institute for Space Studies, 15–17 October 1974.

All of the above results appear to be well established, and I shall accept them as the basic data for further discussions. However, it should be remembered that all the values quoted depend on certain assumptions and laboratory values used in interpreting the actual observational data, so that some revisions, hopefully only minor ones, will eventually have to be made.

3. Preliminary results

What can be made of these facts? The first conclusion drawn from them was that the cloud particles were composed of a strong sulfuric-acid solution (Sill, 1972; Young and Young, 1973). This explains the following facts:


1) The atmosphere is extremely dry, a result of the reaction



which is strongly exothermic and goes very nearly to completion. The great decrease in the number of H_2O molecules in sulfuric acid solutions accounts for the corresponding decrease in their vapor pressure. Sill (1972) suggested that 86% (by weight) acid would be required to explain the low average humidity. However, any additional acids dissolved in the drops, such as HCl and HF, would further lower the vapor pressure, so that such a high concentration is not required.

2) Liquid drops are possible, not only because sulfuric acid solutions generally have lower freezing points than water, but also because they supercool so readily that it is difficult to measure the freezing points accurately. The mixture in the range of interest that freezes at 250 K contains 75.9% H_2SO_4 by weight. Higher concentrations have higher freezing points, up to the monohydrate $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$, which is 84% sulfuric acid and freezes near 281.7 K; but any additional acids in the solution should lower the freezing points.

3) The refractive index of 1.44, and the dispersion curve, are very well explained by sulfuric acid of 70–75% concentration (A. Young, 1973; Hansen and Hovenier, 1974). According to recent refractive index measurements by Palmer and Williams (1975), the best-fitting concentration is 70.5%; however, all higher concentrations lie within the range of permitted refractive indices for the Venus aerosol. It should be pointed out that water solutions of HF have even lower refractive indices than water, so that the addition of some HF to the acid droplets should lower the refractive index appreciably; this would favor a concentration somewhat higher than 70%. Furthermore, HF is highly soluble in H_2SO_4 because it reacts to form fluosulfonic acid:



On the other hand, HCl, which is highly soluble in water because it dissociates, is only weakly soluble in strong sulfuric acid solutions; thus HCl, which might tend to increase the refractive index, is less likely to dissolve in the strongly-acid aerosol than HF, which tends to lower the refractive index. Indeed, this may help explain why HF is some 40 times less abundant in the gas phase than HCl, even though the two halogens have similar cosmic abundances.

4) Some of the previously unexplained features of the IR spectrum of Venus, such as the 11.2 μm band and the extreme blackness of the planet near 4 μm , are in good agreement with the spectrum of strong sulfuric acid solutions (Young and Young, 1973). Furthermore, the spectrum of Venus in the thermal infrared is explained in detail by 75% sulfuric acid drops with the size distribution found by Hansen and Hovenier (1974), if the aerosol is homogeneously mixed with the gas and the stratospheric lapse rate is 3–4 K km^{-1} , as found by Mariner 5 and 10 radio occultations (A. Young, 1974; Samuelson *et al.*, 1974). The uniform stratospheric mixing ratio is supported by other data as well (A. Young, 1974). Both the IR data and the requirement that the optical depth in the visible be unity at the 50 mb level lead to a mass mixing ratio of 5×10^{-6} , or a numerical mixing ratio of 2.3×10^{-6} for H_2SO_4 molecules relative to CO_2 . This is comparable to typical mixing ratios for water vapor.

The spectra of sulfuric acid solutions change only slowly with concentration between 75 and 84.5% (the monohydrate). However, marked changes appear at higher concentrations, due to undissociated sulfuric acid molecules. These allow us to exclude concentrations appreciably higher than 85%. On the other hand, the low relative humidity appears to rule out any concentration much lower than 75%. A small concentration of some other acid will help bring the freezing point, vapor pressure and refractive index closer to the observed values; HF is the most likely candidate. It seems reasonable at present to say the sulfuric acid concentration in the aerosol is about $80 \pm 5\%$.

The effect of HF on the physical properties of this acid at 250 K needs to be investigated in the laboratory. If we imagine that as much HF as HCl were in the gas phase before adding the sulfuric acid aerosol, which then dissolved the bulk of the HF, then between 1 and 2% of the molecules in the liquid would be HF. As only about 1% of the molecules are water (as is shown by the relative humidity of about 1%), and as HF has such a powerful affinity for H_2O that there is no chemical substance known that will dry it, even this small amount of HF may have an appreciable effect in lowering the water vapor pressure of the aerosol. Thus we might expect the vapor-phase abundance of water to vary inversely with that of HF. Such a negative correlation should be looked for,

although it will be difficult to measure with present techniques.

Although sulfuric acid explains the IR spectrum of the Venus clouds very well, it is as incapable of explaining the yellow color of the planet as water. For years this color, due to an absorption in the blue and ultraviolet, was used as an argument against water clouds, and the same argument is equally good (or bad) against sulfuric-acid clouds. The usual argument contains a fallacy, however: while it is true that *pure* water (or sulfuric acid) is nonabsorbing at the short wavelengths where Venus absorbs, there is no reason why there cannot be some other material present, perhaps as a minor contaminant dissolved in the cloud aerosol, which does absorb at short wavelengths. We can only rule out a proposed cloud material if it absorbs where Venus is highly reflecting, not the other way around. Both water and H₂SO₄ are acceptable cloud constituents on this basis.

Indeed, there are indications that some other material must be present. For, if the UV absorber were a major cloud constituent, the absorption should be fairly uniform across the disc, and there should be no UV markings. [The argument, first made by Ross (1928), that the markings could be due to variations in the Rayleigh-scattering optical depth above a uniform yellow cloud, was based on a misunderstanding of Russell's interpretation of twilight phenomena on Venus; the layers visible at the limb and terminator have a normal optical depth less than 0.02 and are therefore so transparent as to be invisible on the disc. Furthermore, the polarization analysis (Hansen and Hovenier, 1974) shows that the Rayleigh optical depth is only about 5% at the wavelengths where the UV markings have maximum contrast, roughly 20-30%. As the ultraviolet albedo of Venus is near 50%, the very low Rayleigh optical depth cannot contribute enough light to account for the brightness variations on UV photographs. Finally, a preliminary look at possible correlations between UV markings and CO₂ absorption variations over the disc (shown in Fig. 1) indicates that the mean difference between UV light and dark markings is only 1±3%. Thus, spatial variations in the concentration of UV absorber are the easiest means of explaining the UV features.]

4. Cloud microstructure

To get a more detailed picture of the cloud, let us look at some additional quantities that can be deduced from the basic data. The projected surface density is about 3 g m⁻² of H₂SO₄, or 4 g m⁻² of total mass, in the aerosol above unit optical depth, which we take to occur at 50 mb pressure. At this pressure and a temperature of 250 K, the mean free path in CO₂ is about a quarter of a micrometer. This is smaller than the size of the droplets, but not enormously so; if we assume that Stokes law is valid, we find that the




FIG. 1. Relation between the relative amount of CO₂ absorption and the relative brightness of the corresponding part of the planet in ultraviolet light. To remove the effect of daily variations in CO₂ absorption, the ratio of the amount observed in a particular area to the average for the standard slit position (parallel to the line of cusps and midway between limb and terminator), which averages over a large part of the disk, is used. The estimated brightness of each area on UV photographs runs from 1 (very bright) to 5 (very dark). The CO₂ absorptions are taken from A. Young *et al.* (1974) and the UV pictures were taken at the New Mexico State and Table Mountain Observatories on the same days as the infrared spectra.

aerosol droplets can fall at the rate of about 3×10⁻⁴ m s⁻¹ or about 25 m day⁻¹ at the 50 mb level. The number density of droplets is about 1.6×10⁸ m⁻³, corresponding to an average separation of about 1.8 mm.

If the gas were perfectly still, these figures would correspond to a downward flux of 5×10⁴ particles per square meter per second (5 cm⁻²), or a mass flux of 1.5 μg cm⁻² per day. This flux must be compensated by a similar upward flux of either aerosol particles in regions of higher number density, or sulfur-bearing gases, depending on whether the sulfuric acid is produced below or above the 50 mb level. If it is produced below, then turbulent mixing must account for the nearly-constant aerosol mixing ratio. If it is produced above, in the region of free molecular flow, then the rate of fall is inversely proportional to the gas density, and a constant production rate will give a constant mixing ratio is still air [an argument first proposed by Link (1969) for the Earth's high scattering layer.] In the Stokes law region, the speed of fall is (nearly) constant and the aerosol number density, rather than the mixing ratio, becomes constant. However, the region below the 50 mb level is probably strongly convective and turbulent, so that a nearly-constant mixing ratio can be expected there too. In any case we know that the aerosol extends with nearly constant mixing ratio up to the level of about 5 mb, or about 2.5 scale heights above our reference level (A. Young, 1974).

The narrow size distribution is evidence that the aerosol we see has not been subjected to much coalescence. As a rough indication of which is involved, note that a particle must travel about a scale height, on the average, to collide with another similar particle at the level of unit optical depth. If we assume that differential velocities of neighboring particles are comparable to the Stokes velocity (due to a spread in particle sizes), it will take a particle about 200 days to collide with another. However, because of the narrow size distribution, Brownian motion may be more important. The thermal velocity for a sulfuric acid droplet, which has a mass of about 10^{-11} g, is about 1 mm s^{-1} —about four times faster than the Stokes velocity at 50 mb. This reduces the coalescence time scale to about 60 days. If the mixing ratio remains constant, the time scale is reduced in proportion to the pressure increase at greater depths (e.g., about 1 day at the 3 atm level). Of course, if the droplets are electrically charged, the whole problem is much more complicated.

These long time scales expected for significant evolution of the cloud structure at the levels we see are in marked contrast to the time scales of significant changes in UV cloud structure and in CO_2 absorption strength observed in the near infrared. Unlike terrestrial weather phenomena, in which clouds can rapidly appear and disappear as water condenses and evaporates, short-term weather on Venus cannot be explained by a simple phase change of the major cloud constituent: sulfuric acid has a completely negligible vapor pressure² at 250 K. Once an aerosol droplet forms, there is no way to get rid of it without transporting it to much deeper levels of the atmosphere than those we see. Yet according to Mariner occultation data, the region we see has a very low lapse rate (about one-third of adiabatic) and is therefore very stable against convection.

If, as is widely supposed, the 4 day periodicities in the UV features and the IR absorptions are due to a rapid rotation of the atmosphere, it is hard to understand how the periodic phenomena can survive in the face of the wind shears and turbulent mixing that should accompany the necessary 100 m s^{-1} winds. Furthermore, there is a considerable body of data that are incompatible with the supposed 4 day rotation (A. Young, 1975). These data include both long-lived limb-terminator asymmetries in CO_2 absorption and some of the most reliable Doppler measurements of rotational velocities.

Finally, let us look at the behavior of one of our sulfuric acid droplets as it moves up and down in the cloud. In the region near the cloud top, the lapse rate is $3\text{--}4 \text{ K km}^{-1}$ ($15\text{--}20 \text{ K}$ per scale height), and the major effect should be a change in composition as water

is cooked out of the droplet (going downward) or as more condenses (going up). For example, Fig. 3 of A. Young (1973) shows that a 7 K change in temperature at constant water vapor pressure, or a 15 K change at constant mixing ratio (allowing for the 30% change in total pressure), corresponds to a 3% change in acid concentration. Suppose the droplet has fallen to a warmer region, so that water evaporates; this represents a 3.8% mass loss. The increase in temperature causes a slight expansion (a few tenths of 1% loss in density), which is overwhelmed by the effect of the change in composition on density (about a 2% increase). Thus the volume of the drop is smaller due to both a drop in mass (3.8%) and a smaller increase in density; the net result is slightly over a 5% decrease in volume. This corresponds to a radius decrease of just under 2%, or a change in projected area (or optical depth, if this happens to all the cloud particles) of about 3½%. The change in refractive index is an increase of about 0.002, again mainly due to the change in composition.

We can sum up these changes by noting that they are dominated by the loss (or gain) of water, due to the temperature dependence of the vapor pressure; the effects of thermal expansion are quite minor. Furthermore, the changes to be expected in one scale height are much smaller than the changes in either radius or refractive index that can be detected with present-day polarization data. Thus the natural vertical inhomogeneity of the cloud does not contribute sensibly to the apparent width of the size distribution, for example.

The above discussion does not take account of possible complications due to HF or other contaminants. However, they are all likely to be much more volatile than sulfuric acid itself, and to be lost with the water as the temperature rises. Hence, at the bottom of the cloud, we should have nearly pure sulfuric acid. Fig. 8 of A. Young (1973) shows the vapor pressure curve for the azeotropic mixture of water and sulfuric acid (98.3% by weight); for a cloud-bottom temperature of 400–450 K, the range indicated by the Venera 8 data, the expected water vapor mixing ratio is near 10^{-4} . This is quite consistent with various radio- and radar-astronomical upper limits near 2×10^{-3} , but is less than some model atmospheres have required to account for the greenhouse effect. However, these models did not allow for the large opacity of the cloud itself. For example, if we assume the same aerosol droplets remain uniformly mixed from unit optical depth at 50 mb down to the cloud base at about 5 bars, the total cloud optical depth is equal to the pressure ratio, 100. This is consistent with estimates of the optical depth required to account for the Venera 8 light measurements, also.

When sulfuric acid boils, the vapor is generally a mixture of H_2SO_4 , H_2O and SO_3 molecules. Thus we should not expect much molecular sulfuric acid in the lower atmosphere. On the other hand, HSO_3F , which

² The expected mixing ratio of H_2SO_4 in the gas phase in equilibrium with 75% acid droplets is about 10^{-13} .

has a much lower boiling point than sulfuric acid and should therefore distil out of the aerosol well above the cloud base, is stable in the vapor phase up to 900°C, and may therefore be a minor constituent of the lower atmosphere.

5. Cloud thermal balance and dynamics

Because of the very high thermal infrared opacity of the cloud, solar radiation absorbed within or below the cloud cannot be directly re-radiated to space. We can expect that this energy will have to be transported by convection, and indeed the Mariner temperature profiles show a lapse rate that is almost exactly adiabatic in the cloud-filled region. Venus absorbs about 20% of the incident sunlight; about half of this is taken up by the mysterious UV absorber (see Fig. 2) which means it is absorbed in the upper part of the cloudy region. About 10% of the rest (1% of the original sunlight) reaches the surface, according to the Venera 8 data. Because of the increasing absorption in near-IR and visible CO₂ bands with increasing temperature and pressure, there must be some sunlight absorbed at every level in the atmosphere. However, according to Lacis and Hansen (1974), the Venera 8 data do not uniquely determine the vertical distribution of the deposited energy. On the other hand, one can make the following argument: because the aerosol particles are large compared to visible and near-IR wavelengths, the cloud optical depth is practically independent of wavelength between 3000 Å and a few micrometers. The near-IR CO₂ bands show that the reflected sunlight penetrates, on the average, to about




FIG. 2. Spectral distribution of the solar energy absorbed by Venus. Upper curve: solar energy distribution; bottom curve: fraction of sunlight absorbed (1 - A_λ) at each wavelength; middle curve: energy absorbed by Venus. Note that the absorbed energy is mostly in the region around 4000 Å.




FIG. 3. Relation between CO₂ rotational temperatures and amount of absorption in the 7820 Å band. Curve 1 shows the variation to be expected if the aerosol number density varies in an atmosphere of fixed temperature-pressure profile. Curve 2 is the relation expected from temperature variations in a 75% H₂SO₄ aerosol, as described in the text. Curve 3 is the effect of temperature alone on the equivalent widths of the CO₂ lines measured, for a fixed amount of gas. This last effect appears to be present, but is hard to see because of large, uncorrelated variations in the amount of CO₂. The two light, unlabelled lines are the two regression lines; note that only curve 3 is contained between them. The heavy cross is centered at the means of *R* and *T*, and indicates ±1 internal standard error in each coordinate.

the level where the temperature is 250 K. The ultra-violet absorber (and hence the region where half of the total heat is absorbed) must lie at, or above, this level; otherwise, the UV absorber would not be seen, and the albedo would be near unity in the ultraviolet. Thus about half of the total absorbed energy is deposited near the cloud top, at a pressure no greater than one or two tenths of an atmosphere.

But the absorbed heat does not remain at the cloud top. If it did, the sunlit side of Venus would be appreciably warmer than the night side; in fact, the reverse appears to be true (Ingersoll and Orton, 1974). Apparently, convective mixing is sufficiently strong to store the absorbed energy deeper in the atmosphere.

L. Young (1972) has pointed out the remarkable constancy of the CO₂ rotational temperatures measured in different bands over several years. In spite of the fact that the strength of the absorptions, and hence the cloud-top pressure, varies considerably with time, no corresponding variation in the temperature has been observed. Therefore, I thought that the "thermostat" involved might be a phase change,




FIG. 4. Relation between UV cloud features and CO_2 rotational temperatures. Although there is no systematic variation of mean temperature with light or dark UV features, the darker features appear to show more temperature variation than the lighter ones. The scatter in the light-feature temperatures is comparable to their internal errors (3–4 K), so they may be nearly isothermal.

such as freezing or melting, of the aerosol droplets (A. Young, 1973). However, in our most recent data, a small (8–9 K rms) but apparently real temperature variation exists.

If an entire column of the Venus atmosphere were heated by 7 K, the previous section shows that an increase in the amount of gas visible should result from the 3.7% decrease in optical depth, due to shrinkage of the aerosol particles as water evaporates from them. As the standard deviation of the amount of CO_2 absorption in this set of data (Young *et al.*, 1974) is only about 5%, of which about half is due to random noise, we should expect to find a strong positive correlation of the temperatures with the CO_2 variations, if the above picture is correct. In fact, there is practically *no* correlation of the temperature and the amount of gas; about 20% negative correlation is observed between the absorption strength and temperature variations, but this is mainly due to the temperature dependence of the (primarily low J) lines we measured (see Fig. 3). Furthermore, the temperatures do *not* show a detectable 4-day variation. Instead, they seem to vary from place to place on the planet, with the mean being about the same from one day to the next.

My first reaction to this was that it proved that the clouds could not be sulfuric acid! However, it is possible to save the acid-cloud model if one assumes that the cloud-top temperature, and indeed the whole atmospheric temperature profile in this region, is determined by an equilibrium between the heat flux convected up from below and the flux radiated away. Then the near-constancy of the cloud-top temperatures means that the convective flux is nearly constant. This picture also explains why the top of the convective region coincides with about optical depth unity

in the cloud: at the point where the cloud can radiate its heat away to space, convection is no longer needed to transport the upward flux. (This coincidence is even closer if we use the optical depth in the thermal infrared, which is a few times smaller than in the visible.) Finally, the near-constancy of the convective heat flux is explained by the depth of the convective cloud, whose base is in contact with the large heat capacity of the lower atmosphere.

The spatial variations in cloud-top temperature invite a comparison with the only two other spatially variable quantities known, the water vapor abundance (Barker, 1974) and the ultraviolet features. Unfortunately, there is hardly any overlap between our data and Barker's water measurements. However, we do have good ultraviolet coverage, largely supplied by the New Mexico State and Paris observatories. The detailed comparisons will be presented elsewhere; our preliminary result (Fig. 4) is that there is no difference between the mean temperatures of light and dark UV features. However, there does appear to be a real difference in the temperature variations: the light regions all seem to have nearly the same temperature, while the largest temperature variations all occur in the dark features. The interpretation of this discovery would be easier if we understood what the light and dark features are, physically.

They are clearly *not* "clearings" in an "upper cloud layer," for we find exactly as much CO_2 absorption in light features as in dark ones (Fig. 1). Indeed, such clearings probably cannot exist. If the cloud top is (nearly) a surface of constant temperature, large variations in cloud-top pressure would mean large temperature variations along a surface of constant pressure, which would produce mass motions tending to remove the imbalance. The clearer parts of the atmosphere, where we see more CO_2 , are the colder at a given pressure level. But, as we find no mean difference between light and dark UV features, they are neither hot nor cold. This is even more surprising because the UV absorber is responsible for a large fraction of the total solar heating; one might expect to find dark areas a little warmer because of this.

It even seems difficult to determine whether the absorbing material is above or below unit optical depth. The generally lighter shade of the cusps, where we see to a smaller optical depth because of oblique illumination and viewing, suggests that the dark stuff is underneath. Then it should be more visible, i.e., we might expect the dark markings to be larger with greater contrast, when we see deeper in (more CO_2). Unfortunately for this argument, the days of maximum contrast and extent of the dark markings are the days when we see the *least* CO_2 . This is why we once suggested more CO_2 over light regions (Young and Young, 1973).

About the only regularity detected in the cloud structure is the tendency for the clouds to be less

dense (and hence, for the isothermal surfaces to lie deeper in the atmosphere) at higher latitudes. The polar clearing has been observed at all four transits since 1761; the pressure at which a fixed optical depth (and hence, a fixed temperature) occurs is about a factor of 2 higher at the poles than at the equator (Link, 1969, pp. 209–214). The same effect is visible at much greater depths in the CO₂ data: spectra taken at higher latitudes show stronger absorptions (cf. Fig. 3 of A. Young *et al.*, 1974), although one would expect to see less because of the oblique illumination and viewing. According to Barker (private communication), the effect is quite prominent at inferior conjunctions. A factor of 2 difference in pressure at constant temperature corresponds to a polar cooling of 10–15 K along a constant-pressure surface. Are the cloud tops lower at the poles because the aerosol is produced at low latitudes and has time to fall out before the general circulation carries it to the poles, or because the aerosol is produced photochemically and there is less sunlight available to manufacture it at high latitudes?

Finally, although it is the 4-day weather cycle on Venus that has attracted most attention, there is ample evidence of longer weather patterns with larger amplitudes. For example, Scott and Reese (1972) have pointed out that the UV features “appear to be randomly distributed and quite ephemeral in nature, rarely enduring in a recognizable pattern for more than 20 days and usually much less.” The spectroscopic observations show much larger variations from one year to the next than are seen within a 3 week interval of continuous and intensive observation; indeed, the general trend of the 3 week sequence (Young *et al.*, 1974) opposes that of the average variation with phase angle (L. Young, 1972). Furthermore, the 4 day cycle appears to come and go, or at least to vary from pronounced regularity to apparent chaos; Ross himself looked for periodic variations and was unable to find any, although his pictures cover several 4-day intervals well enough to show the repetition if it had been present. As Venus has a very low orbital eccentricity and a small equatorial obliquity, seasonal effects should be minor. What, then, is the nature of the long-term variations in weather?

6. Conclusions

I must conclude that we don't really understand the clouds of Venus very well. However, there are some obvious lines of investigation that would help clarify the situation, possibly allowing us to ask the right questions the next time around. For example:

1. How do the trace constituents H₂O, HCl and HF vary? How are these variations related to the temperature variations? Good spatial resolution over the disc is essential. Such an investigation may be possible at present if a sustained cooperative observing program can be conducted with several large telescopes simultaneously, using the highest-dispersion spectroscopic equipment available. The HF is the most difficult, but probably the most interesting after water. At present there is no prospect of getting enough spectral resolution from an orbiting spacecraft, which would obviously solve the spatial resolution problem.
2. We need to know more about the physical chemistry of the H₂O–H₂SO₄–HF system at conditions like those at the Venus cloud tops. This is a fairly straightforward laboratory investigation, though the corrosive nature of the materials and the low concentrations of HF may pose difficulties in getting the measurements.
3. What is the general circulation pattern of the Venus atmosphere? Doppler measurements of wind velocity from Earth are very difficult, but should be repeated, using as many different techniques as possible to eliminate systematic errors. Meteorological probes, such as constant-pressure balloons, have been very useful on Earth and should be tried on Venus; the corrosive aerosol presents problems in maintaining a long lifetime, however.
4. Most frustrating of all, what is the ultraviolet absorber, and what is the nature of the UV features? All the “obvious” explanations conflict with at least some of the data. The lack of correlation of UV features with any easily measurable quantity (cloud-top temperature, pressure, etc.) is baffling. I would guess that we won't understand the features until we know what the UV absorber is, and where it comes from. Until the features are understood, I think it is dangerous to interpret their motions as wind speeds, especially in view of the conflicting data on winds.
5. What is the average vertical structure of the clouds? In other words, how do the aerosol composition, size distribution and mixing ratio vary with altitude? At present, high-resolution thermal infrared spectra seem to offer the best handle on the mixing ratio problem in the upper parts; enough observations should be made to separate long-term averages from short and long weather cycles. The techniques that have been tried in the past—interpretation of the spectroscopic phase curve and line profiles in the near infrared—require higher spectral resolution, and are intrinsically less sensitive to the vertical structure, and more difficult to analyze because of multiple scattering.

Finally, a word of caution: Because of long-term changes in the atmosphere of Venus, a restricted set of data, no matter how refined, cannot present a “typical”

picture of the clouds. There is particularly the danger that data from flyby spacecraft get entrenched in the literature as "definitive," while they actually show only a snapshot of the weather at a particular time. A good example of this is shown by the Mariner 5 temperature profiles. Because the entry and exit data agreed well, they were regarded as a very accurate model by many people. Now we see important differences between Mariner 5 and Mariner 10 data, such as an appreciably different stratospheric lapse rate. Of course, neither set of results is "wrong," but Venus is different at different times and places. (The sampling of the atmosphere at just one point by an entry probe exemplifies a further complication of the same kind.) We cannot separate the "weather" from the "climate" until a large body of data, extending over a long period of time, is available. Both ground-based patrols and long-lived orbiters will be needed to solve these problems.

Acknowledgments. I thank E. S. Barker and W. A. Traub for discussing their unpublished observations with me. I especially wish to thank L. G. Young and R. A. Schorn for teaching me most of what I know about Venus.

This work was supported by NASA Contract NGR 44-001-117 with Texas A&M University.

REFERENCES

- Barker, E. S., 1974: Ground-based observations of Mars and Venus water vapor during 1972 and 1973. *Exploration of the Planetary System* (IAU Symposium No. 65), 203-222.
- Hansen, J. R., and J. W. Hovenier, 1974: Interpretation of the polarization of Venus. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **31**, 1137-1160.
- Ingersoll, A. P., and G. S. Orton, 1974: Lateral inhomogeneities in the Venus atmosphere: Analysis of thermal infrared maps. *Icarus*, **21**, 121-128.
- Lacis, A. A., and J. E. Hansen, 1974: Atmosphere of Venus: Implications of Venera 8 sunlight measurements. *Science*, **184**, 979-982.
- Link, F., 1969: *Eclipse Phenomena in Astronomy*. Springer-Verlag, 71-77.
- Marov, M. Ya., V. S. Avduevsky, N. F. Borodin, A. P. Ekonomov, V. V. Kerzhanovich, V. P. Lysov, B. Ye. Moshkin, M. K. Rozhdestvensky and O. L. Ryabov, 1973: Preliminary results on the Venus atmosphere from the Venera 8 descent module. *Icarus*, **20**, 407-421.
- Owen, T., and C. Sagan, 1972: Minor constituents in planetary atmospheres: Ultraviolet spectroscopy from the orbiting astronomical observatory. *Icarus*, **16**, 557-568.
- Palmer, K. F., and Dudley Williams, 1975: Optical constants of sulfuric acid: Application to the clouds of Venus? *Appl. Opt.*, **14**, 208-219.
- Ross, F. E., 1928: Photographs of Venus. *Astrophys. J.*, **68**, 57-92.
- Samuelson, R. E., R. A. Hanel, V. G. Kunde and W. C. Maguire, 1974: Thermal infrared dependence of the Venus cloud opacity. *Bull. Amer. Astron. Soc.*, **6**, 368.
- Scott, A. H., and E. J. Reese, 1972: Venus: Atmospheric rotation. *Icarus*, **17**, 589-601.
- Sill, G. T., 1972: Sulfuric acid in the Venus clouds. *Comm. Lunar Planet. Lab.*, No. 171, 191-198.
- Traub, W. A., and N. P. Carleton, 1972: Observations of O₂ on Mars and Venus. *Bull. Amer. Astron. Soc.*, **4**, 371.
- Young, A. T., 1973: Are the clouds of Venus sulfuric acid? *Icarus*, **18**, 564-582.
- , 1974: Venus clouds: Structure and composition. *Science*, **183**, 407-409.
- , 1975: Is the four-day "rotation" of Venus illusory? *Icarus*, **24**, 1-10.
- , A. Woszczyk and L. G. Young, 1974: Spectroscopic observations of spatial and temporal variations on Venus. *Acta Astron.*, **24**, 55-68.
- Young, L. D. G., 1972: High resolution spectra of Venus—A review. *Icarus*, **17**, 632-658.
- , and A. T. Young, 1973: Comment on "The composition of the Venus cloud tops in light of recent spectroscopic data." *Astrophys. J.*, **179**, L39-L43.