

The Bering Strait's grip on the northern hemisphere climate

Agatha M. De Boer, Doron Nof*

Department of Oceanography, Florida State University,
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-4320 U.S.A.

To whom correspondence should be addressed:

E-mail: nof@ocean.fsu.edu

Fax: 1-850-644-2581

Tel: 1-850-644-2736

Revised, September 2003

Abstract

The last 10,000 years have been characterized by distinctly stable climates. For the earlier glacial period (up to 125,000 years ago), climate records show long-lasting large-amplitude oscillations, generally known as Dansgaard-Oeschger (D/O) or Heinrich events. These fluctuations are believed to be a result of freshwater anomalies in the North Atlantic which dramatically reduce the transport of the meridional overturning cell (MOC). They are followed by a recovery of the MOC.

Here, we propose that such long lasting instabilities in the meridional circulation are only possible during glacial periods when the Bering Strait (BS) is closed. An analytical ocean model (which includes both wind and thermohaline processes) is used to show that, during interglacial periods (when the BS is open) perturbations in North Atlantic Deep Water (NADW) formation are quickly damped out. This new mechanism involves the strong winds in the Southern Ocean (SO) which, with an open BS, quickly [$O(1-10 \text{ years})$] flush any large low salinity anomalies out of the Atlantic and into the Pacific Ocean. During glacial periods, the stabilizing effect is prevented by the closure of the BS which traps the anomalies within the Atlantic, causing long lasting perturbations. We also show that no continuous freshwater flux is needed in order to keep the collapsed MOC from a recovery in the closed basin case, but a relatively large continuous flux of 0.24 Sv is required in order to keep the collapsed state in the open BS case. With a smaller freshwater transport, the open MOC quickly recovers. This also indicates that an open BS is more stable than the closed BS case.

Process-oriented numerical simulations using idealized geometry in a two-layer ocean support our analytical solutions and show that the flushing mechanism is active even when the shallow BS sill is included.

KEYWORDS: North Atlantic, Bering Strait, Southern Ocean winds, Thermohaline, Interglacial Climate Stability

1. Introduction

The North Atlantic (NA) is an integral part of the Earth's heat engine. Here, warm surface water is transformed to deep water by releasing great quantities of heat to the atmosphere. This flow surfaces outside the Atlantic Ocean and re-enters the Atlantic from the South. The cycle is known as the ocean's meridional overturning cell (MOC).

Because of its associated heat transport, reorganizations of the MOC cell have often been suggested (Boyle 2000; Marotzke 2000; Clark et al. 2002) as the cause of the multiple climate fluctuations during the last glacial period, also known as D/O events (Bond et al. 1993; Blunier et al 1998; Labeyrie 2000). These millennial-scale cycles (**Fig. 1**) are generally believed to be a result of freshwater anomalies in the NA. Some of the cold peaks in the records can be traced directly to massive ice sheets discharges called Heinrich events (Broecker 1994; Cacho et al 1999; Bard et al 2000; Bard 2002). The accompanying salinity anomaly renders the surface water too fresh for deep convection (Birchfield et al 1994; Saravanan and McWilliams 1995; Stocker 2000; Ganopolski and Rahmstorf 2001, 2002; Schmittner et al. 2002).

Curiously enough, such high amplitude oscillations have been absent during the Holocene (see again **Fig. 1**) and evidence is mounting that the penultimate interglacial was equally stable (Kukla 2000; Adkins et al 1997; Rioual et al. 2001; Shemesh et al. 2001). We propose here that the switch between stable and unstable climates is the *onset and cessation of flow through the BS* as modulated by sea level variations. We suggest that this opening took place abruptly (relative to the slow sea level rise) due to an initial jamming of the strait by icebergs and broken ice sheets. We speculate that such jamming was created by the funnel-like shape of the adjacent continent. It persisted until the size of the icebergs was reduced to a size that could pass through the strait, and the sea level difference between the Arctic and Pacific rose to a level high enough




Fig. 1. *Top*: Atmospheric temperature record obtained from the Greenland GIPS2 ice core (upper panel). Note that, prior to the opening of the BS, large ice sheets and their induced albedo kept the mean temperature lower than it is today. The NA sea surface temperature record displays a very similar structure (lower panel). Six Heinrich events (cool NA temperature periods which correspond to massive ice sheet discharges) are indicated by H1-H6. The occurrence of high amplitude rapid oscillations decreased notably after the opening of the BS, 10.4 ka BP. We argue that, although the meridional overturning cell (MOC) recovers from a freshwater-induced collapse in both the open and closed BS cases, the recovery in the open BS case is much quicker than that in the closed case. This is related to our proposed BS flushing mechanism which explains the very small temperature fluctuations during the last 10,000 years compared to the large fluctuations in the period prior to that. [Adapted from Bard (2002).

Bottom: Schematic diagram of our proposed flushing mechanism. During glacial periods (low sea level) the BS is closed and any ice-induced freshwater perturbations in the North Atlantic stay trapped there (right panel). Ultimately (within 100 years or so), dissipation via diffusion and evaporation causes the MOC to recover. On the other hand, during interglacial periods (high sea level), the strong southern winds quickly flush any fresh anomalies out of the Atlantic via the open strait which acts like an open exhaust valve. Hence, in the open BS case, the MOC quickly recovers.

to break the “dam.” Such a scenario is not unusual. It has been argued that Lake Agassiz was dammed in a similar fashion and that icebergs also jammed the Denmark Straits. Our model does not only explain observed data. It also helps us in the interpretation of coupled numerical models which suggest that global warming-induced precipitation increase and glacier melt may inhibit NADW formation and thereby halt the overturning circulation (Manabe and Stouffer 1993; Stocker and Schmittner 1997).

The essence of our proposed scenario is as follows. Island rule calculations show that, with an open BS and no NADW formation, 4 Sv ($1 \text{ Sv} = 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$) of upper ocean water would be forced by the strong SO winds into the South Atlantic (SA). One can think of this flow as being the result of a strong Ekman flux in the SO. This 4 Sv will then exit the NA via the Arctic and the open BS and flow into the Pacific (**Fig. 1**) implying that any large ice sheet-induced freshwater anomalies in the NA would be vigorously flushed (laterally) out of the NA within several years. The implication is that any freshwater perturbation (such as a Heinrich event or other less dramatic anomalies) which is strong enough to completely shut off the NADW formation, would be quickly flushed out of the NA and into the Pacific. Consequently, the NADW formation will immediately (i.e., within several years) resume.

On the other hand, when the BS is closed, freshwater perturbations (due to Heinrich or other events involving salinity anomalies) are trapped in the NA. The ocean ultimately recovers also from these perturbations but this recovery is achieved (and the anomaly eliminated) via processes such as diffusion or evaporation which are much slower (50-1000 years) than the flushing in the open BS case (several years). We shall argue that our new BS flushing mechanism is responsible for the very small temperature fluctuations during the Holocene. It is important to realize that our proposed mechanism is associated with the dynamical role of the BS rather than with the familiar BS buoyancy flux. Recall that the buoyancy flux involves merely the flux of a salinity (or temperature) anomaly through the strait (i.e., $Q\Delta S$, where Q is the mass flux and ΔS is the salinity anomaly). An analysis involving the buoyancy flux alone considers the strait to be physically closed. Hence, it completely ignores the effect that the mass flux (going

through the BS) has on the NA circulation. What we refer to as the “dynamical role” is the effect of such a mass flux and we shall argue that this effect is very dramatic.

1.1 Background

Observations support the idea of a dynamical BS control on climate stability. Since the last glacial maximum, 19 ka BP (Kilo Annum Before Present), global sea level has risen by 130m (Yokoyama et al. 2000). The BS, being presently only 45m deep, opened up to flow around 10.4 ka BP (Dyke et al. 1996) which is coincident with the onset of the stable Holocene (**Fig. 1**). Also, it is reasonable to assume that the BS was open during the height of the last interglacial, 125 ka BP, when the global level was 7m higher than today (Johnson 2001). Although the stability of the last interglacial is still a matter of debate, recent studies favor the idea that it was a stable climatic period (Adkins et al. 1997; Kukla 2000; Rioual et al. 2001; Shemesh et al. 2001). Correlating the BS throughflow and climate stability for the intervening period (40–110 ka BP) is not feasible, because the sea level history at the strait is unknown. Uncertainties exist in both the eustatic, or global, component (Chappell and Shackleton 1986; Shackleton 1987; Chappell et al. 1996) and the isostatic component, i.e., the local response of the mantle due to shifts in surface weight (Lambeck and Chappell 2001).

In the Atlantic Ocean there is an excess of evaporation over precipitation and a steady state is maintained in part by the return of freshwater from the Pacific to the Atlantic through the BS. There are also compensations through the AAIW and AABW (which will be indirectly included in our model). Recently, studies using ocean general circulation models (Goosse et al. 1997; Hasumi 2002) indicate that NADW formation is reduced by the BS throughflow. Shaffer and Bendtsen (1994) employed a 3-box model with a geostrophically controlled BS flow (which is proportional to the depth of the sill in the BS) to show that the overturning could be arrested if

the sea level is high enough to force a sufficient flow through the BS. As the sea level increases, their model shifts from a regime in which both an operational and an arrested overturning can exist, to a regime which cannot sustain any overturning. They argued, therefore, that the higher sea level of the last interglacial could explain some of the proxies that indicate a more unstable interglacial (Dansgaard et al. 1993). Our work differs from the above studies in that we do not merely assume a geostrophically controlled BS throughflow, but rather, determine the flow from the *global* wind field and the rate of NADW formation.

Another model of the influence of the BS freshwater flux is that of Weijer et al. (2000). They used a 2-dimensional numerical model of the Atlantic overturning, to show that, via its buoyancy flux, the BS tends to destabilize the overturning. Our work differs from that of Weijer et al. (2000) in that, as just mentioned, we also consider the dynamical effect of the strait and not only its buoyancy flux. We shall argue that the dynamical effect is more important than the buoyancy flux effect because it allows the NA to be flushed by a wind-induced flow. Related studies concerning the effect of freshwater on the thermohaline circulation are that of Nilsson and Walin (2001), Keeling (2002) and Tziperman and Gildor (2002). It is appropriate to note here in passing that, although the first opening of the BS (Marinkovich and Gladenkov 1999) and the uplift of the Panama Isthmus (Haug and Tiedemann 1998; Nof and Van Gorder 2003) had major impacts on the ocean circulation, our study pertains only to the sea level-induced openings and closures of the BS during the late Quaternary (last ~ 1 million years).

1.2. *Present approach*

We introduce a novel analytical approach, which considers not only the buoyancy effect of BS freshwater flux on NADW formation, but also the important dynamical effect of the strong SO winds and its induced flow through the BS. The NA, between 50°N and 70°N (**Figs. 2 and**

3), is regarded as a mixed box which receives salty water from the South Atlantic (SA) and freshwater from the Pacific through the BS. The inflows are determined by the wind field and the overturning rate, and deep water is formed in accordance to the salinity of the box (Section 2). We use this model to argue that the striking correlation between the opening of the BS (10.4 ka BP) and the onset of climate stability (**Fig. 1**) is not merely a coincidence, but rather a causal relation.

In Section 3 we discuss how, during interglacials, the ocean recovers almost instantly (i.e., within several years or less) from a large perturbation that is sufficient to shut down the overturning. We show that anomalies in the NA surface salinity (caused, for example, by an anomalous freshwater discharge) are quickly flushed out into the Pacific by the strong Southern winds (when the BS is open). Such a quick recovery is not possible in the closed BS case. For these cases of total NADW formation collapse we do not solve explicitly for the entire time-dependent overturning, but rather, deduce the system response from the two end states (i.e., the arrested and resumed overturning).

Although the perturbations displayed in **Fig. 1** are clearly large, we also derive a solution for the time-dependent response of the overturning to small perturbations (i.e., weak freshenings that cause small changes). We find that small perturbations are also removed quickly from the system but, in this limit, there is not much difference between the open and closed basin cases. We then proceed and examine analytically what kind of freshwater flux is required in order to collapse the MOC (Section 4) and what kind of *continuous* freshwater flux is required in order to maintain the collapsed state and prevent a recovery of the MOC. We find that, in order to collapse the MOC, about 0.7 – 0.8 Sv is required in both the closed and open BS case. However, in the closed basin case, even a zero freshwater flux will prevent the MOC from recovering. By contrast, in the open basin case, a relatively large freshwater flux is required (0.24 Sv) in order to avoid recovery. This will again illustrate that the open BS is more stable than the closed BS. The above analytical analysis is followed by numerical experiments which confirm the results of the large perturbation analysis (Section 5). The results are summarized in Section 6.




Fig. 2. *Top panel:* Island rule calculation of the no-NADW formation open BS geography. The integration is done in a counterclockwise manner along the dashed line. It indicates that, in the absence of NADW formation, 4 Sv (of upper ocean water) would be forced into the SA. This 4 Sv, which is primarily due to the strong SO winds, would exit the NA through cross-section CD and then through the Arctic and the open BS. Note that 60% of the transport is due to the strong SO winds acting on AB. The winds over the Arctic and North Atlantic are so weak compared to the SO winds that altering the integration path in the Arctic virtually makes no difference at all.

Lower panel: Island rule calculation for the North Atlantic with NADW formation. Q_1 and Q_2 are the transports into the Atlantic from the south and north, respectively. The convection region in the NA (whose upper layer volume is M) is outlined in solid black and sinking is indicated by f . Note that the direction of the flow through the BS reverses when the NADW formation ceases.




Fig. 3. A three-dimensional view of the (mixed) dynamical-box model of the NA between 50°N and 70°N (i.e., the box bounded by the solid black contour in Fig. 2). The salinity and temperature of the NA box (S and T) are determined by the salinities S_1 and S_2 and temperatures T_1 and T_2 of the water flowing in from the SA (Q_1) and the Arctic/Pacific (Q_2) as well as by the surface freshwater flux, F_F and the heat flux, F_H .

2. The mean state model

Our (hybrid) model is a mixture of a global dynamical model and a box model representing the fraction of the NA situated between 50°N and 70°N . The transports into and out of the box are derived analytically from the momentum equations (for any salinity and temperature fields), but the bulk thermodynamic relations take the salinity and temperature to be fully mixed inside the box.

2.1. The dynamic model

Our analysis of the MOC in the Atlantic is based on an application of the “Thermodynamic Island Rule” (TIR) to the continents of the Americas in a similar fashion to Nof (2000). The TIR is an extension of the original Island Rule (Godfrey 1989) which corresponds to an integration of the horizontal momentum equations along a closed path that avoids the frictional Western boundary current region (**Fig. 2**). The result is an expression of the circulation around the island in terms of the wind field along the path. The TIR differs from the original Island Rule in that sinking is allowed east of the island. Consequently, the circulation around the island is no longer a constant, but instead, the transport into and out of the basin (east of the island) differs by an amount equal to the sinking in the basin east of the island. Furthermore, unlike the original Island Rule, we choose to integrate the momentum equations from the surface to a fixed depth, rather than to a level-of-no-motion. This allows us to choose any depth (above the topography) as an upper layer, and, furthermore, it dispenses with the necessity to make the level-of-no-motion assumption (which is somewhat questionable in high latitudes).

We now present the TIR derivation. The linearized Boussinesq momentum equations for a continuously stratified fluid, integrated from the surface to a fixed depth, H , below the Ekman layer (so that the stress is zero) and above the bottom topography are,

$$- \rho_0 fV = -\frac{\partial P}{\partial x} + \tau^x \quad (1)$$

$$\rho_0 fU = -\frac{\partial P}{\partial y} + \tau^y - RV \quad , \quad (2)$$

where ρ_0 is the mean density, f the Coriolis parameter and U and V are the depth integrated zonal and meridional velocities (respectively). P is the depth integrated pressure from the surface to H , a predetermined depth (above the mid-Atlantic topography) which is not necessarily a level-of-no-motion; τ^x and τ^y are the surface wind stresses in the x and y directions. Note that, for clarity, all variables are defined in both the text and the Appendix. Equations (1) and (2) correspond to a Sverdrup interior and frictional western boundary currents. Most of the energy dissipation occurs in the western boundary region through the term RV (where R is a frictional parameter).

We integrate (1) along the primarily zonal sections(**Fig. 2**) and (2) along the primarily meridional sections. Adding the four resulting equations eliminates the pressure and yields,

$$\rho_0 (-f_1 Q_1 - f_2 Q_2) = \oint_{\partial S} \tau^r dr \quad , \quad (3)$$

where the subscripts 1 and 2 refer to the southern and northern island tips so that Q_1 and Q_2 are the equatorward transports across AB and CD (respectively). The integral $\oint \tau^r dr$ is the counter-clockwise integrated wind stress along the path. Because the frictional term RV is of the same order as the pressure term only in the western boundary region (which we avoid) and is small elsewhere, it does not enter our calculation.

Next, we use mass conservation in the upper layer to close the problem,

$$W = Q_1 + Q_2 + F_F \quad , \quad (4)$$

where W is the mass flux from the upper to the lower layer [$O(10 \text{ Sv})$], and F_F is the much smaller (known) freshwater flux [$O(0.1 \text{ Sv})$] which, though small, cannot always be neglected and needs to be carefully treated. (Note that this is where we digress from the original Island

Rule, which assumes a level-of-no-motion as a vertical integration limit and takes $W = 0$.)

Solving for Q_1 and Q_2 in terms of W and F_F gives the two equations of the TIR,

$$Q_1 = \frac{\oint \tau^r dr + \rho_0 f_2 (W - F_F)}{\rho_0 (f_2 - f_1)} \quad (5)$$

$$Q_2 = - \frac{\oint \tau^r dr + \rho_0 f_1 (W - F_F)}{\rho_0 (f_2 - f_1)} . \quad (6)$$

We shall apply the TIR to the continents of the Americas in a similar fashion to Nof (2000) except that, here, we allow for a flow through the BS. We take not only the sea level to be continuous across the BS, but the entire vertically integrated pressure, P , is also taken to be continuous across the BS sill. The validity of this assumption is discussed in detail in Nof (2000, 2002) and need not be repeated here. It is sufficient to point out here that there is no physical process, such as a hydraulic control or frictional resistance, which would prevent the BS from allowing a much larger flow through it than it does today (~ 1 Sv). For instance, a speed of 1 ms^{-1} , which is not uncommon in straits, would correspond to a BS throughflow of about 10 Sv.

It is important to realize that, with a barotropic geostrophic flow of 0.8 Sv (through the BS), a depth of 50 m and a Coriolis parameter of $1.4 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$, a 22 cm sea level difference between the Arctic and Pacific is induced. This sea level difference is due to *geostrophy* (i.e., it is obtained from $fQ = g\Delta\eta$) and, hence, is *across* the flow rather than along it. As such, it is not neglected in the calculations. Via Bernoulli, the change of upper layer density as one moves from the Pacific to the Atlantic may induce an additional sea level difference of 15 cm or so (for a $\Delta\rho/\rho$ of 1/1000). This inviscid sea level change is associated with approximately zonal flows perpendicular to the BS axis, i.e., flows that remain within the basin from which they originated do not cross the boundary between the Pacific and Atlantic. As such, they are also included in our calculation. Both of these sea level changes need to be distinguished from frictional and form-drag losses along a streamline which *are* neglected in our calculations.

One estimate for the frictional sea level drop can be obtained from the so-called Manning's formula, traditionally used by engineers to estimate the frictional pressure gradient in channels (Chow 1959; Giles 1962; Chaudry 1993) but also used by geologists to estimate the flow from the paleo-Mediterranean to the (then freshwater lake) Black Sea. Taking a speed of 0.2 m s^{-1} (corresponding to a width of approximately 100 km), a frictional coefficient as large as can be reasonably expected ($n = 0.03$), and a length of 100 km, one obtains a negligible sea level drop of about 2 cm. Similar values are obtained by following the more traditional oceanographic estimates. To do so, we consider the familiar vertically integrated relationship,

$$g \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial y} = \frac{1}{\rho_0} \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial z} ,$$

and take the bottom stress (divided by ρ_0) to be $C_D(u^*)^2$ where C_D (the dimensionless drag coefficient) is 1.6×10^{-3} , and u^* is the speed. With an along-strait distance of 100 km (Δy), and a mean speed u^* of 0.2 m s^{-1} , we again get a negligible drop ($\Delta \eta$) of merely 1 cm. Hence, the frictional forces are probably not important within the BS.

Note that, in his pioneering freshwater analysis, Stigebrandt (1984) neglected the important effects of rotation and this forced him to choose parameters which would give him a frictional sea level drop of 50 cm. This 50 cm sea level drop is based on Reid's (1961) dynamics height analysis. While there is no doubt that there could indeed be a 50 cm difference between the Atlantic and the Pacific, this difference is not necessarily along a streamline and, consequently, is probably a representation of sea level differences due to geostrophy and density variations (calculated earlier) rather than due to frictional forces. Stigebrandt took a large value for the transport (1.6 Sv instead of 0.8 Sv), a large value for C_D (3×10^{-3} instead of 1.6×10^{-3}), and a much longer (200 km) and narrower (50 km) channel than ours ($100 \times 100 \text{ km}$). Stigebrandt himself realized that the neglect of rotation is not justified and that his calculation was somewhat questionable. Observations made after the publication of his work showed that his choices for the transport and width correspond to unrealistically high speed (four times higher than the

observed values). Given that the frictional forces are proportional to the square of the velocity and that all his other choices were also on the high side, his selections were enough to push the frictional losses to much higher values.

A potentially problematic issue is the form-drag induced by the BS sill which is also not easy to estimate. Using our numerical simulations (Section 4) we shall show that, even a sill protruding up to 50 m from the free surface (i.e., a sill blocking 93% of the upper layer), causes a deviation of no more than 40–50% from our sill-free calculations. This is because the flow through the strait is much smaller than the flow which the strait is capable of transporting. (As mentioned, a speed of 1-2 ms⁻¹ which is common in many straits would lead to a transport of 10–20 Sv.) Overall, it can be stated that the assumption of a continuous vertically integrated pressure through the BS (i.e., neglecting the form-drag) is certainly adequate for the purpose of our calculation.

Integration of 40 years of NCEP annual winds¹ along the path shown in **Fig. 3** gives 3.9 Sv for the first term in (5) and (6) [i.e., $\oint \tau^r dr / \rho(f_2 - f_1)$]. The Coriolis parameters f_1 and f_2 were evaluated at 45°S and 75°N respectively. (Note that, using an average Coriolis parameter across the approximately zonal sections introduces an error of approximately 10%.) It is important to realize that this 3.9 Sv is the amount of water that will be forced out of the Atlantic and into the Pacific (via the BS) in the no NADW formation case (i.e., $W \equiv 0$; $Q_1 = -Q_2$ as shown in **Fig. 2**). Namely, it is the no-NADW Atlantic throughflow. Note that, in Nof (2000), Q_2 was taken to be zero and W was calculated from (6) according to the relationship,

$$W = \frac{\oint \tau^r dr}{\rho_0 f_1} .$$

¹ NCEP winds were provided by the NOAA-CIRES Climate Diagnostics Center, Boulder, Colorado, from their Web site at <http://www.cdc.noaa.gov>.

This gave 9 Sv for both Q_1 and W which is about twice the no-NADW throughflow calculated here (as should be the case).

2.2. The thermodynamics of the model

In the previous section, the transport into the Atlantic was derived in terms of the global wind field and the rate of NADW formation. We now assume that all the sinking occurs through deep convection between 50°N and 70°N so that Q_1 and Q_2 are also the transports into the box (shown in **Fig. 3**) from the south and the north (respectively). Next, we close the problem by relating the NADW formation rate to the NA surface salinity and expressing the NA salinity in terms of the incoming flows (**Fig. 2**).

The salinity in the convection region, S , is determined by the equation for the conservation of salt,

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{M} [(S_2 - S)Q_2 + (S_1 - S)Q_1 - SF_F] \quad , \quad (7)$$

where M is the volume of the box (**Fig. 2**) and $S_{1,2}$ are the salinities of the incoming water Q_1 and Q_2 . For a steady state (7) and (4) give,

$$\boxed{WS = S_1Q_1 + S_2Q_2} \quad (8)$$

As mentioned, both Q 's are taken to be positive toward the Atlantic. The last term in (7), SF_F/M , represents a virtual salinity flux. When Q_2 is negative, the equation needs to be altered because S_2 , the salinity of Pacific water, is no longer relevant to the salinity balance in the Atlantic.

In our model, NADW is formed by cooling the surface water until it reaches the density of the deep water. This is reflected in the conservation of heat relationship,

$$\boxed{Q_1(T - T_1) + Q_2(T - T_1) + F_f(T - T_a) = - \frac{F_H}{\rho_0 C_p}} \quad , \quad (9)$$

where F_H is the surface heat flux from the box (in watts), ρ_0 the reference density, C_p the heat capacity of sea water, T the temperature of the convective water, and T_1 , T_2 and T_a are the temperatures of the incoming waters (Southern Ocean water, Pacific water and rain).

Next, we note that the temperature change brought about by the heat flux should be large enough to enable the upper water to reach the lower layer density. This convection condition is found from the linearized equation of state to be,

$$\boxed{T = T_1 + \frac{\beta}{\alpha}(S - S_1)} , \quad (10)$$

where α and β are the temperature and salinity expansion coefficients, and T_1 and S_1 are the temperature and salinity of the lower layer. It should be stressed that, in this model, the Southern Ocean (SO), the Pacific Ocean (PO), and the deep Atlantic are taken to be infinitely large so that their salinities and temperature are constants. This enables us to take S_1 , S_2 , T_1 , T_2 , S_1 and T_1 to be given.

2.3. The present mean circulation

The five algebraic equations (5, 6, 8, 9 and 10) fully describe our system for the five unknowns Q_1 , Q_2 , W , S and T . To obtain the solution the heat flux equation (9) is re-written as,

$$W T - Q_1 T_1 - Q_2 T_2 - F_F T_a = -\frac{F_H}{\rho C_p} \quad (11)$$

which, with the aid of the convection condition (10), can be written as,

$$W \left[T_1 + \frac{\beta}{\alpha}(S - S_1) \right] - Q_1 T_1 - Q_2 T_2 - F_F T_a = -\frac{F_H}{\rho C_p} . \quad (12)$$

Incorporation of the salinity conservation (8) into (12) gives a linear equation for W ,

$$W \left(T_1 - \frac{\beta}{\alpha} S_1 \right) + \frac{\beta}{\alpha} (S_1 Q_1 + S_2 Q_2) - Q_1 T_1 - Q_2 T_2 - F_F T_a = -\frac{F_H}{\rho C_p} , \quad (13)$$

where Q_1 and Q_2 are also linear in W and are given by (5) and (6).

Our chosen modern-day parameters are: $f_1 = -1.0 \times 10^{-4} \text{s}^{-1}$, $f_2 = 1.4 \times 10^{-4} \text{s}^{-1}$, $M = 4 \times 10^{15} \text{m}^3$ (corresponding to an area of $4000 \times 1000 \text{ km}^2$ and a depth of 1 km), $F_H = 1.6 \times 10^{14} \text{ W}$ (corresponding to COADS data of 40 W m^{-2}), $F_F = 0.15 \times 10^6 \text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$ (Schmitt et al. 1989), $\rho = 1000 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$, $C_p = 1000 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{kg}^{-1}$, $\beta = 8 \times 10^{-4} \text{ PSU}^{-1}$, $\alpha = 1.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ K}^{-1}$, $S_1 = 35.9 \text{ PSU}$, $S_2 = 34.8 \text{ PSU}$, $S_1 = 34.9 \text{ PSU}$, $T_1 = 10^\circ\text{C}$, $T_2 = 3^\circ\text{C}$, and $T_1 = 3.5^\circ\text{C}$. All were determined from Tomczak and Godfrey 1994 and the Levitus data. For these choices, the solution for the sinking is $W = 11.2 \text{ Sv}$ so that $Q_1 = 10.3 \text{ Sv}$, $Q_2 = 0.8 \text{ Sv}$, $S = 35.1 \text{ PSU}$, and $T = 5.9^\circ\text{C}$.

For a closed BS, we take $Q_2 = 0$ and $W = Q_1 + F_F$; equations (5) and (6) are now meaningless and we are left with three relations (8), (9) and (10) for the three unknowns, Q_1 , S and T . If we use the same numerical values as for the modern-day open BS case, we get $Q_1 = 10.4 \text{ Sv}$, $S = 35.4 \text{ PSU}$ and $T = 6.1^\circ\text{C}$ which are not that different from the open BS values. However, during glacial times, the parameters had different values and according to Romanova et al. (2003), Schäfer-Neth and Paul (2000) and Adkins et al. (2002), it is better to take a heat flux of 38 W m^{-2} , $F_F = 0.05 \text{ Sv}$, $\alpha = 5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ K}^{-1}$, $S_1 = 36.1 \text{ PSU}$, $S_1 = 36.4 \text{ PSU}$, $T_1 = -1.2^\circ\text{C}$, and $T_1 = -5^\circ\text{C}$. For these values we get $Q_1 = 6.5 \text{ Sv}$, $S = 36.1 \text{ PSU}$, and $T = -0.9^\circ\text{C}$.

All of these chosen and calculated mean state values will shortly be used to calculate both the system's recovery time and the freshwater fluxes required for the arrest of the MOC.

3. Perturbations to the mean state

3.1. Large perturbations

Consider a very large freshwater anomaly that is sufficient to shut down the NADW formation completely.

(i) Open BS: We see from (5) and (6) that, when the BS is open and there is no NADW formation (i.e., $W = 0$), the strong winds in the SO would push about 4 Sv into the SA and then out of the NA, through the Arctic, and into the Pacific. This implies that such a NADW shut-off causes a reversal of the flow through the BS, i.e., instead of the presently known flow into the Atlantic, the flow would exit the Atlantic. We shall see in Section 5 that the sill in the BS could reduce the reversed flow by up to 50% (which means that there may be 2–3 Sv or so forced from the Atlantic into the Pacific instead of our calculated 4 Sv) but the remaining flux is still a significant amount. Hence, any salinity anomalies in the NA which are strong enough to collapse the MOC would be quickly flushed (laterally) out of the Atlantic via the open BS so that the MOC will rapidly recover (**Fig. 1**). It is important to realize that, in this stage, the box model does not have to be introduced yet and we can envision a salinity anomaly cap 100–200 m thick covering an area of $4000 \times 1000 \text{ km}^2$. Removal of such an anomaly through a 4 Sv advection would probably take several years.

(ii) Closed BS: When the BS is closed, the anomalies are trapped in the Atlantic and cannot be flushed out. The MOC can still recover (Birchfield et al. 1994; Wang and Mysak 2001; Ganapolski and Rahmstorf 2001, 2002; Schmittner et al. 2002), but much more slowly than in the open BS case because the freshwater anomalies can no longer be horizontally advected out of the convection region. Two possible mechanisms for the removal of the freshwater anomaly (when the strait is closed) are diffusion and evaporation. For the open ocean away from topography and boundaries, the typical vertical eddy diffusivity is $0.1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ (Ledwell et al. 1993) which, with an anomaly thickness scale of 100–200 m, gives a diffusive time scale of ~ 30 –100 years. Some models (e.g., Wang and Mysak 2001) show faster recoveries but these are due to unrealistically high eddy diffusivities. The evaporative time scale for a freshwater cap of 100 m thickness and an evaporation rate of 1mm/day is ~ 270 years. These recoveries can, of course, be faster as the anomalies can certainly be shallower.

Sea ice which, through brine rejection, increases the salinity, also appears to be important (Paul and Schulz 2002). However, the salinity increase is not strong enough to cause a recovery of a collapsed MOC as even the formation of 2 m of sea ice on top of a thermocline 500 m deep will increase the surface salinity by merely 0.14 PSU. This is much smaller than the typical difference between the upper and lower layer salinity in the Atlantic (1 PSU). Another negative feedback is due to local winds (Schiller et al. 1997). A collapsed MOC causes strengthening of the local winds which causes an increased local upwelling. This increases the surface salinity reducing the density difference (which the cooling needs to overcome). Taking an upwelling of 3 Sv and an upper water volume (of the northern NA) to be about 10^7 km^3 , we find that it would take 100 years or so to replace it by deep water. This also implies a long recovery time.

Another mechanism by which the collapsed MOC can recover in the closed BS case is related to the atmospheric response to a shutdown (see e.g., Saravanan and McWilliams 1995). In that case the atmospheric temperatures around the high latitude NA cools significantly following a thermohaline shutdown. The associated increase in heat loss can help to re-establish the overturning circulation within about 100 years. All these mechanisms point to a recovery time of hundreds of years which is considerably longer than the advection time in the open BS case.

3.2. Small perturbations

Although the perturbations illustrated by **Fig. 1** do not appear to be small, it is useful to examine the stability to small perturbations. Here, the perturbations to the system are regarded as small deviations from a mean state and we solve for the system's time-dependent response using the hybrid box model introduced earlier.

(i) Open BS: We shall perturb Q_1 , Q_2 , W , T and S . As before, since the SO, the PO and the deep Atlantic are all taken to be infinitely large, all the other variables are taken to be constant external parameters which do not react to the internal changes in the NA circulation. We now perturb the five equations around a mean state assuming that the time dependent part of the terms in the island rule equations are small and negligible. This is based on the idea that the box has a fixed volume and that, in our model, there is no other light water storage in the Atlantic.

Under such conditions the perturbed equations are,

$$Q_1' = \frac{f_2 W'}{f_2 - f_1} \quad (14)$$

$$Q_2' = - \frac{f_1 W'}{f_2 - f_1} \quad (15)$$

$$M \frac{\partial S'}{\partial t} = S' [\bar{Q}_1 + \bar{Q}_2 + \bar{F}_F] - [(S_1 - \bar{S})Q_1' + (S_2 - \bar{S})Q_2'] = 0 \quad (16)$$

$$M \frac{\partial T'}{\partial t} + (\bar{Q}_1 + \bar{Q}_2 + \bar{F}_F)T' + (Q_1' + Q_2')\bar{T} = 0 \quad (17)$$

$$T' = \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha} \right) S' , \quad (18)$$

where the primed variables are time dependent and the bar denotes the mean state.

Manipulation of (17), (18) and (19) immediately shows that $Q_1' = Q_2' = W' = 0$. The solutions for S and T are decaying exponentials,

$$S' = S_o e^{-\left(\frac{\bar{W}}{M}\right)t} ; T' = T_o e^{-\left(\frac{\bar{W}}{M}\right)t} , \quad (19)$$

showing that the small perturbation recovery time is approximately 11 years.

The stability is due to the wind-induced mean flows which, after a perturbation in the NA surface salinity, attempt to re-establish the mean state salinity. For example, after a freshening of the NA, the salinity of the incoming flows are constant, but the outgoing flows are now fresher.

The excess salinity is, therefore, expelled out of the upper layer by the sinking of fresher (and colder) water. This means that, in contrast to the large perturbations (i.e., a complete NADW collapse) case when the salinity anomalies are flushed out *laterally*, the anomalies in the small perturbation case are flushed out *vertically*. This is done via the convection itself which is still active and pulls down the weak anomaly, pushing it into the infinitely large deep ocean.

(ii) Closed BS: When the strait is closed (14) and (15) are no longer valid. In this case, the system can still remove salinity perturbations via vertical flushing through the convection itself which again pulls the salinity disturbance down, pushing it into the deep ocean. Taking $Q_2 = 0$ and $W = Q_1 + F_F$, the earlier system of equations reduces to two equations with two unknowns (Q_1 and S),

$$M \frac{\partial S}{\partial t} = (S_1 - S)Q_1 - SF_F$$

and

$$M \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + Q_1(T - T_1) + F_F(T - T_a) = -\frac{F_H}{\rho C_p}.$$

A perturbation analysis again shows that $W' = Q_1' = 0$ and that

$$T' = T_0 e^{-\left(\frac{Q_1}{M}\right)t}; \quad S' = \frac{\alpha}{\beta} T_0 e^{-\left(\frac{Q_1}{M}\right)t}.$$

For modern-day conditions, the recovery time (12 years) is approximately the same as that of the open case (about 11 years). For the glacial conditions mentioned earlier in subsection (2.3), the recovery time is about 19 years, somewhat longer than in the open BS case.

All of this illustrates that, in the small perturbation case, there is no significant difference between the closed and open BS cases. This completes our formal small amplitude stability analysis and we shall now proceed to examine the critical freshwater fluxes which can arrest the MOC. We shall see that, in these important aspects, there is again a large difference between the open and closed cases.

4. Critical freshwater fluxes

The system of five steady equations (5, 6, 8, 9 and 10) also allows for a detailed examination of the freshwater flux required for an MOC collapse. As mentioned, this is a more important issue than the small amplitude instability issue discussed earlier because the perturbations during glacial times (**Fig. 1**) do not appear to be small. There are three different critical freshwater fluxes and we shall refer to them as F_{Fa} , F_{Fb} and F_{Fc} . The first (F_{Fa}) is the freshwater flux which makes the upper layer so light that the cooling is insufficient to cause convection. In this case, the wind removes the upper layer from the convection area so quickly that the cooling has no time to cause deep water formation. As we shall see, such an upper layer removal is only possible in the open BS case because, in the closed basin case, there is no process that can remove the water away from the cooling area. We shall see that for the modern-day parameters chosen earlier, this open BS critical flux turns out to be 0.85 Sv. However, we shall also see that this flux corresponds to surface waters that are so fresh (28.6 PSU) that the convection requires a temperature well below freezing (-28°C) indicating that this type of situation is not possible in the modern Atlantic.

The second critical freshwater flux (F_{Fb}) is the near-freezing convective flux, i.e., the flux that makes the convective layer so fresh that the required cooling brings the sinking water to the freezing point. This situation is possible in both the open and closed BS. We shall see that, for modern conditions, both the closed and the open BS correspond to a critical flux of 0.79 Sv. However, for glacial conditions the collapsing flux (of the closed BS) is merely 0.21 Sv, indicating that the glacial ocean was much more susceptible to a collapse than the modern-day ocean.

The third freshwater flux (F_{Fc}) is the flux required to *maintain* the MOC in a near-freezing collapsed state. We shall see that, here, there is again a large difference between the open and closed BS case. In the open BS, 0.23 Sv are required to maintain the collapsed state in a near freezing state whereas in the closed BS case no amount of freshwater is needed to maintain the collapsed state. This is because our closed system cannot recover from a collapse. This difference between the open and closed cases demonstrates again that the open BS case is much more resistant to perturbations than the closed BS case.

4.1 The first critical freshwater flux

(i) Open BS: To obtain this critical freshwater flux, F_{Fa} , we set $W = 0$ in equations (5), (6), and (8). We also note that, here, $S_2 = S$ (because now the flow through the BS exits the Atlantic rather than entering it), and $F_{Fa} \ll W$. We solve for F_{Fa} , Q_1 , Q_2 , S and T to find,

$$F_{Fa} = \frac{(S_1 - S) \oint \tau^r dr}{\rho_0 S (f_2 - f_1)}, \quad (20)$$

where

$$S = S_1 - (T_1 - T_1) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \frac{F_H (f_2 - f_1)}{C_p \oint \tau^r dr}. \quad (21)$$

Substitution of the modern-day parameters chosen earlier into (20) and (21) and solving for Q_1 , Q_2 , S and T show that $F_{Fa} = 0.85$ Sv, that the salinity is as low as 29 PSU, and that the temperature required for this (supposedly no-freezing) collapse is well below the freezing point (-28°C) indicating that this type of collapse is not possible today in the open Atlantic.

(ii) Closed BS: In the closed BS case ($W = -Q_1$; $Q_2 = 0$), there is no steady solution for $W = 0$ because the upper water cannot be removed from the convection area. Consequently, even with a small amount of cooling, the water ultimately sinks.

4.2 The second critical freshwater flux

(i) Open BS: In contrast to the earlier case where we set W to zero, we now obtain the near-freezing collapse by leaving W free and adding the (approximate) freezing condition,

$$T = -\delta S, \quad (22)$$

where $\delta = 0.0575$. With (22) and equations (5, 6, 8, 9, 10) we can now solve for the six unknowns W , Q_1 , Q_2 , S , T and F_{Fb} . Equations (22) and (10) immediately give the solution for T and S ,

$$T = \frac{-\delta \frac{\beta}{\alpha} S_1 + \delta T_1}{\delta + \beta/\alpha} \quad (23)$$

and

$$S = \frac{\frac{\beta}{\alpha} S_1 - T_1}{\delta + \beta/\alpha}, \quad (24)$$

which, for our chosen modern-day parameters give $T = -1.95^\circ\text{C}$ and $S = 33.9$ PSU.

Elimination of Q_1 between (3), which is just a combination of (5) and (6), and (9) gives,

$$Q_2 = \left[-\frac{f_1 F_H}{\rho_0 C_p} + \frac{T - T_1}{\rho_0} \oint \tau^l dl \right] / [f_1(T - T_2) - f_2(T - T_1)]. \quad (25)$$

With the aid of Q_2 and Q_1 , the critical freshwater flux can now be found from (8) to be,

$$F_{Fb} = \left[-\oint (\tau^l dl / f_1 \rho_0) - f_2 Q_2 / f_1 \right] \left(\frac{S_1}{S} - 1 \right) + Q_2 \left(\frac{S_2}{S} - 1 \right). \quad (26)$$

For the modern-day values mentioned earlier, one finds from (9) that $W = 14.6$ Sv which, with the aid of (5) and (6) gives, $Q_1 = 12.5$ Sv, $Q_2 = 2.1$ Sv, and $F_{Fb} = 0.79$ Sv. It may seem odd at

first that, in this case, the convection is stronger than in the normal case even though F_F is larger than before. This is due to the smaller temperature difference which allows for greater transports (for the same heat flux).

(ii) Closed BS: In the closed BS case, (10) and (22) still hold but (5) and (6) are no longer relevant and (8), (9) become,

$$(Q_1 + F_F)S = Q_1 S_1, \quad (27)$$

$$Q_1(T - T_1) = -F_H / \rho_0 C_p, \quad (28)$$

from which Q_1 and F_{Fb} can be easily computed. For the modern-day parameters chosen earlier, we find that $Q_1 = 13.4$ Sv and $F_{Fb} = 0.79$ Sv, showing that for this kind of collapse there is no real difference between the closed and open cases.

For the glacial conditions mentioned earlier, we find $S = 36.05$, $T = 2.07^\circ\text{C}$, $Q_1 = 21.5$ Sv and $F_{Fb} = 0.21$ Sv. This relatively low freshwater flux (0.21 Sv) indicates that it was comparatively easy to collapse the MOC during glacial times. It is much less likely to happen today as the freshwater flux must be about four times greater (0.79 Sv).

4.3 *Maintaining a collapsed MOC state*

As mentioned in Section 2, in the open BS case the salinity perturbations are quickly removed by the Southern winds. This begs the question of what will it take to keep the MOC in a near-freezing collapsed state. To answer this question we again set $W = 0$ but we also require (22) to hold.

With this condition we now have six equations (5), (6), (8), (9), (10) and (22) but only five unknowns (Q_1 , Q_2 , S , T , and F_F) indicating that a near-freezing state of no MOC cannot be

maintained unless an additional process (which we, so far, have not accounted for) is active in the system. This additional process is ice formation which alters the heat flux equation (9) and adds an unknown involving the fraction of the heat flux which goes to the ice formation process. In view of this, we can simply drop (9) and the sixth unknown, and determine the solution to our freshwater flux from (5), (6), (8), (10) and (22) without worrying about the ice formation process.

We find that F_{Fa} is still given by (20) but S is now given by (24). For the chosen modern-day parameters we find this collapse-maintenance freshwater flux to be 0.23 Sv. It is important to realize that, in this scenario, the closed BS case is very different from the open BS case as our closed case model cannot recover from a collapse (implying that a zero freshwater flux is required for the maintenance of a closed-basin collapsed state). As just mentioned, the open BS requires a significant freshwater flux (0.23 Sv) to maintain its collapsed state indicating that it is much more stable than the closed case. This completes our study of the analytical model. We shall now proceed to a numerical examination of the problem.

5. Numerical Simulations

Instead of verifying our analysis using very complicated numerical models (corresponding to **Fig. 2**), the application of (5) and (6) to the model shown in **Fig. 4** (which does not contain meridional winds) was examined. To do so, a "reduced gravity" version of the Bleck and Boudra isopycnic model (Bleck and Boudra 1981, 1986; Bleck and Smith 1990) was used. Namely, we took the upper layer density to be constant in our numerical simulations. A continuously stratified upper layer with variable density would have been better, but, since the ocean will




Fig. 4. *Left panel:* Details of the basin used for the two sets of numerical experiments. The source and the sink $\oplus$, $\ominus$ were only used in the second set which involved NADW. Note that the Bering Strait contains a sill. In all the experiments $\Delta x = \Delta y = 15$ km, $\Delta T = 360$ s.

Right panel: The amplified wind profile used for the simulations. The amplification was adopted due to the magnified β and reduced basin width both of which were adopted to make the runs more economical. The general profile was adapted from Hellerman and Rosenstein (1983).

always adjust its temperature and salinity field (according to the buoyancy exchange with the atmosphere) so that (5) and (6) are satisfied, this is not an issue.

We performed two sets of experiments totaling 16 experiments. Out of the 16 experiments, 8 were without NADW, i.e., they corresponded to a collapsed MOC state. To examine the relationship between the numerical model and the analytical theory, experiments were performed where the wind stress (**Fig. 4**) was varied with a fixed gap (Exp. 1-8). To examine how NADW formation affects the transports, we also performed experiments with a sink in the North Atlantic (Exp. 8-16). To verify that the presence of a *sill* across the Bering Strait is not important, we repeated the varying wind and upper water removal experiments with a sill extending all the way from the bottom to 50 m from the free surface (blocking 93% of the total undisturbed depth of 600 m). This sill corresponds to the situation associated with the Bering Strait. We shall see that the results of the sill and no-sill experiments were similar but the sill clearly retards the flow.

The sill was implemented by keeping the upper layer depth fixed (at, say, 50 m) within the gap itself and leaving the depth east and west of the gap free. Hence, the presence of the sill enters the momentum equations directly only through the lateral friction terms. (Indirectly, it enters through the speeds and pressure.) Similarly, it directly enters the continuity equation by restricting the volume flux through the gap. (Note that the velocity and pressure adjust each other across the gap.) To represent the meridional transport, a (mass flux) source at the center of the southern boundary and a sink in the northern basin were introduced.

As in Nof (2000, 2002), to make our runs more economical we used a magnified β , a magnified wind stress τ , and a reduced basin size. We chose β , the linear variation of the Coriolis parameter with latitude, to be $11.5 \times 10^{-11} \text{m}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$, g' the reduced gravity to be $0.15 \text{m}^2\text{s}^{-1}$, H the undisturbed thickness to be 600 m, ν the eddy viscosity to be $2000 \text{m}^2\text{s}^{-1}$, K the linear drag to be $20 \times 10^{-7} \text{s}^{-1}$, $\Delta x = \Delta y = 15 \text{km}$, and $\Delta t = 360 \text{s}$. The flushing of a hypothetical salinity anomaly is shown in **Fig. 5**. **Fig. 6** shows the numerical transports and their relationship to the analytics for the varying wind experiment. There is a good agreement of the nonlinear numerical simulations and the no-sill analytical computation no matter how strong the wind is. The effect of a sill




Fig. 5. "Reduced gravity" numerical experiment (exp. 5) showing how a freshwater anomaly which is strong enough to shut the NADW off is flushed out of the Atlantic within a short time. The upper layer has one density and the anomaly is represented by dyed fluid.




Fig. 6. The sixteen numerical experiments and their relationship to the analytics (solid lines). The first set (exp. 1-8) does not involve NADW whereas the second (exp. 9-16) involves 20 Sv of NADW (which was artificially introduced to the system through the source and the sink). As expected, the experiments with a sill (protruding up to 50 m from the free surface implying a 93% cross-sectional blockage) show a smaller transport than both the sill-free experiments and the analytics. The difference, however, is not so great because, even with the sill, the strait can accommodate a much larger volume flux than it actually does. Numerals indicate experiment number.

displays a fair (but not good) agreement of the analytics with the numerics. As expected, the discrepancy is greatest when the sill protrudes almost all the way to the surface. Given that the sill blocks 93% of the upper layer thickness, the effect of the sill is relatively small. This is because the modeled BS transport is much smaller than the amount that the strait is capable of handling.

6. Discussion and summary

The opening of the BS is proposed as an explanation for the marked difference between the stability of the glacial and interglacial climate (**Fig. 1**). We focused on the case of a large perturbation, i.e., a massive ice sheet discharge or other freshwater source which shuts down the NADW formation completely.

This example of a fully arrested overturning (caused by a large freshwater anomaly in the NA such as an Heinrich event) illustrates the importance of the strong SO winds and the open gateway of the BS during interglacials to the thermohaline stability. The Island Rule states that, under such conditions, the SO winds would push ~ 4 Sv into the Atlantic (**Fig. 2**). This 4 Sv would then flow straight through the NA and into the Pacific via the BS, taking with it the freshwater anomaly causing the disruption. These results were verified using a process oriented numerical model (**Figs. 5 and 6**). Once the NA regains its former salinity, the overturning is quickly (within several years) re-established. In the closed BS case, the freshwater anomaly is prevented from escaping through the strait. It may be removed by diffusion or eliminated by either evaporation or enhanced atmospheric cooling but all of these processes take much longer, about 50 to 1000 years.

An analytical model combining the gigantic island calculations with a box model enables us to compute the critical freshwater fluxes required to collapse the MOC in both the open and the closed cases. We find that, in the open BS case, a freshwater flux of 0.79 Sv is required to collapse the cell whereas a mere 0.24 Sv is required to maintain the collapsed state. Namely, in

the open BS case, a recovery quickly occurs unless 0.24 Sv is continuously dumped into the open NA. In contrast, in the modern closed BS case, 0.79 Sv is sufficient to collapse the cell but no freshwater flux is required to maintain the collapsed state. That is, in the modeled closed case, the MOC does not recover even when the freshwater flux is reduced to zero. This again shows that the modeled open BS is much more stable than the modeled closed BS case. We also found that, during glacial times, a “mere” 0.21 Sv of freshwater flux (compared to today’s flux of 0.15 Sv) was sufficient for a total MOC collapse. This indicates that the glacial ocean was more susceptible to a collapse than the present-day ocean.

Although the glacial perturbations displayed in **Fig. 1** are large, a small perturbations analysis around a mean state was also performed. As before, the hybrid-dynamical-box model includes not only the effect of the thermodynamic surface forcings to the thermohaline circulation, but also the important effect of the global winds and the meridional flow that they induce. We found that small perturbations to the temperature and salinity would be damped out with a rapid e-folding scale of 11 years. The damping takes place because the convection is still active so that it pulls the salinity anomaly down to the deep ocean. Namely, in contrast to the large perturbation case where the anomaly removal is due to a *lateral* flushing, the removal here is due to *vertical* flushing. In the *closed* basin case, weak perturbations can also recover through vertical flushing by the convection itself. For modern-day conditions, the time scale for this process is about 12 years – a bit slower than in the open BS. For glacial conditions the closed NA recovery time is somewhat longer, about 26 years. It is important to realize that the absence of a large perturbation from the interglacial record shown in **Fig. 1** does not at all mean that there were no large perturbations during that period. The absence may merely mean that they were wiped out very quickly.

The simplicity of the model naturally brings along a couple of weaknesses which need to be mentioned. First, the complex dynamics of localized convection is not accurately resolved in our large box domain and our simple conditions for convection. We simply captured the inverse correlation of NADW formation to NA surface salinity using some basic physical principles.

Second, changes in the salinity of the box was determined in the classical box model style, i.e., by taking a pure salinity mix of the net incoming and outgoing flows and accounting for the surface boundary conditions (Stommel 1961; Park 1999; Marotzke 2000). The method neglects other mixing process such as flows into and out of the box that have no net transport.

Despite these weaknesses our results are informative and, in conclusion, we can say that the interglacial continental geometry and the strong SO winds act to stabilize the thermohaline circulation. More specifically, an open BS allows the use of an integral constraint that links the Arctic/Pacific inflow to deep water formation in the NA. It shows that in the open BS case, large salinity anomalies are vigorously flushed out of the Atlantic and into the Pacific. This implies that the dynamical role of the BS (i.e., the fact that water can flow through it) is far more important than its familiar role as a mere source of buoyancy (i.e., a region that is physically closed but can remove or supply salt from the adjacent basin). The interplay between the BS throughflow, the salinity of the NA, the strength of the wind field and NADW formation act to stabilize the interglacial overturning. The heat transport associated with the thermohaline circulation has an impact on world wide temperatures, but its influence is most noticeable in the high latitudes surrounding the NA. Therefore, our stability analysis of the overturning circulation also serves as a likely explanation of marked difference between the glacial and interglacial variability of the northern hemisphere (**Fig. 1**).

There are two alternative stability explanations that should be mentioned here. First, Ganopolski and Rahmstorf (2001) proposed that the difference between the stability during glacial and interglacial periods is related to the position of the NADW formation. While this result certainly has merit, it does not explain the abrupt transition so vividly visible in **Fig. 1** (left and right of the dashed vertical line). The same can be said of Tziperman (1997) who argued that the MOC was weaker during glacial periods and, hence, it was less stable. Another alternative explanation for the difference in glacial and interglacial climate stability might be that there simply were no ice sheets that would break after the BS opened. We reject this explanation on the ground that large ice sheet discharges are not the only means of perturbing the thermohaline

circulation (Peterson et al. 2000; Ganopolski and Rahmstorf 2002; Rahmstorf and Alley 2002) and on the ground that this transition also could not have happened abruptly. We argue that the opening of the BS could have occurred abruptly due to an initial jamming of the strait by icebergs and broken ice sheets which congregated around the BS because of the funnel-like shape of the surrounding continent. This jamming continued until the size of the icebergs was reduced to a size that could pass through the strait and the sea level difference between the Arctic and Pacific was large enough to break the “dam.”

It should be stressed that, like all model studies, our results are somewhat speculative. The results of both simplified models such as ours (which neglect many ocean processes) and complicated climate models (which unavoidably use very high vertical diffusivities) should be interpreted with much caution. Surely, analytical models have their limitations but so do complicated climate models. Relatively complex climate models suffer from the familiar weakness that all general circulation models suffer from – the results of simulations involving convection of roughly 10–20 Sv are very sensitive to the specified vertical eddy diffusivities (roughly $0.5 \text{ cm}^2\text{s}^{-1}$) which are typically an order of magnitude higher than the observed values ($0.1 \text{ cm}^2\text{s}^{-1}$).

This is not a trivial matter considering that the commonly used numerical diffusivity of $0.5 \text{ cm}^2\text{s}^{-1}$ is associated with a conversion of as much as 10 Sv of upper ocean water to lower layer water or vice versa. (This scaling estimate is based on a thermocline 500 m deep and an Atlantic surface area of $5000 \text{ km} \times 20,000 \text{ km}$.) It is particularly troublesome for simulations involving flows through straits and passages because the transport in many passages is of the order of one Sverdrup, much smaller than the diffusion-induced transport. As a result, several numerical simulations predict flows (through straits) which are not even in the same direction as the observations (Nof and Van Gorder 2003).

Consequently, it is best to examine the natural phenomenon in question using different techniques and approaches with the hope that all of them can be ultimately combined into a more reliable and comprehensive picture of the system.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under grants NAG5-7630 and NGT5-30164; National Science Foundation contracts OCE-9911324 and OCE-0241036; and Office of Naval Research grant N00014-01-0291.

Appendix. List of Symbols

C_D	Dimensionless drag coefficient
C_p	Heat capacity of sea water
f	Coriolis parameter
$f_{1,2}$	Coriolis parameters along the southern and northern island tips (Fig. 4)
F_F	Freshwater flux
F_H	Heat flux
M	Volume of the convection region
P	Vertically integrated pressure
Q_1, Q_2	Southern and northern transports into the island basin (Figs. 4, 5, 6)
r	Integration path
R	Interfacial friction coefficient
S	Salinity of the NA water in the convection region
S_1, S_2	Salinities of the transports Q_1, Q_2
S_l	Salinity of the lower layer
u	Horizontal speed
w	Vertical speed
U, V	Vertically integrated velocities in the x and y directions
W	Net sink of water adjacent to the island or in the NA
α	Temperature expansion coefficient
β	Salinity expansion coefficient
ΔT	Temperature change due to F_H during convection
$\Delta_l \rho$	Density difference between lower and the upper layer
$\Delta_l T$	Temperature difference between lower and the upper layer
ρ	Density of water in the convection region
τ	Wind stress in the direction r

References

- Adkins, J. F., E. A. Boyle, L. Keigwin and E. Cortijo, 1997: Variability of the North Atlantic thermohaline circulation during the last interglacial. *Nature*, **390**, 154-156.
- Adkins, J.F., K. McIntyre, and D. P. Schrag, 2002: The salinity, temperature and delta O-18 of the glacial deep ocean. *Science*, **298**(5599): 1769-1773.
- Bard, E., 2002: Climate shock: Abrupt changes over millennial time scales. *Physics Today*, **55**(12), 32-38.
- Bard, E., F. Rostek, J.-L. Turon, and S. Gendreau, 2000: Hydrological impact of Heinrich events in the subtropical northeast Atlantic. *Science*, **289**, 1321-1324.
- Birchfield, E. G., H. Wang, and J. J. Rich, 1994: Century/millennium internal climate oscillations in an ocean-atmosphere-continental ice sheet model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **99**, 12,459, 1994.
- Bleck, R. and D. Boudra, 1981: Initial testing of a numerical ocean circulation model using a hybrid, quasi-isopycnic vertical coordinate. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **11**, 755-770.
- Bleck, R. and D. Boudra, 1986: Wind-driven spin-up in eddy-resolving ocean models formulated in isopycnic and isobaric coordinates. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **91**, 7611-7621.
- Bleck, R. and L. T. Smith, 1990: A wind-driven isopycnic coordinate model of the North and Equatorial Atlantic Ocean, 1, Model development and supporting experiments. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **95**, 3273-3285.
- Blunier, T., J. Chappelaz, J. Schwander, A. Dallenbach, B. Stauffer, T. F. Stocker, D. Raynaud, J. Jouzel, H. B. Clausen, and C. U. Hammer, 1998: Asynchrony of Antarctic and Greenland climate change during the last glacial period. *Nature*, **394**, 739-743.

- Bond, G., W. Broecker, S. Johnson, J. McManus, L. Labeyrie, J. Jouzel, and G. Bounani, 1993: Correlations between climate records from North Atlantic sediments and Greenland ice. *Nature*, **365**, 143-147.
- Boyle, E. A., 2000: Is the ocean thermohaline circulation linked to abrupt stadial/interstadial transitions. *Quatern. Sci. Rev.*, **19**, 255-272.
- Broecker, W. S., 1994: Massive iceberg discharges as triggers for global climate change. *Nature*, **372**, 421-424.
- Cacho, I., J. O. Grimalt, C. Pelejero, M. Canals, F. J. Sierro, J. A. Flores, and N. Shackleton, 1999: Dansgaard-Oeschger and Heinrich event imprints in Alboran Sea paleotemperatures. *Paleoceanography*, **14**(6), 698-705.
- Chappell, J., A. Omura, T. Esat, M. McMulloch, J. Pandelfi, Y. Ota, and B. Pillans, 1996: Reconciliation of Late Quaternary sea levels derived from coral terraces at Huon Peninsula with deep sea oxygen isotope records. *Earth Plan. Sci. Lett.* **141**, 227-236.
- Chappell, J., and N. J. Shackleton, 1986: Oxygen isotopes and sea level, *Nature*, **324**, 137-140.
- Chaudry, M. H., 1993: *Open Channel Flow*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 483 pp.
- Chow, V. T., 1959: *Open-channel hydraulics*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 680 pp.
- Clark, P. U., N. G. Pisias, T. F. Stocker and A. J. Weaver, 2002: The role of the thermohaline circulation in abrupt climate change. *Nature*, **415**, 863-869.
- Dansgaard, W., S. Johnsen, H. B. Clausen, D. Dahl-Jensen, N. S. Gundestrup, C. U. Hammer, C. S. Hvidberg, J. P. Steffensen, A. E. Sveinbjornsdottir, J. Jouzel, G. Bond, 1993: Evidence for general instability of past climate from a 250-kyr ice core record. *Nature*, **364**, 218-220.

- Dyke, A. S. , J. E. Dale and R. N. McNeely, 1996: Marine mollusks as indicators of environmental change in glaciated North America and Greenland during the last 18,000 years. *Geographie physique et Quaternaire*, **50**(2), 125-184.
- Ganapolski, A. and S. Rahmstorf, 2001: Rapid changes of glacial climate simulated in a couple climate model. *Nature*, **409**, 153-158.
- Ganapolski, A. and S. Rahmstorf, 2002: Abrupt glacial climate changes due to stochastic resonance. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **88**(3), 038501(1-4).
- Giles, R., 1962: *Theory and Problems of Fluid Mechanics and Hydraulics*. McGraw-Hill, New York, 362 pp.
- Godfrey, J. S., 1989: A Sverdrup model of the depth-integrated flow for the world ocean allowing for island circulations. *Geophys. Astrophys. Fluid Dyn.*, **45**, 89-112.
- Goosse, H., J. M. Campin, T. Fichefet and E. Deleersnijder (1997): Sensitivity of a global ice-ocean model to the Bering Strait throughflow. *Clim. Dyn.*, **13**, 349-358.
- Hasumi, H., 2002: Sensitivity of the global thermohaline circulation to interbasin freshwater transport by the atmosphere and the Bering Strait throughflow. *J. Clim.*, **15**, 2515-2526.
- Haug, G. and R. Tiedemann, 1998: Effect of the formation of the Isthmus of Panama on Atlantic Ocean thermaline circulation. *Nature*, **393**, 673-676.
- Hellerman, S. and M. Rosenstein, 1983: Normal monthly wind stress over the world ocean with error estimates. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **13**, 1093-1104.
- Johnson, R. G., 2001: Last interglacial sea stands on Barbados and an early anomalous deglaciation timed by differential uplift. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **106**(C6), 11543-11551.
- Keeling, R. F., 2002: On the freshwater forcing of the thermohaline circulation in the limit of low diapycnal mixing. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **107**(C7), art. no. 3077.

- Kukla, G. J., 2000: The last interglacial. *Science*, **287**, 987-988.
- Labeyrie, L., 2000: Glacial climate instability. *Science*, **290**, 1905-1907.
- Lambeck, K. and J. Chappell, 2001: Sea level change through the last glacial cycle. *Science*, **292**, 697-686.
- Ledwell, J. R., A. J. Watson and C. S. Law, 1993: Evidence for slow mixing across the pycnocline from an open-ocean tracer-release experiment. *Nature*, **364**, 701-703.
- Manabe, S. and R. J. Stouffer, 1993: Century-scale effects of increased atmospheric CO₂ on the ocean-atmosphere system. *Nature*, **397**, 149-151.
- Marinkovich, L., and A. Y. Gladenkov, 1999: Evidence for an early opening of the Bering Strait, *Nature*, **397**, 149-151.
- Marotzke, J., 2000: Abrupt climate change and thermohaline circulation: Mechanisms and predictability. *Proc. National Acad. Science*, **97**(4), 1347-1350.
- Nilsson, C. S. and G. Walin, 2001: Freshwater forcing as a booster of thermohaline circulation. *Tellus*, **53A**, 628-640.
- Nof, D., 2000: Does the wind control the import and export of the South Atlantic? *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **30**, 2650-2667.
- Nof, D., 2002: Is there a meridional overturning cell in the Pacific and Indian Oceans? *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **32**, 1947-1959.
- Nof, D. and S. Van Gorder, 2003: Did an open Panama Isthmus correspond to an invasion of Pacific water into the Atlantic? *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, in press.
- Park, Y.-G, 1999: The stability of thermohaline circulation in a two-box model. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **29**, 3101-3110.

- Paul, A. and Schulz, M., 2002: Holocene climate variability on centennial-to-millennial time scales: 2. Internal and forced oscillations as possible causes. In *Climate Development and History of the North Atlantic Realm*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 55-73.
- Peterson, L. C., G. H. Haug, K. A. Hugen and U. Rohl, 2000: Rapid changes in the hydrologic cycle of the tropical Atlantic during the last glacial. *Science*, **290**, 1947-1951.
- Rahmstorf, S. and R. Alley, 2002: Stochastic resonance in glacial climate. *EOS*, **83**(12), 129-135.
- Reid, J. L., 1961: On the temperature, salinity and density differences between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans in the upper kilometer. *Deep-Sea Res.*, **7**, 265-275.
- Rioual, P., V. Andrieu-Ponel, M. Rietti-Shati, R. W. Battarbee, J.-L. De Beaulieu, R. Cheddadi, M. Reille, H. Svobodova & A. Shemesh, 2001: High-resolution record of climate stability in France during the last interglacial period. *Nature*, **413**, 293-296.
- Romanova, V., M. Prange and G. Lohmann, 2003: Stability of the glacial thermohaline and its dependence on the background hydrological cycle. *Clim. Dyn.*, submitted.
- Saravanan, R. and J. C. McWilliams, 1998: Multiple equilibria, natural variability, and climate transitions in an idealized ocean-atmosphere interaction. *J. Climate*, **8**, 2296-2323.
- Schäfer-Neth, C. and A. Paul, 2000: Circulation of the glacial Atlantic: a synthesis of global and regional modeling. In *The Northern North Atlantic: A Changing Environment*, ed. P. Schäfer, W. Ritzrau, M. Schlüter and J. Thiede, pp. 441-462, Springer, Berlin.
- Schiller, A., Mikolajewicz, U., and Voss, R., 1997: The stability of the North Atlantic thermohaline circulation in a coupled ocean-atmosphere general circulation model. *Climate Dyn.* **13**, 325-347.
- Schmitt, R. W., P. S. Bogden and C. E. Dorman, 1989: Evaporation minus precipitation and density fluxes for the North Atlantic. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **19**, 1208-1221.

- Schmittner, A., M. Yoshimori and A. J. Weaver, 2002: Instability of glacial climate in a model of the ocean-atmosphere-cryosphere system. *Science*, **295**, 1489-1493.
- Shackleton, N. J., 1987: Oxygen isotopes, ice volume and sea level. *Quatern. Sci. Rev.*, **6**, 183-190.
- Shaffer, G. and J. Bendtsen, 1994: Role of the Bering Strait in controlling North Atlantic ocean circulation and climate. *Nature*, **367**, 354-357.
- Shemesh, A., Rietti-Shati, M., Rioual, P., Battarbee, R., de Beaulieu, J.-L., Reille, M., Andrieu, V. and Svobodova, H., 2001: An oxygen isotope record of lacustrine opal from a European maar indicates climatic stability during the last interglacial. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **28**, 2305-2308.
- Stigebrandt, A., 1984: The North Pacific – A global-scale estuary. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **14**, 464-470.
- Stocker, T. F. and A. Schmittner, 1997: Influence of CO₂ emission rates on the stability of the thermohaline circulation. *Nature*, **351**, 729-732.
- Stocker, T. F., 2000: Past and future reorganizations in the climate system. *Quatern. Sci. Rev.*, **19**, 201-319.
- Stommel, H., 1961: Thermohaline convection with two stable regimes of flow. *Tellus*, **13**, 224-230.
- Tomczak, M. and J. S. Godfrey, 1994: *Regional Oceanography: An Introduction*. Pergamon Press, 422 pp.
- Tziperman, E., 1997: Inherently unstable climate behavior due to weak thermohaline ocean circulation. *Nature*, **386**, 592-595.

- Tziperman, E. and H. Gildor, 2002: The stabilization of the thermohaline circulation by the temperature-precipitation feedback. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* **32**, 2707-2714.
- Wang, Z. and L. A. Mysak, 2001: Ice sheet thermohaline circulation interactions in a simple climate model of intermediate complexity. *J. Oceanog.*, **57**, 481-484.
- Weijer, W., W. P. M. de Ruijter, and H. A. Dijkstra, 2000: Stability of the Atlantic overturning circulation: Competition between Bering Strait freshwater flux and Agulhas heat and salt sources. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **31**, 2385-2402.
- Yokoyama, Y. K. Lambeck, P. D. Decker, Johnston and L. K. Fifield (2000): Timing of the Last Glacial Maximum from observed sea level minima. *Nature*, **406**, 713-716.