

UNCLASSIFIED

AD 261 532

*Reproduced
by the*

**ARMED SERVICES TECHNICAL INFORMATION AGENCY
ARLINGTON HALL STATION
ARLINGTON 12, VIRGINIA**



UNCLASSIFIED

NOTICE: When government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related government procurement operation, the U. S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

**AEROELASTIC AND STRUCTURES RESEARCH LABORATORY
MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**

TECHNICAL NOTE 75-3

**PROPOSED TEST PROGRAM ON
AEROTHERMOELASTIC SIMILARITY LAWS**

BY

JOHN DUGUNDJI

JOHN M. CALLIGEROS

FOR THE

**OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**

CONTRACT NO. NONR-1841(46)

JUNE 1961

**AEROELASTIC AND STRUCTURES RESEARCH LABORATORY
MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**


TECHNICAL NOTE 75-3

**PROPOSED TEST PROGRAM ON
AEROTHERMOELASTIC SIMILARITY LAWS**

By

JOHN DUGUNDJI

JOHN M. CALLIGEROS



**FOR THE
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
CONTRACT NO. Nonr-1841(46)**

JUNE 1961

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF SYMBOLS	iv
OBJECT	1
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF THE SIMILARITY PARAMETERS	2
a) General Aerothermoelastic Body	2
b) Wing Structures	4
c) Thin, Solid, Plate-Type Lifting Surfaces	5
d) Panel Flutter	6
EXPERIMENTAL TEST PROGRAM	7
a) Flutter of Thin, Solid, Plate-Type Lifting Surfaces	7
b) Flutter of Heated Built-Up Wings	9
c) Flutter of Heated Panels	10
REFERENCES	11

ABSTRACT

The similarity laws required for experimental aerothermoelastic studies at $M_{\infty} < 3.5$ are reviewed. An experimental program to check out some of the concepts and ideas involved in these studies is proposed with particular emphasis on flutter of thin, solid, plate-type lifting surfaces, built-up wing structures, and panel flutter.

LIST OF SYMBOLS

R	Aspect Ratio
C	Specific Heat of Body Material
c_p	Specific Heat of Gas at Constant Pressure
E	Young's Modulus
G	Shear Modulus
g	Acceleration Due to Gravity
J	Torsional Stiffness Constant
K	Heat Conductivity of Body Material
k	Heat Conductivity of Gas
L	Characteristic Length
M_∞	Free Stream Mach Number
p	Pressure
Pr	Prandtl Number, $\frac{\mu c_p}{k}$
Re_∞	Free Stream Reynolds Number, $\frac{\rho_\infty V L}{\mu_\infty}$
T	Temperature
T_{Aw}	Adiabatic Wall Temperature = $T_\infty \left[1 + r \frac{(\gamma-1)}{2} M_\infty^2 \right]$
T_{Bi}	Initial Body Temperature
t	Time
u	Displacement Component
V	Free Stream Velocity

LIST OF SYMBOLS (Cont'd)

α	Coefficient of Thermal Expansion
γ	Ratio of Specific Heats
δ	Thickness Distribution
ϵ	Emissivity
$\bar{\theta}$	Non-dimensional Temperature = $(T - T_{Bi}) / (T_o - T_{Bi})$
κ	Thermal Diffusivity, $\frac{K}{\rho_B C}$
μ	Viscosity of Gas
ν	Poisson's Ratio
ρ	Density
σ	Stefan-Boltzmann Constant
σ	Stress Component
τ	Thickness Ratio

Subscripts

Aw	Adiabatic Wall
B	Relating to Body
F	Relating to non-Aerodynamic Origin
i	Initial Value
O	Reference Value
∞	Free Stream Value

Superscripts

$(\bar{\cdot})$	Non-dimensional, temperature dependent gas or material property variation.
-----------------	--

Object

A theoretical study of the similarity laws for aerothermoelastic testing has been made by the Aeroelastic and Structures Research Laboratory at MIT. The results are contained in References 1,2 and particularly 3. It would be of interest now to carry out an experimental test program to check out some of the concepts and ideas involved in these similarity studies. The present note describes such a possible test program that might be undertaken. For simplicity this program will be limited to $M_\infty < 3.5$.

Introduction

As was pointed out in the above mentioned references, similitude for the general aerothermoelastic model is generally not possible for scale ratios other than unity. The primary conflict occurs between the free stream Mach number M_∞ , the Reynolds number Re_∞ , the basic aeroelastic parameter $\rho_\infty V^2/E_0$, the heat conduction parameter k_∞/K_0 , and the thermal expansion parameter $\alpha_0 T_0$. However, certain relaxations of this basic conflict are possible when considering specialized situations, such as the behavior of wing structures, thin plate-like lifting surface structures, and panel flutter. Under these conditions the similarity parameters assume less restrictive forms, even permitting geometrical distortions in some cases.

In the event that similarity is not achievable under these specialized situations, recourse may be made to "incomplete aerothermoelastic testing" in which the pressure and/or thermal loadings are estimated in advance and applied artificially to the model. This is in contrast to the previous complete aerothermoelastic testing where the high

stagnation temperature air stream provides both the appropriate aerodynamic pressure loads and heating rates to the model.

Finally, if not much coupling is evident between the aerodynamic pressure, aerodynamic heating, heat conduction, and stress and deflection phenomena, one can construct "restricted purpose" models investigating separately one or another of the above facets of the complete aerothermoelastic problem.

Since both "restricted purpose" models and "incomplete aerothermoelastic testing" have been widely used and studied in the past, the present test program will attempt to deal with the more novel specialized situations of the complete aerothermoelastic problem.

In proposing such an aerothermoelastic test program, it is desirable to select situations where aerothermoelastic coupling effects are pronounced. The following situations have accordingly been selected:

- 1) Flutter of heated solid section wings
- 2) Flutter of heated built-up wings
- 3) Flutter of heated panels

In addition to checking out the aerothermoelastic similarity relations, the present program can also serve to investigate the aerothermoelastic phenomena involved, and the theory developed to predict it.

Review of the Similarity Parameters

a) General Aerothermoelastic Body

The similarity parameters for a general aerothermoelastic model at $M_{\infty} < 3.5$ are essentially (Ref. 1, Eq. 2.35

and Ref. 3, Eq. 52)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & M_\infty, Re_\infty, \frac{\rho_\infty V^2}{E_0}, \frac{\mu_\infty}{K_0}, \alpha_0 T_0, \frac{\rho_B}{\rho_\infty}, \frac{T_0}{T_\infty}, \\
 & \frac{\kappa_0 t_0}{L^2}, \frac{V t_0}{L}, \frac{u_0}{L}, \frac{\sigma_0}{E_0}, \frac{P_F}{E_0}, \frac{\epsilon_0 \sigma T_0^3 L}{K_0}, \frac{\rho_B g L}{\rho_\infty V^2}, \quad (1) \\
 & \bar{R}, \bar{\gamma}, \bar{\nu}, \bar{k}, \bar{c}_p, \bar{\mu}, \bar{K}, \bar{G}, \\
 & \bar{E}, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\epsilon}, \frac{T_{Bi}}{T_0}
 \end{aligned}$$

The first five parameters above are the primary ones to be reconciled. The ρ_B / ρ_∞ condition is required only in dynamic aerothermoelastic problems such as flutter, and often there it may be neglected at sufficiently large values of ρ_B / ρ_∞ . The next five parameters serve to define the reference values of T_0 , t_0 , u_0 , and σ_0 to be used in the nondimensionalizations*. The P_F / E_0 condition defines any additional non-aerodynamic loads present. The $\epsilon_0 \sigma T_0^3 L / K_0$ and $\rho_B g L / \rho_\infty V^2$ conditions enter only when surface radiation effects and gravity effects are significant, while the next three conditions can usually be satisfied by many gases and materials. The remaining double-barred quantities are all functions of temperature and require that they have the same variation for model and prototype. The T_{Bi} / T_0 calls for similarity of body initial temperature states.

If the above parameters are satisfied, then the nondimensional quantities $P / \rho_\infty V^2$, T / T_0 , t / t_0 , u / u_0 and $\dot{\sigma} / \dot{\sigma}_0$

*The presence of the two reference times t_0 need not be bothersome if thermal times are considerably different from aerodynamic times.

will be the same for model and prototype, and behavior of the model may infer behavior of the prototype. References 1 and 3 give a discussion of the use of different materials and gases to satisfy the above requirements.

Similitude under the conditions of Eq. (1) is generally not possible for scale ratios other than unity. The following specialized aerothermoelastic problems were therefore also studied in which it is shown that several of the parameters of the general problem above appear in less restrictive combined forms.

b) Wing Structures

For the specialized situation of wing structures, the similarity parameters of Eq. (1) reduce essentially to (Ref. 1, Eq. 4.8 and Ref. 3, Eq. 58)

$$M_\infty, \frac{k_\infty (Re_\infty)^{.8} (Pr)^{1/3}}{K_0}, \frac{\rho_\infty V^2}{E_0}, \alpha_0 (T_0 - T_{Bi}), \frac{\rho_B}{\rho_\infty}, \frac{T_0 - T_{Bi}}{T_{Aw} - T_{Bi}},$$

$$\frac{K_0 t_0}{L^2}, \frac{V t_0}{L}, \frac{u_0}{L}, \frac{\sigma_0}{E_0}, \frac{P_F}{E_0}, \frac{\epsilon_0 \sigma L [(T_0 - T_{Bi}) \bar{\theta} + T_{Bi}]^4}{K_0 (T_0 - T_{Bi})}, \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{\rho_B g L}{\rho_\infty V^2}, \gamma, \nu, \bar{k}, \bar{c}_p, \bar{\mu}, \bar{K}, \bar{C}, \bar{E}, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\epsilon}.$$

The parameters above are less restrictive than the general case since $k_\infty (Re_\infty)^{.8} (Pr)^{1/3} / K_0$ above is a combination of the Re_∞ , k_∞ / K_0 and Pr conditions of Eq. (1). This parameter results from the application of Prandtl's boundary layer concept to the flow close to the body region. Turbulent flow is assumed above (if laminar then the second parameter is replaced here and throughout by $k_\infty (Re_\infty)^{.5} (Pr)^{1/3} / K_0$). The parameter $(T_0 - T_{Bi}) / (T_{Aw} - T_{Bi})$ now serves to define

the reference temperature T_o . The non-dimensional temperature $\bar{\theta}$ is now defined as $(T - T_{Bi}) / (T_o - T_{Bi})$ rather than the T/T_o of the general case a), therefore eliminating problems in maintaining cumbersome uniform initial temperature conditions on the models.

A further simplification can be made at early times, when only the skin heats up and not much heat has been conducted to the webs. Under these conditions and with the assumption that heat flow in the plane of the thin skin is negligible, the second and seventh parameters above combine into the less stringent parameter.

$$\frac{k_{\infty} (Re_{\infty})^8 (Pr)^{1/3} t_o}{\rho_B C_o L^2} \quad (3)$$

Under these conditions it is seen that the Reynolds number Re_{∞} merely serves to redefine the reference time t_o . This eliminates the primary obstacle in the scaling laws and any scale length may now be accommodated.

c) Thin, Solid, Plate-Type Lifting Surfaces

The parameters of Eq. (1) are further reduced to the following less restrictive forms when considering affinely related thin, solid, plate-type lifting surfaces (Ref. 2, Eq. 5.11, 2.34, 3.12, etc., and Ref. 3, Eq. 63)

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{M_{\infty}^2 - 1} \gamma, \quad \frac{k_{\infty} (Re_{\infty})^8 (Pr)^{1/3}}{K_o \gamma}, \quad \frac{\rho_{\infty} V^2}{E_o \gamma^2}, \quad \frac{\alpha_o (T_o - T_{Bi})}{\gamma^2}, \quad \frac{\rho_B}{\rho_{\infty}}, \\ & \frac{T_o - T_{Bi}}{T_{AW} - T_{Bi}}, \quad \frac{\rho_o t_o}{L^2}, \quad \frac{V t_o}{L}, \quad \frac{u_o}{L \gamma}, \quad \frac{\sigma_o}{E_o \gamma^2}, \quad \frac{P_F}{E_o \gamma^4} \left(\frac{L \gamma}{u_o} \right), \\ & \frac{\epsilon_o \sigma L [(T_o - T_{Bi}) \bar{\theta} + T_{Bi}]^4}{K_o \gamma (T_o - T_{Bi})}, \quad \frac{\rho_B g L \sqrt{M_{\infty}^2 - 1}}{\rho_{\infty} V^2} \left(\frac{L \gamma}{u_o} \right), \quad \gamma, \quad \gamma^2, \\ & \bar{k}, \quad \bar{\mu}, \quad \bar{K}, \quad \bar{C}, \quad \bar{E}, \quad \bar{\alpha}, \quad \bar{\epsilon}, \quad \bar{\delta} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where τ is the thickness ratio. These parameters are applicable for large deflections and it is assumed that the heat flow into the thin plate-like surface causes a very small temperature variation through the thickness.

The parameters above are less restrictive than Eq. (1) because of their combined forms involving τ . If small deflections are assumed and if additionally piston theory can be assumed for the aerodynamic loading, the reference parameter $u_o/L\tau$ does not appear separately in Eq. (4) and u_o becomes a free quantity.

The scaling requirements are further simplified if it can be assumed that heat flow in the plane of the plate-like surface is negligible. In this case the following parameter replacing the second and seventh conditions of Eq. (4) results

$$\frac{k_{\infty} (Re_{\infty})^{.8} (Pr)^{1/3} t_o}{\rho_B C_o \gamma L^2} \quad (5)$$

where again it is seen that Re_{∞} will serve only to redefine the reference time t_o .

d) Panel Flutter

The parameters of Eq. (1) reduce essentially to the following for the flutter of thin heated panels undergoing large deflections (Ref. 1, Eq. 4.30, Ref. 2, Eq. 4.19, and Ref. 3, Eq. 70)

$$\frac{\rho_{\infty} V^2}{E_o \gamma^3 \sqrt{M_{\infty}^2 - 1}}, \quad \frac{k_{\infty} (Re_{\infty})^{.8} (Pr)^{1/3}}{K_o \gamma}, \quad \frac{\alpha_o (T_o - T_{Bi})}{\gamma^2}, \quad \frac{\rho_B \sqrt{M_{\infty}^2 - 1} \gamma}{\rho_{\infty}},$$

$$\frac{T_0 - T_{Bi}}{T_{Aw} - T_{Bi}}, \frac{R_0 t_0}{L^2}, \frac{V t_0}{L}, \frac{u_0}{L\gamma}, \frac{\sigma_0}{E_0 \gamma^2}, \frac{P_F}{E_0 \gamma^4} \left(\frac{L\gamma}{u_0} \right), \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{\epsilon_0 \sigma L [(T_0 - T_{Bi}) \bar{\theta} + T_{Bi}]^4}{K_0 \gamma (T_0 - T_{Bi})}, \frac{\rho_B g L \sqrt{M_\infty^2 - 1} \left(\frac{L\gamma}{u_0} \right)}{\rho_\infty V^2}, \bar{\nu}, \bar{k}, \bar{\mu}$$

$$\bar{K}, \bar{G}, \bar{E}, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\epsilon}$$

where τ is the thickness ratio of the panel. The absence of $\sqrt{M_\infty^2 - 1} \tau$ is to be noted since now there are no aerodynamic thickness effects. For small deflections, the deflection parameter $u_0 / L\tau$ will not appear separately above in Eq. (6).

As in the case of the thin solid lifting surface of section c, the second and sixth parameters above combine into the single parameter of Eq. (5) if heat conduction in the plane of the panel is negligible.

EXPERIMENTAL TEST PROGRAM

a) Flutter of Thin, Solid, Plate-Type Lifting Surfaces

It is proposed to test three similar wings of different scale in a large, high stagnation temperature wind tunnel at $M_\infty = 3$. Their aerothermoelastic behavior, principally flutter, is to be correlated according to the specialized parameters of section c above.

The wings are to be rectangular in planform, of solid double wedge cross section with $\tau = .03$, $AR = 3$ and maximum thickness at seventy percent chord. The tunnel stagnation temperature should be approximately 500°F and the wings constructed of stainless steel 17-7 PH for strength and minimum change in material properties with temperature. This latter consideration would provide a better indication of the direct effect of thermal stresses in reducing the torsional

stiffness of the wing. For such wings, the dynamic pressure, $\rho_{\infty} V^2/2$, at flutter is approximately 3800 lbs/ft² and the maximum reduction in GJ is approximately 70% according to the theory of Budiansky and Mayers (Ref. 4). In order to minimize the starting loads on the wing, it may be provided either with a flexible root, injected into the test section after flow has been established or provided with a protective cover shell which will take the starting loads and then become disengaged after the flow has been established. This latter method has been used by the NASA in their 6' x 9', $M_{\infty} = 3$, thermal tunnel.

Models of different scale are suggested so that the influence of the Reynolds number appearing in the second parameter of Eq. (4) may be ascertained. It is also of particular interest to see if correlation is possible with the parameter of Eq. (5). If so, the effect of a change in length scale at fixed free stream conditions would be to merely change the actual time of occurrence of the aerothermoelastic phenomena being investigated.

The flutter test procedure would be to first establish the cold flutter dynamic pressure of these wings by testing at room stagnation temperatures. Then one could run at some lower $\rho_{\infty} V^2/2$ but higher stagnation temperature and observe the time to flutter for each of these wings.

The models could also be instrumented to measure temperature and root strains and correlation again attempted using the parameters of Eqs. (4) and (5). In addition to correlating similarity parameters, the above tests would provide an experimental check of Budiansky and Mayers' theory of thermal stress effects (Ref. 4) on basic aeroelastic flutter.

The effect of using different materials may be investigated by using one of the 17-7 PH steel wings above as a

prototype and an identical wing constructed of aluminum 2024 as the model. According to Eqs. (4) and (5) above, similarity may be achieved using a lower stagnation temperature such that $\alpha_o(T_o - T_{Bi})$ was maintained. The corresponding dynamic pressure for the aluminum model would be about 1/3 as great as the steel prototype.

The effect of using a different thickness ratio τ could be investigated. This would then require testing at a different Mach number to maintain the same $M_\infty \tau$, and at a different stagnation temperature. Again correlation with the basic 17-7 PH steel wing as a prototype could be attempted, in both flutter speeds, time to flutter, and temperature time histories.

This proposed experimental program was discussed with the personnel of the Structures Research Division and Dynamic Loads Division of the NASA at Langley Field, Virginia. As a result of discussions there, it is recommended that tests be conducted also on flat plate delta and swept wing planforms similar in nature to the tests described above for the rectangular wings. Some of their current tests on such delta wings are along similar lines as described here and it is anticipated that when more data is available correlation will be attempted according to the parameters described here.

b) Flutter of Heated Built-Up Wings

In this program, it is proposed to again place three different scale built-up wing sections in a large, high stagnation temperature $M_\infty = 3$ tunnel, and to correlate aeroelastic behavior.

The suggested wings could be of typical X-15 type construction. In this case, there is not expected to be a marked decrease in GJ due to thermal effects. Probably here,

only temperatures or static tip twists as influenced by temperature could be measured.

Another program that might be of interest to undertake here would be to build three different scale models of the chordwise type flutter observed originally in Reference 5. The time to flutter for these different scale models might possibly be correlated according to the parameters of Eqs. 2 and 3.

c) Flutter of Heated Panels

In this program, it is proposed to place three similar panels of differing scale in a high stagnation temperature tunnel. Again, the correlation of the flutter behavior and time to flutter of the different size panels could be attempted according to the parameters of Eq. 6. Different materials as well as different thickness ratios and stagnation temperatures could be tried for correlation as previously suggested in the flutter of heated solid section wings.

In this connection, the interesting phenomenon of heated panels first fluttering and then stopping after buckling is produced might possibly be examined. As reported in Ref. 6 the times to start and stop fluttering might possibly be correlated. For the stopping behavior of this flutter, the large deflection parameters would no doubt have to be used.

REFERENCES

1. Calligeros, J. M. and Dugundji, J., Similarity Laws Required for Experimental Aerothermoelastic Studies, M.I.T. ASRL TR 75-1, May 1959.
2. Calligeros, J. M. and Dugundji, J., Similarity Laws Required for Experimental Aerothermoelastic Studies, Part 2 -- Hypersonic Speeds, M.I.T. ASRL TR 75-2, May 1961.
3. Dugundji, J., and Calligeros J. M., Similarity Laws for Aerothermoelastic Testing, paper to be published.
4. Budiansky, B., and Mayers, J., Influence of Aerodynamic Heating on the Effective Torsional Stiffness of Thin Wings, Journal of the Aeronautical Sciences, Vol. 23, No. 12, Dec. 1956.
5. Heldenfels, R. R., and Rosencrans, R., Preliminary Results of Supersonic-Jet Tests of Simplified Wing Structures, NACA RM L 53E26a, July 1953.
6. Kordes, E. E., Tuovila, W. J., and Guy, L. D., Flutter Research on Skin Panels, NASA TN D-451, September 1960.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

ONR Technical Reports

Chief of Naval Research Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Code 438	(2)	Office of the Chief of Engineers Asst. Chief for Military Construction Department of the Army Building T-7, Gravelly Point Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Library Branch Engineering Division (Pl., Eng., and Contracts)	(1)	Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Code D-213 Code D-222 Code D-410C Code D-440	(1)	Commanding General U. S. Air Force Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Research and Development Division	(1)
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 495 Summer Street Boston 10, Massachusetts	(1)	Commanding Officer Engineer Research Development Laboratory Fort Belvoir, Virginia	(1)	Commanding Officer and Director David Taylor Model Basin Washington 7, D. C. Attn: Code 647 Code 700 Code 720 Code 730 Code 740	(1)	Commander Air Materiel Command Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Dayton, Ohio Attn: MCREX-B Structures Division	(1)
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office John Crerar Library Building 86 East Randolph Street Chicago 11, Illinois	(1)	Office of the Chief of Ordnance Department of the Army Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Research and Materials Br. (Ord. R+D Division)	(1)	Commander U. S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory White Oak, Maryland Attn: Technical Library Technical Evaluation Dept.	(2)	Commander U. S. Air Force Institute of Technology Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Dayton, Ohio Attn: Chief, Applied Mechanics Group	(1)
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 346 Broadway New York 13, New York	(1)	Office of the Chief Signal Officer Department of the Army Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Engineering and Technical Div.	(1)	Director Materials Laboratory New York Naval Shipyard Brooklyn 1, New York	(1)	Director of Intelligence Headquarters, U. S. Air Force Washington 25, D. C. Attn: P. V. Branch (Air Targets Div.)	(1)
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1030 East Green Street Pasadena, California	(1)	Commanding Officer Watertown Arsenal Watertown, Massachusetts Attn: Laboratory Division	(1)	Officer-in-Charge Naval Civil Engineering Research and Evaluation Laboratory U. S. Naval Construction Battalion Center Port Hueneme, California	(2)	Commander Air Research and Development Command P. O. Box 1395 Baltimore 3, Maryland Attn: RDMPE	(1)
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research 1000 Geary Street San Francisco, California	(1)	Commanding Officer Frankford Arsenal Bridesburg Station Philadelphia 37, Pennsylvania Attn: Division of Engineering Sciences	(1)	Director Naval Air Experimental Station Naval Air Materiel Center Naval Base Philadelphia 12, Pennsylvania Attn: Materials Laboratory Structures Laboratory	(1)	U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Director of Research	(2)
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Navy 100, c/o Fleet Post Office New York, New York	(27)	Commanding Officer Scripps Signal Laboratory Fort Monmouth, New Jersey Attn: Components and Materials Br.	(1)	Officer-in-Charge Underwater Explosion Research Div. Norfolk Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Virginia Attn: Dr. A. H. Kell	(2)	Commandant U. S. Coast Guard 1300 E Street, NW Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Chief, Testing and Development Division	(1)
Director Naval Research Laboratory Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Tech. Info. Officer Code 6200 Code 6205 Code 6250 Code 6260	(6)	Office of Ordnance Research 2127 Myrtle Drive Duke Station Durham, North Carolina Attn: Division of Engineering Sciences	(1)	Commander U. S. Naval Proving Grounds Dahlgren, Virginia	(1)	U. S. Maritime Administration General Administration Office Building Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Chief, Division of Preliminary Design	(1)
Armed Services Technical Information Agency Arlington Hall Station Arlington 12, Virginia	(10)	Chief of Naval Operations Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Op 37	(1)	Superintendent Naval Gun Factory Washington 25, D. C.	(1)	National Aeronautics and Space Administration 1520 H Street, NW Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Structures Division	(1)
Office of Technical Services Department of Commerce Washington 25, D. C.	(1)	Commandant, Marine Corps Headquarters, U. S. Marine Corps Washington 25, D. C.	(1)	Commander Naval Ordnance Test Station Inyokern, China Lake, California Attn: Physics Division Mechanics Branch	(1)	Director Langley Aeronautical Laboratory Langley Field, Virginia Attn: Structures Division	(2)
Office of the Secretary of Defense Research and Development Division The Pentagon Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Technical Library	(1)	Chief, Bureau of Ships Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Code 327 Code 371 Code 420 Code 423 Code 442	(2)	Commander Naval Ordnance Test Station Underwater Ordnance Division 3203 East Foothill Boulevard Pasadena 8, California Attn: Structures Division	(1)	Director Forest Products Laboratory Madison, Wisconsin	(1)
Chief Armed Forces Special Weapons Project The Pentagon Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Technical Information Division Weapons Effects Division Special Field Projects	(2)	Chief, Bureau of Naval Weapons Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: AD AD-2 RS-7 RS-8 RS-9 TD-42	(1)	Commanding Officer and Director Naval Engineering Experiment Station Annapolis, Maryland	(1)	Civil Aeronautics Administration Department of Commerce Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Chief, Aircraft Engineering Division Chief, Airframe and Equip- ment Branch	(1)
Office of the Secretary of the Army The Pentagon Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Army Library	(1)	Chief, Bureau of Naval Weapons Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: R-3 Re-5 Re-9 Re	(1)	Superintendent Naval Post Graduate School Monterey, California	(1)	National Sciences Foundation 1520 H Street, NW Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Engineering Sciences Division	(1)
Chief of Staff Department of the Army Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Development Br. (R+D Div) Research Branch (R+D Div) Special Weapons Branch (R+D Division)	(1)			Commandant Marine Corps Schools Quantico, Virginia Attn: Director, Marine Corps Development Center	(1)		

DISTRIBUTION LIST

ONR Technical Reports

National Academy of Science 2101 Constitution Avenue Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Technical Director, Committee on Ships' Structural Design Executive Secretary, Committee on Undersea Warfare (1)	Professor P. G. Hodge, Jr. Department of Mechanics Illinois Institute of Technology Technology Center Chicago 16, Illinois (1)	Professor William A. Nash Department of Engineering Mechanics University of Florida Gainesville, Florida (1)	Project Staff (10)
Professor Lynn S. Beedle Fritz Engineering Laboratory Lehigh University Bethlehem, Pennsylvania (1)	Dr. N. J. Hoff Department of Aeronautical Engineering Stanford University Stanford, California (1)	Professor N. M. Newmark Department of Civil Engineering University of Illinois Urbano, Illinois (1)	For future distribution (10)
Professor R. L. Bisplinghoff Department of Aeronautical Engineering Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge 39, Massachusetts (1)	Professor W. H. Hoppman Department of Mechanical Engineering Johns Hopkins University Baltimore, Maryland (1)	Professor Aris Phillips Department of Civil Engineering 15 Prospect Street Yale University New Haven, Connecticut (1)	Professor Bernard W. Shaffer Mechanical Engineering Department New York University University Heights New York 53, New York (1)
Professor H. M. Bleich Department of Civil Engineering Columbia University New York 27, New York (1)	Professor Bruce G. Johnson University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan (1)	Professor W. Prager, Chairman Physical Sciences Council Brown University Providence, Rhode Island (1)	Prof. Chieh-Chien Chang Department of Aeronautical Engr. Institute of Technology University of Minnesota Minneapolis, 14, Minnesota (1)
Professor B. A. Boley Department of Civil Engineering Columbia University New York 27, New York (1)	Professor J. Kempner Department of Aeronautical Engineering and Applied Mechanics Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn 99 Livingston Street Brooklyn 2, New York (1)	Professor E. Reissner Department of Mathematics Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge 39, Massachusetts (1)	
Professor G. F. Carrier Pierce Hall Harvard University Cambridge 38, Massachusetts (1)	Professor H. L. Langhaar Department of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics University of Illinois Urbano, Illinois (1)	Professor M. A. Sadowsky Department of Mathematics Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, New York (1)	
Professor Herbert Deresiewicz Department of Civil Engineering Columbia University 632 West 125th Street New York 27, New York (1)	Professor B. J. Lazan, Director Engineering Experiment Station University of Minnesota Minneapolis 14 Minnesota (1)	Professor C. B. Smith College of Arts and Sciences Department of Mathematics Walker Hall University of Florida Gainesville, Florida (1)	
Professor Lloyd Donnell Department of Mechanics Illinois Institute of Technology Technology Center Chicago 16, Illinois (1)	Professor E. H. Lee Division of Applied Mathematics Brown University Providence 12, Rhode Island (1)	Professor J. Stollmeyer Department of Civil Engineering University of Illinois Urbano, Illinois (1)	
Professor D. C. Drucker, Chairman Division of Engineering Brown University Providence, Rhode Island (1)	Professor George H. Lee Director of Research Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, New York (1)	Professor Eli Sternberg Department of Mechanics Illinois Institute of Technology Technology Center Chicago 16, Illinois (1)	
Professor A. C. Erlingen Department of Aeronautical Engineering Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana (1)	Mr. M. M. Lemcoe Southwest Research Institute 8500 Culebra Road San Antonio 6, Texas (1)	Professor S. P. Timoshenko School of Engineering Stanford University Stanford, California (1)	
Professor W. Flugge Department of Mechanical Engineering Stanford University Stanford, California (1)	Professor Paul Lieber Geology Department Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, New York (1)	Professor A. S. Veikos Department of Civil Engineering University of Illinois Urbano, Illinois (1)	
Mr. Martin Goland, Vice President Southwest Research Institute 8500 Culebra Road San Antonio 6, Texas (1)	Professor Hsu Lo School of Engineering Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana (1)	Professor Max L. Williams Department of Aeronautics California Institute of Technology Pasadena, California (1)	
Professor J. N. Goodier Department of Mechanical Engineering Stanford University Stanford, California (1)	Professor R. D. Mindlin Department of Civil Engineering Columbia University 632 West 125th Street New York 27, New York (1)	Professor Dana Young Yale University New Haven, Connecticut (1)	
Professor L. E. Goodman Engineering Experiment Station University of Minnesota Minneapolis, Minnesota (1)	Dr. A. Nodai 136 Cherry Valley Road Pittsburgh 21, Pennsylvania (1)	Dr. John F. Braitz Department of Engineering University of California Los Angeles, California (1)	
Professor M. Hetenyi The Technological Institute Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois (1)	Prof. Paul M. Naghdi Mechanical Engineering Mechanics and Design University of California Berkeley 4, California (1)		