

AD-A104 687

CALIFORNIA INST OF TECH PASADENA GRADUATE AERONAUTIC--ETC F/G 11/9  
DYNAMIC FRACTURE IN VISCOELASTIC SOLIDS.(U)  
JUL 81 K S KIM, W G KNAUSS

N00014-78-C-0634

UNCLASSIFIED

GALCIT-SM-81-7

NL

1 OF 1  
AD A  
104687

END  
DATE  
FILMED  
10-81  
DTIC

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

12

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                     | READ INSTRUCTIONS<br>BEFORE COMPLETING FORM                             |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. REPORT NUMBER<br>GALCIT-SM-81-7                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.<br>AD-A104687 | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER                                           |
| 4. TITLE (and Subtitle)<br>DYNAMIC FRACTURE IN VISCOELASTIC SOLIDS.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                     | 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED<br>Annual Report<br>1/1/81 - 8/31/81 |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                     | 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER                                        |
| 7. AUTHOR(s)<br>K.S./Kim, W.G./Knauss                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                     | 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)<br>ONR N00014-78-C-0634                  |
| 9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS<br>California Institute of Technology 105-50<br>Pasadena, CA 91125                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                     | 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK<br>AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS<br>110   |
| 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS<br>Office of Naval Research, Code 473<br>Dept. of the Navy, Arlington, VA 22217                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                     | 12. REPORT DATE<br>July 2, 1981                                         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                     | 13. NUMBER OF PAGES<br>86                                               |
| 14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)<br><b>LEVEL</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                     | 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)<br>UNCLASSIFIED                    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                     | 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING<br>SCHEDULE                           |
| 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)<br><br>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                     |                                                                         |
| 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)<br><br>DTIC<br>SELECTED<br>SEP 29 1981                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                     |                                                                         |
| 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES<br><br>H                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                     |                                                                         |
| 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)<br><br>Dynamic fracture, viscoelasticity, running cracks,<br>crack branching.                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                     |                                                                         |
| 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)<br><br>Dynamic crack propagation in viscoelastic media is<br>studied experimentally with, Homalite 100, and a polyurethane,<br>Solithane 113, at various temperatures. Employing the method<br>of caustics, high speed photography determines the variation of |                                     |                                                                         |

DD FORM 1473  
1 JAN 73

UNCLASSIFIED  
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

81 9 28 164

AD A104687

DTIC FILE COPY



SM 81-7

Annual Report on  
DYNAMIC FRACTURE IN VISCOELASTIC SOLIDS

by  
K. S. Kim  
W.G. Knauss

July 2, 1981

This work was performed under contract N00014-78-C-0634  
with the Office of Naval Research at  
California Institute of Technology  
Pasadena, California

## Table of Contents

### Abstract

1. Introduction
2. Brief Experimental Review
3. Analysis of Viscoelastic Dynamic Fracture
4. Evaluation of the Stress Intensity Factor-  
Experimental Preliminaries
5. The Caustics for a Stationary Crack in a  
Viscoelastic Solid
6. Analytical Determination of the Caustics for  
a Crack Moving in a Viscoelastic Solid
7. Appearance of Fracture Surfaces, Smoothness and  
Branching Related Surface Features
8. Dynamic Crack Propagation Behavior - Crack  
Speed Dependence on Loading and Temperature
9. Estimation of Load Variation Resulting from  
Temperature Induced Changes in Material  
Stiffness

### Figures

### Distribution List

## ABSTRACT

Dynamic crack propagation in viscoelastic media is studied experimentally with a polyester known as Homalite 100 and a polyurethane known as Solithane 113 at various temperatures. Employing the optical method of caustics [1-5], high speed photography is used to determine the variation of the stress intensity factor and the velocity of a running crack initiated and driven by the dynamic step loading on the faces of an initial semi-infinite crack in an infinite medium. The loading condition is simulated experimentally with the technique introduced by Smith and Knauss [6]. In this work an application of the method of caustics is extended for the determination of the time dependent stress intensity factor of a running crack in a viscoelastic material. Also, the viscoelastic effects on the initiation of a running crack, the variation of the stress intensity factor, the speed of the crack and the branching of the running crack are discussed. In addition, a mechanism of branching is proposed based on the study of the fracture surfaces.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

When one compares the progress made in understanding quasi-static fracture with that related to dynamic crack propagation one is impressed with the wide range of engineering applications in which quasistatic fracture analyses have proven useful. Speaking comparatively, much less understanding has been generated for dynamics related problems. No doubt it is primarily a matter of time before a body of knowledge on dynamic fracture has been developed that has a design oriented impact comparable to that which is now offered with respect to quasi-static fracture.

The problem of dynamic fracture in viscoelastic solids has enjoyed a proportionately still smaller degree of attention. This is in part due to the fact that a) viscoelastic solids are relative newcomers on the engineering scene, b) analytical treatment of dynamics problems is significantly more difficult than for purely elastic materials and c) interpretation of experimental work is severely limited by the lack of analytical understanding.

Because of this relative paucity of effort in dynamic fracture, there appears to have emerged in recent years several attempts to improve our empirical knowledge of dynamic fracture. However, these new developments are almost exclusively devoted to the fracture of rate insensitive materials. While experimentation proceeds with polymeric solids as test materials these polymers

are chosen as metal substitutes primarily for reason of convenience; their viscoelastic behavior tends to be an undesirable inconvenience rather than a chosen characteristic.

This report outlines work conducted to better define and predict the friability of strongly viscoelastic solids, and oriented to better understand the effects of viscoelastic material behavior on the fracture process with particular attention devoted to comminution related problems. The motivation for this work derives from problems encountered in understanding safety limitations in handling the new high energy solid propellants (vulnerability) as well as the problem of deflagration-to-detonation transition (DDT). Both phenomena depend potentially strongly on the rapid generation of large amounts of new (burning) surface such as is observed to occur usually in dynamic fracture processes. The time scale of dynamic fractures is typically in the high microsecond range (hundreds of  $\mu\text{sec}$ ) and thus of the same order experienced in a motor DDT.

The basic interest here is to understand the conditions that lead to crack branching. For, if crack branching criteria can be established one would, in principle, be able to estimate whether the dynamic stresses accompanying DDT could cause a rapid proliferation of crack surface via branching and thus feed the DDT process by offering a rapidly growing burning surface.

There are several important issues that are subordinate to this basic question:

a) Wave propagation in viscoelastic solids: Simple problems of wave propagation involving viscoelastic material behavior are fairly well understood; so is the attenuation of propagating waves in simple geometries. However, in geometries involving cracks or even propagating cracks much less is known. It is hoped that work going on at this time at other institutions can usefully complement the present effort in the future. Of particular interest would be information on the crack tip strain field of a running crack.

b) A problem similar and related to that just mentioned under a) is the experimental identification of the crack tip stresses. To date this has been accomplished via optical caustics, although a slightly more laborious method, namely photoelasticity, could be employed. In either case the modification enforced by viscoelastic material behavior offers a major complication. To date we have assumed in part of our work employing caustics that a modicum of viscoelastic behavior does not materially effect the caustics, so that the crack tip stresses are approximately determined by the caustics as interpreted via linear elasticity. For other parts of our investigation concerned with a stronger viscous material component that assumption is not justified and ad hoc modifications are used as indicated later on in this report.

c) Probably an important consideration in any explanation or theory for multiple crack branching is the microstructural response of the material at the crack tip. To date little attention has been paid to this fact, in part because virtually no

information exists on its likely effect. As a consequence we report here some detailed, if initial information on how the material responds as crack branching is approached.

d) With this problem of micro structural effects is connected the general question of constitutive behavior of viscoelastic propellant materials under high rates of loading. That behavior is fairly well understood, as far as engineering accuracy is concerned as long as (strain) loading rates are below, say, 1000/sec. However, when rates 1000 times higher are involved time-temperature superposition is somewhat questionable without some further tests.

## 2 BRIEF EXPERIMENTAL REVIEW

In this work the fracture of viscoelastic polymers under dynamic loading is studied. The loading condition is a step loading on the faces of a semi-infinite crack in an unbounded visco-elastic two-dimensional plane. The condition is simulated experimentally by applying on the crack faces electromagnetic forces induced by a square pulse of high electric current flowing in opposite directions through a doubled up thin copper strip; this strip, the legs of which are separated by a Mylar insulator 125  $\mu\text{m}$  thick, is inserted into the crack of a large specimen plate. In order to control the intrinsic time scale of viscoelasticity, the

temperature is changed through the use of the time-temperature shift phenomenon. In these experiments, Homalite-100 is used at three different temperatures ( $60^{\circ}\text{C}$ ,  $80^{\circ}\text{C}$ ,  $100^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) under three different load levels. Solithane 113 (50/50) is also used in a similar fashion. ( $0^{\circ}\text{C}$ ,  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$ ,  $-40^{\circ}\text{C}$ ,  $-60^{\circ}\text{C}$ .)

The result of this study is basically divided into three parts. The first part is the characterization of the stress state near the crack tip, measuring the stress intensity factor  $K(t)$  as a function of time in the given load history. This is done experimentally by extending the method of caustics to viscoelastic materials. This extension is discussed in detail in the following sections [4,5,6]. For a qualitative comparison, the stress analysis is also performed analytically for the case of a stationary crack in antiplane shear (mode III) deformation within the realm of linear viscoelasticity. Also discussions of elastic analyses [7-16] and viscoelastic analysis [17,18] for the moving crack are mentioned.

The second part of this report concerns the process of fracture under the characterized stress state at the crack tip. This is investigated by relating the stress intensity factor and the corresponding velocity of the extending crack, and by observing the fracture surfaces microscopically. Together with the data of crack velocities at various temperatures, data for the initiation of a running crack are obtained. In addition it appears to turn out that the micromechanism of crack propagation is related to the stability of the crack front in the fracture

surface plane; this behavior may be interpreted to produce discontinuous crack growth with the attendant generation of rough surfaces.

In the third part of this report we make some observations on the behavior of crack branching. In this work a possible mechanism of crack branching is suggested, which may explain the continuous energy release rate before and after branching. Observations seem to show that the branching is preceded by the sequence of (i) division of crack front in the fracture surface plane, (ii) deviation of each of the new crack fronts from the original fracture surface plane due to crack path instability, and (iii) interaction of the deviated crack fronts which would cause further global branching depending on the stress state near the global crack front and finally (iv) helical climbing of the crack front and subsequent side cutting. Details of this mechanism are given in section 7 with the picture of fracture surfaces near the place where the crack branching occurred.

For further study, more effort has to be expended in obtaining analytical results for the transient behavior of running cracks in viscoelastic media under dynamic loading. Also, analytic modelling of the instability of the crack front has to be improved. Finally, since irreversible heat dissipation is important in the process of viscoelastic fracture, thermodynamic considerations need to be examined for the study of the energy balance by measuring other physical quantities such as the

temperature rise at the running crack tip.

### 3 ANALYSES OF VISCOELASTIC DYNAMIC FRACTURE

In preparation for the experiments described later on we consider now the analyses of dynamically loaded cracks in a two dimensional domain. The appropriate geometry is shown in fig. 1. For the purposes of this analysis we consider that the dynamic loading is achieved in step fashion and is applied to the faces of the semi-infinite crack embedded in the unbounded medium. From a practical point of view, this problem is appropriate for our later experiments as long as the plate dimensions used in the experiments are so large, that during the course of the experiment no reflected waves from the boundary arrive back at the (moving) crack tip. In terms of the linear analyses employed subsequently the stresses near the crack tip can be characterized by the singularity expansion which is characterized in part, by the stress intensity factor. This stress intensity factor varies as a function of the load history and as a function of the crack tip velocity. For dynamic linearly elastic problems in the plane the analytical tools have been well developed by Achenbach and Freund [11-16]. As a result of these analyses it is well known that the dynamic stress intensity factor can be expressed in the form

$$K[\ell(t), \dot{\ell}(t)] = k[\dot{\ell}(t)]K[\ell(t), 0] \quad (1)$$

In this expression  $\dot{\ell}(t)$  denotes the instantaneous crack length and the dot connotes differentiation with respect to time. Note that this stress intensity factor is of a product form, in which the second factor is the stress intensity factor corresponding to the corresponding static problem and the first factor is a function of the instantaneous crack speed only. We observe also that the static stress intensity factor can be computed from

$$K[\dot{\ell}(t), 0] = \int_0^\infty \int_{-\infty}^t K_F(\chi, t-\xi) \frac{P(\chi, \xi)}{\partial \xi} d\xi d\chi \quad (2)$$

where  $K_F(\chi, t)$  is a Green's function solution for the stress intensity factor of a stationary crack, to the surface of which a delta function has been applied in step fashion;  $\xi$  denotes the distance parameter along the crack length measured from the tip and  $P$  is the distributed pressure which is a function of this distance parameter  $\chi$  as well as a function of time  $\xi$ .

When viscoelasticity is involved the solution indicated in equation (1) is no longer valid; it turns out that for even stationary cracks the stress intensity factor resulting from the fundamental solution of a Dirac delta function to the crack surfaces is not available; in other words, the function  $K_F(\chi, t-\xi)$  is not known at this time. Because this general tool of computing dynamic stress intensity factors for linearly elastic problems does not have a counter-part in viscoelasticity, there appear to be at this time only a few solutions to problems available in

which special boundary conditions have been imposed and in which rather special constitutive relations are used. For example, Atkinson and List [17] solved an antiplane shear problem (mode III) in which loading was applied as a step function in time, and in which the viscoelastic material was represented as a standard linear solid. Moreover, in this problem the crack was considered to move with a constant velocity which starts instantaneously at time zero and the loading follows the moving crack. This physical situation would correspond to an instantaneously applied gas pressure which can spread with the same velocity with which the crack propagates. In spite of the simplicity of the physical problem and inspite of the limitations in the applicability of these results\* later experimental problems it is interesting to extract from this analysis the following observation: If the velocity of a crack is sufficiently high then for large time after the crack starts to grow the stress intensity factor approaches a constant value; this constant value depends on the crack tip velocity  $v$  for the condition  $\frac{v}{c} > \frac{\alpha^*}{\beta}$  where  $c = \sqrt{\mu/\rho}$ . We further extract from this solution that the change of this stress intensity factor for very short times after the step loading has been accomplished is also given by the elastic solution. This is even true if the material is represented by a Maxwell model.

---

\* This problem is considered for the special constitutive equation suggested by Achenbach and Chao [19]

$$\left(\frac{d}{dt} + \beta\right)^2 \sigma = 2\mu \left(\frac{d}{dt} + \alpha\right)^2 \epsilon; \quad (3)$$

Observe now that we are interested in short term behavior in our later experiments; in particular we are interested in the fracture of viscoelastic materials that may approach brittle fracture in non-viscoelastic materials. For this reason we carry out first the subsequent analyses for dynamic loading on the crack faces, allowing, however, the crack to remain stationary in the linearly viscoelastic solid. Because we are dealing with a semi-infinite crack in the infinite domain there is no characteristic length in this formulation. For this reason it turns out that even for a linearly viscoelastic material the Laplace transformed solution can be manipulated with the aid of the Wiener-Hopf technique. Thereafter the solution procedure is basically the same as for the linearly elastic case. The difficulty arises thereafter, because it is still necessary to determine the inverse Laplace transform which in the elastic case is carried out most easily in terms of the Cagniard-Hoop [20] method. In the viscoelastic case this method cannot be exercised because it is extremely difficult to define the double inversion variable consisting of the spacial variable  $y$  and the time variable  $t$ . Instead we perform a single inversion on the spacial variable  $y$  to leave a solution that depends on the time-time like Laplace variable  $s$ .

Consider the semi-infinite crack under shear loading as shown inset in figure 2a. The shear stress

$$\sigma_{yz} = -\tau H(t) \quad (4)$$

is applied to the crack surfaces embedded in the infinite domain, the motion of which is governed by the single, non-trivial equation of motion

$$\sigma_{yz,y} + \sigma_{xz,x} - \rho \dot{w} = 0 \quad (5)$$

where  $w$  is the velocity component in  $z$  direction, augmented by the strain displacement compatibility conditions and stress-strain relations ( $\mu(t)$  = relaxation modulus in shear)

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial \epsilon_{xz}}{\partial t}, \quad \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial \epsilon_{yz}}{\partial t} \quad (6)$$

$$\sigma_{xz} = \int_0^t \mu(t-\xi) \frac{\partial \epsilon_{xz}}{\partial \xi} d\xi = \int_0^t \mu(t-\xi) \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} d\xi \quad (7a)$$

$$\sigma_{yz} = \int_0^t \mu(t-\xi) \frac{\partial \epsilon_{yz}}{\partial \xi} d\xi = \int_0^t \mu(t-\xi) \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} d\xi \quad (7b)$$

Upon Laplace transforming these equations we have

$$\bar{\sigma}_{yz,y} + \bar{\sigma}_{xz,x} - \rho s \bar{w} = 0 \quad (8)$$

$$\bar{\sigma}_{xz} = \bar{\mu}(s) \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial x} \quad (9a)$$

$$\bar{\sigma}_{yz} = \bar{\mu}(s) \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial y}$$

which equations combine to render the field equation for  $\bar{w}$

$$\nabla^2 \bar{w} - \frac{\rho s}{\bar{\mu}} \bar{w} = 0 \quad (10)$$

with the attendant boundary conditions

$$\bar{\sigma}_{yz}(x, 0; s) = \bar{u}(s) \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial y} = -\frac{\tau}{s} ; x < 0 \quad (11)$$

$$\bar{w}(x, 0; s) = 0 \quad x > 0 \quad (12)$$

Apply now the two-sided Laplace transform to  $\bar{w}$  with respect to "x" resulting in

$$\hat{w}(\eta, y; s) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \bar{w}(x, y; s) e^{-\gamma \eta x} dx \quad (13)$$

where  $\gamma = \sqrt{\rho s / \bar{\mu}}$ . Equation (10) becomes then

$$\frac{d^2 \hat{w}}{dy^2} - \gamma^2 (1 - \eta^2) \hat{w} = 0 \quad (14)$$

with the solution (vanishing at  $y \rightarrow \infty$ )

$$\hat{w} = A(\eta, s) e^{-\gamma \zeta y}; \quad \zeta = \sqrt{1 - \eta^2} \quad \text{Re } \zeta \geq 0 \quad (15)$$

Evaluation of the boundary conditions (11) and (12), suitably transformed, yields

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{w}(\eta, 0; s) &= \int_{-\infty}^0 \bar{w}(x, 0; s) e^{-\gamma \eta x} dx \\ &= F_-(\eta; s) = A(\eta; s) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

which is analytic for  $\text{Re } \eta < 0$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sigma_{yz}(\eta, 0; s) &= \int_{-\infty}^0 -\frac{\tau}{s} e^{-\gamma \eta x} dx + \int_0^{\infty} \bar{\gamma}(x, 0, s) e^{-\gamma \eta x} dx \\
 &= \frac{\tau}{\gamma \eta s} + F_+(\eta; s) \\
 &= \bar{\mu} \left. \frac{\partial \hat{W}}{\partial y} \right|_{y=0} = -\bar{\mu} \gamma \zeta A(\eta; s)
 \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where  $F_+(\eta, s)$  is analytic for  $\text{Re } \eta > -1$ . Thus, upon eliminating  $A(\eta; s)$  from (16) and (17)

$$F_+(\eta; s) = -\bar{\mu} \gamma \zeta F_- - \frac{\tau}{\gamma \eta s} \tag{18}$$

We apply now the Wiener-Hopf technique after writing (18) as

$$\frac{F_+}{\zeta_+} + \frac{\tau}{\gamma s \eta} \left[ \frac{1}{\zeta_+} - \frac{1}{\zeta_+(0)} \right] = -\bar{\mu} \gamma \zeta_- F_- - \frac{\tau}{\gamma s \eta \zeta_+(0)} \tag{19}$$

where  $\zeta = \zeta_+ \zeta_-$  and  $\zeta_+ = (1+\eta)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ ;  $\zeta_- = (1-\eta)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\zeta_{\pm}(0)$  are the appropriate limits of  $\zeta_+$  and  $\zeta_-$  as  $\eta \rightarrow 0$ .

Considering  $\eta \rightarrow \pm \infty$  it follows from the fact that the left side and right side of (19) are entire functions in their respective half planes and vanish there one has

$$-\bar{\mu} \gamma \zeta_- F_- - \frac{\tau}{\gamma s \eta \zeta_+(0)} = 0 \tag{20}$$

or

$$A(s, \eta) = F_- = -\frac{\tau}{\bar{\mu} \gamma^2 s \eta \zeta_+(0) \zeta_-} \tag{21}$$

The inverse of 16 yields then

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{w}(x, y; s) &= - \frac{\tau}{\bar{\mu} \gamma^2 s \zeta_+(0) 2\pi i} \int_{Br} \frac{e^{\gamma(\eta x - \zeta y)}}{\eta - (\eta)} d(\eta \zeta) \quad (22) \\ &= - \frac{\tau}{\bar{\mu} \gamma s 2\pi i} \int_{Br} \frac{e^{\gamma(\eta x - \zeta y)}}{\eta(1-\eta)^{\frac{1}{2}}} d\eta\end{aligned}$$


and from (17)

$$\bar{\sigma}_{yz}(x, y; s) = \bar{\mu} \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial y} = \frac{\tau}{2\pi i s} \int_{Br} \frac{\beta e^{\gamma(\eta x - \zeta y)}}{\eta(1-\eta)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \quad (23)$$

Here Br denotes the Bromwich integration contour shown in the sketch.

Upon applying the Cagniard-Hoop transformation one finds for  $y = 0$ .

$$\bar{\sigma}_{yz}(x, 0; s) = \frac{\tau}{\pi s \sqrt{x}} \int_0^\infty \frac{\sqrt{\xi}}{\xi + x} e^{-\gamma(\xi + x)} d\xi \quad (24)$$



from which it follows that the Laplace transform of the stress intensity factor (with respect to time) is

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{K} &= \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{2\pi x} \bar{\sigma}_{yz} = \frac{\tau}{\pi} \frac{1}{s} \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-\gamma \xi}}{\sqrt{\xi}} d\xi \quad (25) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{\gamma}} \frac{\tau}{s} = \sqrt{\frac{2\sqrt{\mu}}{\gamma \rho s}} \frac{\tau}{s}\end{aligned}$$

In general this inversion needs to be carried out numerically. However, for illustrative purposes we turn now to an evaluation of this relation for a (viscoelastic) Maxwell solid, for which

$$\mu(t) = \mu_0 \exp\left(-\frac{\mu_0}{\eta_0} t\right) \quad (26)$$

with  $\mu_0$  and  $\eta_0$  being material constants. One has therefore

$$\bar{\mu}(s) = \frac{\mu_0}{\frac{\mu_0}{\eta_0} + s}$$

so that (25) becomes, with  $c_t^0 = \sqrt{\mu_0/\rho}$

$$\bar{K} = \sqrt{2c_t^0} \tau \frac{1}{s[s(\frac{\mu_0}{\eta_0} + s)]^{\frac{1}{4}}} \quad (27)$$

The inversion of (27) can be accomplished in terms of a convolution integral to yield ( $\Gamma$  = Gamma function)

$$K(t) = \frac{\tau \sqrt{2c_t^0}}{\Gamma(\frac{5}{4})\Gamma(\frac{1}{4})} \int_0^t \xi^{-\frac{3}{4}}(t-\xi)^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\frac{\mu_0}{\eta_0}\xi} d\xi \quad (28)$$

In non-dimensional form this becomes, with  $\kappa = \frac{\mu_0}{\eta_0} t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{K(t)}{\tau \sqrt{\frac{\eta_0 c_t^0}{\mu_0}}} &= \frac{2 \cdot \kappa}{\Gamma(\frac{5}{4})\Gamma(\frac{1}{4})} \int_0^1 p^{-\frac{3}{4}}(1-p)^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\kappa p} dp & (29) \\ &\approx 2 \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa}{\pi}} & \kappa \ll 1 \\ &\approx \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\Gamma(\frac{5}{4})} \kappa^{\frac{1}{4}} & \kappa \gg 1 \end{aligned}$$

The results, obtained, numerically from (29) are shown in figures 2a and b.

#### 4 EVALUATION OF THE STRESS INTENSITY FACTOR - EXPERIMENTAL PRELIMINARIES

In experimental stress analyses relating to static or dynamic cracks, there are generally two techniques that have evolved during the past decades to measure stress intensity factors. The most recent development in that direction has been the method of caustics which is the one that is adopted in this work. The somewhat older and more classical method is based on photoelasticity. Either method has been employed to date primarily to elastic materials. This is unequivocally true with respect to dynamic problems. It turns out that the photoelastic method has certain disadvantages for our investigation: Most important among these restrictions is that the Homelite 100 material with which we are working in a part of this investigation, is used in relatively thin sheets (3/16 inch thick) and the fringe count is not sufficiently high to give a reasonable number of fringes in these tests. There are a number of fringe multiplication techniques available; however, they require a large amount of light which is not available in our set-up but which is required for the very high speed photography used here. Apart from these limitations arising from the specimen size and from the experimental equipment it turns out that the fringe interpretation-through

fitting an analytical expression in a least square fit- has probably no greater accuracy than the limitations inherent in the caustic method. Beyond this comparison it turns out that the caustic method is well suited to our optical setup allowing sufficient passage of light in a single pass from the laser light source to expose the film during the 20 nano second exposure required for stop action at 100,000 frames/sec as employed in these tests. Moreover in some of our tests (on Solithane 113) the rigidity of the test material is relatively small. As a consequence somewhat larger than "normal" deformations occur which cause a relatively large deflection of the light beam. As a result, it is difficult to capture all this information with a reasonably sized lense. In contrast the caustic method exhibits many fewer difficulties and is relatively simple to apply. For this reason we extend here the computations underlying the shape of the caustic in elastic materials to viscoelastic fracture.

For reference purposes consider the optical set-up shown in figure 3. Denote a generic point in the crack tip vicinity by  $\underline{x}$  and consider a light ray passing through this point  $\underline{x}$  in the loaded specimen. In the image plane the ray strikes the corresponding point  $\underline{x}'$  so that we have the transformation

$$\underline{x}' = \underline{x} + \underline{\omega}(\underline{x}, t) \quad (30)$$

where we denote by  $\underline{\omega}$  the deflection vector due to the stress state near the crack tip. This deflection vector can be expressed

as [3]

$$\underline{\omega}(\underline{x}, t) = z_0 \cdot \text{grad } \Delta s(\underline{x}, t) \quad (31)$$

where  $z_0$  is the distance between the stress specimen midplane and the image plane and  $\Delta s$  is the change of the effective optical path length

$$\Delta s = d_0 C \{ \sigma_I + \sigma_{II} \pm \lambda (\sigma_I - \sigma_{II}) \} . \quad (32)$$

This change of the optical path length depends on the principal stresses at the point  $\underline{x}$ , on the specimen thickness  $d_0$  and on a constant  $C$  (a shadow optical constant). If the material is optically anisotropic a parameter  $\lambda$  will enter into the relation between the optical path length change and the state of stress. For optically isotropic materials this constant or anisotropy function is zero. For a viscoelastic material the optical path length is a function of the stress history. Expressed mathematically for a linearly viscoelastic system the path length difference is a convolution with the stress state and the shadow optical function  $C(t)$ . For isotropic linearly viscoelastic material we have therefore, instead of eq. (32),

$$\Delta s = d_0 C \sigma \quad (33)$$

where we have written  $\sigma$  for the first stress invariant (sum of the principal stresses) and allowed for isotropic behavior only. Using these stress representations in the immediate vicinity of the crack tip for which [21,22] with mode I stress intensity factor  $K_I$ ,

$$\sigma = K_I \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi r}} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} + a \quad (34)$$

where  $r = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}$ ,  $\theta = \tan^{-1} \frac{x_2}{x_1}$  and "a" is a constant. Making use of equations (30), (31), (33) and (34) there results

$$\underline{x}' = \underline{x} + d_o z_o (C * K_I) \text{grad} \left( \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi r}} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \quad (35)$$

Employing now the condition that the Jacobian vanishes, that is

$$J = \frac{\partial (x'_1, x'_2)}{\partial (x_1, x_2)} = 0$$

one obtains for the shape equation of caustics the relation

$$r = \left( \frac{3 z_o d_o}{2 \sqrt{2\pi}} C * K_I \right)^{\frac{2}{5}}$$

or

$$K_I = \frac{2 \sqrt{2\pi}}{3 z_o d_o} |C^{-1}| * r^{\frac{5}{2}} \quad (36)$$

This equation is, strictly speaking, true only for a stationary crack and it is therefore used later on for the variation in the stress intensity factor of a stationary crack (see section 5).

We now turn the measurement of the shadow optical function  $C(t)$ . Clearly the function  $C(t)$  is of primary importance in the experimental evaluation of stress intensity factors in visco-elastic materials.

## 5 THE CAUSTIC FOR A STATIONARY CRACK IN A VISCOELASTIC MATERIAL

Equation (36) may be rewritten upon using equation (30), (31) and (33) to yield

$$K_I = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{3f^{\frac{5}{2}}z_0d_0} |C^{-1}| * D_0^{\frac{5}{2}} \quad (37)$$

In this latter form  $D_0$  denotes the diameter across the caustic in the y-direction. The shadow optical function  $C$  is composed of two contributions. One arises from the change of the index of refraction, (denote this contribution by  $A$ ) and by the lense like deformation of the viscoelastic sheet and; this contribution is given by  $(n-1)\frac{\nu}{E(\tau)}$  so that  $C$  may be defined as

$$C = A - (n - 1)\frac{\nu}{E} \quad (38)$$

Let us assume now that the contribution (optical relaxation) to a change in the index of refraction is small and proportional to mechanical relaxation, say,  $\epsilon \cdot \frac{\nu}{E}$  [23,24]; then  $C$  is given only by the rigidity contribution

$$C = (1 - n + \epsilon)\frac{\nu}{E} \quad (39)$$

which allows us to write (37) as

$$(1 - n + \epsilon)\frac{3z_0d_0}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{\nu}{E}\right)^* K_I = \left\{\frac{D_0}{\epsilon}\right\}^{\frac{5}{2}}$$

Clearly this equation indicates that if a stress intensity factor of known magnitude acts at the tip of the crack, then the caustic

diameter  $D_0$  should grow in conformity with the shadow optic function  $C(t)$ . Moreover, this shadow optic function should be directly proportional to the creep compliance - or at worst a convolution of a creep compliance and Poisson's ratio - in accordance with equation (39).

In order to test out this relation it is appropriate to make use of the viscoelastic properties of Solithane 113 and device a geometry with a non-propagating crack. Such a geometries is given by a large sheet with a central crack perforation. The stress intensity factor for this problem remains constant if a step function as the far field stress is applied. In fig. 4a and b we show a sequence of time exposures of a caustic at the tips of such a crack in Solithane 113. These particular figures were taken at  $-10$  and  $-15^{\circ}\text{C}$ ; clearly the diameter of the caustic is seen to grow with time after load application. This type of data is then obtained at three different temperatures and the results suitably normalized are shown in figure 5. Also shown in that figure is the reciprocal Young's relaxation modulus normalized by its value at infinite time-that is, by its rubbery modulus. This function is taken as an approximation to the creep compliance in uniaxial tension. It is seen that the comparison of the analytical estimate is quite reasonable with the data derived from tests. The data derived from these three temperatures has been superposed according to the time temperature shift phenomenon making use of the shift factor which has been determined previously for Solithane-113 [25].

In figure 6 the shadow optical function for Homalite 100 is given reduced to a temperature of 60°C [24]. This curve is the result of tests at temperatures of 60, 80 and 100°C with an estimated scatter band as indicated by the error bar.

Both curves for the shadow optical functions are basic input into the experimental determination of the stress intensity factor for running cracks: The shape and size of the caustic involves a convolution of this property with the deformation history at the tip of the moving crack tip. We proceed to discuss now this analytical problem.

## 6 ANALYTICAL DETERMINATION OF THE CAUSTICS FOR A CRACK MOVING IN A VISCOELASTIC SOLID

We need to recall that analyses of the dynamic stress intensity factor for a moving crack tip are usually formulated so that the state variables such as stress, strain etc. are expressed in terms of a position vector  $\underline{x}$  which has its origin at the running crack tip. In contrast the shadow optic function  $C(t)$  is a material property and therefore the appropriate convolution "\*" has to be applied with respect to a fixed material point  $\underline{X}$  in equation (32). Accordingly the expression for the optical path length which is commensurate with equation (32) is given by

$$\Delta s = d_0 \int_{-\infty}^t C(t-\tau) \left( -v \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial \underline{x}_1} + \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial \tau} \right) \bigg|_{\underline{X}} d\tau \quad (40)$$

where  $v$  is the velocity of the crack tip and it is assumed that the crack propagates in the  $x_1$  direction. An illustrative trajectory of the material path in the  $t$ - $x_1$  plane is shown in figure 7.

Let us now turn to consider an approximation for the caustic in a viscoelastic material arising from a crack tip moving through a two dimensional geometry. We consider this in the context of a problem of plane stress. Drawing on the results with the stationary crack in which case this stress at the crack tip could be written as a product function of a time dependent stress intensity factor and a function representing this spatial distribution of the stresses, we write tentatively for the dynamic case

$$\sigma[\underline{x}(X,t),t] = K(t)f[\underline{x}(X,t);v] + a \quad (41)$$

Although there exists an explicit form for the function  $f(\underline{x};v)$  for the case of dynamically moving cracks in an elastic material this function is not available for the viscoelastic material. However, in order to arrive at an adequate estimate we note that the speed of cracks in viscoelastic materials tends to be relatively low. This observation allows us to disregard dynamic effects in this stress distribution so that we may make use of the quasi-static stress distribution as an approximation. In accordance with equation (34) we use

$$f(\underline{x}) = \left\{ \frac{x_1 + (x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\pi (x_1^2 + x_2^2)} \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (42)$$

It is a general observation that for crack propagation velocities less than about half the Rayleigh surface wave speed, the error due to the use of quasi-static behavior is within the range of experimental error for the elastodynamic crack problem. Making use of this assumption, we obtain for the deflection vector of the light rays in passing through the deformed crack tip area, via equations (31), (34), (39) and (42) as

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\omega}[\underline{x}(X,t)] = d_0 z_0 \text{grad} \left[ \int_{-\infty}^t C(t-\xi) \{ -K(\xi) v(\xi) \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} [\underline{x}(X,\xi)] \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\partial K(\xi)}{\partial \xi} f[\underline{x}(X,\xi)] \} d\xi \right] \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Upon integrating this by parts we obtain the result

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\omega}[\underline{x}(X,t), t] = d_0 z_0 \{ K(t) C(0) \text{grad} f[\underline{x}(X,t)] \\ + \int_{t_0}^t C'(t-\xi) K(\xi) \text{grad} f[\underline{x}(X,\xi)] d\xi \} \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where  $t_0$  denotes the time when the loading of  $K(t)$  begins and  $C'(t) = \frac{dC}{dt}$ .

In order to compute the shape of the caustic we have to make use again of the condition that the Jacobian of the transformation

$$J = \frac{\partial(x_1', x_2')}{\partial(x_1, x_2)} = 0$$

represented by equations (30) and (45) vanishes. However, we are not really interested in the shape of the caustic for a given

history of the stress intensity factor. Rather, we are only interested in the measurement of the stress intensity factor as a function of velocity and time. It indeed turns out from experiments described later that the shape of the caustic for a crack running in a viscoelastic material is not much different at all from that of the stationary crack for the velocities encountered in our experiments. In order to determine the radius of the initial curve it is therefore not necessary to compute the total shape of the caustic; rather it is sufficient to compute this radius " $r_0$ " by using the condition that on the crack axis

$$\left. \frac{\partial x_1'}{\partial x_1} \right|_{x_2=0} = 0, \quad (45)$$

Let us make the further assumption that the stress intensity factor varies slowly. This is actually a condition found in our experiments. Then  $\frac{\partial K}{\partial t} \approx 0$  and the second term in eq. (43) is assumed to be negligibly small due to the structure of the function  $f[\underline{x}(\underline{X}, \tau)]$ . If in addition the acceleration of the crack is small we can obtain from equation (43) the deflection vector of the light rays as

$$\omega_1[\underline{x}(\underline{X}, t), t] = -d_0 z_0 K(t) v(t) \int_{-\infty}^t C(t-\xi) \cdot \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_1^2}[\underline{x}(\underline{X}, \xi)] d\xi \quad (46)$$

where

$$x_1(\underline{X}, \xi) = x_1(\underline{X}, t) + (t - \xi)v_0 \quad (47)$$

and  $v_0$  denotes the speed of the crack. Then, the condition

$$\left. \frac{\partial x_1'}{\partial x_1} \right|_{x_2=0} = 0 \quad (\text{or} \quad \left. \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial x_1} \right|_{x_2=0} = -1)$$

renders the stress intensity factor

$$K = \frac{4\sqrt{2\pi}}{15d_0z_0 \int_0^\infty \frac{|C(\chi/v_0)|}{(r_0 + \chi)^{\frac{5}{2}}} d\chi} \quad (48)$$

Let us now examine the limit expressions for the stress intensity factor in eq. (48) namely for the cases of vanishing and for infinite crack propagation velocity  $v_0$ . One has then

$$K = \frac{2\sqrt{2\pi}}{3z_0d_0|C(\infty)|} r_0^{\frac{5}{2}} \quad v_0 \rightarrow 0 \quad (49)$$

$$K = \frac{2\sqrt{2\pi}}{3z_0d_0|C(0)|} r_0^{\frac{5}{2}} \quad v_0 \rightarrow \infty$$

These expressions correspond to the elastic expressions except that the optical constants are replaced by  $C(\infty)$  and  $C(0)$ , respectively. In general the function  $C(\xi/v_0)$  is the function shown in figures 5 and 6 for Solithane 113 and Homalite 100, respectively.

In any experiment the diameter of the caustic along the line normal to the plane of crack propagation is used as a definition for the size of the caustic. This diameter  $D$  is

related to the radius of the initial curve by  $r_0 = mD$ . For the case of parallel incident light, this constant is, for a stationary crack, equal to  $m = 1/3.17$ . We have now estimated the size of the caustic and thus provided the tool to measure the stress intensity factor instantaneously for a crack propagating in a viscoelastic material.

#### 7 APPEARANCE OF FRACTURE SURFACES SMOOTHNESS AND BRANCHING RELATED SURFACE FEATURES

In this section we discuss the physical appearance of fracture surfaces generated in dynamic tests on Solithane-113 and Homalite-100. In either material the temperature was adjusted so as to move towards the more viscoelastic response of the material in the vicinity of the glass transition temperature. For the polyester Homalite-100 which has a glass transition temperature in the vicinity of  $100^{\circ}\text{C}$  this implied heating, while for the polyurethane Solithane-113 with a glass transition temperature of approximately  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$  this implied cooling.

Let us first consider the behavior of Homalite-100. An initial set of tests was performed at distinct pressure levels and different temperatures, namely, in a test matrix consisting of pressures on the crack surfaces of 133, 357 and 805 psi. For each of these pressure levels tests were conducted at 60, 80 and  $100^{\circ}\text{C}$ . The objective was to determine whether the crack propagation rate varies significantly as a function of temperature and/or how

branching was facilitated or suppressed. Figure 8 shows the appearance of the crack path in each one of these nine tests. One notes immediately that branching occurred only at 805 psi and this occurrence was not systematic with the temperature variation in the three tests, inasmuch as branching occurred at 60 and 100°C but not at 80°C. We only note in this context that the crack propagation rate for the 80°C and 805 psi test was slightly smaller than the velocity associated with the 60°C and 805 psi test.

The fracture surfaces corresponding to these tests are shown in figure 9 with a more detailed view of the 805 psi 60°C case shown in figure 10. Here we note that the appearance of the fracture surfaces reflects essentially the branching or non-branching characteristics of the test. Although this evidence may be difficult to identify in the reproductions of this figure in this report, closer examination of the actual photographs shows that the 133 psi tests all produced only smooth fracture surfaces. At 357 psi only the 60°C test produces a somewhat roughly textured surface while the 80 and 100°C tests produce smooth fracture surfaces. This appearance is in keeping with the somewhat smaller stress intensity factors encountered at 80 and 100°C when compared to the 60°C test. At 805 psi the 60°C test produces a typical transition in the appearance of the fracture surface from "smooth", to "mist", to "hackle", then branching [26]. At the same pressure at 80°C the surface remains relatively smooth, this

indicates that branching was not approached even closely. At 100°C and 805 psi most of the surface appears relatively smooth; however, there is a short transition from mist to hackle which indicates possibly that the branching in this particular test was precipitated by a flaw in the specimen and, had it not been for this flaw, no branching might have occurred. This statement is, however, essentially conjectured. We are thus not able to state definitively that increasing the viscous response of the material will suppress branching, although the slight indication in that direction exists but only further testing will allow us to examine the possible truth of this statement.

We consider next the appearance of the fracture surfaces of Solithane-113. The physical appearance of the failed specimen is summarized in figure 11. First note that the path of crack propagation is rather similar to that in Homalite 100. One concludes from this that the mechanics of wave propagation and the conditions that determine the instantaneous orientation of crack propagation are apparently not markedly affected by the viscoelasticity of the material response. Note also from the temperatures indicated in that figure, that most of these Solithane tests have been conducted at or below the glass transition temperature. However, in none of the tests branching has been observed.

When one studies the fracture surfaces they exhibit the typical transition from smooth to rough as the stress intensity

factor increases and as branching is approached. It may appear thus that branching was indeed approached but that the pressure applied to the Solithane specimens was not quite large enough to precipitate the branching phenomenon. The reason for this failure to achieve branching in Solithane, may be two-fold. One reason may be that the relatively large crack flank opening displacements reduce the applied pressure and thus the stress intensity. Moreover, the viscoelastic response can reduce the stress intensity factor, also. However, as we have indicated earlier, at temperatures of  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$  or below this reduction should be relatively small because the material is essentially in its glassy state. Hence we discount this reason for suppressing branching. For the remaining reason we simply have to deal with the fact that Solithane in its glassy state may be a considerably tougher material than Homalite 100. If that is so, our failure to achieve branching in Solithane 113 may simply due to the fact that insufficiently high pressures have been applied to date.

Let us now inquire into the mechanism of branching; the basic question here is whether the phenomenon occurs in a continuous growth process or whether branching is the result of secondary fractures that link with the main crack. To date evidence suggests that both occur.

One of the possible mechanisms is associated with crack path instability: Suppose the crack path deviates slightly from the original, straight path. We speak then of crack path stability if

the deviation increases, and stability if the path returns to the original, straight one. For quasistatic problems crack path instability is fostered by tension at the crack tip in the direction of crack growth (first order term in the singularity expansion) while stability is enhanced by a compressive stress.

We first observe that in the early stages of crack propagation with our loading configuration, the crack path is stable. Figure 12 shows three photographs of fracture surfaces in which the left hand side depicts the initial crack. Note that in each case the initial crack does not fall on the same plane. The crack face is composed of several different planes which have different levels and directions. In each case these different crack planes coalesce into one main crack. We deal here thus clearly with crack path stability.

This stability may be explained in terms of energy expenditure. Clearly the crack wants to propagate at the maximal rate with a minimum of energy expenditure. The growth of the crack on different planes obviously requires more energy than for growth in one plane, because the total area generated is larger than for one planar crack if the local crack speeds are equal. Thus one deduced that for low intensity cracks, when just enough energy is available to drive the crack, that path is stable.

We insert here a side remark concerning figure 12 that relates to the surface roughness. The top figure results from a

test at 60°C and 357 psi pressure: The fracture surface is glass-like and smooth. However, in the other two photographs, resulting from tests at 805 psi and 80°C and 100°C, respectively, one notices increased roughness with temperature increase, which roughness, however disappears. The conclusion is thus close at hand that this feature is associated with the transient generation of the plastic zone established as part of the initial loading process.

We return now to the question of crack path stability and consider the behavior of the crack at branching. Figure 13 shows views of surfaces that are mating up to the line of branching. While it is difficult to reproduce the pertinent features of these fracture surfaces, a direct visual inspection which renders the true three dimensional geometry reveals the following: In the upper photograph the upper edge exposes a continuous surface across the branch "line"; this represents a smooth turning of the crack near the specimen surface away from the main crack and into the paper (i.e. away from the viewer). The same feature is observed in the upper right hand corner of the lower photograph, which is near the specimen surface opposite from that referred to in connection with the upper photograph. Thus, on one side of the specimen a crack grows away from the main crack in, say, the "up"-direction while at the opposing specimen surface, the surface near crack is in the "down" direction. Thus branching would occur in an assymmetric fashion from the surface of the specimen, with subsequent crack growth sideways towards the middle. Evidence of

this "side-cutting" is visible in the upper photograph of figure 13 where striations at right angles to the direction of general crack growth indicate that locally and temporarily crack progression occurred transversely to the plate. This mechanism may be helpful for the interpretation of continuous surface generation and energy release rate before and after branching [27]. We note that we are aware, that this potential mechanism of branching is tied to the finite thickness of the test geometry, and unduely so. For this reason we are now examining also discontinuous mechanisms in which secondary fractures away from the main crack become responsible to open new paths for crack propagation.

#### 8 DYNAMIC CRACK PROPAGATION BEHAVIOR - CRACK SPEED DEPENDENCE ON LOADING AND TEMPERATURE

In the previous section we have indicated the test matrices on temperature and (nominal) applied pressure for Homalite 100 and for Solithane 113. In this section we discuss the crack propagation response resulting from these investigations. Let us consider the Homalite tests first. A typical high speed photograph of caustics (60°C, 805 psi) is shown in Fig. 14(a) and (b) for the measurement of the history of the stress intensity factor. The stress intensity histories for the test matrix are shown in figure 14(c). We note that even after the cracks have started to run there is a significant variation in the magnitude of the stress intensity factor, however, there are no sudden changes in these traces, so that, on first inspection, the assumption made in the analytic section, namely that  $\partial K/\partial t \approx 0$ , is not unreasonable. It turns out, that inspite of

the readily measurable variation in the stress intensity factor the velocity of crack propagation is constant within the accuracy of our measurements. These results are plotted in figure 15 where one notes a clear trend to lower velocities with increasing temperature. Note also that there exists a minor decrease in the stress intensity factor with increasing temperature - also clear from figure 16 - which arises from the material softening and the effect which this softening has on the stresses transmitted from the copper loading strips to the specimen. This latter phenomenon will be considered in more detail later on.

In figure 17 we compare these tests at elevated temperatures to room temperature tests performed by other investigators [28]. Again one observes the clear temperature related trend to lower crack speeds for comparable stress intensity factors. This observation is documented graphically more clearly in figure 16.

For Solithane 113 we show the time traces for the stress intensity factor in figure 18. Note that the initial portions of these traces are estimated and thus shown dotted. The uncertainty arises from the following fact: The pressure producing copper conductor in the crack generates a steady state pressure on the crack surfaces which, in turn, generates a caustic at the bend of the copper strip. This bend is close to the crack tip: the caustic associated with this bend remains stationary as the crack grows.

Because the caustic induced by the copper strip is large the smaller caustic resulting from the crack tip stresses is first engulfed in the former and some time of crack growth has to pass

before the dynamically induced caustic emerges from the dark field of the initial stationary caustic.

The sequence shown in figure 18 indicates the response of crack growth in tests conducted at different temperatures. As discussed in section 7 there are (probably) two causes for the change in crack speed, one being the change of material compliance with temperature, the other the effect of energy dissipation associated with different temperatures. At this time these two effects cannot be separated clearly; a more complete test matrix is required. In addition, our newly developed capability of evaluating caustics for cracks running in viscoelastic solids allow us now to attempt the construction of this test matrix in terms of stress intensity factor and temperature instead of the nominal pressure applied to the crack faces. For now we merely plot in figure 19 the velocity of crack growth as a function of temperature, being well aware that this dependence is at least in part due to the change in stress intensity, (also indicated in figure 18).

#### 9 ESTIMATION OF LOAD VARIATION RESULTING FROM TEMPERATURE INDUCED CHANGES IN MATERIAL STIFFNESS

Recall that the pressure is applied to the crack surfaces via a double bent copper strip in which a mechanical force is generated by virtue of a flowing current and the induced magnetic field (cf. figure 20). The pressure depends on the separation of

the two conductors. If the separation is small, the pressure is high; if the separation is large the converse is true. Thus if a relatively rigid material is used in the experiments the separation of the conductors will remain small for the duration of the test. However, if the material is relatively compliant then the induced force will separate the crack surfaces during the later phase of the pressure pulse, carrying the conductor with it and allow wider separation. Therefore during the latter portions of the experiments the driving force will drop off. This phenomenon may be responsible for generally reducing the stresses at the crack tip so that they are lower than we might have otherwise expected. It is the purpose of the immediate following developments to estimate the amount of pressure loss due to this effect. This pressure loss is then translated into an estimate of the stress intensity factor history if the crack tip were to remain stationary. This procedure will provide us with a rough estimate, therefore, of a more realistic stress intensity factor history even at a tip of a moving crack indicating primarily substantial loss over which one might expect from a high modulus test material.

In addition to the pressure<sup>1</sup> reduction due to the relatively low rigidity of one of the test materials one finds that the viscoelastic response has an effect on this stress intensity factor history. The magnitude of this effect, which turns out to be also a reduction in the stress intensity factor, is estimated

by drawing on the computation for the stress intensity factor from the anti-plane problem discussed in section 3.

We start with considering the effect of material rigidity without specific viscoelastic response. The ingredient of this estimation is first a knowledge of the instantaneous force supplied by the conductor strips to the crack faces as a function of this separation. The analytical treatment of this has been given in a previous report [29] and is reproduced here in figure 21. If one knew therefore what the instantaneous separation of the strips is one could deduce the pressure pulse history to the crack surface. Accordingly the strip separation has been determined photographically in an experiment. The result of this is shown in figure 22 and the time dependent evaluation in figure 23. Using figures 21 and 23 one computes therefore the instantaneous pressure applied to the crack surfaces as given in figure 24.

Note that for the compliant Solithane material which corresponded to the properties at 20°C there is a considerable loss of pressure at times roughly beyond 50-60  $\mu$ s. The present arrangement therefore produces a load history that is more appropriately represented by a pressure pulse on the order of 60  $\mu$ s roughly with a ramp type loading and ramp type unloading. Drawing again for a moment on purely elastic results which have been calculated elsewhere [30] and as shown in the left inset in figure 25, we can, by a superposition of that result in terms of loading and delayed unloading of the same type, compute the stress

intensity factor for a pressure pulse as indicated in the right inset in that figure. Thus while a relatively stiff material such as Homalite 100 at room temperature would produce significant stress intensities for times on the order of a 100 to 150  $\mu$ s the softer Solithane type of material at least for temperatures around room conditions would produce stress intensities that are approximately 25% of that produced in Homalite 100, although at short times up to approximately 50  $\mu$ s the same kind of stress intensities would probably result.

Let us now turn to estimate the effect of viscoelastic behavior on this stress intensity factor. In order to do this we draw on the results in the earlier section 3 in which this stress intensity factor for the anti-plane shear mode in a viscoelastic material was considered. Because we lack any type of viscoelastic stress analyses for the opening mode - i.e. for the inplane deformation mode of the crack - we make use of the antiplane shear mode for an estimation of the amount by which the elastic stress intensity factor might be reduced as a result of viscoelastic material properties.

Recall that the Laplace transform of this stress intensity factor was given as equation (25);

$$\bar{K} = \sqrt{\frac{2\sqrt{\mu}}{\sqrt{\rho s}}} \frac{\tau_0}{s} \quad (25)$$

note also that in the event of purely elastic properties in which the shear modulus is given by the glassy shear modulus

$$\bar{\mu} = \mu_o / s \quad (50)$$

The transform of the glassy elastic intensity would be given by

$$\bar{K}_{g.e.} = \frac{2}{s} \frac{\mu_o}{\rho} \frac{\tau_o}{s} \quad (51)$$

deviding equation 50 by 52 results in

$$\frac{\bar{K}}{\bar{K}_{g.e.}} = \left\{ \frac{s\bar{\mu}}{\mu_o} \right\} \quad (52)$$

The Laplace inverse of this equation poses in general some difficulty and must therefore be accomplished by numerical means. However, we believe that for our present estimation purposes it is sufficient to accomplish this inversion in terms what is known as a quasi elastic solution and write therefore that the stress intensity factor is given as

$$K(t) = K_{g.e.} \left\{ \frac{\mu(t)}{\mu_o} \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (53)$$

The function in curly brackets is shown in figure 26 at 0°C. The time dependent stress intensity factor as given by equation (53) is then shown in figure 27; for purely elastic response the ratio of  $\mu(t)/\mu_o$  equals unity. Thus the curve indentified as the elastic one corresponds to the glassy response of the material. It

is clear that Solithane 113 at  $0^{\circ}\text{C}$  produces approximately only half the stress intensity factor that one would expect from the material if it were to undergo only small deformations and respond with its glassy properties. This statement is more thoroughly amplified by showing also the effect of lowering the temperature in that at a temperature of  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$  this stress intensity factor is only marginally smaller than the one represented for purely elastic properties. Recall now that fracture tests were conducted at temperatures of  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$  and lower. Hence for those tests it does not appear that viscoelasticity is a significant detriment to the generation of the stress intensity.

## REFERENCES

1. P. Manogg, Anwendung der Schattenoptik zur Untersuchung des Zerreißvorganges von Platten, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Freiburg (1964).
2. P.S. Theocaris and E.E. Goloutos, "An Optical Method for Determining Opening-Mode and Edge Sliding-Mode Stress Intensity Factors", Journal of Applied Mechanics, 39, pp. 91-97 (1972).
3. J. Beinert and J.F. Kalthoff, "Experimental Determination of Dynamic Stress Intensity Factors by the Method of Shadow Patterns", Chapter in Mechanics of Fracture, VII. (edited by G.C. Sih), to appear in 1981.
4. A.J. Rosakis, "Analysis of the Optical Method of Caustics for Dynamic Crack Propagation", Engineering Fracture Mechanics, 13, pp. 331-347 (1980).
5. A.J. Rosakis and L.B. Freund, "The Effect of Crack-Tip Plasticity on the Determination of Dynamic Stress-Intensity Factors by the Optical Method of Caustics", Journal of Applied Mechanics, 48, pp. 302-308, (1981).
6. G.C. Smith and W.G. Knauss, "Experiments on Critical Stress Intensity Factors Resulting from Stress Wave Loading", Mech. Res. Comm., Vol. 2, No.4, pp. 187-192, Pergamon Press (1975).
7. B.R. Baker, "Dynamic Stress Created by a Moving Crack", Journal of Applied Mechanics, pp. 449-458, (1962).
8. B.V. Kostrov, "On the Crack Propagation with Variable Velocity", International Journal of Fracture, 11, No.1, pp. 47-55 (1975).
9. J.D. Achenbach and L.M. Brock, "Rapid Extension of a Crack", Journal of Elasticity, 1, pp. 51-63, (1971).
10. F. Erdogan, "Crack Propagation Theories", Fracture, 2, Chap. 5., pp. 497-590, H. Liebowitz (ed.), Academic Press, N.Y. (1968).

11. L.B. Freund, "The Stress Intensity Factor Due to Normal Impact Loading of the Faces of a Crack", International Journal of Engineering Science, 12, pp. 179-189 (1974).
12. L.B. Freund, "Crack Propagation in an Elastic Solid Subjected to General Loading - I. Constant Rate of Loading", Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, 20, pp. 129-140 (1972).
13. L.B. Freund, "Crack Propagation in an Elastic Solid Subjected to General Loading - II. Non-Uniform Rate of Extension", Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, 20, pp. 141-152 (1972).
14. L.B. Freund, "Crack Propagation in an Elastic Solid Subjected to General Loading - III. Stress Wave Loading", Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, 21, pp. 47, 61, (1973).
15. L.B. Freund, "The Analysis of Elastodynamic Crack Tip Stress Fields", Mechanics Today, III, pp. 55-91, (1976).
16. J.D. Achenbach, "Dynamic Effects in Brittle Fracture", Mechanics Today, I, Chap. I, pp. 1-52, Nemat-Nasser (ed.), Pergamon, N.Y. (1974).
17. C. Atkinson and R.D. List, "A Moving Crack Problem in a Viscoelastic Solid", International Journal of Engineering Science, 10, pp. 309-322 (1972).
18. C. Atkinson and C.H. Popelar, "Antiplane Dynamic Crack Propagation in a Viscoelastic Strip", Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, 27, pp. 431-439, (1979).
19. J.D. Achenbach and C.C. Chao, "A Three-Parameter Viscoelastic Model Particularly Suited for Dynamic Problems", Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, 10, pp. 245-252 (1962).

20. A.T. deHoop, "Representation Theorems for the Displacement in an Elastic Solid and Their Application to Elastodynamic Diffraction Theory", Doctoral Dissertation, Technische Hogeschool, Delft (1958).
21. M.L. Williams, "On the Stress Distribution at the Base of a Stationary Crack", Journal of Applied Mechanics, 24, pp. 109-114, (1959).
22. G.R. Irwin, "Analysis of Stresses and Strains Near the End of a Crack Traversing a Plate", Journal of Applied Mechanics, 24, pp. 361-364, (1959).
23. M.L. Williams, W.M. Beebe, R.J. Arenz and C.W. Ferguson, "The Mechanical and Optical Characterization of Solithane 113 and Investigation of Optical Lag in Photoviscoelastic Analysis", GALCIT SM 64-42, WL TR-64-155, California Institute of Technology (1964).
24. W. M. Beebe, "An Experimental Investigation of Dynamic Crack Propagation in Plastic and Metals", Ph.D. Thesis, California Institute of Technology, (1966).
25. W.G. Knauss, "On the Steady Propagation of a Crack in a Viscoelastic Sheet: Experiments and Analysis" Deformation and Fracture of High Polymers, pp. 501-541, Edited by H. Henning Kausch et al., Plenum Press (1973).
26. A.S. Kobayashi, B.G. Wade, W.B. Bradley and S.T. Chiu, "Crack Branching in Homalite-100 Sheets", Engineering Fracture Mechanics, 6, pp. 81-92 (1974).
27. J.D. Eshelby, "The Elastic Field of a Crack Extending Non-uniformly Under General Anti-Plane Loading", Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, 20, pp. 129-140, (1972).
28. J.W. Dally, "Dynamic Photoelastic Studies of Fracture", Experimental Mechanics, 19, pp. 349-361, (1979).

29. M.C. Gupta and W.G. Knauss, Dynamic Fracture in Viscoelastic Solids, First Annual Report of Navy Contract # N00014-78-C-0634, California Institute of Technology, (1979).
30. G.C. Smith; "An Experimental Investigation of the Dynamic Fracture of a Brittle Material" Ph.D. Thesis, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, 1975.




Fig.1 Schematic of Dynamic Loading on Semi-Infinite Crack  
Faces




Fig. 2(a) Stress Intensity Factor Resulting from Dynamic Loading (Mode III, Stationary Crack)




Fig. 2(b) Stress Intensity Factor Resulting from Dynamic Loading (Mode III, Stationary Crack; Short Time Behavior)





Fig. 3 Optical Method of Caustics

-10°C




Fig. 4(a) Caustic Growth in Solithane 113 at -10°C

-15°C




Fig. 4(b) Caustic Growth in Solithane 113 at -15°C




Fig. 5 Caustic Growth Curve for Solithane 113




Fig. 6 Shadow Optical Function  $C(t)$  for Homalite 100




Fig. 7 Typical Trajectory of  $\underline{x}(\underline{X}, t)$  for a Fixed Point of  $\underline{X}$




Fig. 8 Fracture Paths in Homalite 100




Fig. 9 Fracture Surfaces in Homalite 100





Fig. 10 Fracture Surface Detail of Homalite 100 Test at 305 psi and 60°C



-20°C 10 KV



-40°C 10 KV



-40°C 12 KV



-40°C 14 KV



-60°C 10 KV


Fig. 11 Fracture Surfaces in Solithane 113



a)  $60^{\circ}\text{C}$  ; 357 psi



b)  $80^{\circ}\text{C}$  ; 805 psi



c)  $100^{\circ}\text{C}$  ; 805 psi

Fig. 12 Crack Path Stability for Initial Crack Propagation




Fig. 13 Mating Fracture Surfaces Near Branch Location




Fig. 14(a). Caustics for a running crack in Homalite-100: (1.) Stress-wave arrival; (2.) Initiation of running crack; (3.) Crack bifurcation. (Pictures taken with high-speed camera at California Institute of Technology.)




Fig. 14(b). Caustics, or shadow-spots, of a crack that has bifurcated (enlargement of frame in Fig. 5(a) at time  $t = 200 \mu s$ ).




Fig. 14(c) Stress-Intensity factor  $K_I(t)$  as a function of time  $t$  for a running crack in Homalite-100.




Fig. 15 Crack Speeds in Homalite 100




Fig. 16 Sensitivity of Crack Speed in Homalite 100 to Temperature




Fig. 17 Current Test Results Compared to those of other Investigators.




Fig. 18 Stress Intensity History in Solithane 113




Fig. 19 Effect of Temperature on Crack Speeds in Solithane 113




Fig. 20 Schematic of the Dynamic Loading Device





FIG.2| PRESSURE PRODUCED ON CRACK FACES  
AS A FUNCTION OF STRIP SEPARATION






Fig. 23 Crack Opening Displacement vs time




Fig. 24 Pressure Loss Attributed to Specimen Compliance




Fig. 25 Estimated Stress Intensity Factor Resulting from  
Pulse of Finite Duration




Fig. 26 Normalized Modulus Function at 0°C for  
Solithane 113




Fig. 27 Stress Intensity Factor for a Stationary Crack at Different Temperatures

DISTRIBUTION LIST

|                                                                                                                                            | <u>No. Copies</u> |                                                                                                                                                          | <u>No. Copies</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Dr. L.V. Schmidt<br>Assistant Secretary of the Navy<br>(R,E, and S) Room 5E 731<br>Pentagon<br>Washington, D.C. 20350                      | 1                 | Dr. F. Roberto<br>Code AFRPL MKPA<br>Edwards AFB, CA 93523                                                                                               | 1                 |
| Dr. A.L. Slafkosky<br>Scientific Advisor<br>Commandant of the Marine Corps<br>Code RD-1<br>Washington, D.C. 20380                          | 1                 | Dr. L.H. Caveny<br>Air Force Office of Scientific<br>Research<br>Directorate of Aerospace Sciences<br>Bolling Air Force Base<br>Washington, D.C. 20332   | 1                 |
| Dr. Richard S. Miller<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Code 413<br>Arlington, VA 22217                                                       | 10                | Mr. Donald L. Ball<br>Air Force Office of Scientific<br>Research<br>Directorate of Chemical Sciences<br>Bolling Air Force Base<br>Washington, D.C. 20332 | 1                 |
| Mr. David Siegel<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Code 260<br>Arlington, VA 22217                                                            | 1                 | Dr. John S. Wilkes, Jr.<br>FJSRL/NC<br>USAF Academy, CO 80840                                                                                            | 1                 |
| Dr. R.J. Marcus<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Western Office<br>1030 East Green Street<br>Pasadena, CA 91106                              | 1                 | Dr. R.L. Lou<br>Aerojet Strategic Propulsion Co.<br>P.O. Box 15699C<br>Sacramento, CA 95813                                                              | 1                 |
| Dr. Larry Peebles<br>Office of Naval Research<br>East Central Regional Office<br>666 Summer Street, Bldg. 114-D<br>Boston, MA 02210        | 1                 | Dr. V.J. Keenan<br>Anal-Syn Lab Inc.<br>P.O. Box 547<br>Paoli, PA 19301                                                                                  | 1                 |
| Dr. Phillip A. Miller<br>Office of Naval Research<br>San Francisco Area Office<br>One Hallidie Plaza, Suite 601<br>San Francisco, CA 94102 | 1                 | Dr. Philip Howe<br>Army Ballistic Research Labs<br>ARRADCOM<br>Code DRDAR-BLT<br>Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005                                       | 1                 |
| Mr. Otto K. Heiney<br>AFATL - OLOL<br>Elgin AFB, FL 32542                                                                                  | 1                 | Mr. L.A. Watermeier<br>Army Ballistic Research Labs<br>ARRADCOM<br>Code DRDAR-BLI<br>Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005                                   | 1                 |
| Mr. R. Geisler<br>ATTN: MKP/MS24<br>AFRPL<br>Edwards AFB, CA 93523                                                                         | 1                 | Dr. W.W. Wharton<br>Attn: DRSMI-RKL<br>Commander<br>U.S. Army Missile Command<br>Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898                                              | 1                 |

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

|                                                                                                                                                 | <u>No. Copies</u> |                                                                                                                                         | <u>No. Copies</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Dr. R.G. Rhoades<br>Commander<br>Army Missile Command<br>DRSMI-R<br>Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898                                                  | 1                 | Dr. E.H. Debutts<br>Hercules Inc.<br>Baccus Works<br>P.O. Box 98<br>Magna, UT 84044                                                     | 1                 |
| Dr. W.D. Stephens<br>Atlantic Research Corp.<br>Pine Ridge Plant<br>7511 Wellington Rd.<br>Gainesville, VA 22065                                | 1                 | Dr. James H. Thacher<br>Hercules Inc. Magna<br>Baccus Works<br>P.O. Box 98<br>Magna, UT 84044                                           | 1                 |
| Dr. A.W. Barrows<br>Ballistic Research Laboratory<br>USA ARRADCOM<br>DRDAR-BLP<br>Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005                             | 1                 | Mr. Theodore M. Gilliland<br>Johns Hopkins University APL<br>Chemical Propulsion Info. Agency<br>Johns Hopkins Road<br>Laurel, MD 20810 | 1                 |
| Dr. C.M. Frey<br>Chemical Systems Division<br>P.O. Box 358<br>Sunnyvale, CA 94086                                                               | 1                 | Dr. R. McGuire<br>Lawrence Livermore Laboratory<br>University of California<br>Code L-324<br>Livermore, CA 94550                        | 1                 |
| Professor F. Rodriguez<br>Cornell University<br>School of Chemical Engineering<br>Olin Hall, Ithaca, N.Y. 14853                                 | 1                 | Dr. Jack Linsk<br>Lockheed Missiles & Space Co.<br>P.O. Box 504<br>Code Org. 83-10, Bldg. 154<br>Sunnyvale, CA 94088                    | 1                 |
| Defense Technical Information<br>Center<br>DTIC-DDA-2<br>Cameron Station<br>Alexandria, VA 22314                                                | 12                | Dr. B.G. Craig<br>Los Alamos National Lab<br>P.O. Box 1663<br>NSP/DOD, MS-245<br>Los Alamos, NM 87545                                   | 1                 |
| Dr. Rocco C. Musso<br>Hercules Aerospace Division<br>Hercules Incorporated<br>Alleghany Ballistic Lab<br>P.O. Box 210<br>Washington, D.C. 21502 | 1                 | Dr. R.L. Rabie<br>WX-2, MS-952<br>Los Alamos National Lab.<br>P.O. Box 1663<br>Los Alamos NM 87545                                      | 1                 |
| Dr. Ronald L. Simmons<br>Hercules Inc. Eglin<br>AFATL/DLDL<br>Eglin AFB, FL 32542                                                               | 1                 | Dr. R. Rogers<br>Los Alamos Scientific Lab.<br>P.O. Box 1663<br>Los Alamos, NM 87545                                                    | 1                 |

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

|                                                                                                                                       | <u>No. Copies</u> |                                                                                                             | <u>No. Copies</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Mr. R. Brown<br>Naval Air Systems Command<br>Code 330<br>Washington, D.C. 20361                                                       | 1                 | Dr. J. Schnur<br>Naval Research Lab.<br>Code 6510<br>Washington, D.C. 20375                                 | 1                 |
| Dr. H. Rosenwasser<br>Naval Air Systems Command<br>AIR-310C<br>Washington, D.C. 20360                                                 | 1                 | Mr. R. Beauregard<br>Naval Sea Systems Command<br>SEA 64E<br>Washington, D.C. 20362                         | 1                 |
| Mr. B. Sobers<br>Naval Air Systems Command<br>Code 03P25<br>Washington, D.C. 20360                                                    | 1                 | Mr. G. Edwards<br>Naval Sea Systems Command<br>Code 62R3<br>Washington, D.C. 20362                          | 1                 |
| Dr. L.R. Rothstein<br>Assistant Director<br>Naval Explosives Dev.<br>Engineering Dept.<br>Naval Weapons Station<br>Yorktown, VA 23691 | 1                 | Mr. John Boyle<br>Materials Branch<br>Naval Ship Engineering Center<br>Philadelphia, PA 19112               | 1                 |
| Dr. Lionel Dickinson<br>Naval Explosive Ordnance<br>Disposal Tech. Center<br>Code D<br>Indian Head, MD 20640                          | 1                 | Dr. H.G. Adolph<br>Naval Surface Weapons Center<br>Code R11<br>White Oak<br>Silver Spring, MD 20910         | 1                 |
| Mr. C.L. Adams<br>Naval Ordnance Station<br>Code PM4<br>Indian Head, MD 20640                                                         | 1                 | Dr. T.D. Austin<br>Naval Surface Weapons Center<br>Code R16<br>Indian Head, MD 20640                        | 1                 |
| Mr. S. Mitchell<br>Naval Ordnance Station<br>Code 5253<br>Indian Head, MD 20640                                                       | 1                 | Dr. T. Hall<br>Code R-11<br>Naval Surface Weapons Center<br>White Oak Laboratory<br>Silver Spring, MD 20910 | 1                 |
| Dr. William Tolles<br>Dean of Research<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93940                                             | 1                 | Mr. G.L. Mackenzie<br>Naval Surface Weapons Center<br>Code R101<br>Indian Head, MD 20640                    | 1                 |
| Naval Research Lab.<br>Code 6100<br>Washington, D.C. 20375                                                                            | 1                 | Dr. K.F. Mueller<br>Naval Surface Weapons Center<br>Code R11<br>White Oak<br>Silver Spring, MD 20910        | 1                 |

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

|                                                                                                      | <u>No. Copies</u> |                                                                                                                      | <u>No. Copies</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Mr. J. Murrin<br>Naval Sea Systems Command<br>Code 62R2<br>Washington, D.C. 20362                    | 1                 | Dr. A. Nielsen<br>Naval Weapons Center<br>Code 385<br>China Lake, CA 93555                                           | 1                 |
| Dr. D.J. Pastine<br>Naval Surface Weapons Center<br>Code R04<br>White Oak<br>Silver Spring, MD 20910 | 1                 | Dr. R. Reed, Jr.<br>Naval Weapons Center<br>Code 388<br>China Lake, CA 93555                                         | 1                 |
| Mr. L. Roslund<br>Naval Surface Weapons Center<br>Code R122<br>White Oak, Silver Spring<br>MD 20910  | 1                 | Dr. L. Smith<br>Naval Weapons Center<br>Code 3205<br>China Lake, CA 93555                                            | 1                 |
| Mr. M. Stosz<br>Naval Surface Weapons Center<br>Code R121<br>White Oak<br>Silver Spring, MD 20910    | 1                 | Dr. B. Douda<br>Naval Weapons Support Center<br>Code 5042<br>Crane, Indiana 47522                                    | 1                 |
| Dr. E. Zimmet<br>Naval Surface Weapons Center<br>Code R13<br>White Oak<br>Silver Spring, MD 20910    | 1                 | Dr. A. Faulstich<br>Chief of Naval Technology<br>MAT Code 0716<br>Washington, D.C. 20360                             | 1                 |
| Dr. D. R. Derr<br>Naval Weapons Center<br>Code 388<br>China Lake, CA 93555                           | 1                 | LCDR J. Walker<br>Chief of Naval Material<br>Office of Naval Technology<br>MAT, Code 0712<br>Washington, D.C. 20360  | 1                 |
| Mr. Lee N. Gilbert<br>Naval Weapons Center<br>Code 3205<br>China Lake, CA 93555                      | 1                 | Mr. Joe McCartney<br>Naval Ocean Systems Center<br>San Diego, CA 92152                                               | 1                 |
| Dr. E. Martin<br>Naval Weapons Center<br>Code 3858<br>China Lake, CA 93555                           | 1                 | Dr. S. Yamamoto<br>Marine Sciences Division<br>Naval Ocean Systems Center<br>San Diego, CA 91232                     | 1                 |
| Mr. R. McCarten<br>Naval Weapons Center<br>Code 3272<br>China Lake, CA 93555                         | 1                 | Dr. G. Bosmajian<br>Applied Chemistry Division<br>Naval Ship Research & Development<br>Center<br>Annapolis, MD 21401 | 1                 |
|                                                                                                      |                   | Dr. H. Shuey<br>Rohn and Haas Company<br>Huntsville, Alabama 35801                                                   | 1                 |

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

|                                                                                                                                  | <u>No. Copies</u> |                                                                                                                                                                         | <u>No. Copies</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Dr. J.F. Kincaid<br>Strategic Systems Project<br>Office<br>Department of the Navy<br>Room 901<br>Washington, D.C. 20376          | 1                 | Dr. C.W. Vriesen<br>Thiokol Elkton Division<br>P.O. Box 241<br>Elkton, MD 21921                                                                                         | 1                 |
| Strategic Systems Project Office<br>Propulsion Unit<br>Code SP2701<br>Department of the Navy<br>Washington, D.C. 20376           | 1                 | Dr. J.C. Hinshaw<br>Thiokol Wasatch Division<br>P.O. Box 524<br>Brigham City, Utah 84302                                                                                | 1                 |
| Mr. E.L. Throckmorton<br>Strategic Systems Project Office<br>Department of the Navy<br>Room 1043<br>Washington, D.C. 20376       | 1                 | U.S. Army Research Office<br>Chemical & Biological Sciences<br>Division<br>P.O. Box 12211<br>Research Triangle Park<br>NC 27709                                         | 1                 |
| Dr. D.A. Flanigan<br>Thiokol<br>Huntsville Division<br>Huntsville, Alabama 35807                                                 | 1                 | Dr. R.F. Walker<br>USA ARRADCOM<br>ORDAR-LCE<br>Dover, NJ 07801                                                                                                         | 1                 |
| Mr. G.F. Mangum<br>Thiokol Corporation<br>Huntsville Division<br>Huntsville, Alabama 35807                                       | 1                 | Dr. T. Sinden<br>Munitions Directorate<br>Propellants and Explosives<br>Defence Equipment Staff<br>British Embassy<br>3100 Massachusetts Ave.<br>Washington, D.C. 20008 | 1                 |
| Mr. E.S. Sutton<br>Thiokol Corporation<br>Elkton Division<br>P.O. Box 241<br>Elkton, MD 21921                                    | 1                 | LTC B. Loving<br>AFROL/LK<br>Edwards AFB, CA 93523                                                                                                                      | 1                 |
| Dr. G. Thompson<br>Thiokol<br>Wasatch Division<br>MS 240 P.O. Box 524<br>Brigham City, UT 84302                                  | 1                 | Professor Alan N. Gent<br>Institute of Polymer Science<br>University of Akron<br>Akron, OH 44325                                                                        | 1                 |
| Dr. T.F. Davidson<br>Technical Director<br>Thiokol Corporation<br>Government Systems Group<br>P.O. Box 9253<br>Ogden, Utah 84409 | 1                 | Mr. J. M. Frankle<br>Army Ballistic Research Labs<br>ARRADCOM<br>Code ORDAR-BLI<br>Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005                                                    | 1                 |

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

|                                                                                                                               | <u>No. Copies</u> |                                                                                                                              | <u>No. Copies</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Dr. Ingo W. May<br>Army Ballistic Research Labs<br>ARRADCOM<br>Code DRDAR-BLI<br>Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005            | 1                 | Dr. J. P. Marshall<br>Dept. 52-35, Bldg. 204/2<br>Lockheed Missile & Space Co.<br>3251 Hanover Street<br>Palo Alto, CA 94304 | 1                 |
| Professor N.W. Tschoegl<br>California Institute of Tech<br>Dept. of Chemical Engineering<br>Pasadena, CA 91125                | 1                 | Ms. Joan L. Janney<br>Los Alamos National Lab<br>Mail Stop 920<br>Los Alamos, NM 87545                                       | 1                 |
| Professor M.D. Nicol<br>University of California<br>Dept. of Chemistry<br>405 Hilgard Avenue<br>Los Angeles, CA 90024         | 1                 | Dr. J. M. Walsh<br>Los Alamos Scientific Lab<br>Los Alamos, NM 87545                                                         | 1                 |
| Professor A. G. Evans<br>University of California<br>Berkeley, CA 94720                                                       | 1                 | Professor R. W. Armstrong<br>Univ. of Maryland<br>Department of Mechanical Eng.<br>College Park, MD 20742                    | 1                 |
| Professor T. Litovitz<br>Catholic Univ. of America<br>Physics Department<br>520 Michigan Ave., N.E.<br>Washington, D.C. 20017 | 1                 | Prof. Richard A. Reinhardt<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Physics & Chemistry Dept.<br>Monterey, CA 93940                   | 1                 |
| Professor W. G. Knauss<br>Graduate Aeronautical Lab<br>California Institute of Tech.<br>Pasadena, CA 91125                    | 1                 | Dr. R. Bernecker<br>Naval Surface Weapons Center<br>Code R13<br>White Oak, Silver Spring, MD 20910                           | 1                 |
| Professor Edward Price<br>Georgia Institute of Tech.<br>School of Aerospace Engin.<br>Atlanta, Georgia 30332                  | 1                 | Dr. M. J. Kamlet<br>Naval Surface Weapons Center<br>Code R11<br>White Oak, Silver Spring, MD 20910                           | 1                 |
| Dr. Kenneth O. Hartman<br>Hercules Aerospace Division<br>Hercules Incorporated<br>P.O. Box 210<br>Cumberland, MD 21502        | 1                 | Professor J. D. Achenbach<br>Northwestern University<br>Dept. of Civil Engineering<br>Evanston, IL 60201                     | 1                 |
| Dr. Thor L. Smith<br>IBM Research Lab<br>042.282<br>San Jose, CA 95193                                                        | 1                 | Dr. N. L. Basdekas<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Mechanics Program, Code 432<br>Arlington, VA 22217                         | 1                 |
|                                                                                                                               |                   | Professor Kenneth Kuo<br>Pennsylvania State Univ.<br>Dept. of Mechanical Engineering<br>University Park, PA 16802            | 1                 |

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

|                                                                                                                            | <u>No. Copies</u> |                                                                                                                                                                    | <u>No. Copies</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Dr. S. Sheffield<br>Sandia Laboratories<br>Division 2513<br>P.O. Box 5800<br>Albuquerque, NM 87185                         | 1                 | Rockwell International<br>12214 Lakewood Blvd.<br>Downey, CA 90241<br>Attn: H.M. Clancy,<br>Mail Stop AB 70                                                        | 1                 |
| Dr. M. Farber<br>Space Sciences, Inc.<br>135 Maple Avenue<br>Monrovia, CA 91016                                            | 1                 | ONR Resident Representative<br>Ohio State University<br>Research Center<br>1314 Kinnear Road<br>Columbus, Ohio 43212<br>Attn: Joseph Haggard,<br>Dept. of the Navy | 1                 |
| Dr. Y. M. Gupta<br>SRI International<br>333 Ravenswood Avenue<br>Menlo Park, CA 94025                                      | 1                 |                                                                                                                                                                    |                   |
| Mr. M. Hill<br>SRI International<br>333 Ravenswood Avenue<br>Menlo Park, CA 94025                                          | 1                 |                                                                                                                                                                    |                   |
| Professor Richard A. Schapery<br>Texas A&M Univ.<br>Dept of Civil Engineering<br>College Station, TX 77843                 | 1                 |                                                                                                                                                                    |                   |
| Dr. Stephen Swanson<br>Univ. of Utah<br>Dept. of Mech. & Industrial<br>Engineering<br>MEB 3008<br>Salt Lake City, UT 84112 | 1                 |                                                                                                                                                                    |                   |
| Mr. J. D. Byrd<br>Thiokol Corp. Huntsville<br>Huntsville Div.<br>Huntsville, AL 35807                                      | 1                 |                                                                                                                                                                    |                   |
| Professor G. D. Duvall<br>Washington State University<br>Dept. of Physics<br>Pullman, WA 99163                             | 1                 |                                                                                                                                                                    |                   |
| Prof. T. Dickinson<br>Washington State University<br>Dept. of Physics<br>Pullman, WA 99163                                 | 1                 |                                                                                                                                                                    |                   |