

AD-A145 576


THE ROLE OF MOLECULAR DIFFUSION IN THE ADHESION OF
ELASTOMERS(U) AKRON UNIV OH INST OF POLYMER SCIENCE
M D ELLUL ET AL. SEP 84 TR-34 N00014-76-C-0408


1/1

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 11/1

NL





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

AD-A145 576

DTIC FILE COPY

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Contract N00014-76-C-0408

Project NR 092-555

Technical Report No. 34

THE ROLE OF MOLECULAR DIFFUSION IN THE ADHESION
OF ELASTOMERS

by


M. D. Ellul and A. N. Gent

Institute of Polymer Science
The University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325

September, 1984


Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted
for any purpose of the United States Government
Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unrestricted

13



REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Technical Report 34	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A145576	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) The Role of Molecular Diffusion in the Adhesion of Elastomers		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) M. D. Ellul and A. N. Gent		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-76-C-0408
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Institute of Polymer Science The University of Akron Akron, Ohio 44325		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS NR 092-555
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Office of Naval Research Power Program Arlington, VA 22217		12. REPORT DATE September, 1984
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 51
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) According to attached distribution list. Approved for public release; distribution unrestricted		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Submitted to: Journal of Polymer Science: Polymer Physics Edition		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Adhesion, Autohesion, Butyl rubber, Crosslinking, Diffusion, Elastomers, Entanglements, Fracture, Interdiffusion, Interlinking, Peeling, Reptation, Separation, Strength, Viscoelasticity.		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) ➤ Butyl rubber (polyisobutylene-co-isoprene) mixed with polyisobutylene was crosslinked to yield elastomeric macromolecular networks containing dissolved linear macromolecules. Adhesion of these materials to themselves (self-adhesion) and to an inert substrate was investigated over a wide range of peel rates and test temperatures. Greatly enhanced self-adhesion was found when linear polyisobutylene molecules of		

high molecular weight were present, but the strength of adhesion to a rigid inert substrate was hardly affected. The enhancement of self-adhesion is attributed to interdiffusion of polyisobutylene molecules. It was greatest at intermediate peel rates and temperatures, becoming insignificant at extremely low rates, probably because the diffusing species can then migrate readily, and at high effective rates of peel when the polymer approaches the glassy state and the strength of adhesion is high in all cases. A transition to somewhat lower levels of adhesion at relatively high rates of peel is tentatively ascribed to the onset of molecular fracture in place of pull-out. The presence of large amounts of low-molecular-weight polyisobutylene ($M_v = 50,000$ g/mole) increased the level of self-adhesion and of adhesion to an inert substrate to a similar degree, over a broad range of peel rates. This effect is attributed primarily to enhanced viscous losses in the elastomeric layer during separation. Application of these results to crack and weld-line healing in glassy plastics is discussed.



1. Introduction

Diffusion of polymer molecules across an interface has been proposed to play a major role in adhesion (1,2). Certainly the development of self-adhesion or "tack" between two layers of materials seems likely to involve the diffusion of molecules across the interface after the layers have been brought into intimate contact (3-9). Even here, however, the question is not decided. The development of intimate contact is, itself, a relatively slow process and could be the rate-determining step in self-adhesion (10). Indeed, molecular interdiffusion may not be required at all; molecular contact may be sufficient for strong adhesion between layers of the same, or even of different polymers (11, 12).

In an attempt to separate the effects of intimate contact from those of molecular interdiffusion, studies have now been carried out of the adhesion of a simple model system, consisting of a crosslinked elastomer layer containing a proportion of uncrosslinked linear macromolecules. In this system, the crosslinked macromolecules are unable to diffuse readily but at least for low degrees of crosslinking they are able to conform to small surface irregularities and make molecular contact (13, 14). The dissolved linear molecules are presumably able to diffuse readily across an interface into any compatible material. Thus, by comparing the adhesion of crosslinked layers with and without linear molecules present, the contribution from molecular interdiffusion can be elucidated.

The system employed consists of butyl rubber, a copolymer of isobutylene and isoprene containing only 1.6 per cent of isoprene and hence wholly compatible with linear polyisobutylene, in admixture with various amounts of polyisobutylene of various molecular weights. The butyl rubber fraction could be crosslinked by reaction of the isoprene groups with conventional difunctional sulfurating reagents, leaving the polyisobutylene molecules dissolved in an elastomeric matrix.

The viscoelastic properties of such systems, containing a linear polymeric species within a gelled matrix, have been described by Ferry and co-workers (15, 16). Measurement of adhesion for such materials is not a simple matter, however. The work of separating one layer of an elastomer from another, or from a rigid substrate, depends strongly upon the rate of propagation of the line of separation and upon the test temperature (17-20). It is clear that the mechanical strength of an adhesive joint depends upon both the intrinsic strength of the interface and upon the viscoelastic properties of the adhering materials (21, 22). Thus, in order to clarify the role of interdiffused molecules upon the strength of adhesion, it has proved necessary to study the response over a wide range of test speeds and temperatures.

2. Experimental details

(a) Materials

Mixtures of butyl rubber (IIR) and polyisobutylene were prepared on an open two-roll mill using Butyl 301 (Polysar Ltd., Canada), which has a viscosity-average molecular weight $\bar{M}_v$ of 4×10^5 g/mole and 1.6 mole per cent of unsaturation, and one of three grades of polyisobutylene (Vistanex, Exxon Chemical Company): LM-MH, denoted L5 here, with $\bar{M}_v$ of 5×10^4 g/mole; MML-100, denoted L100 here, with $\bar{M}_v$ of 1.1×10^6 g/mole; and MML-140, denoted L140 here, with $\bar{M}_v$ of 1.8×10^6 g/mole. Various proportions of polyisobutylene were added, up to 100 per cent of the butyl rubber content, or 50 per cent of the total.

Preliminary studies were carried out to find a vulcanization recipe that yielded crosslinked sheets essentially free from "bloom", i.e., surface contamination by additives or by-products of the vulcanization reaction. Reasonable success was achieved with the following recipe, in parts by weight: Butyl 301, 100; polyisobutylene, 0 to 100; zinc oxide, 5; tetramethylthiuram disulfide, 5; zinc-2-ethyl hexanoate, 2. Crosslinking was effected by heating for 3 to 4 h at 148°C in a heated press.

Sheets about 1.5 mm thick were prepared in this way with one surface adhering to a thin cotton cloth backing and the other molded against a polished Ferrottype plate to yield a smooth glossy surface.

Since polyisobutylene is fully saturated it should not participate in the crosslinking reaction. Crosslinked sheets or carbon tetrachloride were extracted for long periods with boiling hexane, in order to assess the ease with which the polyisobutylene could be removed from the crosslinked material. Although extraction was extremely slow, after four weeks 85 to 95 per cent of L5 polyisobutylene and 80 to 95 per cent of L100 had been extracted, indicating that the polyisobutylene was, indeed, substantially independent of the butyl rubber molecular network.

(b) Measurement of self-adhesion

Preliminary experiments were carried out to find optimum contact conditions so that no further increase in strength could be obtained with higher contact pressures. It was found sufficient to place test strips in contact for 14 h at a temperature of 60°C under a pressure of about 1 MPa. These conditions gave reasonably reproducible results and were therefore adopted in all cases.

Strips, about 15 mm wide and 150 mm long, were pressed together and then separated in a T-peel geometry, Figure 1. The cloth backing served to minimize extension of the separated parts under the action of the peel-force F . Under these circumstances, the work G_a of separation per unit area of interface is given by

$$G_a = 2F/w \quad (1)$$

where w is the width of the adhering strips. Results are given below in terms of G_a for comparison with other measurements

of adhesion, and also for comparison with the work G_c required to propagate a tear through unit area of the same material.

(c) Adhesion to a rigid substrate

Measurements were also made of the adhesion of test strips to a rigid inert substrate. For this purpose, sheets of polyethylene terephthalate (Mylar 300 A, E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Co.) were glued flat to a steel plate. Test strips were pressed into close contact and then peeled back at an angle of 180° , ^{Figure 1b.} Again, the work G_a of separation is given by equation 1.

(d) Fracture energy

Values of the work G_c required to propagate a tear through unit area were determined by cutting through the cloth backing of a test strip with a sharp knife and then measuring the tear force F , Figure 1c. Equation 1 yields values for G_c in this case when w is replaced by the thickness t of the rubber layer, assuming that the tear path is, indeed, perpendicular to the plane of the layer.

Measurements were also made of G_c for uncrosslinked materials. Samples of the polymers were milled to an equivalent degree to that required for mixing in the vulcanization ingredients and then pressed between two layers of thin cotton cloth to form a sandwich about 1.5 mm thick. Test strips were cut from such sheets, about 20 mm wide and 150 mm long. The cloth backing on both sides was then cut through along the center line leaving the thickness of the polymer layer to be torn through, as in Figure 1c.

3. Results and discussion

(a) Adhesion to Mylar

Experimentally-determined values of the work $\underline{G_a}$ of separation of test strips from a Mylar substrate are plotted in Figure 2 against the rate $\underline{R}$ of advance of the line of separation. In view of the wide range employed for $\underline{R}$, and the large variation in the strength of adhesion $\underline{G_a}$ at various rates and temperatures, logarithmic scales have been used for both axes. Each point represents an average of the measured peel force over a peel distance of about 100 mm, averaged for at least three test strips.

At the highest temperature employed, 100°C, and at the lowest rate of peel, 4 $\mu\text{m/s}$, the value obtained for $\underline{G_a}$ was extremely low, only about 1-2 J/m^2 . On the other hand, at the lowest temperature, -20°C, and at the highest peel rate, about 10 mm/s, the value obtained for $\underline{G_a}$ was relatively high, about 1 kJ/m^2 , and detachment took place in a stick-slip fashion with the peel force oscillating between high and low values.

This marked dependence of $\underline{G_a}$ upon peel rate and temperature is reminiscent of other viscoelastic processes. Indeed, when the results shown in Figure 2 are replotted against the reduced rate of peel $\underline{Ra_T}$ appropriate to ambient temperature, 25°C, then they are all found to fall on a single curve, Figure 3. This successful superposition of results over a wide temperature range shows that the temperature dependence of $\underline{G_a}$ arises

solely from rheological effects within the elastomer itself, associated with the motion of molecular segments, and not with variations in its wetting properties, or surface attractions. Similar results have been obtained previously for the adhesion of simple pressure-sensitive adhesives (19,23) and for the adhesive and fracture properties of other elastomers (20,24,25).

In the present instance, values of a_T were calculated from the relation given by Ferry as appropriate for polyisobutylene (26),

$$\ln a_{T_g} = -38(T - T_g)/(104 + T - T_g) \quad (2)$$

where T denotes the test temperature and T_g the glass transition temperature of polyisobutylene, 203°K. It should be noted that the second numerical coefficient in equation 2 is considerably different from the "universal" value of 52°C, reflecting the well-known relatively-sluggish response of polyisobutylene at temperatures well above its glass transition temperature. ^(P) The results shown in Figures 2 and 3 are for a sample containing 20 parts (16.7 per cent of the total amount of polymer) of L100 polyisobutylene. Similar results were obtained for a control sample containing no polyisobutylene, and for samples containing up to 100 parts (50 per cent of the total) of L100, Figure 4. There is a significant increase in the work of separation in the latter case but the effect is comparatively small. Thus, the presence of uncrosslinked polymer of high molecular weight does not appear to increase

the strength of adhesion much to an inert substrate. In contrast, as shown later, the strength of self-adhesion is greatly enhanced.

(b) Self-adhesion of a control sample

Adhesion to itself of a butyl rubber sample containing no polyisobutylene was studied over the same wide ranges of test temperature and peel rate. Again, the results at different temperatures were found to superimpose satisfactorily by plotting them against the effective rate of peel Ra_T at ambient temperature, the factor a_T being calculated for each test temperature by means of equation 2. The results are shown in Figure 5, together with a broken curve representing the strength of adhesion of the control sample to a Mylar substrate.

At all effective rates of peel the strength of self-adhesion is seen to be somewhat greater than the strength of adhesion to Mylar, by a factor of about 3 at most. This enhanced adhesion is probably due largely to a greater affinity between butyl rubber and itself than between butyl rubber and a Mylar substrate, but it may also reflect some interdiffusion of molecular segments across the interface. The crosslinked polymer was found to contain a relatively large soluble fraction, about 20 per cent, and the network itself will have long pendant molecular chains attached to it only at one end, that can interdiffuse to a limited extent.

(c) Self-adhesion of samples containing high-molecular-weight polyisobutylene

When the two layers pressed into contact contained high-molecular-weight polyisobutylene, then the strength of

adhesion was found to be substantially higher than before. Some representative results are shown in Figure 6. Now, however, use of the WLF reduction factor a_T , calculated by means of equation 2, was less successful in superimposing experimental results obtained at different temperatures onto a single curve in terms of a reduced rate of peel Ra_T . Instead, as shown in Figure 6, the results appeared to fall on two overlapping curves, so that a broad but discontinuous transition occurred at relatively high effective rates of peel (or equivalently at low temperatures) to lower strengths. This transition occurred over 3-4 decades of reduced peel rate, approaching

the glass transition region, and amounted at most to a drop by 50 per cent in the measured strength. Nevertheless, it was observed consistently in systems where the strength is mainly associated with interdiffused and entangled molecules, as noted later. It is therefore tentatively attributed to a particular feature of such systems: that the interconnecting molecules can either disentangle or break. The former process will become increasingly difficult as the peel rate is increased, so that at some critical rate, depending upon the molecular weight of the interlinking molecules and their speed of diffusion, they will break instead of disentangling.

Some reduction in peel strength can well occur when the mechanism of detachment changes, even when the interfacial stresses continue to rise. This is because the peel force represents the work expended in detachment, and does not necessarily follow the detachment stress for strongly non-linear systems (20). For example, a marked reduction in peel force is found at the transition from liquidlike flow to rubberlike elasticity in soft viscoelastic adhesives (20). Thus, if the work expended in breaking interdiffused molecules is less than that required to disentangle them, then the observed peel force would be expected to decrease at the transition from one mode of failure to the other.

Further discussion of the observed transition in strength of self-adhesion for samples containing polyisobutylene is deferred until later. The principal effect of the presence of polyisobutylene is to cause a marked increase in the strength of self-adhesion, by a factor of about 5 in comparison with the self-adhesion of a control sample containing no polyisobutylene and by a factor of over 10 in comparison with the adhesion to a Mylar substrate, at rates of peel somewhat below the transition, i.e., at peel rates of the order of $100 \mu\text{m/s}$ at room temperature (Figure 6). This effect is attributed to the presence of interdiffused linear polyisobutylene molecules spanning the interface. At lower effective rates of peel the effect becomes relatively small, presumably because the linear molecules can then diffuse readily back again. At higher effective rates of peel, in the vicinity of the glass transition, the enhancement of self-adhesion is again relatively small, probably because ~~then~~ the interdiffused molecules are ^{and} broken rather than disentangled, they contribute less to the total work of separation.

In Figure 7 the strength of self-adhesion at an intermediate rate of peel, $400 \mu\text{m/s}$, is plotted against the amount of polyisobutylene incorporated. Addition of more than 15-20 per cent does not appear to cause any further increase in the level of self-adhesion. It seems likely that the density of interlinking molecules at the interface does not increase significantly with a further increase in their concentration in the two contacting layers (27).

(d) Effect of low-molecular-weight polyisobutylene ($\bar{M}_v = 50,000$ g/mole)

Experimental results for the strength of ~~the~~ adhesion to Mylar of a butyl rubber compound containing 17 and 50 per cent of the low-molecular-weight polyisobutylene ^(LM-MH) L5_A are shown in Figure 8. Corresponding relations for the strength of self-adhesion ~~to Mylar~~ are represented by broken curves in Figure 8. For each sample the strength of self-adhesion is quite similar to the strength of adhesion to Mylar at all effective rates of peel. However, the addition of 50 per cent of L5 causes a substantial increase in adhesion whereas addition of 17 per cent has little effect, giving results similar to those obtained for a control sample containing no polyisobutylene, Figure 5.

These results are quite different from those obtained by addition of high-molecular-weight polyisobutylene, described in the preceding section. Then, the level of self-adhesion was increased substantially, at least over a certain range of effective peel rates, whereas the strength of adhesion to Mylar was not much affected. Moreover, additions of 17 to 50 per cent were virtually equivalent. These effects were ascribed to interdiffusion of linear ^{macro-} molecules at the interface.

In contrast, the present results suggest that diffusion of low-molecular-weight polyisobutylene molecules across the interface does not contribute significantly to the strength of self-adhesion. Low-molecular-weight species can presumably diffuse back readily under all circumstances and they will be

less able to form entanglements with the molecular networks that contain them, so that a major enhancement of strength is less likely in this case as a result of interdiffusion.

The origin of the substantial increase, both in self-adhesion and in adhesion to Mylar, must therefore be sought elsewhere. Ferry et al have shown that the loss compliance J'' is greatly increased over a range of effective frequencies of deformation from 1×10^{-4} rad/s to 10 rad/s, when 50 per cent of L5 is present within a crosslinked butyl rubber (15). Over most of the same frequency range the loss compliance is hardly changed at all by the presence of 50 per cent of a high-molecular-weight polyisobutylene. (It is increased in a similar way only at lower frequencies: 1×10^{-3} rad/s and below (15).) Now, the effective deformation frequency in a peeling experiment is given approximately by R/t , where R is the peel rate and t is the thickness of the elastomer layer. Thus, the range of effective frequencies over which L5 has a major effect on the loss compliance whereas L100 has little effect is equivalent to the range of peel rates; $1 \mu\text{m/s}$ to 10 mm/s ; over which the principal changes in the strength of adhesion are observed. It is therefore concluded that the enhanced strength of adhesion observed with L5 arises from greater energy losses within the adhering layer as it is deformed in the peeling process. These losses are apparently unimportant with L100 over the same range of peel rates.

(e) Adhesion of butyl rubber containing polyisobutylene to a control sample.

Strips of the butyl rubber compound containing 17 per cent of L100 polyisobutylene were pressed into contact with strips of the butyl rubber compound containing no added polyisobutylene. Measurements of the work G_a of separation are plotted in Figure 9 against the effective peel rate Ra_T at 25°C. The results are seen to be similar, both in form and magnitude, to those obtained previously for the strength of self-adhesion of the material with 17 per cent of L100, Figure 6.

As before, the present results show a transition over a broad range of peel rates. Indeed, they differ only by a small factor over the entire range of effective peel rates, being consistently somewhat lower than the values of self-adhesion. Thus, it appears that diffusion of linear polyisobutylene molecules takes place across the interface with a butyl rubber control sample and leads to enhanced adhesion in this case also. The somewhat lower values of adhesion may reasonably be ascribed to a lower density of interlinking molecules when they are supplied by only one of the contacting strips.

(f) Comparison of the work of separation G_a with the work of fracture G_c .

The work G_a of separating two adhering layers is quite large in some cases (for example, when linear polyisobutylene molecules are present) and it approaches the intrinsic strength of the layers themselves. Indeed, incipient tearing of the layers was observed for the strongest bonds. It is therefore of interest to compare the work of fracture of the layers with the work required to separate them.

Measurements were made of the work G_c of fracture per unit area torn through for the butyl rubber compound containing 17 per cent of linear polyisobutylene L100 and for the L100 polymer itself. In the latter case there is no permanent molecular network and therefore, at least at the lowest rate of "tearing", the molecules presumably disentangle and flow apart, rather than break. It is particularly interesting to note that the measured fracture energy for this material, when plotted against the effective rate Ra_T of tear propagation, calculated by means of equation 2 from measurements at various rates and temperatures, does not fall on a single curve but shows a diffuse transition to lower values at high effective rates of tearing, Figure 10. This behavior closely resembles that found for self-adhesion of the butyl rubber compound containing 17 per cent of L100 polyisobutylene, represented by the broken curves in Figure 10, and lends support to the hypothesis that the transition reflects a change from molecular

slippage to molecular rupture.

This hypothesis is further strengthened by the observation that no similar transition is observed in measurements of the work of fracture for the crosslinked butyl rubber containing a small proportion (17 per cent) of linear polyisobutylene. As shown in Figure 11, although the work of fracture for this material is comparable in magnitude to that for the linear polymer alone, and depends in a similar way upon the effective rate of tear propagation, there is no indication of a transition from one level of fracture energy to another (lower) level over a characteristic range of tear rates. Molecular slippage is, of course, prevented in this sample at all rates of deformation by the presence of chemical crosslinks.

(g) Relaxation times for linear polyisobutylene molecules within a butyl rubber network.

An indication of the characteristic relaxation time for linear polyisobutylene molecules within a butyl rubber network may be obtained from the delayed elastic response of the material. Measurements were therefore made of the tensile creep compliance $D(t)$ as a function of time t under load, for butyl rubber compounds containing 50 per cent of each linear polyisobutylene. The results are plotted in Figure 12.

As can be seen in the Figure, the butyl rubber compound containing no added polyisobutylene has a low compliance of about $1 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}^2/\text{N}$, increasing slowly with time over long periods. In contrast, whereas the material containing

50 per cent of high-molecular-weight linear polyisobutylene L100 shows a similar low compliance at short times, it then increases relatively rapidly to reach a value of about $1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{N}$ after times under load of the order of 10^7 s . For the material containing 50 per cent of low-molecular weight linear polyisobutylene L5, the tensile compliance is large, even after times under load as short as 10 s, and it appears to reach a quasi-equilibrium value of about $1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{N}$ after about 10^4 s under load.

The equilibrium level of the excess compliance shown by materials containing linear polyisobutylene can be regarded as substantially equal. They probably reflect a lower degree of crosslinking in diluted butyl rubber. The obvious differences in response time may be attributed to the different times taken by linear polyisobutylene molecules of different molecular weight to rearrange themselves and allow the butyl rubber network to support the applied load fully. If it is assumed that the whole response curve is similar in form for different polyisobutylenes, and merely shifted to shorter or longer times by a multiplying factor, then the compliance curves shown in Figure 12 can be superimposed by lateral shifts to form a master response curve applicable to all molecular weights. The curve obtained in this way is shown in Figure 13.

From the shift factors and master curve, the times t_r required for one-half of the excess compliance to be attained may be estimated for each material. These times are a reasonable

measure of the "reptation" time or relaxation time for each sample of polyisobutylene when embedded within a butyl rubber network. The values obtained are about 0.3 s for L5 and about 3×10^4 s for L100.

Similar values have been deduced by Ferry et al from dynamic mechanical measurements on the same systems (15). The present values are also in ^{rough} accord with their conclusions that the principal relaxation times are proportional to the third power of molecular weight of the entrapped linear species.

We therefore infer that the principal relaxation time for molecules of L100 polyisobutylene within a butyl rubber network is quite long, about 12 h at room temperature. This explains why it was found necessary to press samples together for relatively long periods to achieve an equilibrium level of adhesion.

An estimate of the time allowed for molecular rearrangement during the peeling process may be obtained from the effective rate e of elongation (given approximately by R/t , where R is the peel rate and t is the thickness of the rubber layer) and the maximum elongation e_m undergone by the rubber at the point of separation. The total time permitted for molecular rearrangement is then given approximately by $\underline{e_m} t/R$.

As shown in Figures 6, 9 and 10, the transition in cohesive and adhesive strength for materials containing linear polyisobutylene of high molecular weight occurs over a range of effective rates of peeling and tearing beginning at about

100 $\mu\text{m/s}$ at 25°C. Thus, the permitted response time is about 100 s, taking the value of e_m to be 5-10 and putting $t = 1.5 \text{ mm}$. This is considerably shorter than the relaxation time of the polyisobutylene molecules within a butyl rubber matrix, estimated above to be about $3 \times 10^4 \text{ s}$. However, only about one-half of an interlinking molecule, at most, is required to disentangle in order to permit separation. Indeed, on average, relaxation of about one-fourth of the length of "tie" molecules will be sufficient. Assuming an M^3 relationship between molecular length (weight) and relaxation time, a time of about 500 s is therefore estimated to be required, for substantial disentanglement of molecules crossing an interface. This is comparable to, although somewhat larger than, the time permitted for molecular rearrangement during peeling or tearing at the critical rate. Thus, the onset of the transition in peel strength and tear strength is reasonably consistent with the time scale of relaxation processes for dissolved polyisobutylene molecules.

(h) Kinetics of adhesion

The effect of contact time upon the strength of self-adhesion and adhesion to Mylar is shown in Figure 14 for a crosslinked sample of butyl rubber containing 50 per cent of L100 polyisobutylene. These measurements were made at a peel rate of $400 \mu\text{m/s}$ and at a temperature of 25°C , when the relative difference between the two strengths is greatest (see Figure 6).

As shown in Figure 14, the strength of self-adhesion does not reach a constant value until after periods of contact of the order of 10^5 s at 25°C . This time period is similar to the mean relaxation time t_r of the linear macromolecules present, deduced from studies of creep compliance (section g), and is thus consistent with the hypothesis that the rate-controlling process in self-adhesion is the interdiffusion of linear polyisobutylene molecules.

An estimate of the mean distance $(\overline{x^2})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ that a molecule can diffuse through within the relaxation time t_r , or within the similar time required to attain the maximum level of self-adhesion, can be deduced from the Einstein equation:

$$\overline{x^2} = 2Dt_r. \quad (3)$$

A value for the diffusion coefficient D is readily obtained from the measured steady-state flow viscosity η of polyisobutylene L100 ($\eta = 2 \times 10^8 \text{ Ns/m}^2$ at 25°C), using Bueche's relation (28):

$$D \eta = e^{RT(\overline{r^2}/M)/36}$$

where the density ρ is approximately $1 \times 10^6 \text{ g/m}^3$, the characteristic ratio $\overline{r^2}/M$ is approximately $6 \times 10^{-21} \text{ m}^2 \text{ mole/g}$ and R and T denote the gas constant and the absolute temperature, respectively. In this way, an estimate for D is obtained of $2 \times 10^{-21} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ at 25°C , yielding a value for $(\overline{x^2})^{1/2}$ of about 10 nm when a value for t_r of $3 \times 10^4 \text{ s}$ is employed in equation 3. Thus, the mean distance through which a molecule can diffuse within the characteristic relaxation time t_r , or within the similar time of contact required to reach the maximum level of self-adhesion, is of the same order as the size of the random-coil molecule itself. It seems quite reasonable that interdiffusion to this extent would give a fully-developed bond.

(i) Implications for crack and weld-line "healing"

When glassy polymers are brought together and annealed, they soften and come into closer contact. If they are compatible, then a process of molecular interdiffusion will take place as in the experiments described here for layers of butyl rubber. The strength of adhesion of joints prepared in this way, measured after cooling them back to the glassy state, has been attributed largely to molecular interdiffusion (5, 6, 8, 9), although quite strong joints are formed between incompatible materials as well (12).

The present experiments show that the level of adhesion for viscoelastic materials can be quite high, even in the absence of molecular interdiffusion. Indeed, a clear contribution from interdiffused molecules can only be recognized over a limited range of rates of separation and temperature, and then only for diffusing species of relatively high molecular weight. Under the ^{se} circumstances the strength of adhesion may be increased by a factor of 10 or more as a result of interdiffusion. This increase appears to be due in part to the additional work required to disentangle interlinking molecules. When the rate of separation is too high, then the molecules appear to break, rather than flow, and their contribution to the observed strength is reduced.

Similar experiments on polymers in the glassy state seem necessary in order to establish the magnitude of the contribution of interdiffused molecules to the strength of adhesion in that case also, and to separate it from contributions due solely to adsorption.

Conclusions

The following general conclusions are obtained:

1. The strength of adhesion of lightly-crosslinked butyl rubber to itself and to a rigid (Mylar) substrate is greatly dependent upon the rate of peeling detachment and upon the test temperature, increasing by more than three orders of magnitude as the peel rate is increased and the test temperature is reduced. The effect of test temperature is in good accord with the Williams, Landel and Ferry relation for molecular segmental mobility in simple viscoelastic substrates.
2. Addition of high-molecular-weight linear polyisobutylene to lightly-crosslinked butyl rubber leads to enhanced self-adhesion, but to little change in the strength of adhesion to Mylar. The enhancement is attributed to interdiffusion of polyisobutylene molecules between the contacting layers. It reaches a maximum value of about 10X at intermediate rates of peel, being smaller both at low rates when back diffusion is relatively rapid, and at high rates, approaching the glass transition, when the strength of adhesion is high in all cases.
3. A small but significant decrease in strength of adhesion, and of the fracture energy of polyisobutylene, starting at a peel rate or tear rate of about $100\mu\text{m/s}$ at 25°C , is attributed to a change from flow to fracture of the interlinking molecules when the rate of elongation is too

- rapid to permit them to disentangle and separate.
4. Addition of small amounts of a low-molecular-weight polyisobutylene does not significantly enhance the strength of self-adhesion or adhesion to a Mylar substrate. At higher concentrations both are increased strongly, by a factor of about 10X. This effect is attributed to enhanced viscous energy losses within the elastomer layer. Interdiffusion does not appear to increase the strength of adhesion significantly, in this case.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by a research contract from the Office of Naval Research (ONR N00014-76-C-0408) and by a research grant-in-aid from Johnson and Johnson Products, Inc. Samples of polyisobutylene and butyl rubber, and helpful advice on their use, were kindly supplied by Dr. M.J. Doyle, Dr. I. Gardner and Dr. G. Ver Strate of Exxon Chemical Company and by Dr. J.R. Dunn of Polysar Ltd., Canada.

References

1. S.S. Voyutskii "Autohesion and Adhesion of High Polymers", Interscience, New York, 1963.
2. S.S. Voyutskii and V.L. Vakula, Rubber Chem. Technol. 37, 1153 (1964).
3. W.G. Forbes and L.A. McLeod, Trans. Instn. Rubber Industr. 34, 154 (1958).
4. J.D. Skewis, Rubber Chem. Technol. 39, 217 (1966).
5. K. Jud, H.H. Kausch and J.G. Williams, J. Materials Sci. 16, 204 (1981).
6. S. Prager and M. Tirrell, J. Chem. Phys. 75, 5194 (1981).
7. G.R. Hamed, Rubber Chem. Technol. 54, 403 (1981).
8. L. Bothe and G. Rehage, Rubber Chem. Technol. 55, 1308 (1982).
9. R.P. Wool and K.M. O'Connor, J. Appl. Phys. 52, 5953 (1981).
10. G.R. Hamed and C.-H. Shieh, Rubber Chem. Technol. 55, 1469 (1982).
11. J.N. Anand and H.J. Karam, J. Adhesion 1, 16 (1969).
12. R.E. Robertson, J. Adhesion 7, 121 (1975).
13. K.L. Johnson, K. Kendall and A.D. Roberts, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London), A324, 301 (1971).
14. A.D. Roberts, Rubber Chem. Technol. 52, 23 (1979).
15. O. Kramer, R. Greco, R.A. Neira and J.D. Ferry, J. Polym. Sci. Polym. Phys. Ed. 12, 2361 (1974).
16. O. Kramer, R. Greco, J.D. Ferry and E.T. McDonel, J. Polym. Sci. Polym. Phys. Ed. 13, 1675 (1975).

17. A.D. McLaren and C.J. Seiler, J. Polym. Sci. 4, 63 (1949).
18. W.M. Bright in "Adhesion and Adhesives", ed. by J. Clark, J.E. Rutzler and R.L. Savage, Wiley, New York, 1954.
19. D.H. Kaelble, J. Coll. Sci. 19, 413 (1964).
20. A.N. Gent, and R.P. Petrich, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A310, 433 (1969).
21. E.H. Andrews and A.J. Kinloch, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A332, 401 (1973).
22. A. Ahagon and A.N. Gent, J. Polym. Sci. Polym. Phys. Ed. 13, 1285 (1975).
23. D.W. Aubrey and M. Sherriff, J. Polym.Sci. Polym. Chem. Ed. 18, 2597 (1980).
24. T.L. Smith, J. Polym.Sci. 32, 99 (1958).
25. L. Mullins, Trans. Instn. Rubber Industr. 35, 213 (1959).
26. J.D. Ferry, "Viscoelastic Properties of Polymers", 3rd. Ed., Wiley, New York, 1980.
27. A.N. Gent and R.H. Tobias, J. Polym. Sci. Polym. Phys. Ed., in press.
28. F. Bueche, "Physical Properties of Polymers", Interscience, New York, 1962.

Figure Legends

- Figure 1. Methods of measurement (a) Self-adhesion
(b) Adhesion to Mylar
(c) Fracture energy
- Figure 2. Effect of peel rate R and test temperature T upon the adhesion to Mylar of a sample containing 17% L100.
- Figure 3. Data from Figure 2 plotted against the effective peel rate Ra_T at a temperature of 25°C . Values of a_T were calculated for each test temperature from equation 2.
- Figure 4. Work G_a of detachment from Mylar of a butyl rubber compound containing 50 per cent L100, plotted against the effective peel rate Ra_T at 25°C . The broken curve denotes the response of compounds containing 0 and 17 per cent L100.
- Figure 5. Work G_a of separation of a sample containing no polyisobutylene from itself (full curve) and from Mylar (broken curve) ~~taken from Figure 4~~, plotted against the effective peel rate Ra_T at 25°C .
- Figure 6. Work G_a of separation for self-adhering strips of a sample containing 17 per cent L100, plotted against the effective peel rate Ra_T at 25°C . The broken curve represents the self-adhesion of a sample containing no polyisobutylene, taken from Figure 5, and the lower curve represents the adhesion to Mylar, taken from Figure 3.

Figure 7. Work G_a of separation for self-adhering strips of samples containing various amounts of L100 and L140. Peel rate: 400 $\mu\text{m/s}$. Test temperature: 25°C.

Figure 8. Work G_a of separation from Mylar of samples containing 17 per cent and 50 per cent of L5 (LM-MH), plotted against the effective peel rate Ra_T at 25°C. The broken curves represent the work of separation for self-adhering strips of the same materials.

Figure 9. Work G_a of separation for a butyl rubber compound containing 17 per cent of L100 adhering to a butyl rubber compound containing no polyisobutylene, plotted against the effective peel rate Ra_T at 25°C. The broken curves represent the self-adhesion of the material containing 17 per cent L100.

Figure 10. Work G_c of fracture for polyisobutylene L100 plotted against the effective rate Ra_T of tear propagation at 25°C. The broken curves represent the self-adhesion of a butyl rubber compound containing 17 per cent L100 (taken from Figure 6).


Figure 11. Work G_c of fracture at 25°C for a butyl rubber compound containing 17 per cent of linear polyisobutylene L100. The broken curves represent the work of fracture for the L100 polymer alone, taken from Figure 10.

Figure 12. Tensile creep compliance $D(t)$ plotted against time t under load for butyl rubber compounds containing 50 per cent of L5 polyisobutylene, 50 per cent of L100 polyisobutylene, and no polyisobutylene.


Figure 13. Tensile creep compliance $D(t)$ plotted against the effective time $t a_M$ under load at 25°C. Butyl rubber with L5 polyisobutylene (50/50), $\square$, $a_M = 1 \times 10^5$; butyl rubber with L100 polyisobutylene (50/50), $\Delta, \blacktriangle$, $a_M = 1$.

Figure 14. Work G_a of separation plotted against time of contact for a butyl rubber compound containing 50 per cent of L100 polyisobutylene. Peel rate: 400 $\mu\text{m/s}$.

(c)



(b)



(a)




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6




Figure 7




Figure 8




Figure 9




Figure 10




Figure 11




Figure 12




Figure 13




Figure 14

DISTRIBUTION LIST

	<u>No. Copies</u>		<u>No. Copies</u>
Dr. L.V. Schmidt Assistant Secretary of the Navy (R,E, and S) Room 5E 731 Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20350	1	Dr. F. Roberto Code AFRPL MKPA Edwards AFB, CA 93523	1
Dr. A.L. Slafkosky Scientific Advisor Commandant of the Marine Corps Code RD-1 Washington, D.C. 20380	1	Dr. L.H. Caveny Air Force Office of Scientific Research Directorate of Aerospace Sciences Bolling Air Force Base Washington, D.C. 20332	1
Dr. Richard S. Miller Office of Naval Research Code 413 Arlington, VA 22217	10	Mr. Donald L. Ball Air Force Office of Scientific Research Directorate of Chemical Sciences Bolling Air Force Base Washington, D.C. 20332	1
Mr. David Siegel Office of Naval Research Code 250 Arlington, VA 22217	1	Dr. John S. Wilkes, Jr. FJSRL/NC USAF Academy, CO 80840	1
Dr. R.J. Marcus Office of Naval Research Western Office 1030 East Green Street Pasadena, CA 91106	1	Dr. R.L. Lou Aerojet Strategic Propulsion Co. P.O. Box 15699C Sacramento, CA 95813	1
Dr. Larry Peebles Office of Naval Research East Central Regional Office 666 Summer Street, Bldg. 114-D Boston, MA 02210	1	Dr. V.J. Keenan Anal-Syn Lab Inc. P.O. Box 547 Paoli, PA 19301	1
Dr. Phillip A. Miller Office of Naval Research San Francisco Area Office One Hallidie Plaza, Suite 601 San Francisco, CA 94102	1	Dr. Philip Howe Army Ballistic Research Labs ARRADCOM Code DRDAR-BLT Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	1
Mr. Otto K. Heiney AFATL - DLJL Elgin AFB, FL 32542	1	Mr. L.A. Watermeier Army Ballistic Research Labs ARRADCOM Code DRDAR-BLI Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	1
Mr. R. Geisler ATTN: MKP/MS24 AFRPL Edwards AFB, CA 93523	1	Dr. W.W. Wharton Attn: DRSIII-RKL Commander U.S. Army Missile Command Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898	1

DISTRIBUTION LIST

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

DISTRIBUTION LIST

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

DISTRIBUTION LIST

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

DISTRIBUTION LIST

	<u>No. Copies</u>		<u>No. Copies</u>
Dr. J.F. Kincaid Strategic Systems Project Office Department of the Navy Room 901 Washington, D.C. 20376	1	Dr. C.W. Vriesen Thickol Elkton Division P.O. Box 241 Elkton, MD 21921	1
Strategic Systems Project Office Propulsion Unit Code SP2701 Department of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20376	1	Dr. J.C. Hinshaw Thickol Wasatch Division P.O. Box 524 Brigham City, Utah 84302	1
Mr. E.L. Throckmorton Strategic Systems Project Office Department of the Navy Room 1043 Washington, D.C. 20376	1	U.S. Army Research Office Chemical & Biological Sciences Division P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park NC 27709	1
Dr. D.A. Flanigan Thickol Huntsville Division Huntsville, Alabama 35807	1	Dr. R.F. Walker USA ARRADCOM ORDAR-LCE Dover, NC 27801	1
Mr. G.F. Mangum Thickol Corporation Huntsville Division Huntsville, Alabama 35807	1	Dr. T. Sinden Munitions Directorate Propellants and Explosives Defence Equipment Staff British Embassy 3100 Massachusetts Ave. Washington, D.C. 20008	1
Mr. E.S. Sutton Thickol Corporation Elkton Division P.O. Box 241 Elkton, MD 21921	1	LTC B. Loving AFROL/LK Edwards AFB, CA 93523	1
Dr. G. Thompson Thickol Wasatch Division MS 240 P.O. Box 524 Brigham City, UT 84302	1	Professor Alan N. Gent Institute of Polymer Science University of Akron Akron, OH 44325	1
Dr. T.F. Davidson Technical Director Thickol Corporation Government Systems Group P.O. Box 9269 Cannon, Utah 84409	1	Mr. J. M. Frankle Army Ballistic Research Labs ARRADCOM Code ORDAR-BLI Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	1

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. Copies</u>		<u>No. Copies</u>	
1	Dr. Ingo W. May Army Ballistic Research Labs ARRADCOM Code DRDAR-BLI Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	1	Dr. J. P. Marshall Dept. 52-35, Bldg. 204/2 Lockheed Missile & Space Co. 3251 Hanover Street Palo Alto, CA 94304
1	Professor N.W. Tschoegl California Institute of Tech Dept. of Chemical Engineering Pasadena, CA 91125	1	Ms. Joan L. Janney Los Alamos National Lab Mail Stop 920 Los Alamos, NM 87545
1	Professor M.D. Nicol University of California Dept. of Chemistry 405 Hilgard Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90024	1	Dr. J. M. Walsh Los Alamos Scientific Lab Los Alamos, NM 87545
1	Professor A. G. Evans University of California Berkeley, CA 94720	1	Professor R. W. Armstrong Univ. of Maryland Department of Mechanical Eng. College Park, MD 20742
1	Professor T. Litovitz Catholic Univ. of America Physics Department 520 Michigan Ave., N.E. Washington, D.C. 20017	1	Prof. Richard A. Reinhardt Naval Postgraduate School Physics & Chemistry Dept. Monterey, CA 93940
1	Professor W. G. Knauss Graduate Aeronautical Lab California Institute of Tech. Pasadena, CA 91125	1	Dr. R. Bernecker Naval Surface Weapons Center Code R13 White Oak, Silver Spring, MD 20910
1	Professor Edward Price Georgia Institute of Tech. School of Aerospace Engin. Atlanta, Georgia 30332	1	Dr. M. J. Kamlet Naval Surface Weapons Center Code R11 White Oak, Silver Spring, MD 20910
1	Dr. Kenneth O. Hartman Hercules Aerospace Division Hercules Incorporated P.O. Box 210 Cumberland, MD 21502	1	Professor J. D. Achenbach Northwestern University Dept. of Civil Engineering Evanston, IL 60201
1	Dr. Thor L. Smith IBM Research Lab 042.282 San Jose, CA 95133	1	Dr. N. L. Sasdekis Office of Naval Research Mechanics Program, Code 432 Arlington, VA 22217
		1	Professor Kenneth Kuo Pennsylvania State Univ. Dept. of Mechanical Engineering University Park, PA 16802

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. Copies</u>	<u>No. Copies</u>
Dr. S. Sheffield Sandia Laboratories Division 2513 P.O. Box 5800 Albuquerque, NM 87185	1 ONR Resident Representative 1 Ohio State University Res. Ctr. 1314 Kinnear Road Columbus, OH 43212
Dr. M. Farber Space Sciences, Inc. 135 Maple Avenue Monrovia, CA 91016	1
Dr. Y. M. Gupta SRI International 333 Ravenswood Avenue Menlo Park, CA 94025	1
Mr. M. Hill SRI International 333 Ravenswood Avenue Menlo Park, CA 94025	1
Professor Richard A. Schapery Texas A&M Univ. Dept of Civil Engineering College Station, TX 77843	1
Dr. Stephen Swanson Univ. of Utah Dept. of Mech. & Industrial Engineering MEB 3008 Salt Lake City, UT 84112	1
Mr. J. D. Byrd Thiokol Corp. Huntsville Huntsville Div. Huntsville, AL 35807	1
Professor G. D. Duvall Washington State University Dept. of Physics Pullman, WA 99163	1
Prof. T. Dickinson Washington State University Dept. of Physics Pullman, WA 99163	1

END

FILMED

10-84

DTIC