

121

NSWC TR 86-336

AD-A178 206


EFFECT OF PARTICLE SIZE ON THE SHOCK SENSITIVITY OF PURE POROUS HE

BY DONNA PRICE

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT

SEPTEMBER 1986

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.



NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER

Dahlgren, Virginia 22448-5000 • Silver Spring, Maryland 20903-5000

JMC FILE COPY

87 3 11 001

UNCLASSIFIED
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

42-078-206

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				
1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS	
2a SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3 DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.	
2b DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE				
4 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) NSWC TR 86-336			5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
6a NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Naval Surface Weapons Center		6b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) R13	7a NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION	
6c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 10901 New Hampshire Avenue Silver Spring, MD 20903-5000			7b ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	
8a NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Chief of Naval Res. Office of Naval Technology		8b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) ONT-23	9 PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Arlington, VA 22217-5000			10 SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO 62314	PROJECT NO RJ14E31 NS3A
11 TITLE (Include Security Classification) Effect of Particle Size on the Shock Sensitivity of Pure Porous HE				
12 PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Donna Price				
13a TYPE OF REPORT TR		13b TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____		14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) September 1986
15 PAGE COUNT 37				
16 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION				
17 COSATI CODES			18 SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	Explosive Safety, / Pure, Pressed Explosives. Propellant Safety	
19	01			
19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) (U) Literature data show that in the gap tests, coarse porous HE seems more shock sensitive than fine whereas in most wedge tests, the reverse is true. It is proposed that gap tests measure threshold for ignition, and that the reversal occurs because the time to ignition is shorter and the time of buildup of chemical reaction is longer for the coarse than the fine material. In other words, for any pair of fine and coarse HE in any specific experiment, there is a pressure (P_g) at and above which ignition for the fine and coarse is simultaneous. At and above this pressure, the finer material appears more sensitive than the coarse.				
20 DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT ☐ DTIC USERS			21 ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
22a NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Donna Price			22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) 202/394-2485	22c OFFICE SYMBOL R13

DD FORM 1473, 84 MAR

83 APR edition m / be used until exhausted
All other editions are obsolete

0102-LF-014-6602

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

U.S. Government Printing Office: 1988-639-012

UNCLASSIFIED


FOREWORD

The purpose of this study is to explain the apparent reversals of relative shock sensitivity of coarse and fine explosives. The results are of interest in the fields of safety and sensitivity of explosives and propellants. Publication was funded by Project RJ14E31/NS3A.

Approved by:



KURT F. MUELLER, Head
Energetic Materials Division



CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
EARLIER RESULTS AND POSSIBLE EXPLANATION	1
MOST RECENT DATA	9
HNS	9
TATB	9
PROPOSED THEORIES	20
SUMMARY	22
REFERENCES	23

ILLUSTRATIONS

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 LANL SMALL SCALE TEST RESULTS FOR SAMPLES OF PETN OF VARIOUS SPECIFIC SURFACES	2
2 OUTPUT OF TETRYL OF TWO PARTICLE SIZES	3
3 FREE SURFACE VELOCITY VERSUS INPUT PRESSURE FOR HIGH DENSITY TNT	5
4 GENERALIZED CURVE FOR SHOCKED EXPLOSIVES AT A CONSTANT DENSITY . .	6
5 THE FLUX-TIME IGNITION HISTORY FOR HMX. THE EXPERIMENTAL DATA OBTAINED FROM XENON ARC IMAGE EXPERIMENTS	8

ILLUSTRATIONS (Cont.)

6	EFFECT OF MORPHOLOGY ON SENSITIVITY	10
7	EFFECT OF PULSE DURATION ON INITIATION SENSITIVITY	11
8	PARTICLE VELOCITY HISTORIES RECORDED AFTER PROPAGATION THROUGH 3.9 mm OF EXPLOSIVE	12
9	SCHEMATIC DRAWING OF PANTEX ONE-INCH GAP TEST	14
10	GAP TEST DATA	15
11	IMPACT DATA	16
12	SHORT-DURATION SHOCK DATA FOR PURE TATB, SHOWING THE EXTENSION OF DISTANCE TO DETONATION OVER THE SUSTAINED-SHOCK POP PLOTS . .	18
13	PRESENT DATA COMPARED WITH THAT OF SEITZ ON THE SAME EXPLOSIVES	19

TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	RAW DATA FROM THIN FLYER SHOCK INITIATION EXPERIMENTS ON TATB . .	13

INTRODUCTION

There seems to be much confusion and many contradictions in the current literature on the effect of particle size on the shock sensitivity of explosives. This report is the first phase of a study of available literature data in an attempt to eliminate such confusion. It is restricted to pure, pressed explosives.

About forty years ago, shock sensitivity was assessed by gap tests¹. The experiment consisted of a standard donor explosive separated from the test high explosive (HE) by an attenuator material (the gap), the thickness of which was varied until the test explosive detonated in 50% of the trials. That 50% point thickness could be translated into pressure at the end of the gap and pressure entering the explosive (initiating pressure P_i) provided that a test calibration was made and Hugoniot data were available for both gap material and HE.

More recently, with the invention of the wedge test,² it has become fashionable to measure shock sensitivity by the run distance required for a specified initial shock wave to cause detonation of the test HE.

EARLIER RESULTS & POSSIBLE EXPLANATION

In 1961 Campbell et al.³ reported from wedge test data that fine TNT (20 - 50 μm) was more shock sensitive than coarse (200 - 250 μm). But in 1963, Dinegar et al.⁴ reported the gap test data of Figure 1 in which they showed shock sensitivity decreasing with increasing specific surface and therefore decreasing particle size of 0.95 g/cm³ PETN. Moreover, they reported that comparable experiments on PETN at 0.75 g/cm³ and at 1.4 g/cm³ had shown the same trend. Since then, it has been thoroughly documented that gap test shock sensitivity values show the coarser HE to be more sensitive than the finer. (However, the test must be well designed. A very coarse explosive tested in a very small diameter gap test can produce weird results.⁵)

To resolve the contradictions, more detailed information about the effect of shocking the explosive is required. Scott⁶ provided some of this in 1970. He used the design of the NOL small scale gap test to supply various strength shocks to the same acceptor HE. He used the depth of the resultant steel plate dent as a measure of the shock induced reaction. Figure 2 shows




FIGURE 1. LANL SMALL SCALE TEST RESULTS FOR SAMPLES OF PETN OF VARIOUS SPECIFIC SURFACES. (REF. 4)




FIGURE 2. OUTPUT OF TETRYL OF TWO PARTICLE SIZES (40/60 AND 325/PAN).
(ρ = DENSITY IN gm/cc) (REF. 6)

some of his results on fine (through screen 325 and retained in pan) and coarse tetryl (through screen 40 and retained on screen 60); both charges were compacted to 1.50 g/cm^3 . As Figure 2 shows clearly, the stages of ignition and of buildup of reaction are differentiated in this experiment. Ignition is signalled by the first appearance of a dent in the witness plate and the rate of reaction is indicated by the slope of the subsequent curve. Hence, in the case of tetryl, as well as RDX and PETN, Scott found that the coarser particles ignite more easily, i.e., at lower initial shock pressure, than the fine. But, once ignited, the fine particles show more rapid buildup to detonation than the coarse.

In 1976, Howe and his colleagues at BRL⁷ used projectile impact to provide the stimulus, and measured free surface velocity on the opposite side of the HE target; this is approximately twice the particle velocity of the shocked explosive and hence a measure of the degree of induced reaction. Figure 3, free surface velocity u_{fs} as a function of shock pressure, shows the data for fine ($58 \mu\text{m}$) and coarse ($254 \mu\text{m}$) TNT compacted to 1.55 g/cm^3 . It shows the same differentiation between ignition and buildup reported by Scott. Here ignition is the first departure of the data from the straight line response to be expected when an inert solid of the same impedance as the HE is shocked. Again the coarse material ignites at a lower pressure than the fine, but the latter, once ignited, shows much more rapid reaction.

From the above data, a simplified schematic of the degree of reaction as a function of shock pressure is shown in Figure 4. The curves for fine and coarse explosives cross at P_r before detonation is achieved by either charge. At $P < P_r$, the ease of ignition determines the response, and the coarser material appears more sensitive than the fine. At $P > P_r$, ignition will be simultaneous for the coarse and fine; hence, rate of reaction predominates and the fine appears more sensitive than the coarse.

This suggests that gap tests carried out under conditions favoring propagation of steady state detonation and used to measure the lowest pressure leading to detonation in 50% of the trials are a measure of the minimum pressure for ignition. Seeley⁵ concluded this was the case from results he obtained on high porosity charges in 1963. Now there is some stronger evidence.




FIGURE 3. FREE SURFACE VELOCITY VERSUS INPUT PRESSURE FOR HIGH DENSITY TNT. (REF. 7)




FIGURE 4. GENERALIZED CURVE FOR SHOCKED EXPLOSIVES AT A CONSTANT DENSITY

Ignition requires some reaction. Consequently separating ignition from combustion is impossible. In studies of ignition by radiation,⁸ curves are obtained in a log-log time vs energy flux plane as shown in Figure 5. There is a region between the curve for first light and the curve for sustained ignition (go/no-go); hot spots producing light will fade out in that region. Similar detailed study has not been carried out for shock ignition of many HE--probably because the greater practical interest has been in initiating detonation rather than causing ignition. For the present study, therefore, ignition will be defined according to Liddiard and Jacobs⁹; that is also the definition used by Howe et al. for Figure 3 data.

Liddiard⁹ developed a modified gap test with a short, unconfined acceptor on which he measured free surface velocity as a function of shock pressure to determine a threshold of burning. For the four pressed explosives he tested, the threshold for burning was nearly equal to the threshold for initiation of detonation measured in the NOL large scale gap test (LSGT). That test has a longer and a confined acceptor. However, Tasker,¹⁰ who developed a test based on Liddiard's, showed that the threshold pressure for initiating burning was not affected by confinement or by acceptor thickness, whereas the threshold pressure for initiating detonation was affected by both. Tasker considered that the burning threshold was the most important parameter of shock sensitivity because any sufficiently large charge will detonate when shocked even by the low amplitude shock required to initiate burning.

Unfortunately, most of Tasker's data are for cast charges. The one exception is 95/5 TATB/Kel F at $\rho_0 = 1.91 \text{ g/cm}^3$. This is a pressed explosive although not a pure one. It is of interest that the LSGT value for 96/4 TATB/Kel F at 1.89 g/cm^3 is about 70 kbar¹¹ at the end of the 50% point gap or about 85 - 90 kbar entering the explosive. This is about the threshold pressure for burning measured by Tasker. Because of this and the preceeding discussion, it seems likely that the NOL LSGT, and most gap tests, measure a critical pressure for a sustained ignition which can grow into detonation. In other words, in comparing two particle sizes of the same porous HE, the low amplitude gap tests are in pressure ranges below P_r of Figure 4. Obviously P_r will differ for each pair of particle sizes chosen as well as for each HE, each porosity, and each change (including dimensions) of each experimental test design.




FIGURE 5. THE FLUX-TIME IGNITION HISTORY FOR HMX. THE EXPERIMENTAL DATA OBTAINED FROM XENON ARC IMAGE EXPERIMENTS. (REF. 8)

MOST RECENT DATA

It is now customary to speak of long and short duration shock sensitivities. However, different sensitivities to ignition and reaction buildup after ignition seem more likely to be responsible for reversal of sensitivity ratings. Rather than long and short duration shock sensitivities, low and high amplitude shock sensitivities seems more accurate. To be sure, most gap tests of porous HE use low amplitude, long duration shocks, whereas most foil flyer impact tests use high amplitude, short duration shocks. Nevertheless, in the proper pressure range, flyer impact and gap test can give the same relative sensitivity rating. The reversals with pressure range can be demonstrated by examples from the work on HNS and TATB, two explosives for which shock sensitivity has been most extensively studied.

HNS

In 1981, Schwarz¹² studied three batches of HNS: HNS-I ($1.59 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$), HNS-SF ($2.56 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$) and HNS-HF ($10 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$). With an 1.02 mm flyer and 1.60 g/cm^3 charges, he obtained the results shown in Figure 6; the 0.5 probability of detonation initiation ranged from 76 kbar for the coarsest to 62 kbar for the finest. In this range, the fine was more sensitive than the coarse. He also showed (Figure 7) that $p^{2.4}\tau = \text{constant}$ for durations of 0.01 to $0.10 \mu\text{s}$, but only for that short duration range.

Then in 1984, Setchell¹³ published a study of the shock sensitivity of HNS-I ($2.1 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$) and HNS-FP ($8.2 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$), both pressed to 1.60 g/cm^3 . He used both sustained shocks and those of $0.19 \mu\text{s}$ duration. In both cases, he was amazed to find that his measured wave forms showed the coarse HNS-I more shock sensitive than the finer HNS-FP. Figure 8 shows his results for the $0.19 \mu\text{s}$ pulses and his highest pressure of 40 kbar. In this experiment, an order of magnitude difference in the pulse width did not reverse the relative sensitivities.

TATB

In 1981, Honodel et al.¹⁴ reported both flyer impact and gap test investigation of the insensitive HE, TATB. By varying the thickness (and




FIGURE 6. EFFECT OF MORPHOLOGY ON SENSITIVITY. (REF. 12)




FIGURE 7. EFFECT OF PULSE DURATION ON INITIATION SENSITIVITY. (REF. 12)




FIGURE 8. PARTICLE VELOCITY HISTORIES RECORDED AFTER PROPAGATION THROUGH 3.9 mm OF EXPLOSIVE. (REF. 13.)

thereby the velocity and impact pressure) of the 25.4 mm diameter flyers, they determined threshold velocities required to initiate detonation of 25.4 mm dia cylinders of 1.80 g/cm³ TATB; cylinder lengths of 10 - 19 mm gave the same results. This LLNL group used eight different lots of TATB: ultrafine (4.3 and 4.6 m²/g) and coarser samples (0.3 - 0.7 m²/g). Table 1 contains a portion of the raw data obtained. As they show, for the thinnest flyer (0.051 mm) and highest pressure, the fine material is more sensitive than the coarse. It is not until the flyer thickness becomes 0.5 mm that the coarse TATB is relatively more sensitive than the fine.

TABLE 1⁴

RAW DATA FROM THIN FLYER SHOCK INITIATION
EXPERIMENTS ON TATB

Explosive, Density Mg/m ³	Flyer Thickness mm	Threshold Velocity km/s
B-226 1.80 (5.8 μ m)	0.051	5.4 $\pm$ 0.2
	0.127	3.9 $\pm$ 0.2
	0.254	2.9 $\pm$ 0.2
	0.508	2.45 $\pm$ 0.2
	1.27	2.22 $\pm$ 0.08
B-592 1.80 (~9 μ m)	0.051	4.1 $\pm$ 0.2
	0.127	3.2 $\pm$ 0.2
	0.254	2.6 $\pm$ 0.2
	0.508	2.6 $\pm$ 0.2
	1.27	2.6 $\pm$ 0.2

The LLNL group also ran gap tests on the same lots of TATB. For this, they used the Pantex gap test shown in Figure 9. Figure 10 shows the results as 50% gap thickness vs charge density; they show that, according to this test, the coarse TATB is more sensitive than the fine. In other words, the gap test ranks the two with the same relative sensitivity as that found in the lower pressure range by flyer impact e.g., with the 1.27 mm thick flyers.

The flyer impact threshold velocities were used to obtain threshold pressure-time data. These are shown in Figure 11 for one of the coarser samples of TATB at 1.70 g/cm³. The solid lines are fits to the data; the dashed are for constant flyer kinetic energy normalized to the maximum flyer velocity. As the curves show at lower velocities and pressures, "data deviate




FIGURE 9. SCHEMATIC DRAWING OF PANTEX ONE-INCH GAP TEST. (REF. 14)






FIGURE 10. GAP TEST DATA. (REF 14)



a. THIN FLYER THRESHOLD DATA



b. P-7 RELATIONSHIPS FOR TATB

FIGURE 11. IMPACT DATA. (REF. 14)

substantially from the critical energy criterion". In the log-log plot of P vs τ , the deviation for 1.70 g/cm^3 coarse TATB occurs at 60 kbar. For the range 60 - 250 kbar, the relation $P^2\tau = \text{constant}$ is followed.

Honodel et al.¹⁴ suggested an explanation of the sensitivity reversal on the basis of hot spots resulting from void collapse. They argued that void size would be proportional to particle size and that large hot spots survive longer than small, the energy of which dissipates very rapidly. Hence at lower pressures, the coarser material would ignite more easily. However, at much greater pressures, hot spots of all sizes would become hotter and the total number of hot spots would predominate over hot spot size in determining the time of reaction. Hence, in this range the finer HE would appear more sensitive than the coarse.

Seitz,¹⁵ in 1984, carried out wedge tests on three samples of TATB for which he gave the sieve analyses but no specific surface areas. Samples 1 and 2 were relatively coarse; 3, very fine. He used sustained pulses to obtain Pop plots for 1.80 g/cm^3 charges, and also carried out a few experiments with short ($0.02 \mu\text{s}$) pulses. His results are shown in Figure 12. As in previous work,¹⁴ the coarse samples were indistinguishable from each other but differed definitely from the very fine. The Pop plots cross at about 105 kbar, above which the very fine is more sensitive and below which it is less sensitive than the coarser TATBs. The short pulse data (points above the curves) were taken in the range $P > 105 \text{ kbar}$. They do not change the relative sensitivity (fine greater than coarse) in this range although they do require a higher threshold pressure as might be expected. The increase in required pressure is least for the very fine material as might also be expected. Nevertheless, the relative rating is fine more sensitive than coarse for both long and short duration shocks at pressures greater than 105 kbar.

In 1985, Grief et al.,¹⁶ a group from AWRE, reported on studies on TATB wedges supplied by Wackerle and Seitz (LANL). For this study, an electric gun and flyers (plates and cylinders) were used to produce shocks of 110 - 260 kbar for 0.08 - 0.11 μs duration. The TATB used was fine ($4.5 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$) and coarse (0.5 and $0.7 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$), and the wedges were at 92% TMD or $\rho_0 = 1.783 \text{ g/cm}^3$ as compared to 1.801 g/cm^3 in Seitz's work.¹⁵ Figure 13 shows the AWRE results and compares them to those of Seitz. It is of some interest that for




FIGURE 12. SHORT-DURATION SHOCK DATA FOR PURE TATB, SHOWING THE EXTENSION OF DISTANCE TO DETONATION OVER THE SUSTAINED-SHOCK POP PLOTS. (REF. 15)




FIGURE 13. PRESENT DATA COMPARED WITH THAT OF SEITZ ON THE SAME EXPLOSIVES (REF. 16)

TATB, an insensitive HE, at these high pressures the 0.1 μ s pulse is effectively a sustained shock for production TATB. The single 0.02 μ s pulse on the ultrafine seems equivalent to the 0.1 μ s pulse. However, the curve for the ultrafine TATB (0.1 μ s pulse) crosses Seitz's curve for the ultrafine (sustained pulse). Grief et al. attributed this to the fact that their highest pressure, smallest run distance to detonation (x^*) point is much less accurate than the rest of their data, and that the estimate of $x^* \sim 0.4$ mm is in fact an overestimate. That may be true and, if so, would tilt the curve to agree better with that of Seitz. Another possibility is that the TATB used was of a different particle size distribution. But if we assume that the ultrafine TATB supplied by Wackerle and Seitz is the same that Seitz¹⁵ used at about the same time, and also that the designs of the two sets of experiments were such that the same numerical pressures are equivalent, an obvious conclusion can be drawn. The AWRE data show no reversal of sensitivity between fine and coarse TATB because there were no pressures below $P_r = 105$ kbar. Hence, at the pressures $P > P_r$ used, the ultrafine TATB always appears more sensitive than the coarse.

PROPOSED THEORIES

The qualitative explanation of the observed reversals of relative sensitivity with particle size has been mentioned above.¹⁴ It was based on hot spots formed by pore collapse. Hayes¹⁷ also used the concept of hot spots formed by pore collapse to build a numerical model with which he predicted that a fine grained 91.2% TMD HNS will react more rapidly (be more sensitive) than a coarse grained HNS exposed to the same shock. His data from impact of HNS on fused silica showed this relative sensitivity between 21 μ m and 37 μ m particle sized HNS. However, the data of Setchell¹³ showed that this result is not generally true.

Inasmuch as most of the data has been from charges near 90% TMD, it would seem likely that shear processes have contributed to hot spot formation as much as or more than void collapse. The role of shear and viscoelastic work is being investigated by a number of people in the field.¹⁸⁻²¹ Of these investigators, Frey¹⁹ has made the most progress toward developing a numerical model.

In contrast to the Hayes numerical model developed for HNS, Cochran and Tarver²² combined the ignition and growth reactive flow model of shock initiation and detonation with Cochran's statistical treatment of hot spot formation and subsequent reaction. Among the assumptions made is that the initial hot spot size in production (standard grind) TATB is $1\text{ }\mu\text{m}$; in SF TATB, $0.14\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ (see Reference 14 for TATB B-474 sample), and that the maximum volume of hot spots equals the initial void volume. With this model, the computed wave forms matched closely those measured with manganin gages. They also demonstrated quantitatively "the validity of the classical argument that coarse particles ignite more readily than fine ..., but fine particles react faster once ignited". However, for a 75 kbar shock, after $2\text{ }\mu\text{s}$, there seemed to be little indication of different x^* for the two samples, and it was remarked that other works find no difference in x^* values. Reference 9 of Reference 14 identifies the SF TATB as B-474. In Reference 14, TATB B-474 was compared to production TATB B-226, both at 1.80 g/cm^3 . For the 0.051 mm flyer, Honodel et al. found the following threshold velocities for initiating detonation:

B-226	$5.4 \pm 0.2\text{ km/s}$
B-474	5.35 ± 0.2

In other words, in this high pressure region, the particle size effect on shock sensitivity was negligible as it was also on the two coarser TATB samples investigated by Seitz.¹⁵ Incidentally, although B-474 contained many more smaller particles than B-226, its specific surface area ($0.513\text{ m}^2/\text{g}$) was less than that of the production TATB ($0.539\text{ m}^2/\text{g}$). And as in Seitz's work, it is possible that an order of magnitude difference in particle size would be necessary to show a difference in x^* caused by change in particle size. It is possible that the common sensitivity of the coarser samples is caused by a reduction in particle size during compression of the charges such that the average particle size in the compacted charges is the same. A reduction of the original particle size, after pressing to charge density, has been observed and reported by several investigators including Setchell¹³ who found no increase in surface area when he compacted the ultrafine to the same density. In addition, Elban et al.^{23,24} used the Tinius Olsen Machine to compact

compact a bed of #20 sieve cut HMX. They found widespread fracture of particles at a stress as low as 1.1 MPa.

Finally, I pose the possibility that Figure 4 can be further generalized. As used, it shows a difference in required energies for ignition of fine and coarse samples of the same material. But it might also represent a single sample capable of undergoing two different reactions requiring different activation energies.

SUMMARY

Ignition can be distinguished from the subsequent rate of buildup of reaction in shocked porous HE. When tested at relatively low pressures and long durations as in gap tests or by the impact of thick flyer plates, coarse porous HE appears more shock sensitive than fine. However, when tested at relatively high pressures (sustained or short duration) fine HE seems more shock sensitive than coarse. Most wedge tests have been carried out in the high pressure regime and there they consistently show the fine HE more shock sensitive than the coarse. A reversal of the relative rating is seen only when a large range of pressure down to and including very low amplitudes is used. The reversal found for TNT, HNS, and TATB is probably a general phenomenon. It can be explained in terms of time to ignition and rate of subsequent buildup of reaction to detonation.

REFERENCES

1. Eyster, E. H., Smith, L. C., and Walton, S. R., The Sensitivity of High Explosives to Pure Shocks, NOLM 10,336, July 1949.
2. Majowicz, J. M., and Jacobs, S. J., Initiation to Detonation of High Explosives by Shocks, NavOrd 5710, Mar 1958.
3. Campbell, A. W., Davis, W. C., Ramsay, J. B., and Travis, J. R., "Shock Initiation of Solid Explosives", Phys Fluids Vol. 4, No. 4, 1961, p. 511.
4. Dinegar, R. H., Rochester, R. H., and Mullican, M. S., "The Effect of Specific Surface on the Shock Sensitivity of Pressed Granular PETN", Explosivstoffe No. 9/1963, p. 1.
5. Seely, L. B., "A Proposed Mechanism for Shock Initiation of Low-Density Granular Explosives", Fourth Electric Initiator Symposium, 1963, Rept. EIS-A2357, Franklin Institute, Phila., PA., Paper 27.
6. Scott, C. L., "Effect of Particle Size on Shock Initiation of PETN, RDX, and Tetryl", Fifth Symp. (Int) on Detonation, ONR ACR-184, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Gov. Print Office, 1972) pp. 259-266.
7. Howe, P., Frey, R., Taylor, B., and Boyle, V., "Shock Initiation and the Critical Energy Concept", Sixth Symp. (Int) on Detonation, ONR ACR-221, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Gov. Print. Office, 1978) pp. 11-19.
8. Boggs, T. L., Price, C. F., Atwood, A. I., Zurn, D. E., Parr, T. P., Parr, D. M., and Derr, R. L., "Transient Combustion: A Link in the Deflagration to Detonation Process", Proceedings of 19th JANNAF Combustion Meeting, Oct 1982, Vol. 1, pp. 383-405.
9. Liddiard, T. P., Jr., and Jacobs, S. J., Initiation of Reaction in Explosives by Shocks, NOLTR 64-53, Oct 1965.

REFERENCES (Cont.)

10. Tasker, D. G., "Shock Initiation and Subsequent Growth of the Reaction in Explosives and Propellants: The Low Amplitude Shock Initiation Test, LASI," 7th Symp. (Int) on Detonation, NSWC MP 82-334, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Gov. Print. Office, 1982) pp. 285-298.
11. Liddiard, T. P., and Price, D., "The Expanded Large Scale Gap Test", Propulsion Systems Hazards Meeting, Monterey, CA, 5 Mar 1986.
12. Schwarz, A. C., "Shock Initiation Sensitivity of HNS", Seventh Symp. (Int) on Detonation, NSWC MP 82-334 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Gov. Print. Office, 1982) pp. 1024-1028.
13. Setchell, R., "Grain-Size Effects on Shock Sensitivity of HNS", Combust Flame, 1984, pp. 343-345.
14. Honodel, C. A., Humphrey, J. R., Weingart, R. C., Lee, R. S., and Kramer, P., "Shock Initiation of TATB Formulations", Seventh Symp. (Int) on Detonation, NSWC MP 82-334, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Gov. Print. Office, 1982) pp. 425-434.
15. Seitz, W.L., "Short Duration Shock Initiation of TATB", Proc. Third APS Conference on Shock Waves in Condensed Matter, Elsevier Science Publishers, B.V., 1984, pp. 531-534.
16. Grief, D.; Ward, S. H.; and Coley, G. D.; "Run to Detonation in TATB", Preprints of 8th Symp. (Int) on Detonation 1985, Vol. 1, pp. 13-19.
17. Hayes, D. B., "Shock Induced Hot-Spot Formation and Subsequent Decomposition in Granular, Porous HNS Explosive", Prog. Astro. Aero, Vol. 87, 1983 pp. 445-467.
18. Coffey, C. S., Frankel, M. J., Liddiard, T. P., and Jacobs, S. J., "Experimental Investigation of Hot Spots Produced by High Rate Deformation and Shocks", 7th Symp. (Int) on Detonation, NSWC MP 82-334, 1982, pp. 970-975.

REFERENCES (Cont.)

19. Frey, R. B., "The Initiation of Explosive Charges by Rapid Shear", *ibid*, pp. 36-42.
20. Frey, R. B., "Cavity Collapse in Energetic Materials", 8th Symp. (Int) on Detonation Preprints, 1985, Vol. 1, pp. 385-395.
21. Howe, P. M., Gibbons, G., Jr., Webber, P. E., "An Experimental Investigation of the Role of Shear in Initiation of Detonation by Impact", *ibid*, Vol. 3, pp. 848-855.
22. Cochran, S. G., and Tarver, C. M., "Modeling Particle Size and Initial Temperature Effects on Shock Initiation of TATB-Based Explosives", Third APS Conference on Shock Waves in Condensed Matter, Elsevier Science Pub., B.V., 1984, pp. 393-396.
23. Coyne, Jr., P. J. Elban, W. L., and Chiarito, M. A., "The Strain Rate Behavior of Coarse HMX Porous Bed Compaction" Preprints of 8th Symposium (Int.) on Detonation, Vol. 2, 1985, pp. 700-711.
24. Elban, W. L. and Chiarito, M. A., "Quasi-Static Compaction Study of Coarse HMX Explosive", Powder Technology, Vol. 46, 1986, pp. 181-193.

DISTRIBUTION

Copies

Commander
 Naval Air Systems Command
 Attn: AIR-932H 1
 AIR-932T 1
 AIR-932F (B. Sobers) 1
 Department of the Navy
 Washington, DC 20361

Commander
 Naval Sea Systems Command
 Attn: SEA-99612 2
 SEA-62D2 1
 SEA-62D32 1
 SEA-06G42 1
 Department of the Navy
 Washington, DC 20362

Director
 Strategic Systems Project
 Office (PM-1)
 Attn: SP2731 (J. Culver) 1
 SP273 (E. L. Throckmorton) 1
 Department of the Navy
 Washington, DC 20376

Chief of Naval Research
 ATTN: ONR-1132P (R. Miller) 1
 ONR-741 (Technical Library) 1
 Department of the Navy
 Arlington, VA 22217

Commanding Officer
 Naval Propellant Plant
 Attn: Technical Library 1
 Indian Head, MD 20640

Office of Naval Technology
 ATTN: ONT-21 (E. Zimet) 1
 ONT-213 (D. Siegel) 1
 ONT-23 (A. Faulstich) 1
 ONT-232 (D. Houser) 1
 Department of the Navy
 800 North Quincy Street
 Arlington, VA 22217

Commander
 Naval Weapons Center
 Attn: Technical Library 1
 Code 326B (L. Josephson) 1
 Code 3266 (D. Lind) 1
 Code 326B (G. Greene) 1
 Code 3891 (M. Chan) 1
 Code 3858 (R. Yee) 1
 Code 3264 (H. Gollmar) 1
 Code 385 (R. Atkins) 1
 Code 3265 (J. Paknlak) 1
 Code 38 (R. Derr) 1
 Code 389 (T. Boggs) 1
 Code 3891 (C. Price) 1
 Code 3891 (K. Graham) 1
 China Lake, CA 93555

Director
 Naval Research Laboratory
 Attn: Technical Information
 Section 2
 Washington, DC 20375

Director
 Defense Advanced Research
 Projects Agency
 Washington, DC 20301 1

Commanding Officer
 Naval Weapons Station
 Attn: R & D Division 1
 Code 50, NEDED 1
 Code 505, NEDED 1
 Yorktown, VA 23691

Air Force Office of Scientific
 Research
 ATTN: L. H. Caveny 1
 Bolling Air Force Base
 Washington, DC 20332

DISTRIBUTION (Cont.)

CopiesCopies

Department of the Air Force
AFRPL/DY, Stop 24
Attn: C. Merrill
Edwards AFB, CA 93523

1

Georgia Inst. of Tech.
ATTN: Prof. E. Price
School of Aerospace Eng.
Atlanta, GA 91125

1

Commanding Officer
Naval Weapons Evaluation Facility
Attn: Code AT-7
Kirtland Air Force Base
Albuquerque, NM 87117

1

Superintendent
Naval Academy
Attn: Library
Annapolis, MD 21402

1

Naval Plant Representative Office
Strategic Systems Project Office
Lockheed Missiles and Space Co.
Attn: SPL-332
P. O. Box 504
Sunnyvale, CA 94088

1

AMCRD
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22302

1

Hercules Incorporated
Allegany Ballistics Laboratory
Attn: Library
P. O. Box 210
Cumberland, MD 21502

1

Redstone Scientific Information
Center
U. S. Army Missile Command
Attn: Chief, Documents
Redstone Arsenal, AL 35809

1

Commanding Officer
Army Armament Research and
Development Command
Energetic Materials Division
Attn: DRSMC-LCE (N. Slagg)
DRSMC-LCE (J. Alster)
Dover, NJ 07801

1

1

Commanding Officer
Harry Diamond Laboratories
Attn: Library
DELHD-DE-OM (K. Warner)
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783

1

1

Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Laboratory Command
Attn: AMSLC-TD (R. Vitali)
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783-1145

1

Armament Development & Test
Center
DLOSL/Technical Library
AFATL/MNE (G. Parsons)
AFATL/MNE (T. Floyd)
Eglin Air Force Base, FL 32542

1

1

1

Commanding Officer
Naval Ordnance Station
Louisville, KY 40124

1

U. S. Department of Energy
Attn: DMA
Washington, DC 20545

1

Director
Applied Physics Laboratory
Attn: Library
Johns Hopkins Road
Laurel, MD 20707

1

DISTRIBUTION (Cont.)

	<u>Copies</u>		<u>Copies</u>
Research Director		Director	
Pittsburgh Mining and Safety		Los Alamos National Laboratory	
Research Center		Attn: Library	1
U. S. Bureau of Mines		B. Dobratz	1
4800 Forbes Avenue		P. Studd	1
Pittsburgh, PA 15213	1	L. Stretz	1
		R. L. Rabie	1
Director		J. Ramsay	1
Defense Technical Information		C. Forest	1
Center		A. Bowman	1
Cameron Station		J. McAfee	1
Alexandria, VA 22314	12	P. O. Box 1663	
		Los Alamos, NM 87544	
Goddard Space Flight Center, NASA		Battelle	
Glenn Dale Road		Columbus Laboratories	
Greenbelt, MD 20771	1	ATTN: James H. Adair	1
Lawrence Livermore National		505 King Avenue	
Laboratory		Columbus, OH 43201	
University of California		Chairman	
Attn: Library	1	DOD Explosives Safety Board	
M. Costantino	1	Attn: Dr. T. A. Zaker	1
L. Green	1	2461 Eisenhower Avenue	
E. Lee	1	Alexandria, VA 22331	
P. Urtiew	1	Aerojet Ordnance and Manufacturing	
C. Tarver	1	Company	
K. Scribner	1	9236 East Hall Road	
J. Kury	1	Downey, CA 90241	1
M. Finger	1	Thiokol/Huntsville Division	
P. O. Box 808		Attn: Technical Library	1
Livermore, CA 94550		Huntsville, AL 35807	
Sandia National Laboratories		Zernow Technical Service Center	
Attn: M. Baer		Attn: Dr. L. Zernow	2
P. Stanton	1	425 W. Bonita Ave., Suite 208	
P. O. Box 5800		San Dimas, CA 91773	
Albuquerque, NM 87115			
Library of Congress			
Attn: Gift and Exchange	4		
Division			
Washington, DC 20540			

DISTRIBUTION (Cont.)

	<u>Copies</u>		<u>Copies</u>
SRI International		Director	
Attn: D. Curran	1	Ballistic Research Laboratories	
M. Cowperthwaite	1	Attn: Library	1
333 Ravenswood Avenue		P. Howe	1
Menlo Park, CA 94025		R. Frey	1
		D. Kooker	1
Teledyne McCormick Selph		J. Starckenberg	1
P. O. Box 6		Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	
Hollister, CA 95023	1		
Lockheed Missiles and Space		Paul Gough Associates	
Co., Inc.		1048 South Street	
P. O. Box 504		Portsmouth, NH 03801	1
Sunnyvale, CA 94086	1		
Rohm and Haas		Hercules Incorporated, Bacchus Works	
Huntsville, Defense Contract		Attn: B. Hopkins	1
Office		Library 100-H	1
Attn: H. M. Shuey	1	D. Caldwell	1
723-A Arcadia Circle		K. McCarty	1
Huntsville, AL 35801		A. G. Butcher	1
		P. O. Box 98	
U. S. Army Foreign Service		Magna, UT 84044	
and Technology Center			
220 7th Street, N. E.		Professor H. Krier	
Charlottesville, VA 22901	1	144 MEB, University of IL, at U-C	
		1206 West Green Street	
Princeton Combustion Research		Urbana, IL 61801	1
Laboratories, Inc.			
1041 U. S. Highway One North		Chemical Propulsion Information	
Attn: M. Summerfield	1	Agency	
N. Messina	1	The Johns Hopkins University	
Princeton, NJ 08540		Applied Physics Laboratory	
		Johns Hopkins Road	
Pennsylvania State University		Laurel, MD 20707	1
Dept. of Mechanical Engineering			
Attn: K. Kuo	1	IIT Research Institute	
University Park, PA 16802		Attn: H. S. Napadensky	1
		10 West 35th Street	
		Chicago, IL 60616	
		Brigham Young Univ.	
		Dept. of Chemical Engineering	
		Attn: Dr. M. W. Beckstead	1
		Provo, UT 84601	

DISTRIBUTION (Cont.)

	<u>Copies</u>		<u>Copies</u>
Commanding Officer		R12	1
Naval Underwater Systems Center		R13	1
Attn: LA 151 - Technical		R13 (S. Jacobs)	1
Library	1	R13 (D. Price)	2
Newport, RI 02840		R13 (A. Clairmont)	1
		R13 (H. Sandusky)	10
Superintendent		R13 (C. Coffey)	1
Naval Postgraduate School		R13 (W. Elban)	1
Attn: Library	1	R13 (K. Kim)	1
Monterey, CA 93940		R13 (J. Forbes)	1
		R13 (T. Liddiard)	3
Dr. John Connor, NP1	1	R13 (R. Lemar)	
RARDE/Ft. Halstead		R13 (V. DeVost)	1
Sevenoaks, Kent TN14 7BP		R13 (D. Tasker)	1
England		R14	1
		R15	1
Dr. Conrad Belanger	1	R15 (W. Smith)	1
Defense Research Establishment,		E35 (GIDEP Office)	1
Valcartier			
P. O. Box 8800			
Courcellette, Quebec GOA 1R0			
Canada			
Internal Distribution:			
E231	9		
E232	3		
R04	1		
R10	1		
R101	1		
R10B	1		
R10C	1		
R10D	1		
R10F	2		
R11	1		
R11 (M. Kamlet)	1		
R11 (T. Hall)	1		
R11 (C. Gotzmer)	1		
R11 (R. Gill)	1		
R11 (N. Johnson)	1		
R11 (H. Argentar)	1		
R11 (W. Lawrence)	1		
R11 (R. Doherty)	1		