

AD-A192 050


ADHESION BETWEEN POLYSTYRENE AND POLYMETHACRYLATE  
(U) AKRON UNIV OH INST OF POLYMER SCIENCE K CHO ET AL.  
MAR 88 TR-13 N00014-85-K-0222


1/1

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 11/9

NL





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART  
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS 1963 A

4

AD-A192 050

DTIC FILE COPY

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Contract: N00014-85-K-0222

Work Unit: 4327-555

Scientific Officer: Dr. Richard S. Miller

Technical Report No. 13

ADHESION BETWEEN POLYSTYRENE AND POLYMETHYLMETHACRYLATE

by

K. Cho and A. N. Gent

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

DTIC  
ELECTE  
MAR 10 1988  
S H D

March, 1988

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for  
any purpose of the United States Government

Approved for public release; distribution unrestricted

88 3 5 082

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A  
Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

AD-A190050

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Technical Report No. 13	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Adhesion between Polystyrene and Polymethylmethacrylate		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) K. Cho and A. N. Gent		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-85-K-0222
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 4327-555
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Office of Naval Research Power Program Arlington, VA 22217-5000		12. REPORT DATE March 1988
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 29
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		18. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		18a. 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 for publication in: The Journal of Adhesion		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Adhesion, Fracture, Polymer Interfaces, Polymethylmethacrylate, Polystyrene		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Measurements have been made of the energy required to break through unit area of polystyrene (PS), polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA), and joints prepared by molding the two polymers in contact. The results were: 1.23 ± 0.5 kJ/m <sup>2</sup> (PS), 0.46 ± 0.10 kJ/m <sup>2</sup> (PMMA), and 0.22 ± 0.04 kJ/m <sup>2</sup> for		

<sup>> THE ↓</sup>  
 the bonded joint. Thus, the interface was significantly weaker than either adherend, but surprisingly strong for two incompatible materials. Microscopy and selective dyeing revealed that fracture took place at the interface itself, with no appreciable transfer of material from one side to the other. It is concluded that van der Waals interactions are sufficient to create relatively strong bonds. (K. J. ... 7

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



## 1. Introduction

Various test methods have been used to measure the fracture energy  $G$  of relatively stiff materials, and of adhesive joints between them. A simple torsion test, proposed by Outwater and Gerry (1), has been widely employed because of its many advantages (2-4). It utilizes simple flat rectangular specimens, and the failure force remains constant, at least in principle, while the crack is driven forward over long distances, so that an average value of the strength is readily obtained. Moreover, the fracture energy is given directly in terms of the specimen stiffness and dimensions and the measured failure force, so that no other measurements are necessary.

A new way of imposing the torsional couple  $M$  by means of a pulley arrangement has recently been proposed (5). It allows the Outwater torsion test to be carried out with specimens having a wider range of flexibility. Some experimental measurements were reported of the fracture energy of molded polystyrene bars, to demonstrate the utility of the proposed modification (5). At the same time, possible ways of measuring the fracture energy of adhesive bonds were proposed. We now wish to describe measurements of the strength of adhesion between two glassy plastics, polymethylmethacrylate and polystyrene, carried out with the new method.

Although these two polymers are unlikely to interdiffuse, the fracture energy required to separate them was found to be relatively high, as described below, comparable to the inherent strength of the two adherends. Studies of the fracture surfaces

have therefore been carried out, to establish whether or not a significant degree of interpenetration of the polymers took place.

## 2. Experimental details

### Sample preparation

Commercial grade polymers were used in the experiments: polystyrene (PS), denoted Styron 685 (Dow Chemical Company) and polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA), denoted Plexiglas (Rohm and Haas Company). Before molding, the PMMA pellets were dried under vacuum for 5 h at 50°C.

Sheets of PS and PMMA were prepared by compression molding at 140°C for about 30 min. They were machined as rectangular plates of various dimensions with a V-shaped groove along the center line of the lower surface. An initial saw cut was made at one end, Figure 1a, and the tip of the cut was sharpened by pressing a razor blade into the material at this point.

For preparing adhesion specimens, molded sheets of each polymer were machined as rectangular plates, 150 mm long and 30 mm wide. They were washed with methanol and rinsed with distilled water. They were then dried under vacuum at 50°C for 5 h and kept in covered dishes to protect them from contamination.

Sheets of PS and PMMA were bonded together along their edges in a mold, as shown in Figure 2, for 1½ h at 150°C. The pressure was then removed and the samples allowed to cool to room temperature. Testpieces were again prepared as

rectangular plates, 130 mm long and 40 mm wide by machining these molded sheets. Also, as before, a initial saw cut was made at one end and the tip of the cut was sharpened by pressing a razor blade into the material. An adhesion specimen is shown schematically in Figure 1b.

#### Measurement of fracture energy

The modified Outwater torsion test (5) was used to measure the fracture energy  $G_c$  for testpieces of PS and PMMA and to measure the separation energy  $G_a$  for PS-PMMA adhesive joints. All tests were carried out at room temperature, using an Instron test machine to apply the torsional couple  $M$  with a pulley arrangement as described previously.

#### Examination of fracture surfaces

Fracture surfaces were examined by two techniques. Direct observation was carried out using either an optical microscope or a scanning electron microscope. In the latter case, parts of the surfaces were removed from the specimen by careful sawing, and thin protective coatings of gold were deposited onto them to prevent surface charging.

A dye treatment was also employed to study the fracture surfaces of PS-PMMA adhesive joints, in order to check the failure mode; i.e., whether interfacial failure or cohesive failure had occurred. A dye solution was prepared by dissolving 0.05 per cent of a commercial dye (Oil Red 4B, Pfaltz and Bauer Company) in cyclohexane and filtering it to yield a clear red solution. Using a microsyringe, a droplet of dye solution was

applied to the fractured surfaces in covered dishes, and allowed to penetrate and dry. After dyeing, the samples were stirred in isooctane for 5 min at room temperature and the dyed surfaces were then wiped dry with a cotton applicator to remove unabsorbed dye. The samples were then washed with water and air-dried and the dyed surfaces were examined with an optical microscope.

### 3. Experimental results and discussion

#### Fracture energies for PS and PMMA

Experiments were carried out on molded plates of the two polymers to obtain the fracture energies  $G_c$ . In each case, when the initial saw cut tip was sharpened by pressing a razor blade into it, the crack was found to grow in a stable and continuous manner at a well - defined critical value of the applied torque, denoted  $M_c$ . On the other hand, when the initial crack tip was not sharpened in this way it developed catastrophically at a relatively high applied torque. It was also found advantageous to make the initial crack length  $c_o$  comparable to or greater than the width  $w/2$  of the testpiece arms.

Values of  $G_c$  were calculated from the critical values of applied torque at which the crack propagated using the relation (5)

$$G_c = M_c^2 / 2kT' \quad (1)$$

where  $k$  denotes the torsional stiffness of the specimen for a crack length  $c$  of unity and  $T'$  is the thickness actually broken through (Figure 1). Results for  $G_c$  are given in Table 1. As can be seen they were largely independent of the specimen dimensions. For PS they yielded an average value of  $1.23 \pm 0.5 \text{ kJ/m}^2$ , in good agreement with published results, ranging from 0.5 to  $3.0 \text{ kJ/m}^2$  (6-8). For PMMA the average value was  $0.46 \pm 0.10 \text{ kJ/m}^2$ , also in good agreement with previously - reported values, which range from 0.14 to  $1.0 \text{ kJ/m}^2$  (7-9).

### Fracture energy for the PS -PMMA adhesive joint

Smooth and straight interfaces were obtained by molding plates of PS against plates of PMMA as described. Values of the work of separation  $G_a$  were determined in the same way as for homogeneous plates; the results are given in Table 2.

The mean value was  $0.22 \pm 0.04$  kJ/m<sup>2</sup>, considerably smaller than that obtained for the fracture energy of either PS or PMMA. It is about one-half of the value of  $G_c$  for PMMA and about one-fifth of that for PS. Thus, failure is probably not cohesive within either of the contacting layers but probably takes place at the weaker interfacial plane. Attempts to verify this conclusion were made by examining the fracture surfaces microscopically, as described below.

### Microscopy of the fracture surfaces

Broken surfaces of PS appeared to be quite rough in comparison to those of PMMA. Typical low-magnification photographs are shown in Figure 3. Characteristic craze bands are clearly evident in the PMMA surface, which resembles that reported by Berry (10), but the PS surface shows only a rough irregular fracture plane. However, photographs at higher magnification, shown in Figure 4, revealed that the PS surface consisted of relatively smooth areas, several hundred  $\mu$ m in size, separated by pronounced steps or surface cracks.

High-magnification views of the surfaces obtained by breaking the interface between the two polymers are shown in Figure 5. The

PS and the PMMA side of the interface look identical, and they both show small-scale roughness that is not at all characteristic of a fracture surface of PS (Figure 4a) but more resembles the crazed portions of a PMMA surface (Figure 4b). In fact, R.E. Robertson has shown that failure of a PS/PMMA bond is accompanied by severe crazing on the PMMA side of the joint (11). It is thought that failure takes place at the true interface between the two polymers in the present experiments, even though the fracture surface is different in character from that obtained by cohesive rupture of either polymer and more resembles that of PMMA. Evidence in support of this conclusion was obtained from dye studies, reported below.

#### Dye studies of separated surfaces

In order to determine whether fracture occurred within either polymer or at the interface between them, a sensitive method was required to detect small amounts of one polymer on the surface of the other. For this purpose a dye treatment was used. A suitable red dye was employed, Oil Red 4B, dissolved in cyclohexane, a good solvent for PS but not for PMMA. Thus, the dye was found to stain only PS and not PMMA. After a brief dye treatment the surfaces were washed with a non-solvent for both polymers, isooctane, to remove unabsorbed dye. A PS surface could then be easily distinguished from a PMMS surface by the red color it acquired.

A dye-treated surface of the PMMA side of a fractured interface is shown in Figure 6. Small red regions, appearing dark in the photograph, show that some PS has been torn away from the bulk and transferred to the PMMA side. However, the surface area occupied by PS is extremely small, only one or two percent of the total, so that the surface is substantially all PMMA. When the other fracture surface was examined in the same way, it was found to stain uniformly red, indicating that it consisted solely of PS. Thus, fracture appeared to have separated the two polymers rather cleanly.

However, it is possible that a thin layer of PMMA, too thin to be detected by the dye technique, had been transferred to the PS side of the interface. In order to check whether any PMMA was present on the PS surface, test specimens were prepared by coating a pure PS surface with a dilute solution of PMMA in methyl methacrylate and drying them to give an extremely thin PMMA surface coating. On treating these specimens with dye solution, they were found not to show any red color, indicating that even a thin layer of PMMA will prevent PS from absorbing the dye under the experimental conditions used here. Thus it seems certain that fracture separated the two adhering polymers cleanly, at least on a scale of  $0.1 \mu\text{m}$  or so, because only one of the surfaces could be dyed. This observation is consistent with the lower fracture energy found for separation in comparison with the fracture energies for cohesive rupture of the two polymers themselves (Tables 1 and 2).

#### 4. Conclusions

The following conclusions are obtained.

(i) Fracture energies  $G_c$  for PS and PMMA plates are  $1.23 \pm 0.5$   $\text{kJ/m}^2$  and  $0.46 \pm 0.09$   $\text{kJ/m}^2$ , respectively, in good agreement with previously-reported values.

(ii) When PS and PMMA are molded in contact they adhere together quite strongly, the fracture energy for the joint being  $0.22 \pm 0.04$   $\text{kJ/m}^2$

(iii) Nevertheless, failure appears to take place at the interface between the two polymers, and not to any significant degree away from the interface.

(iv) It is concluded that van der Waals interactions, without any direct chemical bonding or molecular interdiffusion, are sufficient to provide relatively strong adhesive joints (11).

#### Acknowledgements

This work forms part of a program of research into the mechanics of adhesion supported by the Office of Naval Research (Contract N00014-85-K-0222) and by grants-in-aid from Lord Corporation and Westvaco.

### References

1. J.O. Outwater and D.J. Gerry, *J. Adhesion* 1, 290-298 (1969).
2. J.A. Kies and A.B.J. Clark, Paper 42 in "Fracture 1969; Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Fracture, Brighton, 1969," ed. by P.L. Pratt, Chapman and Hall Ltd., London, 1969, pp. 483-491.
3. A.G. Evans, *Internatl. J. Fracture* 9, 267-275 (1973).
4. A.C. Moloney, H.H. Kausch and H.R. Stieger, *J. Mater. Sci. Lett.* 3, 776-778 (1984).
5. K. Cho and A.N. Gent, *Internatl. J. Fracture* 28, 239-244 (1985).
6. J.J. Benbow and F.C. Roesler, *Proc. Phys. Soc. (London), Ser. B*, 70, 201-211 (1957).
7. J.P. Berry, *J. Appl. Phys.* 34, 62-68 (1963).
8. A. Van den Boogaart and C.E. Turner, *Plastics Inst. Trans. J. (London)* 31, 109-117 (1963).
9. C. Gurney, in "Proceedings of the Conference on the Physical Basis of Yield & Fracture, Oxford," Institute of Physics and Physical Society, London (1966), p. 3-6.
10. J.P. Berry, *J. Polym. Sci. Part A* 2, 4069-4076 (1964).
11. R.E. Robertson, *J. Adhesion* 4, 1-13 (1972).

Table 1: Measured fracture energies  $G_C$  for PS and PMMA plates.

<u>Testpiece dimensions</u>				<u>Stiffness</u>	<u>Critical torque</u>	<u>Fracture energy</u>
<u>W</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>T'</u>	<u>c<sub>0</sub></u>	<u>kx10<sup>3</sup></u>	<u>M<sub>C</sub></u>	<u>G<sub>C</sub></u>
(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(Nm <sup>2</sup> /rad)	(Nm)	(kJ/m <sup>2</sup> )
<u>PS</u>						
20	1.13	0.52	40	2.0	0.043	0.9
20	2.39	0.94	40	8.5	0.13	1.1
20	3.79	1.90	40	42.1	0.39	1.0
40	1.89	0.67	31	12.1	0.119	0.9
40	2.39	1.15	26	13.4	0.234	1.8
40	3.79	1.62	26	70.0	0.563	1.4
60	1.13	0.37	28	4.1	0.045	0.7
60	1.89	0.54	31	10.9	0.124	1.3
60	3.79	1.76	30	103.0	0.660	1.2
<u>PMMA</u>						
20	2.16	0.84	35	8.4	0.069	0.34
20	3.04	1.48	35	19.0	0.152	0.41
20	3.04	2.02	37	20.8	0.186	0.41
40	2.16	1.02	37	16.4	0.117	0.41
40	3.04	1.56	35	29.4	0.223	0.54
40	4.06	2.13	36	76.4	0.433	0.58

Table 2: Measured fracture energies  $G_a$  for a PS/PMMA joint.

<u>Testpiece dimensions</u>			<u>Stiffness</u>	<u>Critical torque</u>	<u>Fracture energy</u>
<u>W</u>	<u>T'</u>	<u>c<sub>0</sub></u>	<u>kx10<sup>3</sup></u>	<u>M<sub>C</sub></u>	<u>G<sub>a</sub></u>
(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(Nm <sup>2</sup> /rad)	(Nm)	(kJ/m <sup>2</sup> )
30	2.24	33	16.4	0.132	0.24
30	2.80	32	23.9	0.186	0.26
30	2.83	32	23.7	0.168	0.21
40	2.35	33	22.0	0.147	0.21
40	2.79	32	26.4	0.190	0.25
40	2.79	30	26.3	0.142	0.16

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Test specimens:

(a) PS and PMMA

(b) PS/PMMA joint.

Figure 2. Molding arrangement for PS/PMMA joint.

Figure 3. Fracture surfaces:

(a) PS (b) PMMA.

Figure 4. Fracture surfaces at higher magnification:

(a) PS (b) PMMA.

Figure 5. Fracture surfaces of a PS/PMMA joint:

(a) PS side (b) PMMA side.

Figure 6. Dye-treated fracture surface of a PS/PMMA joint, PMMA side. The dark regions were dyed red in the original view.






Figure 1

## Top View



## Side View




Figure 2




Figure 3a




Figure 3b



Figure 4a



Figure 4b




Figure 5a




Figure 5b



Figure 6

(DYN)

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Dr. R.S. Miller  
Office of Naval Research  
Code 432P  
Arlington, VA 22217  
(10 copies)

Dr. J. Pastine  
Naval Sea Systems Command  
Code 06R  
Washington, DC 20362

Dr. Kenneth D. Hartman  
Hercules Aerospace Division  
Hercules Incorporated  
Alleghany Ballistic Lab  
P.O. Box 210  
Cumberland, MD 20502

Mr. Otto K. Heiney  
AFATL-DLJG  
Elgin AFB, FL 32542

Dr. Merrill K. King  
Atlantic Research Corp.  
5390 Cherokee Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22312

Dr. R.L. Lou  
Aerojet Strategic Propulsion Co.  
Bldg. 05025 - Dept 5400 - MS 167  
P.O. Box 15699C  
Sacramento, CA 95813

Dr. R. Olsen  
Aerojet Strategic Propulsion Co.  
Bldg. 05025 - Dept 5400 - MS 167  
P.O. Box 15699C  
Sacramento, CA 95813

Dr. Randy Peters  
Aerojet Strategic Propulsion Co.  
Bldg. 05025 - Dept 5400 - MS 167  
P.O. Box 15699C  
Sacramento, CA 95813

Dr. D. Mann  
U.S. Army Research Office  
Engineering Division  
Box 12211  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2211

Dr. L.V. Schmidt  
Office of Naval Technology  
Code 07CT  
Arlington, VA 22217

JHU Applied Physics Laboratory  
ATTN: CPIA (Mr. T.W. Christian)  
Johns Hopkins Rd.  
Laurel, MD 20707

Dr. R. McGuire  
Lawrence Livermore Laboratory  
University of California  
Code L-324  
Livermore, CA 94550

P.A. Miller  
736 Leavenworth Street, #6  
San Francisco, CA 94109

Dr. W. Moniz  
Naval Research Lab.  
Code 6120  
Washington, DC 20375

Dr. K.F. Mueller  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
Code R11  
White Oak  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Prof. M. Nicol  
Dept. of Chemistry & Biochemistry  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Mr. L. Roslund  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
Code R10C  
White Oak, Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dr. David C. Sayles  
Ballistic Missile Defense  
Advanced Technology Center  
P.O. Box 1500  
Huntsville, AL 35807

(DYN)

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Mr. R. Geisler  
ATTN: DY/MS-24  
AFRPL  
Edwards AFB, CA 93523

Naval Air Systems Command  
ATTN: Mr. Bertram P. Sobers  
NAVAIR-320G  
Jefferson Plaza 1, RM 472  
Washington, DC 20361

R.B. Steele  
Aerojet Strategic Propulsion Co.  
P.O. Box 15699C  
Sacramento, CA 95813

Mr. M. Stosz  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
Code R10B  
White Oak  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Mr. E.S. Sutton  
Thiokol Corporation  
Elkton Division  
P.O. Box 241  
Elkton, MD 21921

Dr. Grant Thompson  
Morton Thiokol, Inc.  
Wasatch Division  
MS 240 P.O. Box 524  
Brigham City, UT 84302

Dr. R.S. Valentini  
United Technologies Chemical Systems  
P.O. Box 50015  
San Jose, CA 95150-0015

Dr. R.F. Walker  
Chief, Energetic Materials Division  
DRSMC-LCE (D), B-3022  
USA ARDC  
Dover, NJ 07801

Dr. Janet Wall  
Code 012  
Director, Research Administration  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93943

Director  
US Army Ballistic Research Lab.  
ATTN: DRXBR-IBD  
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005

Commander  
US Army Missile Command  
ATTN: DRSMI-RKL  
Walter W. Wharton  
Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898

Dr. Ingo W. May  
Army Ballistic Research Lab.  
ARRADCOM  
Code DRXBR - 1BD  
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005

Dr. E. Zimet  
Office of Naval Technology  
Code 071  
Arlington, VA 22217

Dr. Ronald L. Derr  
Naval Weapons Center  
Code 389  
China Lake, CA 93555

T. Boggs  
Naval Weapons Center  
Code 389  
China Lake, CA 93555

Lee C. Estabrook, P.E.  
Morton Thiokol, Inc.  
P.O. Box 30058  
Shreveport, Louisiana 71130

Dr. J.R. West  
Morton Thiokol, Inc.  
P.O. Box 30058  
Shreveport, Louisiana 71130

Dr. D.D. Dillehay  
Morton Thiokol, Inc.  
Longhorn Division  
Marshall, TX 75670

G.T. Bowman  
Atlantic Research Corp.  
7511 Wellington Road  
Gainesville, VA 22065

(DYN)

DISTRIBUTION LIST

R.E. Shenton  
Atlantic Research Corp.  
7511 Wellington Road  
Gainesville, VA 22065

Mike Barnes  
Atlantic Research Corp.  
7511 Wellington Road  
Gainesville, VA 22065

Dr. Lionel Dickinson  
Naval Explosive Ordnance  
Disposal Tech. Center  
Code D  
Indian Head, MD 20340

Prof. J.T. Dickinson  
Washington State University  
Dept. of Physics 4  
Pullman, WA 99164-2814

M.H. Miles  
Dept. of Physics  
Washington State University  
Pullman, WA 99164-2814

Dr. T.F. Davidson  
Vice President, Technical  
Morton Thiokol, Inc.  
Aerospace Group  
3340 Airport Rd.  
Ogden, UT 84405

Mr. J. Consaga  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
Code R-16  
Indian Head, MD 20640

Naval Sea Systems Command  
ATTN: Mr. Charles M. Christensen  
NAVSEA-62R2  
Crystal Plaza, Bldg. 6, Rm 806  
Washington, DC 20362

Mr. R. Beauregard  
Naval Sea Systems Command  
SEA 64E  
Washington, DC 20362

Brian Wheatley  
Atlantic Research Corp.  
7511 Wellington Road  
Gainesville, VA 22065

Mr. G. Edwards  
Naval Sea Systems Command  
Code 62R32  
Washington, DC 20362

C. Dickinson  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
White Oak, Code R-13  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Prof. John Deutch  
MIT  
Department of Chemistry  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. E.H. deButts  
Hercules Aerospace Co.  
P.O. Box 27408  
Salt Lake City, UT 84127

David A. Flanigan  
Director, Advanced Technology  
Morton Thiokol, Inc.  
Aerospace Group  
3340 Airport Rd.  
Ogden, UT 84405

Dr. L.H. Caveny  
Air Force Office of Scientific  
Research  
Directorate of Aerospace Sciences  
Bolling Air Force Base  
Washington, DC 20332

W.G. Roger  
Code 5253  
Naval Ordnance Station  
Indian Head, MD 20640

Dr. Donald L. Ball  
Air Force Office of Scientific  
Research  
Directorate of Chemical &  
Atmospheric Sciences  
Bolling Air Force Base  
Washington, DC 20332

(DYN)

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Dr. Anthony J. Matuszko  
Air Force Office of Scientific Research  
Directorate of Chemical & Atmospheric  
Sciences  
Bolling Air Force Base  
Washington, DC 20332

Dr. Michael Chaykovsky  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
Code R11  
White Oak  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

J.J. Rocchio  
USA Ballistic Research Lab.  
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066

B. Swanson  
INC-4 MS C-346  
Los Alamos National Laboratory  
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

Dr. James T. Bryant  
Naval Weapons Center  
Code 3205B  
China Lake, CA 93555

Dr. L. Rothstein  
Assistant Director  
Naval Explosives Dev. Engineering Dept.  
Naval Weapons Station  
Yorktown, VA 23691

Dr. M.J. Kamlet  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
Code R11  
White Oak, Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dr. Henry Webster, III  
Manager, Chemical Sciences Branch  
ATTN: Code 5063  
Crane, IN 47522

Dr. A.L. Slafkosky  
Scientific Advisor  
Commandant of the Marine Corps  
Code RD-1  
Washington, DC 20380

Dr. H.G. Adolph  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
Code R11  
White Oak  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

U.S. Army Research Office  
Chemical & Biological Sciences  
Division  
P.O. Box 12211  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

Dr. John S. Wilkes, Jr.  
FJSRL/NC  
USAF Academy, CO 80840

Dr. H. Rosenwasser  
AIR-320R  
Naval Air Systems Command  
Washington, DC 20361

Dr. Joyce J. Kaufman  
The Johns Hopkins University  
Department of Chemistry  
Baltimore, MD 21218

Dr. A. Nielsen  
Naval Weapons Center  
Code 385  
China Lake, CA 93555

(DYN)

DISTRIBUTION LIST

K.D. Pae  
High Pressure Materials Research Lab.  
Rutgers University  
P.O. Box 909  
Piscataway, NJ 08854

Prof. Edward Price  
Georgia Institute of Tech.  
School of Aerospace Engineering  
Atlanta, GA 30332

Dr. John K. Dienes  
T-3, B216  
Los Alamos National Lab.  
P.O. Box 1663  
Los Alamos, NM 87544

J.A. Birkett  
Naval Ordnance Station  
Code 5253K  
Indian Head, MD 20640

A.N. Gent  
Institute Polymer Science  
University of Akron  
Akron, OH 44325

Prof. R.W. Armstrong  
University of Maryland  
Dept. of Mechanical Engineering  
College Park, MD 20742

Dr. D.A. Shockey  
SRI International  
333 Ravenswood Ave.  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Herb Richter  
Code 385  
Naval Weapons Center  
China Lake, CA 93555

Dr. R.B. Kruse  
Morton Thiokol, Inc.  
Huntsville Division  
Huntsville, AL 35807-7501

J.T. Rosenberg  
SRI International  
333 Ravenswood Ave.  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

G. Butcher  
Hercules, Inc.  
P.O. Box 98  
Magna, UT 84044

G.A. Zimmerman  
Aeroject Tactical Systems  
P.O. Box 13400  
Sacramento, CA 95813

W. Waesche  
Atlantic Research Corp.  
7511 Wellington Road  
Gainesville, VA 22065

Prof. Kenneth Kuo  
Pennsylvania State University  
Dept. of Mechanical Engineering  
University Park, PA 16802

Dr. R. Bernecker  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
Code R13  
White Oak  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

T.L. Boggs  
Naval Weapons Center  
Code 3891  
China Lake, CA 93555

(DYN)

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Dr. C.S. Coffey  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
Code R13  
White Oak  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

D. Curran  
SRI International  
333 Ravenswood Avenue  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

E.L. Throckmorton  
Code SP-2731  
Strategic Systems Program Office  
Crystal Mall #3, RM 1048  
Washington, DC 23076

R.G. Rosemeier  
Brimrose Corporation  
7720 Belair Road  
Baltimore, MD 20742

C. Gotzmer  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
Code R-11  
White Oak  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

G.A. Lo  
3251 Hanover Street  
B204 Lockheed Palo Alto Research Lab  
Palo Alto, CA 94304

R.A. Schapery  
Civil Engineering Department  
Texas A&M University  
College Station, TX 77843

Dr. Y. Gupta  
Washington State University  
Department of Physics  
Pullman, WA 99163

J.M. Culver  
Strategic Systems Projects Office  
SSPO/SP-2731  
Crystal Mall #3, RM 1048  
Washington, DC 20376

Prof. G.D. Duvall  
Washington State University  
Department of Physics  
Pullman, WA 99163

Dr. E. Martin  
Naval Weapons Center  
Code 3858  
China Lake, CA 93555

Dr. M. Farber  
135 W. Maple Avenue  
Monnovia, CA 91016

W.L. Elban  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
White Oak, Bldg. 343  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Defense Technical Information Center  
Bldg. 5, Cameron Station  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(12 copies)

Dr. Robert Polvani  
National Bureau of Standards  
Metallurgy Division  
Washington, D.C. 20234

Director  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Attn: Code 2627  
Washington, DC 20375  
(6 copies)

Administrative Contracting  
Officer (see contract for  
address)  
(1 copy)

END

DATE

FILMED

5-88

DTIC