ECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When	Data Entered)	
REPORT DOCUMENTATI	ON PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
Technical Report BRL-TR-2662		
i. TITLE (and Subtitie)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
MODELING ADIABATIC SHEAR		Final
	3	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s)		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)
Barbara E. Ringers		
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADD	RESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
JS Army Ballistic Research Labor	atory	AREA & WORK DATT NUMBERS
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 210	05-5066	RDTE 1L162618AH80
1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS		12. REPORT DATE
JS Army Ballistic Research Labor	atory	July 1985
ATTN: AMXBR-OD-ST		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 210	05-5066	40
4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If di	fferent from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		UNCLASSIFIED
		15e. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING
		SCHEDULE
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on	tered in Block 20, if different fro	m Report)
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necess. Ferminal Ballistics	ery and identify by block number) EPIC-2	
Lagrangian	Adiabatic Sh	lear
Kinetic Energy		
Simulation		
lugging		
0. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessa	ry and identify by block number)	
This paper discusses the techni- target plugging failure due to of two impacts involving steel Lagrangian dynamic impact code,	uy and identify by block number) ques and criteria de adiabatic shear and rods against titanin EPIC-2, was utilize	eveloped to simulate presents simulations um alloy targets. A ed as the basis for

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

techniques combined with an adiabatic slip criterion controlled target failure. Results indicate that such techniques show considerable promise in modeling this complex phenomenon. LIBRARY RESEARCH REPORTS DIVISION WAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93943



AD



US ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

TECHNICAL REPORT BRL-TR-2662

MODELING ADIABATIC SHEAR

Barbara E. Ringers

July 1985

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

US ARMY BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY. ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND Destroy this report when it is no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service, U. S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia 22161.

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

The use of trade names or manufacturers' names in this report does not constitute indorsement of any commercial product.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIGURE			PAGE
	LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	•	5
I.	INTRODUCTION	•	7
II.	SLIDING SURFACE TECHNIQUES	•	7
III.	APPROACH TO MODELING ADIABATIC SHEAR	•	7
	A. CONSTITUTIVE EQUATIONS	•	7
	B. DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA MANDATING TARGET FAILURE	•	11
IV.	CASE I	•	11
	A. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS	•	11
	B. SIMULATIONS AND COMPARISONS	•	12
۷.	CASE II	•	19
	A. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS	•	19
	B. SIMULATIONS AND COMPARISONS	•	19
VI.	CONCLUSIONS	•	21
VII.	REFERENCES	•	29
	APPENDIX A: CRITERIA FOR TOTAL ELEMENT FAILURE		31
	APPENDIX B: PROCEDURE FOR HANDLING FAILED ELEMENTS	•	33
	DISTRIBUTION LIST		35

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FIGU	RE	PAGE
1.	Splitting Between Elements	8
2.	Impact of Steel Cylinder vs Ti 318 Target at 455 m/s No Splitting Enabled	8
3.	Impact of Steel Cylinder vs Ti 125 Target at 350 m/s No Splitting Enabled	8
4a.	Sketch of Experimental Results - Case I - Woodward	13
4b.	Sketch of Incipient Plugging $V_S < V_L$ - Woodward	13
5.	Deformation History - Case I, 100% Plastic Work Converted to Heat	14
6.	Axisymmetric Blowup of Region of Activity - Case I	
	a. 100% Plastic Work Converted to Heat	15
	b. 85% Plastic Work Converted to Heat	16
7.	Pattern of Elements Enabling Split - Case I	
	a. 100% Plastic Work Converted to Heat	17
	b. 85% Plastic Work Converted to Heat	17
8.	Speed Histories - Case I	18
9.	Depth of Penetration Histories - Case I	18
10.	Section of Ti 318 - Case II	20
11.	Deformation History - Case II	
	100% Plastic Work Converted to Heat	22
12.	Axisymmetric Blowup of Region of Activity - Case II	
	a. 100% Plastic Work Converted to Heat	23
	b. 85% Plastic Work Converted to Heat	24
13.	Pattern of Elements Enabling Split - Case II	
	a. 100% Plastic Work Converted to Heat	25
	b. 85% Plastic Work Converted to Heat	25

List of Illustrations

FIGU	RE	PACE
14.	Speed Histories - Case II	26
15.	Depth of Penetration Histories - Case II	26
16.	Caution - Simulation Results Can Be Misleading If Material Failure Not Accurately Modeled	28

· •

.

I. INTRODUCTION

Plugging due to adiabatic shear is a prevalent mode of target failure in both rolled homogeneous armor targets and high hard armor targets. It is therefore of considerable terminal ballistic interest to be able to accurately model this phenomenon. This paper presents techniques and criteria developed to handle simulations of target plugging failure due to adiabatic shear and compares experiment and simulations for two impacts involving titanium alloy targets.

II. SLIDING SURFACE TECHNIQUES

A Lagrangian, dynamic impact code, EPIC-2,¹ was utilized as the basis for this effort. Major modifications had been developed and implemented by the author to provide the mechanics necessary to handle deep penetration/

perforation of targets.² Splitting between target elements (triangles in EPIC-2) was utilized to simulate shearing failure (Figure 1) and total element failure was enabled to simulate the expected accompanying erosion in both projectile and target. An automatic dynamic relocation of sliding surfaces including the addition of new sliding surfaces, when appropriate, enabled both of these target failure techniques to carry a calculation to completion, i.e., through target perforation, if applicable. The beauty of these sliding surface techniques is that they provide the mechanics by which criteria may be tested for their capabilities in handling specific modes of target failure. These techniques were first successfully applied in conjunction with an equivalent strain criterion to handle the modeling of plugging failure due to high strains.³

III. APPROACH TO MODELING ADIABATIC SHEAR

A. Constitutive Equations

Prior to enabling splitting between elements, the impact of a steel cylinder against a Ti318 (6%Al, 4%V) target at a striking velocity of 455 m/s

1. Johnson, Gordon R., "EPIC-2, A Computer Program for Elastic-Plastic Impact Computations in 2 Dimensions Plus Spin," US Army BRL Contract Report ARBRL-CR-00373, June, 1978. (AD A058 786)

 Ringers, B. E., "New Sliding Surface Techniques Enable Lagrangian Code to Handle Deep Target Penetration/Perforation Problems," <u>Computational Aspects</u> of Penetration Mechanics, Lecture Notes in Engineering, Springer-Verlag, 1983.
 Ringers, B. E., "Simulations of Ballistic Impact Situations Involving Deep Penetration and Perforation of Targets With a Lagrangian Impact Code," Proceedings of the Army Symposium on Solid Mechanics, 1982 - Critical Mechanics Problems in Systems Design, AMMRC MS 82-4, September 1982.







Figure 2. Impact of Steel Cylinder vs Figure 3. Impact of Steel Cylinder vs Ti 318 Target at 455 m/s No Splitting Enabled. Ti 125 Target at 350 m/s No Splitting Enabled.

was simulated (Figure 2). The Ti318 material is known to fail by adiabatic shear. Contrast these results with those for the impact of a similar steel cylinder against a Ti125 (99% pure Ti) target at 350 m/s (Figure 3). Although the first case involved a much higher striking velocity, there is no

sign of an incipient shear band by 10×10^{-6} s whereas in the second case plugging failure is due to high strains and an incipient shear band is demonstrated. Such diverse results, and indeed an attempt with the same simulation techniques, indicated that adiabatic shear can not be successfully modeled utilizing only a linear elastic/plastic stress/strain relationship and an equivalent strain criterion, the combination which was successful in modeling plugging due to high strains for the Til25 target. Ti318 has a considerably lower work hardening rate, a much higher yield strength, and a higher thermal softening rate than Til25 as evidenced by material tests conducted by Wulf.⁴

Recht⁵ demonstrated that low values of thermal conductivity, density, specific heat, and work hardening rate and high values of thermal softening rate and yield strength were conducive to adiabatic shear. The author's plan was to take into consideration the temperature rise due to the conversion of plastic deformation into heat.

Johnson⁶ suggested expressing stress as the following analytic function of strain, strain rate and temperature for the Ti318 target material:

$$o = (A + B \epsilon^{II}) (1 + C \ln (\epsilon/\epsilon) K_{T})$$

where A, B, n, and C are material parameters,

 $K_{T} = 1 - (T - T_{R}) / (T_{M} - T_{R})$

and T, T_R , and T_M are present, room, and melting temperature respectively. Johnson had utilized this form for the shear stress and had reasonable agreement with actual test data for several materials.⁷

The first expression is an isothermal relationship between stress and strain. Lindholm⁸ had demonstrated that a logarithmic relationship between stress and rate held over a range of strain rates from 10^{-4} s⁻¹ to 10^3 s⁻¹;

4. Wulf, G. L., "High Strain Rate Compression of Titanium and Some Titanium Alloys," <u>Int. J. Mech. Sci.</u>, Vol. 21, 1979.

5. Recht, R. F., "Catastrophic Thermoplastic Shear," Journal of Applied Mechanics, June, 1964, pp. 189-193.

6. Johnson, Gordon R., Private Communication.

7. Johnson, G. R., Hoegfeldt, J. M., Lindholm, U. S., and Nagy, A., "Response of Various Metals to Large Torsional Strains Over A Large Range of Strain Rates - Part 2; Less Ductile Metals," <u>Journal of Engineering Materials and</u> Technology, January, 1983, p. 48.

8. Lindholm, U.S., "Some Experiments with the Split Hopkinson Pressure Bar," J. Mech. Phys. Solids, Vol. 12, 1964, p. 317. hence, the second expression. ${\rm K}_{\rm T}$ is a linear thermal softening expression and varies from $K_{\tau} = 1$ at room temperature to $K_{\tau} = 0$ at melting temperature.

The author utilized data for titanium (6%Al, 4%V) published by Maiden and Green. 9 Specifically, curve fitting techniques were applied to the stress/strain curve for $\dot{\epsilon} = 1.5 \text{ s}^{-1} \approx \dot{\epsilon} = 1 \text{ s}^{-1}$ to determine the best values for A, B, and n assuming $\dot{\epsilon}_0 = 1 \text{ s}^{-1}$. C was then calculated applying the values of A, B, and n to the curve for $\dot{\epsilon} = 20 \text{ s}^{-1}$. It was assumed that thermal effects were not involved at such low strain rates; therefore $K_{T} = 1$ for these determinations.

The values of material parameters A, B, n, and C (0., 1896.2, .095, .0226, respectively) and the melting temperature (1660° C) became user input parameters to this highly modified EPIC-2 code. For an individual target element, strength as a function of strain, strain rate and temperature was utilized only after the yield strength (1029 MPa) was reached, thereby retaining a linear elastic relationship.

The adiabatic temperature rise is given by:

$$\Delta T = \frac{1}{\rho \,\overline{c}_{p}} \int_{0}^{\gamma} \tau \,d\gamma \tag{10}$$

where ρ = density,

 \overline{C}_{n} = mean specific heat τ = stress when the plastic strain is γ .

The author assumed constant stress for the increment of time involved and utilized a product of equivalent stress ($\overline{\sigma}$), equivalent strain rate ($\overline{\epsilon}$) and the current time increment for the power input.

Since estimates vary from 85% to almost 100% as to what proportion of the work of plastic deformation is converted into heat 11, 12, 13 calculations utilizing both of these limits were performed.

9. Maiden, C. J., Green, S. J., "Compressive Strain-Rate Tests on Six Selected Materials at Strain Rates From 10⁻³ to 10⁴ In/In/Sec," Transactions of the ASME, September, 1966, p. 496. 10. Campbell, J. D. and Ferguson, W. G., "The Temperature and Strain-Rate Dependence of the Shear Strength of Mild Steel," Phil. Mag., Vol. 21, 1970, p. 63. 11. Johnson, W., Impact Strength of Materials, Edward Arnold Ltd., 1972. 12. Rogers, Harry C., "Adiabatic Plastic Deformation," Ann. Rev. Mater. Sci., Vol. 9, 1979, p. 283.

13. Titchener, A. L. and Bever, M. B., Progr. Metal Phys., Vol. 7, 1958.

B. Development of Criteria Mandating Target Failure

"If the rate of decrease in strength, resulting from the local increase in temperature, equals or exceeds the rate of increase in strength, due to the effects of strain-hardening, the material will continue to deform locally. This unstable process leads to the catastrophic condition known as adiabatic slip." - Recht.⁵

Webster defines "adiabatic" as occurring without loss or gain of heat. Rogers¹² notes that although the term "adiabatic" is misleading since heat is lost to the surroundings at a rapid rate, the heat loss is small relative to heat generation. The velocities involved in typical ballistic impacts result in strain rates of $10^5 - 10^6 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and the period of time (microseconds) means there is insufficient time for the heat generated by such strain rates to be dissipated by conduction; hence, adiabatic slip or shear.

This, then, is the basis for the most important criterion in attempting to model adiabatic shear - when the rate of thermal softening overcomes the rate of strain hardening, i.e., when $\partial\sigma/\partial\epsilon = 0$.

The following criteria were developed and utilized to simulate the adiabatic shear responsible for plugging failure:

Criterion 1: An element initiates or furthers a split

- 1) when the rate of thermal softening > rate of work hardening, and
- 2) when, if furthering a split, it is associated with the "next" node, and
- 3) when the magnitude of its shear stress > the magnitudes of its deviatoric axial and radial stresses, and
- 4) when the direction of the split (Criterion 3) is not to a node with a higher z coordinate.

Criterion 2: The node at which initial splitting occurs

- 1) must belong to the element meeting Criterion 1,
- 2) must suffer the highest force of all three nodes belonging to the same element, and
- 3) must be a master node.

Criterion 3: The direction of the split is determined by the strain of the element meeting Criterion 1. In general, if the magnitude of the axial strain > the magnitude of the radial strain, splitting is to the nearer radial node. Otherwise, splitting is to the node closer to the direction of radial strain.

IV. CASE I

A. Experimental Results

Woodward fired five shots of hardened, roller-bearing steel cylinders

into Ti318 targets at normal obliquity.¹⁴ Note the geometric and material properties for the first penetrator and target, Table 1. The minimum velocity at which target perforation occurred was 441 + 14 m/s. In every case the projectile fractured. In one case plugging due to adiabatic shear occurred; the plug was pushed through the target but a small part of the projectile stayed in the target while the remainder rebounded (Figure 4a). However the adiabatic shear band was so narrow that it took metallographic analysis (1000X magnification) to ascertain that it definitely was adiabatic shear. In two other cases the projectile broke up and ricocheted and the plug was not pushed out; the shear band did not reach the rear surface of the target but did precede the crack (Figure 4b).

B. Simulations and Comparisons

The calculations to simulate this situation utilized a striking velocity of 455 m/s. An axisymmetric deformation history of the calculation when 100% plastic work was assumed converted to heat is shown in Figure 5. Axisymmetric blowups of the region of activity for the simulations assuming 100% and 85% conversions, respectively, are shown in Figures 6a and 6b. The corresponding patterns of elements which enabled splitting and the elements which totally failed are shown in Figures 7a and 7b. Note that when 100% plastic work was assumed converted to heat, the shear band reached the rear target surface at 3.25×10^{-6} s implying a crack velocity of 1954 m/s. (The sound speed of Ti318 \approx 1966 m/s.) The plug was completely formed and was pushed approximately 1.5 mm past the rear target surface. The forward motion of the projectile stopped between 25 X 10^{-6} s and 30 X 10^{-6} s and the projectile is progressively rebounding at 30 x 10^{-6} s and 35 x 10^{-6} s. Note that several projectile and target elements were automatically totally failed, primarily on the basis of a minimum time increment violation. (See Appendixes A and B for specifics on element failure.) There were some problems with overlap of elements on the same sliding surface with so much element failure; surface elements can not interfere with elements on another surface but there is no provision for checking interference between elements on the same surface. The speed histories of the projectile are shown in Figure 8, the depth-of-penetration histories in Figure 9.

Distinctions between the results of simulations using 100% and 85% conversion of plastic work into heat, respectively, are almost negligible. In general, the shear band developed a little more slowly and rebound occurred a little later for 85% conversion; the crack velocity was 1890 m/s. The results of the calculations are promising when compared with the experimental evidence with regard to the shape of the deformed rod, the total failure of part of the projectile, the formation of the plug, even the inward-directed angle toward the bottom of the incompletely-formed plug when the velocity is just under the limit velocity. However, the crack velocities would seem to be unreasonably close to the sound speed of the material and

14. Woodward, R. L., Private Communication - experiments performed at Materials Research Laboratories, Australia.

MATERIAL	PENETRATOR 1 STEEL	<i>TARGET 1</i> Ti 318 (Ti WITH 6% AI, 4%V)	PENETRATOR 2 STEEL	<i>TARGET 2</i> Ti 318 (Ti WITH 6% AI, 4% V)
SHAPE	BLUNT	50mm SQUARE	BLUNT	50mm SQUARE
MASS	3.34g	—	3.34g	-
LENGTH	25.4mm	тніск <u>6.35mm</u>	25.4 mm	THICK <u>6mm</u>
DIAMETER	4.76 mm	-	4.76 mm	-
DENSITY	7.39 × 10 ³ kg/m ³	$4.43 \times 10^3 \text{kg/m}^3$	7.39×10 ³ kg/m ³	4.43×10 ³ kg/m ³
σ _Y	<u>2290 MPa</u>	1029MPa	<u>2233 MPa</u>	1029MPa
συ	2500MPa	1209 MPa	2500 MPa	1209 MPa
€U	-	0.2	-	0.2
SPECIFIC HEAT	_	5.65×10 ² J/kg°C	-	5.65×10 ² J/kg°C
YOUNGS MOD	1.93×10 ⁵ MPa	1.158×10 ⁵ MPa	1,93×10 ⁵ MPa	1.158 × 10 ⁵ MPa

Table 1. Geometric and Material Properties Case I and II.



Figure 4a. Sketch of Experimental Results - Case I - Woodward.



INCIPIENT PLUGGING & PROJECTILE REBOUND

Figure 4b. Sketch of Incipient Plugging V_S < V_L - Woodward.



Figure 5. Deformation History - Case I, 100% Plastic Work Converted to Heat.



Figure 6a. Axisymmetric Blowup of Region of Activity - Case I. 100% Plastic Work Converted to Heat.



Figure 6b. Axisymmetric Blowup of Region of Activity - Case I. 85% Plastic Work Converted to Heat.





Figure 7a. Pattern of Elements Enabling Split - Case I. 100% Plastic Work Converted to Heat. PATTERN OF ELEMENTS REACHING $\partial \sigma / \partial \epsilon = 0$ AND INITIATING OR FURTHERING SPLIT $v_s = 455 \text{ m/s}$

 $\sigma_{\rm Y}$ (PENETRATOR) = 2290 MPo



Figure 7b. Pattern of Elements Enabling Split - Case I. 85% Plastic Work Converted to Heat.



Figure 8. Speed Histories - Case I.



Figure 9. Depth of Penetration Histories - Case I.

the jaggedness of the splitting pattern detracts from the results of the simulation. A calculation was made utilizing the stress/(strain, strain rate, temperature) relationship with splitting disabled; the instability worked its way down through a "bandwidth" of elements; it was not as localized as might be expected.

Of more concern, perhaps, is the placement of the split, not directly under the edge of the projectile. This is the result of a built-in bias in the method. The forces on a node are based on the stresses of the elements sharing that node. The forces on a node under the edge of the projectile will depend upon the high stresses of the elements under the projectile as well as the lower stresses of the elements outside the projectile periphery whereas the forces on an inner node will be based on the stresses of elements, all of which are directly under the impact. The nodal accelerations calculated for these inner nodes will be higher and will similarly affect the nodal velocities and, in turn, the element strain rates, strains, and stresses. Therefore the elements vertically aligned close to, but not directly under, the edge of the projectile will attain prescribed failure criteria earlier than those aligned with the edge. This bias and the jagged splitting pattern would, of course, not be as noticeable if the grid resolution was much finer.

V. CASE II

A. Experimental Results

The second case for which simulations were calculated was experimental work only recently conducted by Woodward, Baxter, and Scarlett.¹⁵ A blunt steel cylinder with corners ground to a radius of .25 mm impacted a Ti318 target at normal obliquity with a striking velocity of 247 m/s. Results (Figure 10) indicate very little plug compression and the separation of a plug from the remaining target material at several places, but not everywhere, along the band. Woodward, et al., noted that examinations of sections parallel to the plane of the plate showed the separate nucleation of very narrow shear bands and their independent propagation to the rear surface despite joining circumferentially in several positions. They also noted an initial acceleration phase during which compression takes place preceding the formation of the adiabatic shear band.

This case differed from the first case in the significantly lower striking velocity (247 m/s vs 455 m/s), the lower hardness of the projectile (2233 MPa vs 2290 MPa), and the different target thickness (6 mm vs 6.35 mm).

B. Simulations and Comparisons

These simulations utilized a striking velocity of 247 m/s and the

15. Woodward, R. L., Baxter, B. J. and Scarlett, N. V. Y., "Mechanisms of Adiabatic Shear Plugging Failure in High Strength Aluminum and Titanium Alloys," 3rd International Conference on Mechanical Properties of Materials At High Rates of Strain," Oxford, April, 1984.



Figure 10. Section of Ti 318 - Case II. (15)

geometric and material properties noted for the second penetrator and target in Table 1. The axisymmetric deformation history for 100% conversion of plastic work to heat is shown in Figure 11; blowups of the region of activity are shown in Figures 12a and 12b for the 100% and 85% conversions, respectively. Very jagged splitting patterns are evident for the simulations in Figure 13. Only two projectile elements were totally failed due to a minimum time increment violation before projectile rebound occurred for the 100% conversion simulation. The shear band in this case did not reach the rear target surface until 8.28 x 10^{-6} s, implying a crack velocity of 725 m/s. A plug was completely formed and extends slightly (pprox.3 mm) from the rear of the target. There was no discernible plug compression; the projectile began to rebound by 20 x 10^{-6} s. The speed and depth-of-penetration histories for both simulations are shown in Figures 14 and 15. Again the simulation performed with 85% plastic work converted to heat produced similar results. Note, however, that although the speed and depth of penetration histories are similar for the 100% and 85% conversions for both calculations there is one noticeable difference. Whereas at a striking velocity of 455 m/s the 100% conversion of plastic work to heat generally resulted in a slightly higher velocity and slightly greater depth of penetration than with 85% conversion during penetration, at 247 m/s, a little less than the minimum velocity for perforation, the results would seem to be the reverse of this. Splitting, in general, proceeded a little faster with 100% conversion until the last couple of layers but rebound also started to occur earlier limiting the depth of penetration more but rebounding at a slightly higher speed (4.48 m/s for 100% conversion vs 3 m/s for 85% conversion).

Comparison between the more detailed experimental results in this case and the simulations is most interesting - the correspondingly slower formation of a plug which was not ejected, the highly jagged pattern in the simulation coincidentally reflecting the areas of separation and nonseparation (due possibly to subsequent welding) of plug from the remaining target.

Again the placement of the split is biased toward the axis. The small, but discernible, compression of the plug and the significant indentation of the target in the experiment was not matched in the simulations. It was thought that if the simulation was allowed a longer plug acceleration period before splitting was enabled, target compression might result (as occurred with the Ti125 target in Figure 3). However, the calculation performed with splitting disabled indicated no noticeable compression of the target elements by 10 x 10^{-6} s.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper presented simulations of target plugging failure due to adiabatic shear utilizing finite element techniques, a stress/(strain, strain rate, temperature) relationship, and the monitoring of the instability which occurs when thermal softening overwhelms work hardening. Simulations and comparisons with two experiments indicate considerable promise for the method; plugging was correctly predicted in the simulations and results were consistent between calculations - a much higher striking velocity producing



Figure 11. Deformation History - Case II. $100^{\%}$ Plastic Work Converted to Heat.



Figure 12a. Axisymmetric Blowup of Region of Activity - Case II. 100% Plastic Work Converted to Heat.



Figure 12b. Axisymmetric Blowup of Region of Activity - Case II. 85% Plastic Work Converted to Heat.



Figure 13a. Pattern of Elements Enabling Split - Case II. 100% Plastic Work Converted to Heat. PATTERN OF ELEMENTS REACHING $\partial \sigma / \partial \epsilon = 0$ AND INITIATING OR FURTHERING SPLIT

> $V_{\rm S} = 247 \, {\rm m/s}$ $\sigma_{\rm Y}$ (PENETRATOR) = 2233 MPa











Figure 15. Depth of Penetration Histories - Case II.

26

and dislodging a plug whereas the lower velocity produced a plug more slowly which remained tightly lodged in the target. There remains a problem in accommodating the plug compression; more accurate material behavior descriptions at high strain rates are required.

It is imperative that criteria which indicate promise in modeling target failure modes be incorporated with available simulation techniques and predictions utilizing such must be tested against experimental evidence. Simulations which can handle only partial penetration of a target or which utilize untested failure criteria can betray penetrator and armor designers.

A comparison of the results at 10⁻⁶s, splitting disabled, shown in Figures 16 would seem to imply that the Ti318 material is tougher than the Ti125 material when, in truth, experimental results indicate the the Ti318 material is easier to defeat by kinetic energy penetrators. Ti318 has a much higher static strength but its failure mechanism, adiabatic shear, requires far less energy.

The true ballistic worth of these techniques will soon be ascertained when they are applied to impacts involving rolled homogeneous armor and high hard armor. The extrapolation of these techniques to model other target failure situations such as piercing and to model oblique impacts with plane strain simulations is also planned.

16. Woodward, R. L., "The Penetration of Metal Targets Which Fail By Adiabatic Shear Plugging," Int. J. Mech. Sci., Vol. 20.



Figure 16. Caution - Simulation Results Can Be Misleading If Material Failure Not Accurately Modeled.

- Johnson, Gordon R., "EPIC-2, A Computer Program for Elastic-Plastic Impact Computations in 2 Dimensions Plus Spin," US Army BRL Contract Report ARBRL-CR-00373, June, 1978. (AD A058 786)
- Ringers, B. E., "New Sliding Surface Techniques Enable Lagrangian Code to Handle Deep Target Penetration/Perforation Problems," <u>Computational Aspects</u> of Penetration Mechanics, Lecture Notes in Engineering, <u>Springer-Verlag</u>, 1983.
- 3. Ringers, B. E., "Simulations of Ballistic Impact Situations Involving Deep Penetration and Perforation of Targets with Lagrangian Impact Code," <u>Proceedings of the Army Symposium on Solid Mechanics, 1982 - Critical</u> <u>Mechanics Problems in Systems Design, AMMRC MS 82-4, September 1982.</u>
- 4. Wulf, G. L., "High Strain Rate Compression of Titanium and Some Titanium Alloys," Int. J. Mech. Sci., Vol. 21, 1979.
- 5. Recht, R. F., "Catastrophic Thermoplastic Shear," Journal of Applied Mechanics, June, 1964, pp. 189-193.
- 6. Johnson, Gordon R., Private Communication.
- 7. Johnson, Gordon R., Hoegfeldt, J. M., Lindholm, US, and Nagy, A., "Response of Various Metals to Large Torsional Strains Over A Large Range of Strain Rates - Part 2; Less Ductile Metals," <u>Journal of Engineering</u> <u>Materials and Technology</u>, January 1983, p. 48.
- Lindholm, US, "Some Experiments with the Split Hopkinson Pressure Bar," J. Mech. Phys. Solids, Vol. 12, 1964, p. 317.
- 9. Maiden, C. J., Green, S. J., "Compressive Strain-Rate Tests on Six Selected Materials at Strain Rates From 10⁻³ to 10⁴ In/In/Sec," <u>Transaction of the ASME</u>, September 1966, p. 496.
- Campbell, J. D. and Ferguson, W. G., "The Temperature and Strain-Rate Dependence of the Shear Strength of Mild Steel," <u>Phil. Mag.</u>, Vol. 21, 1970, p. 63.
- 11. Johnson, W., Impact Strength of Materials, Edward Arnold Ltd., 1972.
- 12. Rogers, Harry C., "Adiabatic Plastic Deformation," Ann. Rev. Mater. Sci., Vol. 9, 1979, p. 283.
- 13. Titchener, A. L. and Bever, M. B., Progr. Metal Phys., Vol. 7, 1958.
- 14. Woodward, R. L., Private Communication experiments performed at Materials Research Laboratories, Australia.

- 15. Woodward, R. L., Baxter, B. J. and Scarlett, N. V. Y., "Mechanisms of Adiabatic Shear Plugging Failure in High Strength Aluminum and Titanium Alloys," 3rd International Conference on Mechanical Properties of Materials At High Rates of Strain," Oxford, April 1984.
- 16. Woodward, R. L., "The Penetration of Metal Targets Which Fail By Adiabatic Shear Plugging," Int. J. Mech. Sci., Vol. 20.

APPENDIX A CRITERIA FOR TOTAL ELEMENT FAILURE

All elements were automatically enabled to totally fail under the circumstances discussed below:

1. Minimum time increment violation - A minimum time increment is user assigned, and is based on the time required to travel across the shortest dimension of the triangular element at the sound speed of the material. When a dimension of an element gets too small for the time increment utilized, the choice is to lower the minimum time increment or totally fail the element so that it is no longer processed.

This is a sensitive situation. Lowering the minimum time increment can enable the element to be processed for a longer period of time but it can also allow abnormally high pressures to develop, which, in turn, cause unreasonably high nodal forces and velocities. EPIC-2 checks the kinetic energy; if the kinetic energy of the impact situation increases by more than 10%, a calculation is automatically stopped.

The assumption was made that a reasonable time increment was utilized so the element is totally failed if it violates the minimum time increment. This is the usual reason for totally failing an element.

However, after several elements in an area have totally failed for this reason, there is an adverse effect on nearby elements which results in their total failure due to either -

2. Negative sound speed for an element, implying a severely reduced volume, or

3. Negative area for an element, which results when two nodes reverse position with regard to the third node.

Element failure also requires dynamic relocation of the sliding surfaces. See Appendix B for the details. It is also possible to totally fail elements on an equivalent strain basis, as was done in the original version of EPIC-2. The difference is that master elements are now allowed to fail as well.

31

APPENDIX B PROCEDURE FOR HANDLING FAILED ELEMENTS

The procedure for handling a failed element depends on its position with respect to a particular sliding surface; it is a master or slave element on that surface, or neither.

For master and slave elements (m/s elements) the following procedures apply:

1. A m/s element with two consecutive nodes on a m/s surface has its third node inserted in the surface,

2. A m/s element with three consecutive nodes on a m/s surface has its midnode removed from the m/s surface,

3. A m/s element with four consecutive nodes on a m/s surface (the first node is also the last node) has all nodes removed except for the first.

A non m/s element that has failed is kept in reserve and, after another element is totally failed, is checked for m/s status until it becomes a m/s element and is handled above.

A check is also made for duplicated straight line segments which result after some patterns of element failure, i.e. the m/s surface contains node A, node B, and node A again sequentially. In this case, nodes A and B are removed from the m/s surface.

Copie	s Organization	Copies	Organization
1	Commander Naval Air Development	9	Commander Naval Weapons Center
	Warminster, PA 18974		ATTN: Code 31804, Mr. M. Smith
1	Commander Pacific Naval Missile Test Cent	er	Code 3261, Mr. T. Zulkoski
	Point Mugu, CA 93042		Mr. C. Johnson
12	Administrator Defense Technical Info Center ATTN: DTIC-DDA		Code 3171, Mr. B. Galloway
	Cameron Station		Code 3831,
	Alexandria, VA 22304-6145		Mr. M. Backman Mr. R. F.
1	Commander David W. Taylor Naval Shin		VanDevender, Jr.
	Research & Development Center		China Lake, CA 93555
	ATTN: Code 1740.4, R. A. Gramm	3	Commander Naval Research Laboratory
	Bethesda, MD 20084		ATTN: Dr. C. Sanday Dr. H. Pusey
3	Commander		Pr. S. Zalesak
	Naval Surface Weapons Center ATTN: Dr. W. B. Soper		Washington, PC 20375
	Mr. N. Rupert	2	Superintendent
	Code G35,		Naval Postgraduate School
	Dahlgren, VA 22448		ATTN: Dir of Lib
	Langeen, in Letto		Monterey, CA 93940
10	Commander		Homeerey, on 55540
	Naval Surface Weapons Center	3	Long Beach Naval Shipyard
	ATTN: Dr. S. Fishman (2 cys)		ATTN: R. Kessler
	F = T Zerilli		T. Fto
	K. Kim		K. rernandez
	F. T. Totan		Long Beach, Gr 90022
	M. J. Frankel	1	HO USAF/SAMI
	Code U-11, J. R. Renzi R. S. Gross		Washington, DC 20330
	Code K-22, F. Stecher	- 1	AFIS/INOT
	J. M. Etheridge Silver Spring, MD 20910		Washington, DC 20330
		1	Commander
1	HQDA		US Army Materiel Command
	Washington DC 20310		ATTN: AMCDRA-ST 5001 Fisophower Averue
	hasnington, be 20010		Alexandria, VA 22333-0001

35

Copies	urganization	Copies	Organization
1	APTC/PLJW (MAJ G. Spitale) Eglin AFR, FL 32542	1	AST/XPP Wright Patterson AFB, OH 45433
1	ADTC/DLYV (Mr. J. Collins) Eglin AFB, FL 32542	1	HOUSAFE/DOQ APO New York 09012
1	AFATL/PLYB Eglin AFB, FL 32542	1	Director Benet Weapons Laboratory
1	AFWL/SUL Kirtland AFB, NM 87117		ATTN: SMCAR-LCB-TL Watervliet, NY 12189
1	Air Force Armament Laboratory ATTN: AFATL/DLODL Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000	1	Battelle Northwest Laboratories P.O. Box 999 ATTN: G. D. Marr
1	AFATL/DLODR Eglin AFB, FL 32542		Richland, WA 99352
1	AFATL/CC Eglin AFB, FL 32542	4	P.O. Box 808 ATTN: Dr. R. Werne
1	HQ PACAF/OA Hickam AFB, HJ 96853		Pr. M. L. Wilkins Pr. G. Goudreau Livermore, CA 94550
1	HQ PACAF/DOOQ Hickam AFB, HI 96853	6	Los Alamos Scientific
1	HO TAC/DRA Langley AFB, VA 23665		Laboratory P. O. Box 1663 ATTN: Dr. R. Karpp
1	TAC/INAT Langley AFB, VA 23665		Dr. J. Dienes Pr. J. Taylor Pr. F. Fugelso
1	AUL-LSE 71-249 Maxwell AFB, AL 36112		Dr. R. Keyser Los Alamos, NM 87544
1	AFWAL/MLLN (Mr. T. Nicholas) Wright Patterson AFB, OH 45433	6	Sandia Laboratories ATTN: Pr. R. Woodfin Dr. M. Sears Dr. V. Herrmann
1	ASD/FNFSS (S. Johns) Wright Patterson AFB, OH 45433		Dr. L. Bertholf Dr. A. Chabai Dr. C. B. Selleck Albuquerque, NM 87115
1	ASD/ENFFA Wright Patterson AFB, OH 45433	1	Commander US Army AMCCOM, ARDC ATTN: SMCAR-TSS
1	OOALC/MMWMC Hill AFB, HI 96853	1	Dover, NJ 07801 Commander
1	COMIPAC/I-32 Box 38		US Army AMCCOM, ARDC ATTN: SMCAR-TDC
	Camp H. I. Smith, HI 96861	36	Dover, NJ 0/801

4

Copies Organization

- Jet Propulsion Laboratory 4800 Oak Grove Drive ATTN: Pr. Ralph Chen Pasadena, CA 91109
- Director
 National Aeronautics and Space Administration
 Langley Research Center
 Langley Station
 Hampton, VA 23365
- US Geological Survey 2255 N. Gemini Prive ATTN: Dr. Roddy Flagstaff, A7 86001
- AAI Corporation
 P. 0. Box 6767
 ATTN: R. L. Kachinski
 Baltimore, MD 21204
- 1 Aerojet Ordnance Company 9236 Fast Hall Road Downey, CA 90241
- Aerospace Research Associates of Princeton, Inc.
 50 Washington Road Princeton, NJ 08540
- Aerospace Corporation
 2350 F. El Segundo Blvd.
 ATTN: Mr. L. Rubin
 Fl Segundo, CA 90245
- AVCO Systems Division 201 Lowell Street ATTN: Dr. Reinecke Vilmington, MA 01887
- 4 Battelle Columbus Laboratories 505 King Avenue ATTN: Dr. M. F. Kanninen Dr. G. T. Hahn Dr. L. F. Hulbert Dr. S. Sampath Columbus, OH 43201

Copies Organization

- Boeing Aerospace Company ATTN: Mr. G. G. Blaisdell (M.S. 40-25) Dr. N. A. Armstrong, C. J. Artura (M.S. 8C-23) Dr. B. J. Henderson (M.S. 43-12) Seattle, WA 98124
- 2 Brunswick Corporation 4300 Industrial Avenue ATTN: P. S. Chang R. Grover Lincoln, NF 68504
- Computer Code Consultants, Inc.
 1680 Camino Redondo
 ATTN: Dr. Wally Johnson
 Los Alamos, NM 87544
- 1 Dresser Center P. O. Pox 1407 ATTN: Dr. M. S. Chawla Houston, TX 77001
- Effects Technology, Inc. 5383 Hollister Avenue Santa Barbara, CA 93111
- Flectric Power Research Institute
 P. O. Box 10412
 ATTN: Pr. George Sliter Palo Alto, CA 94303
- 2 Firestone Tire and Rubber Company 1200 Fireston Parkway ATTN: R. L. Voodall L. F. Vescelius Akron, OH 44317
- 1 FMC Corporation Ordnance Fngineering Divison San Jose, CA 95114
- 1 Director US Army TRADOC Systems Analysis Activity ATTN: ATAA-SL White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002

Copies Organization

- Copies
- Ford Aerospace and Communications Corporation Ford Road, P. O. Box A ATTN: L. K. Goodwin Newport Beach, CA 92663
- Commander
 US Army Communications Electronics Command
 ATTN: AMSEL-ED
 Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703
- 1 General Dynamics P. O. Box 2507 ATTN: J. H. Cuadros Pomona, CA 91766
- General Flectric Company Lakeside Avenue ATTN: D. A. Graham, Room 1311 Burlington, VT 05401
- 1 President General Research Corporation ATTN: Lib McLean, Va 22101
- 1 Goodyear Aerospace Corporation 1210 Massilon Road Akron, OH 44315
- 1 H. P. White Laboratory 3114 Scarboro Road Street, MD 21154
- 6 Honeywell, Inc.
 Government and Aerospace Products Divison
 ATTN: Mr. J. Blackburn Dr. G. Johnson Mr. R. Simpson
 Mr. K. H. Poeringsfeld Dr. D. Vavrick Dr. C. Candland
 600 Second Street, NE Hopkins, MN 55343
- 1 Commander US Army Development and Employment Agency ATTN: MODE-TED-SAB Fort Lewis, WA 98433

Organization

- Northrop Norair 3901 W. Broadway ATTN: R. L. Ramkumar Hawthorne, CA 90250
- 2 Kaman Sciences Corporation 1500 Garden of the Gods Road ATTN: Pr. P. Snow Dr. D. Williams Colorado Springs, CO 80907
- Lockheed Missiles and Space Company, Inc.
 3251 Hanover Street ATTN: Org 5230, Rldg. 201 Mr. R. Robertson Palo Alto, CA 94304
- 1 Lockheed Missiles and Space Company, Inc. P. O. Box 504 ATTN: R. L. Williams Dept. 81-11, Bldg. 154 Sunnyvale, CA 94086
- Materials Research Laboratory, Jnc.
 One Science Road Sunnyvale, Ca 94086
- 2 McDonnell-Douglas Astronautics Company 5301 Bolsa Avenue ATTN: Dr. L. B. Greszczuk Dr. J. Wall Hungtington Beach, CA 92467
- New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology ATTN: TERA Group Socorro, NM 87801
- Commandant
 US Army Infantry School
 ATTN: ATSH-CD-CSO-OR
 Fort Benning, GA 31905
- 1 Commander US Army Tank Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-TSL Warren, MI 48090

38

Copies Organization

- Commander
 US Army Armament, Munitions
 and Chemical Command
 ATTN: SMCAR-ESP-L
 Rock Island, IL 61299
- Orlando Technology, Inc.
 P.O. Box 855
 ATTN: Mr. J. Osborn
 Mr. D. Matuska
 Shalimar, FL 32579
- Systems, Science and Software P.O. Box 1620 ATTN: Dr. R. Sedgwick La Jolla, CA 92038
- Rockwell International Artimetic Missile Systems Div. ATTN: A. R. Glaser 4300 F. Fifth Avenue Columbus, OH 43216
- 3 Schlumberger Well Services Perforating Center ATTN: J. F. Brooks J. Brookamn Dr. C. Aseltine P. O. Box A Rosharon, TX 77543
- Director
 US Army Air Mobility Research
 and Development Laboratory
 Ames Research Center
 Moffett Field, CA 94035
- Commander
 US Army Electronics Research
 and Development Command
 Technical Support Activity
 ATTN: DELSD-L
 Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703-5301
- 1 Commander US Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-R Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898
- 1 Commander US Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-YDL Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898

Copies Organization

- United Technologies Research Center
 438 Weir Street
 ATTN: P. R. Fitzpatrick
 Glastonbury, CT 06033
- US Steel Corporation Research Center
 125 Jamison Lane Monroeville, PA 15146
- 1 VPI & SU 106C Norris Hall ATTN: Dr. M. P. Kamat Blacksburg, VA 24061
- Commander
 US Army Aviation Research and
 Development Command
 ATTN: AMSAV-E
 4300 Goodfellow Blvd
 St. Louis, MO 63120
- 1 Westinghouse, Inc. P. 0. Box 79 ATTN: J. Y. Fan W. Mifflin, PA 15122
- Drexel University Dept. of Mechanical Engr. ATTN: Dr. P. C. Chou 32d and Chestnut Streets Philadelphia, PA 19104
- Southwest Research Institute ATTN: Dr. C. Anderson
 6220 Culebra Road
 San Antonio, Texas 78228
- Southwest Research Institute Pept. of Mechanical Sciences ATTN: Dr. U. Lindholm 8500 Celebra Road San Antonio, TX 78228
- 4 SRI International
 333 Ravenswood Avenue
 ATTN: Dr. L. Seaman
 Dr. L. Curran
 Dr. D. Shockey
 Dr. A. L. Florence
 Menlo Park, CA 94025

Copies Organization

Copies

- 2 University of Arizona Civil Engineering Department ATTN: Dr. D. A. DaDeppo Dr. R. Richard Tucson, AZ 85721
- 1 University of Arizona School of Engineering ATTN: Dean R. Gallagher Tucson, AZ 85721
- University of California Los Angeles
 504 Hilgard Avenue
 Los Angeles, CA 90024
- University of California Dept. of Physics ATTN: Dr. Harold Lewis Santa Barbara, CA 93106
- 2 University of California College of Engineering ATTN: Prof. W. Goldsmith Dr. A. G. Evans Berkeley, CA 94720
- 2 University of Delaware Dept. of Mechanical Engr. ATTN: Prof. J. Vinson Dr. M. Taya Newark, DE 19711
- University of Denver Denver Research Institute ATTN: Mr. R. F. Recht 2390 S. University Blvd. Denver, CO 80210
- 2 University of Florida Dept. of Engr. Sciences ATTN: Dr. R. L. Sierakowski Dr. L. E. Malvern Gainesville, FL 32611

Organization

- West Virginia University Dept. of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering ATTN: Dr. N. J. Salamon Morgantown, WV 26505
- University of Oklahoma School of Aerospace, Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering ATTN: Dr. C. W. Bert Norman, OK 73069
- University of Dayton Impact Physics Research Institute ATTN: Dr. S. J. Bless 300 College Park Dayton, Ohio 45469-0001
- US Army Research and Technology Laboratories ATTN: Mr. Wade Fort Eustis, VA 23604
- 1 AFATL/DLJW ATTN: 2 LT Michaela Mezo Eglin AFB, FL 32542
- 1 AFATL/DLJW ATTN: 1LT Paul Thee Eglin AFB, FL 32542

ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND

Dir, USAMSAA ATTN: AMXSY-D AMXSY-MP, H. Cohen Cdr, USATECOM ATTN: AMSTE-TO-F Cdr, CRDC, AMCCOM ATTN: SMCCR-RSP-A SMCCR-MU SMCCR-SPS-IL Dir, USACSTA ATTN: Mr. S. Keithely

USER EVALUATION SHEET/CHANGE OF ADDRESS

This Laboratory undertakes a continuing effort to improve the quality of the reports it publishes. Your comments/answers to the items/questions below will aid us in our efforts.

1. Date of Report BRL Report Number

2. Date Report Received

3. Does this report satisfy a need? (Comment on purpose, related project, or other area of interest for which the report will be used.)_____

4. How specifically, is the report being used? (Information source, design data, procedure, source of ideas, etc.)

5. Has the information in this report led to any quantitative savings as far as man-hours or dollars saved, operating costs avoided or efficiencies achieved, etc? If so, please elaborate._____

6. General Comments. What do you think should be changed to improve future reports? (Indicate changes to organization, technical content, format, etc.)

Name

CURRENT ADDRESS

Address

City, State, Zip

Organization

7. If indicating a Change of Address or Address Correction, please provide the New or Correct Address in Block 6 above and the Old or Incorrect address below.

	Name	
OLD ADDRESS	Organization	
	Address	

City, State, Zip

(Remove this sheet along the perforation, fold as indicated, staple or tape closed, and mail.)

Director

ATTN:

US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory

Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066

NO POSTAGE

NECESSARY

IF MAILED

IN THE UNITED STATES

- FOLD HERE -

OFFICIAL BUSINESS PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

AMXBR-OD-ST

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL FIRST CLASS PERMIT NO 12062 WASHINGTON, DC

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Director US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory ATTN: AMXBR-OD-ST Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-9989

FOLD HERE -

U219188

-

1