### MARSHALL ISLANDS FILE TRACKING DOCUMENT

Record Number: 179
File Name (TITLE): <u>Alliminary Blast Jummary</u>
Document Number (ID): $135192$
DATE: $\frac{12}{1952}$
AUTHOR: F.B. Porse/
Addditional Information:

12 OrMIbox: \_\_\_\_ CyMIbox: \_\_\_

			9.10 g. 0
RC 326 AS STOMIC ENERGY		4 A 5^A	g - 10
Location SNL Roll#1282	DIARY BLAST SUBGARY - O	PERATION IVY 64	3-10 2
Collection Central Tech. Files	December 22, 1952		t stata
Folder <u>O-1 TVY</u>	P. B. Porsel	n Bar Haide and Anna Anna A	for of ant=
1. GEWERAL		is 3 Jlab - 1 d 1 m	ted. 5 2 2 4

This supplements my memorandum dated Hovember 22, 1952, J-15162, ' Preliminary Elast Summary - Operation Ivy". It is concerned with a more detailed presentation of the blast data, based on the Sandia results as of December 15th, rather than their earlier numbers as read in Eniwetok. Two major conclusions seem to result from these data: (1) The agreement is excellent between Sandia's consurements and the purely theoretical predictions of LA-1406; there is also worthwhile evidence of a possible revision of the MIKE hydrodynamic yield downward to 10 to=22 memory.

2. KING SECT

CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED

ō

IN JENTORIEI

2510 JAN 8

BEST COPY AVAILABLE WYFNT TREE

ac: 1 A Draves 1(181

135192

The argument for revision of the hydrodynamic yield on MIKE is based 755 in part on the degree of reliance which can be attached to the same hydro-

Figure 1 shows the time of arrival for KING shot. This excellent agreement was previously noted because it had been used as a method for checking the actual blast position of KING as determined by Pussell. It is significant here in showing that the basic time of arrival curve (and the necessary transformations through the height of burst curves to correct for the finite height of burst) leads to predicted times of arrival which are "pencil-width" correct. Incidentally, note the early times of arrival over land in comparison with both the theoretical prediction and the measured values over water; this is due to precursor action from the thermal effect; it is strikingly

THIS DOCUMENTED OF CONTRACT OF CONTRACT.

CENTRAL M & A 23097

evident on the pressure-time curve; Sandia's time of arrival refers of course to the pressure  $t_{able}$  in the "thermal shock .

Figure 2 shows the peak pressure vs. distances over land and water. Here again the agreement with the theoretical predictions is considered excellent, both over land and water. Note the return of the thermal curve to approach the ideal values near 8 psi. Further, beyond 10,000 feet the pressures are below ideal, indicating that the effect of atmospheric inhomogeneity sets in somewhere beyond 10,000 to 15,000 feet.

Figure 3 shows the positive duration vs. horisontal distances. The theoretical curves are not emact; for simplicity, I have used here the positive duration of a free air curve with a reflection factor of 2. For a bomb at altitude, the close-is positive duration should be more nearly like 1/2 the tennage indicated here. On the curves, the two close-is ideal surface positive durations are, in fact, shorter than indicated but at large distances for the positive durations become such longer than predicted. This is attributed to atmospheric inhomogeneity setting in beyond 15,000 feet. Note also that the positive durations are considerably longer over land than over water; this is again due to thermal effect and precursor action, with some reinforcement of the blast wave from thermal rediction.

3. NIKE SECT

#### BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SNL

ID

During his visit last week, Lew Fussell reported that the more recent fireball measurements are giving values of  $\neq$  like 268 from the Parry-Eastman films, and 278 from the Engebi Repatronics. The fireball measurements at Farry, which resulted in the fireball yield of 12 megatons, was based on data whose  $\neq$  values were more like 277; now the Engebi measurements will be large because the apparent mise of the fireball is measurements by the tangent to the fireball, and at these eleme-in distances, the proper correction will reduce

-2-

these values of  $\not\sim$  to something like 272. Also, there may be appreciable helation on these films and I would consider, for the moment, that the Parry - Eastman value of 268 is probably more reliable. If the fireball data are then revised dommard, indicated by  $\leq$  = 268, the apparent yield from MIKE shot will then be in the order of 10.2 megatons, even by the analytic solution.

A STATE OF STATE

Figure 4 shows the time of arrival curve from MIKE in comparison with the predicted times of arrival for both 10 and 12 megatons. I have included some preliminary fireball points, from measurement at Enjustok, shown as crosses, and the firstall curve resulting from a  $\phi$  of 268 shown as a dashed line. Saudia's measured times of arrival are shown by circles. In view of the excellent correlation obtained by this same prediction on KING, the times of arrival at 8300 feet and 16,000 feet seen significantly closer to 10 memotions than 12. Reyond 15,000 feet atmospheric inhomogeneity will result in later times of arrival. Only one point on the time of arrival curve is high, at 36,000 fost; this point was not included by Cox in his most recent publication of results; I have carried it over from the estimates on Parry to show that there is a reasonable possibility, although small, that the time of arrival curve is like 12 mentions in this region, and that on Enivetok it had been included as part of the judgement that the time of arrival curve was **BEST COPY AVAILABLE** resconble for 12 megatons.

Figure 5 shows the peak pressure vs. distance curve for MIKE; generally two different pressures were measured at the same distances. At 16,000 feet, Cox has revised the pressure downward from an original 23.6 pei down to a spread between 20.2 and 17.4 pei. This was a station close to water and had a fairly good wave form; I think this downward revision is again evidence that 12 megatoms is high in this region. Further revision was made by Cox in revising

-3-

(THERE WAS

West States

SNL

in the same which is

the pressure on NMFry from an original 0.36 pai up to a spread between .46 and .66 psi and in view of the difference in damage on Parry from the two shots. Even allowing for the slow rise time on MDKE, this revision is difficult to understand in comparisons with the 0.33 psi for KDEG; on the other more consistent with the hand, it is theoretical predictions for a homogeneous medium. The intermediate stations have changed very slightly from the original numbers. However, the dommard revision at close-in and the upward revision far out result in reducing the apparent magnitude of the stmospheric inhomogeneity. Whereas the Parry measurements indicated that the pressures would extrapolate to ideal values short of 15,000 feet, the present data would indicate that the peak pressures are low for 12 megatons even at close-in distances. The results are not clear-cut without further study because of the interference of surface effects.

Figure 6 shows the positive duration for MIKE shot. Here again one notes the abnormally long positive durations at almost all distances, which is attributed to atmospheric inhomogeneity and reinforcement of the blast wave by thermal rediation. BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. CONCLUSIONS

E?

In general, the agreement of these measured data with the purely theoretical predictions of LA-1406 is significant in showing that basic field variables are well understood, theoretically and experimentally. In view of the possible revision of the fireball data downward and the hydrodynamic data on MIKE, it is recommended that for the time being the hydrodynamic yield be guoted somewhat lower than before - perhaps as "10 to 12" megatons, instead of  $12 \frac{1}{2}$  1.

SNL



11 6 al turination dem Grant Charles 1406 (Parent) AIMOS. i. 30 Δ 

20 Chin Frings 10. 4 2 24 7712 1 CX 2715 1 ŧ tsrs. S



Pressa

Roc

04

03

0.1



11 4-----Ξ± -0 TI

> ·┝┿╡┾┝┿┾╛┼ ┿┲┿┲╋┎  $\mathbb{H}$ eo tou 60 0 1 60 1

DD9-112 REVERL & C98CR Logarithmic, 3 X 2 Cycles, u.oc.in u.s. A.

SNL

8

200 Kiloteat

•	<del>T.</del> ;	ĥ	-1-	<del>n î</del>		În	· nf	I	· To		กร์			r	ĥ	<u>,</u>	-r	, <del>7</del> 2	21	<u> </u>			<del>.</del>	<del>Ter</del>	- <del></del>		•		-	<u>- 15</u>	fire	•-	ः. माम	÷ F	- - -	1(	U8	36	<b>;</b>			<b>*</b>	
. 0			1		<u></u>	<u> </u>						Ìŀ							Ŧ	ŗ					+	Ż		1				Ì	1		k	-i Li			4	8			
· 1	-	+		-	• • • • • • • •		-+				111				Ē		+			<u> </u>						100		ų V	30	<u> </u>		2		+	\$	1			1	-			
	of-	╄	$\mathbf{t}$				-		-		_					;;;	i	÷	• <del>•••</del> •	<u></u>	-					34.2		2	.y	<u> </u>		3			<u>: N</u>		-			9			
	∽ <b>†</b> -	t	:_ <b>D</b> i	2					 					- ++			-		•				1		¥.,			r		 	<u> </u>			9		5				-18			
	╺┥	ţ.			7		-		-				+							- <del></del>					4			2	- <del></del>			ž		2	4	200							
							S	с <u>і</u> -					1										1	-		00		1	Q.		 	2	۲	ñ	5	1 1 1			2	0			
								L.							ŀ					; 						10		Ř	Ŷ	. 1	 	1			K	U K			¢. ⊾∔-				
			1		ų., 1.	17			Y.	e l				4							 ,					A		U U				3		5	Ľ.	3			10.1	8			
		:   •   •			4 F. 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 1				1	đ					.  -  -	: 		: 	·- : ; ; ··	1 1		 1			2	S				्य . \		111		3	275	Ś		<b>)</b>	Ŋ.	T			
	+	.4-	-			   		71			Å	<u>.</u>					+						:/ <del>''</del> 	: <u>K</u>		2	• : • •••••	5	11.0			4			9		5		<u>- (</u> -	-			
	-				14.10 11. 11.		•••	3				1		1.1.1.  	Ē			•				rt .			ĝ.	~	-+-	12				đ	: <u>-</u>	5	9	53		х, 2., 3.	1				
•				-				14-		.14			A	52				1	4				119	- 15		1	1+:	2	5			Ż			0	7	- 1		ų.	10			
	-			-				ų,	3				+	9: 1.1	ł			1				-			) )			ñ	<u></u>			4		3	<	<u>d</u>		2					
		+	Ħ							T,				<u>-</u>	Ň	į.		=	-1-	-				i q			<u> </u>	-											l		,		20
							-	ļ							-	il il	5				1:1			iii		Ê		-			Į.			d				Ξ			÷	Ŷ	) )
	1				- + + + + + + + + + + + - + + + +					-	ij	* * *					Ŋ.	Ę								i u	ŦĦ		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		17	#				1						_	
·				_								<u>-</u>					EP	<i>i</i>	-				1			, L		Ĩ			l.	1				11.							ò
	m	-			<u>.</u>							111 111				r. F.F.		- 7	<i>H</i>			<u>.</u>				H H	÷	Ē	田田			1					-	+			•		2
•							; ; ; ;	; ; ; ; ; ;				<u><u> </u></u>			H		-		<u>-1</u>	1																Ŧ	Ē						3
•	$\sim$			2.1	174). 1947			بونون مونون مونون			 1	Fit-			H				<u>-</u> [-	<u>./</u>																					ŀ	1	2
								H		Щ				*  -+ •  -+ •  -+				<u>+</u>			Ň								1			ļ		F		+			- +-	-		•	
		-									+ +					ĻĻ.			•	-   -		Æ				l			1			#	4+-					+		-	ş -	•	30
i.						i: Di	Гļ							ļ.					•	+ +				H	2	N.							14-7- 			 		•		-		ŀ	<b>`</b>
5 U 4 7	6												H			ŧ۲ L				1			1			0		- F.			- 1' 24					- <b>i</b>		f L		-		<u> </u>	
	~				17.		15	Ï	Ē	ŧ			ľ			-	ļ	i. 1	-				1	Ň	ų.					117						Ť.	.1						
•	· -	4		뷥											F	T÷ ÷F		17. 17.	<u> </u>	-		1			$\mathcal{H}$	#		°ц.			B	E	ST.	(	0	P	Y.	-1	¥	ΨJ	LA	BL	E
	<u>الم</u>			17 <u>1</u> 1-1								11). 			H	11		1:1 1:1		+			IY T			1							<u></u> :::::									. ,	
	-				т. 1 4						111 111	141. GFE		Ц		1-1		Ļ			 										ļμ					-				-		1	
	1111																-	F.	<u>-</u>			-					Т. П				Ŧ		2	k									
	<b>6</b>						E					H	H			Ŧ	<u>i</u> [	Ţ-					•	F	Ē	=r 1!		Ż					17	22	:E								i.
											÷.			ħ	-				Ĩ					if				Ŧ	Į,				4	.0		-	Ŧ						•
	~		H.I			F	ij			ЦЦ ЦЦ					t	11	<del>,</del>	-	-							124		ij,	大	, in		Ţ	Ś	Ħ		+	Ē	F		15	-		s,
						Ľ							ļ	Ŧ	-			[-] 				r.			14	247 13		H		Į.			-	4		-F	H	f	[-				
•				F.		II.	Ţ		Ŧ			ŧ.		H		T.		1-1	+	- - - - - -						riju			Щ		Į.	1	R			Ŧ	ŀŀ				SŅ	D	1
	4	뱃	町	lit,		H	+!	ilt			<u>الا</u>	μ		赳	Į.	<u>H</u>	<u> </u>		-1-	t					ij	5	Щ	Ш	王	Hi	Et al		14		+++ */#54		<u>F</u>		֠	<u> </u> _	1 1	11	
Te see	D His								13		í.						Ň	Ê	Z	ζ× γ	4.5	5		2.5	Ś	k													榜		服		

.....

1445 C.W.

#### **BEST COPY AVAILABLE**



## BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1400



1.4

.









an en en antipalitantes des landatives provinsi di Changel de Change es en antipalitatives provinsi anno es e



# BEST AVAILABLE COPY

1094

500KT







Second Contraction