

FEB 28 1962

UCRL-9936

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
Berkeley, California
Contract No. W-7405-eng-48

MASTER

HYDROMAGNETIC IONIZING WAVES

Wulf E. Kunkel and Robert A. Gross

December 26, 1961

LEGAL NOTICE

This report has been released to the United States Atomic Energy Commission by the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority under an Agreement for Cooperation with the understanding that the position of the United Kingdom regarding legal responsibility is identical to that of the United States, which is stated as follows: Neither the United States, nor the Commission, nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission:

A. Makes any warranty or representation, expressed or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights; or

B. Assumes any liability with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.

As used in the above, "person acting on behalf of the Commission" includes any employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor, in the event that such employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor, prepares, disseminates, or provides access to, any information pursuant to his employment or contract with the Commission, or his employment with such contractor.

750 001

HYDROMAGNETIC IONIZING WAVES*

Wulf B. Kunkel and Robert A. Gross†

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California

December 26, 1961

ABSTRACT

One of the techniques by which highly ionized plasmas can be generated in the laboratory makes use of strong, electromagnetically driven shock waves propagating into a cold gas. If a magnetic field already exists in the undisturbed region these shocks will in general not be gasdynamic in character but the current-carrying interface will coalesce with the ionizing front. The process has certain features in common with detonation waves, and differs from previously analyzed hydro-magnetic shocks in that the electric field in the undisturbed region need not vanish. If the initial magnetic field has a longitudinal component the gas must be permitted to acquire a transverse velocity. Moreover, since such shocks are almost always compressive, the plasma will usually also have a forward velocity. In closed-end tubes, therefore, the front must be followed by a rarefaction wave in which the longitudinal flow is brought to rest again.

In this paper the phenomenon is analyzed as a one-dimensional single-fluid hydromagnetic problem, neglecting dissipation behind the wave. Zero conductivity is assumed for the region in front of the wave, and thermodynamic equilibrium is required behind. The problem is not

determined unless an additional condition is imposed. We hypothesize that the rarefaction wave remains attached to the front. In the limit of essentially complete ionization behind the front, the problem can be solved analytically as long as the transverse magnetic field there remains small compared with the longitudinal field. In this case the front velocity, plasma density and temperature, and the electric fields--as well as the structure of the rarefaction wave--can be expressed as simple functions of the initial magnetic field, the discharge current, the ionization energy, and the initial gas density. It is of particular interest to note that in this limit the compression is found to be very modest $[\rho_2 = \rho_1(\gamma + 1)/\gamma]$, and the trailing edge of the rarefaction wave propagates at half the speed of the front. It is also possible to generate noncompressive ionizing waves, provided that the magnetic field in the undisturbed region has a transverse component that is being appropriately reduced by the driving current flowing in the ionizing front.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years it has become convenient to produce and heat highly ionized plasmas by means of electromagnetically driven shock waves. A great variety of shock tubes have been developed, and actually many pinch discharges and rapid compression experiments fall into the same category. In the analysis of the dynamics of the phenomena it is usually assumed that the current-carrying region can be regarded as an impenetrable piston. The assumption is strictly justified only if the conductivity there is essentially infinite and if no magnetic field exists in the undisturbed region. If a finite magnetic field is present ahead of the disturbance

however, in many cases of interest some of the current will have to flow in the shock front itself. This is true even if the conductivity is infinite, and irrespective of whether the gas is already conducting or whether it is ionized by the shock itself.

This means that the shock is a hydromagnetic phenomenon, and the first current interface does not represent an impenetrable piston at all. Moreover, if the initial magnetic field has a component parallel to the direction of propagation of the disturbance, no real magnetic piston can exist anywhere. The piston-like discontinuity, or driving interface, in that case is replaced by a continuously expanding region of nonsteady flow, a rarefaction wave, in which the applied magnetic field spreads at a finite velocity through the propelled plasma. The flow pattern of plasma in a shock tube under these conditions has recently been analyzed for the case in which the gas ahead of the shock is already highly conducting.¹ In this paper we investigate the phenomenon for cases in which the gas ahead of the shock is not yet ionized, i.e., where the undisturbed region has essentially zero conductivity and the ionization is assumed to take place in the front itself. We will use the term hydromagnetic ionizing front.

From the theory of gasdynamics it is well known that the speed of a plane shock, or the ratio in which the energy is distributed between internal energy and mass motion, is not uniquely determined by the conservation laws alone. In addition to the state of the undisturbed gas either the shock speed or the flow velocity or the pressure of the gas behind the shock must be specified. The energy driving the shock and

heating the gas can then be considered as being supplied by the flow itself (or by the piston). If, on the other hand, the shock is driven primarily by an independent energy release in the front itself, as for instance in the case of detonations, neither the shock speed nor the flow velocity or the gas pressure behind the shock can be specified as given conditions. Therefore some other criterion must be found to render the problem unique. In the theory of gaseous detonations the Chapman-Jouguet hypothesis is used according to which the gas leaves the combustion zone at exactly sonic speed.²

In hydromagnetics the electromagnetic energy driving a shock is likewise released in the front itself. In these phenomena either the flow conditions or the magnetic field behind the shock, but not both, may be considered as specified. The additional constraint needed to determine the hydromagnetic shock flow uniquely, in almost all analyses to date, has been the requirement that the electric field must vanish in the frame of the medium ahead of the shock as well as behind it. In other words, the gas has been assumed conducting in the undisturbed as well as in the shocked region. A very complete discussion of all the different types of shocks that may exist under these conditions has been given by Baser and Ericson.³

If, on the other hand, the undisturbed gas has negligible conductivity, the electric field there may be finite and cannot be specified a priori. We conclude that in the analyses of hydromagnetic ionizing fronts, just as in the theory of detonations, another criterion must exist that determines the phenomenon uniquely. We repeat: hydromagnetic

750 005

ionizing fronts differ from ordinary hydromagnetic shocks not only because some energy must be invested in ionization (and perhaps dissociation of molecules), but primarily because the electric field in the undisturbed region cannot be directly related to the shock velocity and the magnetic field. The last statement is equivalent to pointing out that the un-ionized medium ahead of the ionizing front does not permit any propagation of hydromagnetic signals. It is these latter features, and not the energy conversion in the ionization process, which make the phenomenon similar to gaseous detonations.

In this paper, then, we limit our discussion to magnetically driven ionizing shocks under the condition that a magnetic field exists in the undisturbed region ahead. Moreover, we focus our attention on cases where the field is not parallel to the plane of the ionizing front. It is certainly possible to devise experiments in the laboratory in which a hydromagnetic driver is constrained to move in a direction with a component parallel to a magnetic field existing ahead of it;⁴ in some experiments the propagation is exactly along the magnetic field ahead of it.⁵ We will show that such an ionizing wave may provide a unique and very useful way of producing a magnetized uniform plasma if certain requirements are fulfilled. In fact, this latter aspect has motivated the present investigation.

THE MODEL

In the analysis we restrict ourselves to a simplified one-dimensional model. The geometry is best explained with the help of Fig. 1. The gas is considered to be confined between two infinite conducting planes, both

parallel to the xz plane. The initial magnetic field is also parallel to the xz plane, the applied electric field is always parallel to the y axis, and everything is assumed to be independent of both the y and z coordinates. This means we are looking at plane wave motion and are choosing our x coordinate along the direction of propagation. It also implies that we ignore viscous drag at the flow boundaries, and any variation of the fluid properties, such as the electrical conductivity, that might appear in the neighborhood of the surfaces.

The gas ahead of the wave is assumed to be at rest, in equilibrium, and nonconducting. Furthermore, we assume that immediately behind the shock the gas is again in thermodynamic equilibrium, so that it obeys an equation of state and so that its relevant physical properties such as composition, electrical conductivity, etc. can be computed from equilibrium considerations. This means we are limiting ourselves to densities high enough to ensure sufficiently rapid equilibration rates. We need not make any assumptions concerning the shock structure in this case, other than requiring that the shock thickness is finite and constant. The exact mechanism of ionization is not under discussion here. The requirement of equilibrium behind the front implies that the current there is zero if the flow is steady. This means that the electric field must be zero in the frame of the moving gas behind the front, even if the gas had finite resistivity there. Therefore, the shock jump relations are always automatically independent of the transport properties, such as the conductivity.⁶

It is not immediately obvious that a steady wave should always

propagate in a shock-tube experiment in which, for instance, the current input is kept constant. Because shocks are usually compressive, the front must ordinarily be followed by an expansion wave with its nonsteady flow, unless a suitable additional driving piston is provided. However, it has been shown that in the limit of negligible dissipation, i.e., isentropic conditions in the expansion region, the flow there can be described as a "centered rarefaction wave".⁷ This means that, in this approximation at least, the entire flow pattern spreads at a uniform rate and draws constant total current, so that a steady shock can indeed be driven ahead of it. Accordingly, we treat the problem in two steps. First we discuss the shock relations under the assumptions of steady flow. Here we include the effects of dissociation and ionization and point out the conditions under which steady propagation should be possible. Then we look at the expansion wave, assuming negligible resistivity, viscosity, and thermal conductivity. Finally we combine the two regions to describe the entire phenomenon. The model is depicted schematically in Fig. 2. The situation and the analyses here are therefore very similar to those treated by Kemp and Petschek,¹ the only difference being that the latter assume complete dissociation and ionization ahead of the wave, whereas we require negligible electrical conductivity.

SHOCK RELATIONS

In accordance with Fig. 2, we distinguish quantities in the regions R_1 and R_2 ahead of and behind the shock by the subscripts 1 and 2, respectively. Since we assume the shock to be steady, it is most convenient to start out by describing the flow in a frame of reference in which the front

750 008

is stationary (see Fig. 3a). The basic equations are then independent of time and, in our one-dimensional problem, may be immediately integrated to give the familiar symmetric jump conditions connecting the quantities in region R_1 and R_2 . It is easily shown that these relations do not depend explicitly on any of the irreversible processes occurring in the transition as long as no energy is lost by radiation, i.e., they are true conservation laws. If we denote the velocities in this frame of reference by small letters $\vec{v}_1 = (u_1, 0, 0)$ and $\vec{v}_2 = (u_2, 0, v_2)$, where u_1 and u_2 will be considered negative as indicated in Fig. 3a, the conservation laws are:

for the mass,

$$\rho_1 u_1 = \rho_2 u_2 \quad (1)$$

for the x-momentum,

$$\rho_1 u_1^2 + P_1 + \frac{\mu}{2} H_{z1}^2 = \rho_2 u_2^2 + P_2 + \frac{\mu}{2} H_{z2}^2 \quad (2)$$

for the z-momentum,

$$-\mu H_x H_{z1} = \rho_2 u_2 v_2 - \mu H_x H_{z2} \quad (3)$$

for the energy,

$$\rho_1 u_1 h_1 + E_s H_{z1} = \rho_2 u_2 h_2 + E_s H_{z2} \quad (4)$$

Here we have expressed the total enthalpy per unit mass as

$$h = e_0 + \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1} \frac{P}{\rho} + \frac{1}{2} u^2 + \frac{1}{2} v^2. \quad (5)$$

Equation (4) is most easily derived from the complete energy equation as given by Pai.⁸ We have retained the symbol E_s for the electric field as measured in this frame of reference, however, because the quantities in region R_1 are not directly related to E_s . It should also be noted that

only in this frame do we have $E_{s1} = E_{s2} = E_s$; in any other frame moving along the x-direction, there will be a difference between E_1 and E_2 (unless $H_{z1} = H_{z2}$, of course). Furthermore, we have expressed the internal energy per unit mass of the gas by two terms: $e = e_0 + p/[(\gamma-1)\rho]$. This means that we are assuming we can describe the plasma as a polytropic ideal gas with an additional "frozen-in" internal energy e_0 , as for instance stored in dissociation and ionization. The reason for this realization will become clear later on. In general, of course, both γ and e_0 will be functions of p and ρ , depending on the composition to be determined from equilibrium considerations.

In addition, we need the field equations for the magnetic and electric quantities. These are

$$H_{z1} = H_{z2} = H_x \quad (6)$$

[Eq. (6) was already used in the derivation of (2), (3), and (4)] and

$$E_s = \mu(u_2 H_{z2} - v_2 H_x), \quad (7)$$

which follows from the assumed conductivity and absence of current in region R_2 . If region R_1 were also conducting, we would obtain an additional relation, i.e.

$$E_s = \mu u_1 H_{z1}. \quad (8)$$

It is instructive, and in fact algebraically economical, to express the set (1) to (7) in a coordinate system fixed in the undisturbed un-ionized gas, before we discuss the consequences of abandoning Eq. (8). As indicated in Fig. 3c, we accomplish this by substituting $u_1 = -U$, $u_2 = -(U - v_2)$, $v_2 = v_2$, $E_1 = E_s + \mu U H_{z1}$, and $E_2 = E_s + \mu U H_{z2}$. The shock

750 010

relations can then be written in the form

$$\rho_1 U = \rho_2 (U - v_2), \quad (9)$$

$$\rho_1 U v_2 = p_2 - p_1 + \frac{\mu}{2} (H_{z2}^2 - H_{z1}^2), \quad (10)$$

$$-\rho_1 U w_2 = \mu H_x (H_{z2} - H_{z1}), \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 U (e_2 - e_1 + \frac{1}{2} v_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} w_2^2) + \frac{\mu U}{2} (H_{z2}^2 - H_{z1}^2) \\ = p_2 v_2 + E_2 H_{z2} - E_1 H_{z1}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

and

$$E_2 = E_1 + \mu U (H_{z2} - H_{z1}) = \mu (v_2 H_{z2} - v_2 H_x). \quad (13)$$

Equation (12) is the interesting one. It states that the work done on a unit volume of the undisturbed gas, including the energy change in the magnetic field, has to be provided by both a piston moving with the gas velocity v_2 and the negative divergence of the Poynting vector in the tube. It is the divergence of the Poynting vector which, at least in part, takes the place of the chemical energy released in a combustion wave. The piston, of which either p_2 or v_2 may be specified as the additional datum mentioned before, is necessary to ensure the assumed steady flow. We shall show, however, that here, as in the case of detonation waves, the flow is only maintained uniform by such a piston if its speed equals or exceeds a certain minimum.² If no such piston is provided or if the piston is too slow, a region of nonsteady flow in the manner of a rarefaction wave appears between it and the propagating shock front, and the quantity $p_2 v_2$ in Eq. (12) is not determined by the physical piston but by the dynamics of the expansion wave, i.e., the energy is taken from the

expanding gas itself.

The system of Eq. (9) to (13) must still be supplemented by a set of equations which determine

$$e_2 = e_0 = \frac{1}{\gamma_2 - 1} \frac{P_2}{\rho_2} \quad (14)$$

as a function of P_2 and ρ_2 . This requires numerical means, and although for hydrogen it has essentially been done already,⁹ in the analysis discussed here we shall simply consider both e_0 and γ_2 as given fixed quantities. The latter is, in fact, a valid approximation if the gas is hot enough to be practically fully dissociated and fully ionized. In this case, we simply have $e_0 = e_1 + e_d$, the total energy of ionization and dissociation per unit mass, and $\gamma_2 = 5/3$. For hydrogen the approximation is good if, for instance, P_2 is less than one atmosphere and the temperature exceeds $30\,000^\circ\text{K}$, i.e., P_2/ρ_2 is greater than $5 \times 10^8 \text{ m}^2/\text{sec}^2$.⁹

If we set $E_1 = 0$, $e_0 = 0$, and $\gamma_2 = \gamma_1$ the system of equations (9) through (14) is identical with the one derived very elegantly by List for ordinary nonrelativistic hydromagnetic shocks,¹⁰ the solutions of which have been adequately studied.³ Since we have to abandon the condition $E_1 = 0$ for our ionizing fronts it is obvious that the set of algebraic equations (9) to (14) is insufficient to determine the solutions completely. Just as is done in the discussion of gaseous detonations we can derive a relation between any two dependent variables, eliminating all the others with the help of the shock equations. This yields the locus of all possible solutions, thus affording us considerable insight into the nature of the phenomenon.

SIMPLIFIED SOLUTION

In the treatment of detonations, relations between p_2 and $1/\rho_2$, the so-called Hugoniot, are usually derived for purposes of discussion. In our case it is more instructive and convenient to find the relationship between U , the shock velocity, and v_2 , the x component of the flow velocity behind the front. We use Eqs. (9) to (14) to express U , v_2 , E_2 , ρ_2 , E_2 , and hence also E_1 , as functions of ρ_1 , p_1 , γ_1 , H_x , H_{x1} , and of H_{x2} , γ_2 , and e_0 , as well as of v_2 . Physically, this means that we are specifying the conditions in the undisturbed gas and the current, but not the electric field. If we eliminate in Eq. (12) the quantities v_2 , e_2 , ρ_2 , p_2 , E_2 , and E_1 with the help of Eqs. (9), (10), (11), (13), and (14), we obtain a relation of the fourth degree which is cubic in U and quadratic in v_2 . We could solve this for v_2 and study the behavior of $v_2(U)$. Algebraically, however, it turns out to be much more convenient to introduce a set of new dimensionless variables which simplify the expressions considerably, and permit a much more direct inspection of the character of the solutions.

Let us define the following new variables:

$$\Delta H = H_{x2} - H_{x1} \neq 0$$

$$X = \frac{\rho_1 U v_2}{\mu (\Delta H)^2}$$

$$Y = \frac{\rho_1 U^2}{\mu (\Delta H)^2}$$

$$Z = \frac{\rho_1 U v_2}{\mu (\Delta H)^2}$$

(15)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \eta &= \frac{D}{\mu(\Delta H)^2} \\
 \epsilon &= \frac{\rho_1^0}{\mu(\Delta H)^2} \\
 \alpha &= \frac{H_x}{\Delta H} \\
 \beta &= \frac{H_{x1} + H_{x2}}{\Delta H}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{15}$$

We are not interested in the case $\Delta H = 0$ because this is the ordinary gasdynamic shock. The parameter β can have any value in principle. In particular, $\beta = 1$ implies $H_{x1} = 0$, $\beta = -1$ means $H_{x2} = 0$, and $\beta = 0$ refers to $H_{x2} = -H_{x1}$. In analogy to the nomenclature introduced for ordinary hydromagnetic shocks,⁷ we shall call these cases magnetic "switch-on", "switch-off", and "transverse" ionizing fronts, respectively. With the above substitutions, the solution takes on the form

$$Y = \frac{(\gamma_2 + 1)X^2 + (\gamma_2 - 1 - \beta + 2\gamma_2 H_1)X + (\gamma_2 - 1)\alpha^2}{2X + 2(\gamma_2 - 1)\epsilon + \gamma_2 - 1 - \beta - 2H_1(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)/(\gamma_1 - 1)}
 \tag{16}$$

$$Z = -\alpha
 \tag{17}$$

$$\rho_2/\rho_1 = Y/(Y - X)
 \tag{18}$$

$$H_2 = X - \beta/2 + H_1
 \tag{19}$$

$$\frac{E_2}{\mu U \Delta H} = \frac{E_1}{\mu U \Delta H} + 1 = \frac{\alpha^2 + \frac{1}{2}(1 + \beta)X}{Y}
 \tag{20}$$

Although this form is still implicit since X contains the dependent variable U , many features of the solutions are easily demonstrated. When E_1 , ϵ , and $\gamma_2 - \gamma_1$ are all set equal to zero, these equations are again reduced, of course, to the ones investigated by Bazer and Ericson.³ In particular, it is readily shown that in such a case X cannot be negative if the entropy is not supposed to diminish across the shock. Also, it is easily seen that under these circumstances X can only be zero if $\beta = 0$, and then we have $Y = \alpha^2$, and $\Pi_2 = \Pi_1$, i.e., the noncompressive so-called symmetrical or Alfvén shock.

None of these inferences can be drawn from Eqs. (16) to (20) if E_1 is allowed to differ from zero. This is the first important conclusion.

We shall now point out some of the general features of Eq. (16), which is plotted for various α 's in Fig. 4. Of course we are only interested in the region $Y < \alpha^2 + \frac{1}{2}(1 + \beta)X$ so that E_1 never vanishes.

(a) Equation (16) describes hyperbolas in the xy plane. The asymptotes are:

$$X = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \beta - \gamma_2) - (\gamma_2 - 1)\epsilon + \Pi_1(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)/(\gamma_1 - 1) \quad (21a)$$

and

$$Y = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_2 + 1)X + \frac{1}{4}(\gamma_2 - 1)(1 + \beta - \gamma_2) - \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_2^2 - 1)\epsilon \\ + (\gamma_2 - 1)\Pi_1(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)(\gamma_2 - 1)/(\gamma_1 - 1) \quad (21b)$$

i.e., they do not depend on the parameter α .

(b) When X is very large compared to α , β , γ , ϵ , and Π_1 we have $Y \sim \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_2 + 1)X$. This is the ordinary gas dynamic strong shock. We should expect this property because it is clear that the piston in Eq. (12) is doing practically all the work in this case.

(c) The curves $Y(X)$ have minima. The minima have as loci the straight lines

$$Y_m = (\gamma_2 + 1)X - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \beta - \gamma_2) + \gamma_2 H_1. \quad (22)$$

These are seen to be independent of α and ϵ . The fact that the $Y(X)$ have minima means that for each set of given conditions $\rho_1, P_1, \Delta H$, etc. the resulting relation $U(v_2)$ has a minimum. Again, this feature is reminiscent of the behavior of detonation waves. One might, for instance, be tempted to identify the minimum with the familiar Chapman-Jouguet point in the theory of gaseous detonations, although the analogy should not be stretched too far.

The analysis of gaseous detonation waves shows that at the point of minimum propagation speed the flow velocity of the gas behind the front relative to the front is always exactly sonic. That is, at that point the rarefaction wave follows the front immediately. Moreover, the entropy behind the front is a minimum when compared to values of entropy on other points along the $U(v_2)$ curve. The analogous conditions are generally not fulfilled for the propagation speeds Y_m of our hydromagnetically driven ionizing fronts. However, in the special case $\beta = -1$, the magnetic switch-off wave, we can show that the analogy is almost complete. This is the second important conclusion.

The proof is elementary. We merely have to express the relative velocity $u_2 = -(U - v_2)$ in terms of our new variables:

$$\frac{\rho_2 u_2^2}{\mu(\Delta H)^2} = Y - X. \quad (23)$$

Substitution from Eqs. (19) and (22) yields for the relative gas speed at the minimum of U

$$(u_2^2)_m = (U - v_2)_m^2 = \frac{1}{\rho_2} \left[\gamma_2 D_2 + \frac{1}{2}(1 + \beta)(\gamma - 1)\mu(\Delta H)^2 \right]. \quad (24)$$

If dissipation can be neglected, the propagation speeds c_2 along the x direction for small disturbances in the plasma in region R_2 are given by the relation^{7, 11}

$$c_2^2 \left[\frac{\mu}{\rho_2} (H_x^2 + H_{x2}^2) - c_2^2 \right] = \frac{\gamma_2 D_2}{\rho_2} \left(\frac{\mu}{\rho_2} H_x^2 - c_2^2 \right). \quad (25)$$

Obviously for $H_{x2} = 0$, we have $\beta = -1$, and hence

$$(u_2^2)_m = \gamma_2 D_2 / \rho_2 = c_2^2.$$

Likewise, it can be readily shown that the change of entropy per unit mass $ds = 1/T[de + pd(1/\rho)]$ taken along the curve $Y(X)$ at the point where $dY = 0$ is given by

$$(T_2 ds_2)_m = \frac{\mu}{2\rho_1} (1 + \beta)(H_{x2} - H_{x1})^2 \frac{dX}{Y} \quad (26)$$

which again is zero for $\beta = -1$. We shall therefore call this point in this special case the C-J (Chapman-Jouguet) point, and the mode of operation of the ionizing front at this point the C-J ionizing process.

This result is not too surprising because here the magnetic field has no transverse component behind the front so that the gas flow in the x direction is purely acoustic. The entropy produced in a switch-off ionizing wave can be shown to be a maximum at the C-J point rather than a minimum; it is therefore not clear whether the phenomenon is stable at this point.

In the theory of simple gaseous detonation, as pointed out before,

it is usually argued that the C-J process must occur whenever there is no piston added that moves with a speed $v_2 > (v_2)_M$, the gas flow velocity in the x direction corresponding to the C-J point.² The same can be demonstrated here. It is easily verified that, in the case of $\beta = -1$, we have $\gamma_2 \rho_2 > \rho_2 (U - v_2)^2$ for $v_2 > (v_2)_M$. This means that any rarefaction wave existing behind the shock will catch up with and weaken the shock, reducing both U and v_2 either until the flow behind the front is uniform, or until v_2 equals $(v_2)_M$, whichever is reached first. In that case, therefore, the situation $v_2 < (v_2)_M$ is never obtained. Besides, situations with $v_2 < (v_2)_M$, $\beta = -1$ are believed to be unstable, because they involve supersonic flow normal to the front on both sides of the shock. As a result, we can use Eq. (22) for $\beta = -1$ to express the additional condition for the C-J process. Hence we can eliminate either Y or X from Eq. (16) so that the problem of the switch-off wave is completely determined provided the C-J process itself is stable. In this connection see, for instance, the recent observations by White.¹²

In order to extend the solution to the general case $-\infty < \beta < +\infty$, we shall postulate here that the relevant physical condition determining the mode of operation according to the arguments in the previous paragraph is

$$U - v_2 = c_2. \quad (27)$$

This means region R_2 in Fig. 2 is assumed always to be shrunk to zero length. Here c_2 is given by the smallest positive root of Eq. (25), because a magnetosonic expansion is a slow wave.¹

It does, of course, seem possible that the actual propagation of

ionizing fronts is governed by the ionization rate rather than by the magnetosonic conditions analyzed here. In particular it may be argued that E_1 must be sufficiently small so that no electric breakdown occurs in region R_1 . In that case, however, a steady phenomenon can only result if v_2 is equal to or smaller than given by condition (27), because otherwise the expansion wave will overtake the front, causing a nonsteady or nonequilibrium flow. Equation (27) can therefore be regarded as a limiting condition on v_2 for steady propagation. In experiments where steady ionizing switch-on fronts have actually been observed,⁵ one of the two electrodes (conducting plates) shown in Fig. 1 does not extend into region R_1 , so that the electric field E_1 is, as it were, convected along with the speed U and attenuates with increasing distance from the front. This means the gas in region R_1 is exposed to electric fields of the magnitude of E_1 only for a short time and a finite ionization rate is consistent with a steady propagation speed. Since a completely self-consistent calculation of ionization rates and hence of the structure of the hydromagnetic front is an exceedingly complex problem, we keep this discussion simple by assuming that condition (27) can be used as a good approximation for all cases of interest.

Equation (27) can be combined with Eq. (25) and rewritten with the help of our new variables (15) to read

$$(Y - X) \left[\alpha^2 + \frac{1}{4}(1 + \beta)^2 - Y + X \right] = \gamma \Pi_2 (\alpha^2 - Y + X). \quad (28)$$

Because of Eq. (19), and after some rearrangement, we finally obtain our general subsidiary equation

$$(1 + \beta)^2(Y - X) = 4(\gamma_2 X + X - Y - \frac{1}{2} \gamma_2 \beta + \gamma_2 H_1)(\alpha^2 + X - Y). \quad (29)$$

The solution of the simultaneous equations (16) and (29) is still algebraically cumbersome unless $\beta = -1$ or $\alpha = 0$.

First we examine the case where $\alpha = 0$, i.e., $H_x = 0$. In this case the smallest root of Eq. (25) vanishes and $c_2 = 0$. This means that $\rho_2 = \infty$, and $Y = X$, i.e., we get a so-called "snowplow" solution and, of course, there is no expansion wave. In particular we find, neglecting D_1 ,

$$U = v_2 = (2e_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (30)$$

$$D_2 = 2\rho_1 e_0 - \frac{1}{2} \mu (H_{z2}^2 - H_{z1}^2) \quad (31)$$

$$E_2 = \mu H_{z2} U \quad (32)$$

$$E_1 = \mu H_{z1} U. \quad (33)$$

These results differ from previous "snowplow" solutions, because in the earlier treatments the energy equation was not used. We obtain the conventional form of the plane snowplow solution if we eliminate e_0 between Eqs. (30) and (31) and arbitrarily set $D_2 = 0$. In view of the predicted infinite density and the possible negative pressures, according to Eq. (31), it is quite clear that our model is not any better than the earlier one. In fact, we must conclude that an ionizing front will not be steady if $\alpha = 0$ and Eq. (27) applies.

If Eq. (27) is abandoned, of course, steady solutions are possible. Since there cannot be an expansion wave when $\alpha = 0$, the flow is similar to that driven by a conventional impenetrable piston. This situation

has recently been studied in more detail by Lyubimov and Kulikovskii¹³⁻¹⁵ who decided that they had to supply information concerning the shock structure and dissipative effects in order to arrive at unique solutions. It is interesting to note that they found conditions under which current-free, i.e., ordinary gasdynamic ionizing shocks should propagate ahead of the current-carrying interface. The question of stability was not yet considered, however. Clearly, the special case of $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta = -1$, i.e., $H_x = H_{z1} = 0$, gives no trouble if the conductivity is sufficiently high behind the front because in that case E_1 is certainly vanishingly small and the usual model of the idealized flow in a magnetically driven shock tube should be valid. The expressions for the velocities, pressures, and electric fields in all these cases differ somewhat from those given in Eqs. (30) to (33), of course. We shall not discuss these here, but rather limit the treatment to the range of values of $\alpha > \alpha_{crit}$ for which the speed of the expansion wave is fast enough to rule out the possibility of purely gasdynamic shocks even if the conductivity were infinite. In this case Eq. (27) can certainly be used as a limiting condition.

For simplicity we examine the important case where

$$\alpha^2 \gg (1 + \beta)^2 \quad (34)$$

so that we can use as a good approximation

$$Y = (\gamma_2 + 1)X - \frac{1}{2} \gamma_2 \beta + \gamma_2 H_1. \quad (35)$$

A plot of Eq. (35) is also included in the example on Fig. 4. For $\beta = -1$, both Eqs. (29) and (35) are identical with Eq. (22), and then Eq. (35) is valid for all $\alpha > 0$. Certainly for experiments in which $H_x \gg H_{z1}$ and $H_x \gg H_{z2}$, Eq. (35) is adequate. We may, moreover, always neglect

Π_1 , because we will certainly need $\Pi_1 \ll 1$ in ionizing hydromagnetic waves; Π_1 was only carried in our equations for completeness sake. The subscript of γ_2 may then also be dropped. If we now use Eq. (35) to eliminate X from Eq. (16) we obtain the solution for the wave speed

$$Y = (A + E^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} - E \quad (36)$$

where

$$A = (\gamma^2 - 1)\alpha^2 + \frac{1}{2} \beta \gamma (\frac{1}{2} \beta \gamma + \gamma - 1 - \beta)$$

and

$$E = (\gamma^2 - 1)\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \gamma (\gamma - 1 - \beta).$$

The terms containing β in this expression are strictly justified only for $(1 + \beta)^2 \ll 1$, because of condition (34).

For $A \gg E^2$, i.e., $\mu H_X \Delta H \gg \rho_1 \epsilon_0$, we find

$$U^2 = (\mu/\rho_1) H_X \Delta H (\gamma^2 - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (37)$$

For $E^2 \gg A$, on the other hand, we have

$$U = \mu H_X \Delta H / \rho_1 (2\epsilon_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (38)$$

In Fig. 5 we show a plot of Y as a function of α for $\beta = -1$, $\gamma = 5/3$, and a variety of values for ϵ .

The other quantities of interest -- v_2 , ρ_2 , p_2 , and E_2 -- are most easily expressed in terms of U , the wave speed, by using Eqs. (35), (18), (19), and (20). In these, too, we shall ignore p_1 everywhere and drop the subscript of γ_2 . From Eq. (35) we obtain immediately

$$v_2 = \frac{U}{\gamma + 1} \left(1 + \frac{\beta \gamma}{2Y} \right) \quad (39)$$

and, by using Eq. (18),

$$\rho_2 = \rho_1 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{2\gamma} \right)^{-1} \right) \quad (40)$$

According to Eq. (19), P_2 is given by

$$P_2 = \frac{\rho_1 U^2}{\gamma + 1} \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{2\gamma} \right) \quad (41)$$

This also determines the temperature behind the front as

$$(RT)_2 = \frac{P_2}{\rho_2} = \frac{\gamma U^2}{(\gamma + 1)^2} \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{2\gamma} \right)^2 \quad (42)$$

Finally, the electric field in the region R_2 is determined from Eq. (20) to be

$$E_2 = \frac{\mu \Delta H}{U} \left[\frac{\mu}{\rho_1} H_x^2 + \frac{(1 + \beta)U^2}{2(\gamma + 1)} \left(1 + \frac{\beta\gamma}{2\gamma} \right) \right] \quad (43)$$

SPECIFIC CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that many of the previously drawn conclusions concerning hydromagnetic shock jump properties cannot be carried over to the important case where E_1 is allowed to differ from zero. Also we have shown that the magnetic switch-off ionizing wave is almost in complete analogy with Chapman-Jouguet detonation theory.

From the set of relations (36) to (43) further conclusions concerning these hydromagnetic ionizing fronts may be drawn immediately. First of all, it is easily demonstrated, with the help of Eq. (16), that $\alpha^2 \gg \gamma \gg 1$ if both $\alpha^2 \gg (1 + \beta)^2$ and $\alpha^2 \gg 1$ are fulfilled. Equations (36) to (43) therefore show that under these circumstances v_2 , ρ_2 , P_2 ,

and E_2 do not depend strongly on β . Also, we see that in this case the difference between conditions (22) and (35) is negligible. In other words, if the longitudinal magnetic field H_x is much stronger than both H_{z1} and H_{z2} , Eqs. (36) through (43) can be expected to describe the phenomenon rather well, even if the postulate (27) is not the correct one. This is the third important conclusion.

Furthermore, certain interesting features pertaining to the extreme case mentioned above are worth pointing out. Equation (40) in this limit states that ρ_2/ρ_1 is remarkably insensitive to changes in the independent variables, the value being surprisingly low. For example, for $\gamma = 5/3$, we have $\rho_2/\rho_1 = 1.6$.

Substitution for U from Eq. (36) in Eq. (43) shows that E_2 varies only slowly with ΔH . In fact, for $\mu H_x \Delta H \ll \rho_1 e_0$ Eq. (38) applies, and we have

$$E_2 = \mu H_x (2e_0)^{1/2} \tag{44}$$

which is independent of the current and gas density. Equation (44) as well as Eq. (30) resemble the findings by Alfvén¹⁶ and Fahleson,¹⁷ although the experiments described by them apparently did not involve distinct fronts producing full ionization, as assumed in our model. Equation (38), when combined with Eq. (11) can also be written

$$w_2^2 = 2e_0. \tag{45}$$

Actually, when Eq. (38) applies, the temperature T_2 is often too low to justify the original assumption of complete ionization.

In Fig. 6, Eq. (43) -- for the case of $\beta = +1$ -- is plotted in a

750 024

nondimensional form, i.e., expressing the quantity $K_2/[\mu R_X(2\epsilon_0)^{1/2}]$ as a function of $\Delta H[\mu/(\rho_1\epsilon_0)]^{1/2}$ for various values of $R_X[\mu/(\rho_1\epsilon_0)]^{1/2}$. The solid curves are fair approximations also for $\beta \neq 1$ provided that $(1 + \beta)^2 \ll \alpha^2$. The predictions of Eqs. (36) through (43) may be compared with the experimental findings of Wilcox et al. in which $\beta = +1$.⁵ Their geometry is not one-dimensional but cylindrical, as indicated schematically in Fig. 7. Nevertheless their observations agree fairly well with some of the major conclusions arrived at here (slow uniform propagation speed of a distinct front, voltage regulations, etc.).¹⁸ More extensive comparison between theory and experiment is planned for the near future.

Whereas the magnetic "switch-on" wave is of particular interest to the experimentalist because of the simplicity in instrumentation, the "switch-off" wave is more attractive from the analytical point of view. In addition to the close correspondence to gaseous detonation waves, in the switch-off case, we note that both Eqs. (16) and (20) become simplified. In particular, it is interesting to see that, for $\beta = -1$, Eqs. (36) through (43) are exact, the only restriction being $\alpha > 0$.

Finally, we investigate under what conditions v_2 can be zero, i.e., $\rho_2 = \rho_1$. As pointed out before, Eqs. (16) through (20) do not restrict X to values greater than zero if β is permitted to take on values less than zero. In our model of a closed input end of the tube, v_2 can never be negative. If conditions in the front call for $v_2 < 0$, a precompression shock is set up, violating the assumption of gas at rest in region R_1 . If the precompression shock is strong enough to ionize the gas, the front will change its character so that v_2 is greater than zero. In

a very similar manner, deflagrations are changed into detonations in the case of closed gas-combustion tubes. We certainly may set $X = 0$ in both Eqs. (16) and (29) and obtain two simultaneous equations in Y , β , and α :

$$Y_0 = \frac{(\gamma - 1)\alpha^2}{2(\gamma - 1)\epsilon + \gamma - 1 - \beta} \quad (46)$$

and

$$-(1 + \beta)^2 Y_0 \geq 2(2Y_0 + \beta\gamma)(\alpha^2 - Y_0). \quad (47)$$

We use the symbol \geq to allow values of $v_2 \geq U$ in Eq. (27). If we eliminate Y_0 between Eqs. (46) and (47), we find the minimum condition for $-\beta$ as a function of α and ϵ that makes $v_2 = 0$ possible. We shall not do this here, because it is lengthy and not particularly instructive. However, we may also ask what can be the maximum α for which a switch-off wave, $\beta = -1$, does not yet bring about a compression. This means that, after imposing $\beta + 1 = 0$ in Eqs. (46) and (47), we solve for α . The result is

$$\alpha^2 \leq \gamma \left[\epsilon + \frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma - 1)} \right]. \quad (48)$$

We may, of course, express this relation as a condition for the minimum admissible value of H_{z1} if H_x , e_0 , ρ , and γ are all given:

$$H_{z1}^2 \geq 2(\gamma - 1) \left[H_x^2 - (\gamma/\mu)\rho e_0 \right] / \gamma^2. \quad (49)$$

The propagation speed of the front is then given directly by Eq. (46).

The transverse velocity becomes independent of H_x :

$$v_2^2 = 2e_0 + \frac{\gamma\mu}{(\gamma - 1)\rho} H_{z1}^2. \quad (50)$$

The expression for the pressure is simply

$$P_2 = \frac{1}{2} \mu H_{z1}^2 \quad (51)$$

which imposes a required minimum on H_{z1} to ensure adequate ionization.

The electric fields are

$$E_2 = -\mu v_2 H_x \quad (52)$$

and

$$E_1 = E_2 \left(1 - \frac{cU^2}{\mu H_x^2} \right).$$

The situation is particularly simple for $\mu H_x^2 \gg \gamma \rho c_0$. In that case, Eq. (49) reduces to

$$H_{z1}/H_x \geq [2(\gamma - 1)]^{1/2}/\gamma = 0.7 \quad (53)$$

for $\gamma = 5/3$. Moreover, both U and the impedance $-E_2/H_{z1}$ become independent of current (the minus sign refers to the fact that, for $\beta < 0$, E is negative if H_{z1} is positive):

$$U^2 = \frac{(\gamma - 1)\mu}{\gamma\rho} H_x^2 \quad (54)$$

$$E_2 = \gamma E_1 = - \left[\frac{\gamma\mu}{(\gamma - 1)\rho} \right]^{1/2} \mu H_x H_{z1}. \quad (55)$$

While

$$v_2^2 = \frac{\gamma\mu}{(\gamma - 1)\rho} H_{z1}^2 = \frac{2\gamma\rho_2}{(\gamma - 1)\rho}. \quad (56)$$

We feel that such a switch-off ionizing wave would be a very suitable means of generating a uniform magnetized plasma. After the plasma is formed, the resulting transverse motion is easily arrested by shorting out E_2 through a suitable resistor so that a simple Alfvén-wave relaxation will take place without disturbing the state of the gas. It would be interesting to try to realize this situation experimentally and to

test the various conclusions arrived at in this analysis.

For $v_2 > 0$, however, the front must be followed by a rarefaction wave. A brief discussion of this phenomenon is presented in the next section.

RAREFACTION WAVE

As pointed out before, in the analysis of the nonsteady flow behind the front, we shall have to assume isentropic motion. Otherwise the analysis would become very complicated. This problem has already been treated by several authors,^{1, 7, 19} and, in the main, we shall merely summarize the results. If we assume plane motion, we can eliminate the time and space differentials in the basic equations of magnetohydrodynamics by the formal operator substitution¹⁹

$$d = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + (v \mp c) \frac{\partial}{\partial x}. \quad (57)$$

As a result, we obtain the so-called "characteristic equations" for the motion, which for our geometry take the following form corresponding to the conservation laws:

Mass

$$\pm \rho dv = \rho dv \quad (58)$$

x-momentum

$$\pm \rho dv + s^2 d\rho + \mu R_x dH_x \quad (59)$$

z-momentum

$$\pm \rho dv - \mu R_x dH_x \quad (60)$$

Energy

$$pp^{-\gamma} = \text{constant}. \quad (61)$$

Here we have written a_s for the speed of ordinary sound:

$$\frac{dP}{d\rho} = \frac{\gamma P}{\rho} = a_s^2 \quad (62)$$

The field equations are:

$$H_x = \text{constant} \quad (63)$$

$$\pm c dH_z = H_z dv - H_x dw \quad (64)$$

$$E = \mu(vH_z - wH_x). \quad (65)$$

Some authors have used the term "simple magnetosonic waves" for this case.²⁰ The fact that the substitution (57) indeed eliminates both independent variables from the equations implies that the dependent variables are all constant for given "phases" $x_0 = x - (c + v)t$. In our particular case of the rarefaction wave, all phases coincide at, say, $x = 0$ for $t = 0$, so that we may set $x_0 = 0$ for all variables. Such a phenomenon is called a centered wave. It means that the coordinate of a constant condition, a "phase", is given by $x = (c + v)t$. Inspection of the character of hydro-magnetic waves shows that the quantity c here in the case of a rarefaction wave is given by the smallest positive root of Eq. (25). In line with our earlier treatment, we shall describe the wave in the laboratory frame of reference.

The simultaneous solution of Eqs. (58) to (64) is complicated only because of the complex nature of the condition (25). The set is easily reduced to two simultaneous equations. In order to obtain explicit answers, however, numerical means have to be used eventually. This has already been done rather completely by Kesp and Petschek,¹ and therefore shall not be repeated here. We shall only demonstrate the almost obvious fact

that, for large ratios H_x/H_z , the flow can be approximated by the familiar acoustic solution, in which case an analytic treatment is possible.²¹ These solutions will be exact for the switch-off case, where $H_{z2} = 0$.

Let us suppose that, in an actual experiment where such a wave is propagated, the input current is given and constant in time. According to our model, this determines H_{z4} . Equations (58) to (64) then indicate that at any point x moving with constant velocity x/t , H_x is constant. Particularly at a point moving immediately behind the front, $x = Ut$, the transverse field is given by H_{z2} and also is constant in time. Since we already know the relationship between U and H_{z2} from our shock analysis, it is easier to pretend that H_{z2} is given, so that we may compute U , v_2 , w_2 , P_2 , ρ_2 , etc. in order to apply them as boundary conditions for the solution of Eqs. (58) to (64). The only other condition we know is that at $x = 0$, either $v = v_h = 0$ or $\rho = \rho_h = 0$. (In our acoustic approximation, of course, we will never find $\rho = 0$.) Integration of our equations then will determine H_{z4} , w_4 , P_4 , ρ_4 , etc. This approach is a standard technique for treating rarefaction waves.

Using Eq. (62) and dropping the subscript 2 which only refers to region R_2 , we can write Eq. (25) in the form

$$\frac{a_s^2}{c^2} = 1 + \frac{H_z^2}{H_x^2} \left(1 - \frac{\rho c^2}{\mu H_x^2} \right). \quad (66)$$

For the slow-wave root where we limit ourselves to cases $\rho c^2 \ll \mu H_x^2$, we may therefore also approximate

$$c^2 \approx a_s^2 = \gamma P / \rho \quad (67)$$

and
$$a_s^2 = c^2 = c^2(H_z^2/H_x^2) \quad (68)$$

as long as we have $H_z \ll H_x$ ($\alpha \gg 1$).

For Eq. (58), we obtain in that case the well-known acoustic solution using Eq. (61) to eliminate p :

$$c = c_2 + \frac{1}{2} (\gamma - 1)(v - v_2). \quad (69)$$

If the expansion wave is attached to the shock, as postulated in Eq. (27), we therefore find

$$c = U - \frac{1}{2} (\gamma + 1)v_2 + \frac{1}{2} (\gamma - 1)v. \quad (70)$$

For c_h , where $v = v_h = 0$ with Eq. (39), we have

$$c_h = \frac{1}{2} U(1 - \beta\gamma/2Y). \quad (71)$$

In other words, the tail of the expansion wave moves at roughly half the speed of the front. The density ρ_h is obtained from Eqs. (27), (39), (61), and (67) using Eq. (71):

$$\rho_h = \rho_2 \left(\frac{\gamma + 1}{2\gamma} \right)^{2/(\gamma-1)} = 2\rho_1 \left(\frac{\gamma + 1}{2\gamma} \right)^{(\gamma+1)/(\gamma-1)} \quad (72)$$

where the value of ρ_1 was substituted from Eq. (40). For $\gamma = 5/3$, this yields $\rho_h = 0.8 \rho_1$.

Therefore it appears that the expansion produced by a hydromagnetic ionizing wave is very mild if H_z is much less than H_x and about half the length of the generated plasma is uniform and without longitudinal motion.

Pressure and temperature in region R_h may also be immediately computed from Eqs. (61) and (72). The results are

$$P_4 = P_2 \left(\frac{\gamma + 1}{2\gamma} \right)^{2\gamma/(\gamma-1)} = \frac{\rho_1 U^2}{2\gamma} \left(\frac{\gamma + 1}{2\gamma} \right)^{(\gamma+1)/(\gamma-1)} \quad (73)$$

and

$$(RT)_4 = (RT)_2 \left(\frac{\gamma + 1}{2\gamma} \right)^2 = \frac{U^2}{4\gamma} \quad (74)$$

where the values of P_2 and $(RT)_2$ are substituted from Eqs. (41) and (42).

Finally, we wish to calculate H_{x4} and E_4 (or w_4) in this approximation. Using Eqs. (58), (59), (67), and (68), we find

$$\mu H_x^2 dH_x = - H_x dp$$

so that we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{x4} &= H_{x2} \exp \left[\frac{\mu}{H_x} (P_2 - P_4) \right] \\ &= H_{x2} \left[1 + \frac{\mu}{H_x} (P_2 - P_4) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

Similarly, we deduce from Eqs. (60) and (64) the approximate solution

$$w_4 = w_2 = \frac{H_{x2}}{H_x} v_2$$

so that we have

$$E_4 = - \mu w_4 H_x = E_2 \quad (76)$$

For large H_x/H_{x4} , the net impedance of the shock tube, which we may express as $E_4(H_{x4} - H_{x1})^{-1}$, is then essentially computed from Eq. (43), where U must be evaluated from Eq. (36). That is, the expansion wave does not contribute appreciably to the electrical behavior. This is fortunate,

750 032

in retrospect, since large current densities at finite conductivity in region R_3 would certainly conflict violently with the assumption of isentropic flow there. We conclude that the major deviation from this idealized model will be caused by the finite viscosity of the plasma, which must definitely cause considerable dissipation. It is therefore essential that the channel in which such a plasma is generated is not too narrow in the direction of the electric field.

This discussion may suffice to outline the principal features of hydromagnetic ionizing waves and of the plasma which can be generated by them. It is felt that a more precise analysis is not warranted at this point because of the drastic simplifying assumptions that had to be made at the outset. The main problems that still need to be investigated most urgently center on the ionizing mechanism itself, which is active in the propagating front and which controls the shock structure and governs the approach to the equilibrium assumed in this paper.

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES


- * Work done under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.
- † Present address: School of Engineering, Columbia University, New York.
- 1. N. H. Kemp and H. E. Petschek, *Phys. Fluids* 2, 599 (1959).
- 2. R. Courant and K. O. Friedrichs, Supersonic Flow and Shock Waves (Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, 1948), pp. 204-232.
- 3. J. Bazer and W. B. Ericson, *Astrophys. J.* 129, 758 (1959).
- 4. R. M. Patrick, *Phys. Fluids* 2, 589 (1959).
- 5. J. M. Wilcox, A. W. DeSilva, and W. S. Cooper III, *Phys. Fluids* 4, 1506 (1961).
- 6. H. W. Liepmann and J. D. Cole, Symposium of Plasma Dynamics, edited by P. Clauser (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., Reading, Massachusetts, 1960) p. 199.
- 7. K. O. Friedrichs and H. Kranzer, "Notes on Magnetohydrodynamics VIII, Nonlinear Wave Motion," U. S. Atomic Energy Commission New York Operations Office Report NYO-6486, July 1958 (unpublished).
- 8. S.-I. Pai, *Phys. Rev.* 105, 1424 (1957).
- 9. R. A. Gross and C. L. Eisen, "Some Properties of a Hydrogen Plasma," Proceedings of the Third Biennial Gas Dynamics Symposium (Northwestern University Press, Chicago, 1959) p. 15.
- 10. R. Lüst, *Z. Naturforsch.* 8a, 277 (1953).
- 11. E. Zuminò, *Phys. Rev.* 108, 1116 (1957).
- 12. D. R. White, *Phys. Fluids* 4, 465 (1961).

150
034

13. G. A. Lyubimov, *Doklady Akad. Nauk S. S. R.* 126, 291 (1959).
14. A. G. Kulikovskii and G. A. Lyubimov, *Doklady Akad. Nauk* 129, 52 (1959).
15. A. G. Kulikovskii and G. A. Lyubimov, *Doklady Akad. Nauk* 129, 525 (1959).
16. H. Alfvén, *Revs. Modern Phys.* 32, 710 (1960).
17. U. V. Fahlson, *Phys. Fluids* 4, 125 (1961).
18. J. M. Wilcox (Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley), private communication.
19. H. Grad, in The Magnetodynamics of Conducting Fluids, edited by D. Bershafer (Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1959).
20. A. I. Akhiezer, G. J. Lubarski, and R. F. Polovin, in Proceedings of the Second United Nations International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy (United Nations, Geneva, 1958), Vol. 31, p. 225.
21. R. Courant and K. O. Friedrichs, Supersonic Flow and Shock Waves (Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, 1948), pp. 92-95.

FIGURE LEGENDS


- Fig. 1 Idealized experiment with plane hydromagnetic ionizing waves.
- Fig. 2 Model for analysis of hydromagnetic ionizing waves.
- Fig. 3 Schematic for shock conditions. Note that in this example the current is in the $-y$ direction so that the velocity w_2 is negative ($-z$ direction).
- Fig. 4 Plot of $Y(X)$, Eq. (16), for various values of α^2 . This includes plots of Eqs. (21) and (35).
- Fig. 5 Plot of $Y(\alpha)$ for various values of ϵ and β .
- Fig. 6 Plot of $E_2(\Delta H)$, Eq. (43), for various values of $\mu H_x^2/\rho_1$ (made nondimensional).
- Fig. 7 Plasma generation by means of a hydromagnetic switch-on ionizing front.



750 037


Idealized experiment with plane hydromagnetic ionizing waves

59927-1




Model for analysis of hydrodynamic ionizing waves


27



(a) Flow and E field in shock frame




(b) Gas conditions and H field in all frames (nonrelativistic)



(c) Flow and E field in laboratory frame

Schematic for shock conditions




5925-1



1-03505 040 150

56




750 041

56


61343-1

750 042



56

59932-1



Plasma generation in "Hothouse" experiments

Fig. 7

60524-1

END

150
043

UCRL-9936