




From Charpy to Present Impact Testing

Editors: **D. François & A. Pineau**



ESIS Publication 30



FROM CHARPY TO PRESENT IMPACT TESTING

Other titles in the ESIS Series

- EGF 1 *The Behaviour of Short Fatigue Cracks*
Edited by K.J. Miller and E.R. de los Rios
- EGF 2 *The Fracture Mechanics of Welds*
Edited by J.G. Blauel and K.-H. Schwalbe
- EGF 3 *Biaxial and Multiaxial Fatigue*
Edited by M.W. Brown and K.J. Miller
- EGF 4 *The Assessment of Cracked Components by Fracture Mechanics*
Edited by L.H. Larsson
- EGF 5 *Yielding, Damage, and Failure of Anisotropic Solids*
Edited by J.P. Boehler
- EGF 6 *High Temperature Fracture Mechanisms and Mechanics*
Edited by P. Bensussan and J.P. Mascarell
- EGF 7 *Environment Assisted Fatigue*
Edited by P. Scott and R.A. Cottis
- EGF/ESIS 8 *Fracture Mechanics Verification by Large Scale Testing*
Edited by K. Kussmaul
- ESIS/EGF 9 *Defect Assessment in Components -
Fundamentals and Applications*
Edited by J.G. Blauel and K.-H. Schwalbe
- ESIS 10 *Fatigue under Biaxial and Multiaxial Loading*
Edited by K. Kussmaul, D.L. McDiarmid and D.F. Socie
- ESIS 11 *Mechanics and Mechanisms of Damage in Composites and Multi-Materials*
Edited by D. Baptiste
- ESIS 12 *High Temperature Structural Design*
Edited by L.H. Larsson
- ESIS 13 *Short Fatigue Cracks*
Edited by K.J. Miller and E.R. de los Rios
- ESIS 14 *Mixed-Mode Fatigue and Fracture*
Edited by H.P. Rossmannith and K.J. Miller
- ESIS 15 *Behaviour of Defects at High Temperatures*
Edited by R.A. Ainsworth and R.P. Skelton
- ESIS 16 *Fatigue Design*
Edited by J. Solin, G. Marquis, A. Siljander and S. Sipilä
- ESIS 17 *Mis-Matching of Welds*
Edited by K.-H. Schwalbe and M. Koçak
- ESIS 18 *Fretting Fatigue*
Edited by R.B. Waterhouse and T.C. Lindley
- ESIS 19 *Impact of Dynamic Fracture of Polymers and Composites*
Edited by J.G. Williams and A. Pavan
- ESIS 20 *Evaluating Material Properties by Dynamic Testing*
Edited by E. van Walle
- ESIS 21 *Multiaxial Fatigue & Design*
Edited by A. Pineau, G. Gailletaud and T.C. Lindley
- ESIS 22 *Fatigue Design of Components. ISBN 008-043318-9*
Edited by G. Marquis and J. Solin
- ESIS 23 *Fatigue Design and Reliability. ISBN 008-043329-4*
Edited by G. Marquis and J. Solin
- ESIS 24 *Minimum Reinforcement in Concrete Members. ISBN 008-043022-8*
Edited by Alberto Carpinteri
- ESIS 25 *Multiaxial Fatigue and Fracture. ISBN 008-043336-7*
Edited by E. Macha, W. Będkowski and T. Łagoda
- ESIS 26 *Fracture Mechanics: Applications and Challenges. ISBN 008-043699-4*
Edited by M. Fuentes, M. Elices, A. Martin-Meizoso and J.M. Martinez-Esnaola
- ESIS 27 *Fracture of Polymers, Composites and Adhesives. ISBN 008-043710-9*
Edited by J.G. Williams and A. Pavan
- ESIS 28 *Fracture Mechanics Testing Methods for Polymers Adhesives and Composites.
ISBN 008-043689-7*
Edited by D.R. Moore, A. Pavan and J.G. Williams
- ESIS 29 *Temperature-Fatigue Interaction.
ISBN 008-043982-9*
Edited by L. Rémy and J. Petit

For information on how to order titles 1-21, please contact MEP Ltd, Northgate Avenue,
Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, IP32 6BW, UK. Titles 22-29 can be ordered from Elsevier Science
(<http://www.elsevier.com>).

FROM CHARPY TO PRESENT IMPACT TESTING

Editors: D. François and A. Pineau

ESIS Publication 30

This volume contains 52 peer-reviewed papers selected from those presented at the Charpy Centenary Conference held in Poitiers, France, 2-5 October 2001.



2002



Elsevier

Amsterdam – Boston – London – New York – Oxford – Paris
San Diego – San Francisco – Singapore – Sydney – Tokyo

ELSEVIER SCIENCE Ltd.
The Boulevard, Langford Lane
Kidlington, Oxford OX5 1GB, UK

© 2002 Elsevier Science Ltd. and ESIS. All rights reserved.

This work is protected under copyright by Elsevier Science, and the following terms and conditions apply to its use:

Photocopying

Single photocopies of single chapters may be made for personal use as allowed by national copyright laws. Permission of the Publisher and payment of a fee is required for all other photocopying, including multiple or systematic copying, copying for advertising or promotional purposes, resale, and all forms of document delivery. Special rates are available for educational institutions that wish to make photocopies for non-profit educational classroom use.

Permissions may be sought directly from Elsevier Science Global Rights Department, PO Box 800, Oxford OX5 1DX, UK; phone: (+44) 1865 843830, fax: (+44) 1865 853333, e-mail: permissions@elsevier.com. You may also contact Global Rights directly through Elsevier's home page (<http://www.elsevier.com>), by selecting 'Obtaining Permissions'.

In the USA, users may clear permissions and make payments through the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, USA; phone: (978) 7508400, fax: (978) 7504744, and in the UK through the Copyright Licensing Agency Rapid Clearance Service (CLARCS), 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1P 0LP, UK; phone: (+44) 171 631 5555; fax: (+44) 171 631 5500. Other countries may have a local reprographic rights agency for payments.

Derivative Works

Tables of contents may be reproduced for internal circulation, but permission of Elsevier Science is required for external resale or distribution of such material.

Permission of the Publisher is required for all other derivative works, including compilations and translations.

Electronic Storage or Usage

Permission of the Publisher is required to store or use electronically any material contained in this work, including any chapter or part of a chapter.

Except as outlined above, no part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Publisher. Address permissions requests to: Elsevier Science Global Rights Department, at the mail, fax and e-mail addresses noted above.

Notice

No responsibility is assumed by the Publisher for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products, instructions or ideas contained in the material herein. Because of rapid advances in the medical sciences, in particular, independent verification of diagnoses and drug dosages should be made.

First edition 2002

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data.

A catalog record from the Library of Congress has been applied for.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data.

A catalogue record from the British Library has been applied for.

ISBN : 0 08 043970 5

ISSN : 1566-1369

Ⓢ The paper used in this publication meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).
Printed in The Netherlands.

The papers presented in these proceedings have been reproduced directly from the authors' 'camera ready' manuscripts. As such, the presentation and reproduction quality may vary from paper to paper.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

International Committee :

R.A. Ainsworth (U.K.), H. Blumenauer (Germany), W. Brocks (Germany), J. Brozzetti (France), R. Chaouadi (Belgium), W. Dahl (Germany), J. Defourny (Belgium), R. Denys (Belgium), M. Elices (Spain), T. Ericsson (Sweden), N. Farbas (Romania), D. Firrao (Italy), J. de Fouquet (France), D. François (France), J. Giovanola (Switzerland), F. Gutierrez-Solana (Spain), M. Holzmann (Czech Republic), K. Kalna (Slovakia), J.F. Kalthoff (Germany), J. Klepaczko (France), J. Knott (U.K.), A.S. Kobayashi (USA), T. Kobayashi (Japan), A. Ja. Krasowsky (Ukraine), K. Kusssmaul (Germany), J. Leclerc (France), H. MacGillivray (U.K.), N.A. Makhutov (Russia), I. Milne (U.K.), F. Minami (Japan), A. Needleman (USA), A. Neimitz (Poland), V. Papazoglou (Greece), A. Pineau (France), R. Pippan (Austria), G. Rousselier (France), W. Schmitt (Germany), K.H. Schwalbe (Germany), S. Sedmak (Yugoslavia), T. Shoji (Japan), T.A. Siewert (USA), K. Takahashi (Japan), C. Thaulow (Norway), L. Toth (Hungary), V. Troshchenko (Ukraine), V. Tvergaard (Denmark), T. Varga (Austria), S. Vodenicharov (Bulgaria), G. Vogt (Germany), K. Wallin (Finland), C. Wiesner (U.K.), J.G. Williams (U.K.)

Organization Committee:

R. Batisse (Gaz de France), Ph. Bompard (ECP), M. Bousseau (DSN-INDRET), P. Forget (CEA), J. de Fouquet (ENSMA), Y. Franchot (SF2M), D. François (ECP), J.M. Frund (EDF), A. Galtier (IRSID), Y. Grandjean (EDF), B. Houssin (Framatome), D. Kaplan (IRSID), J. Klepaczko (Univ. Metz/CNRS), M.C. Lafarie-Frenot (ENSMA), H. MacGillivray (Imperial College, UK), B. Marini (CEA), A. Pineau (ENSMP), R. Piques (ENSMP), C. Prioul (ECP), R. Schirrer (Groupe Français Polymères), M. Martin (ECP), Th. Sturel (IRSID), B. Tanguy (ENSMP), Th. Thomas (DYMAT, DGA/CTA), L. Toth (Bay Zoltan Inst. Miskolc),

Chairmen:

D. François, A. Pineau

Elsevier Science Internet Homepage - <http://www.elsevier.com>

Consult the Elsevier homepage for full catalogue information on all books, journals and electronic products and services.

Elsevier Titles of Related Interest

CARPINTERI

Minimum Reinforcement in Concrete Members.
ISBN: 008-043022-8

FUENTES *ET AL.*

Fracture Mechanics: Applications and Challenges.
ISBN: 008-043699-4

JONES

Failure Analysis Case Studies II.
ISBN: 008-043959-4

MACHA *ET AL.*

Multiaxial Fatigue and Fracture.
ISBN: 008-043336-7

MARQUIS & SOLIN

Fatigue Design of Components.
ISBN: 008-043318-9

MARQUIS & SOLIN

Fatigue Design and Reliability.
ISBN: 008-043329-4

MOORE *ET AL.*

Fracture Mechanics Testing Methods for Polymers, Adhesives
and Composites.
ISBN: 008-043689-7

MURAKAMI

Metal Fatigue Effects of Small Defects and Nonmetallic
Inclusions
ISBN: 008-044064-9

RAVICHANDRAN *ET AL.*

Small Fatigue Cracks: Mechanics, Mechanisms & Applications.
ISBN: 008-043011-2

RÉMY and PETIT

Temperature-Fatigue Interaction.
ISBN: 008-043982-9

TANAKA & DULIKRAVICH

Inverse Problems in Engineering Mechanics II.
ISBN: 008-043693-5

UOMOTO

Non-Destructive Testing in Civil Engineering.
ISBN: 008-043717-6

VOYIADJIS *ET AL.*

Damage Mechanics in Engineering Materials.
ISBN: 008-043322-7

VOYIADJIS & KATTAN

Advances in Damage Mechanics: Metals and Metal Matrix
Composites.
ISBN: 008-043601-3

WILLIAMS & PAVAN

Fracture of Polymers, Composites and Adhesives.
ISBN: 008-043710-9

Related Journals

Free specimen copy gladly sent on request. Elsevier Science Ltd, The Boulevard, Langford Lane, Kidlington, Oxford, OX5 1GB, UK

Acta Metallurgica et Materialia
Cement and Concrete Research
Composite Structures
Computers and Structures
Corrosion Science
Engineering Failure Analysis
Engineering Fracture Mechanics
European Journal of Mechanics A & B
International Journal of Fatigue
International Journal of Impact Engineering
International Journal of Mechanical Sciences
International Journal of Non-Linear Mechanics
International Journal of Plasticity

International Journal of Pressure Vessels & Piping
International Journal of Solids and Structures
Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics
Journal of Construction Steel Research
Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids
Materials Research Bulletin
Mechanics of Materials
Mechanics Research Communications
NDT&E International
Scripta Metallurgica et Materialia
Theoretical and Applied Fracture Mechanics
Tribology International
Wear

To Contact the Publisher

Elsevier Science welcomes enquiries concerning publishing proposals: books, journal special issues, conference proceedings, etc. All formats and media can be considered. Should you have a publishing proposal you wish to discuss, please contact, without obligation, the publisher responsible for Elsevier's mechanics and structural integrity publishing programme:

Dean Eastbury
Senior Publishing Editor, Materials Science & Engineering
Elsevier Science Ltd
The Boulevard, Langford Lane
Kidlington, Oxford
OX5 1GB, UK

Phone: +44 1865 843580
Fax: +44 1865 843920
E.mail: d.eastbury@elsevier.com

General enquiries, including placing orders, should be directed to Elsevier's Regional Sales Offices – please access the Elsevier homepage for full contact details (homepage details at the top of this page).

CONTENTS

Preface	xi
Keynote Lectures	
Historical Background and Development of the Charpy Test <i>L. Tóth, H.-P. Rossmanith and T.A. Siewart</i>	3
Micromechanisms and the Charpy Transition Curve <i>D. François</i>	21
Finding G_c for Plastics Using Modified Charpy Tests <i>J.G. Williams and A. Rager</i>	33
Modelling of the Charpy Test as a Basis for Toughness Evaluation <i>W. Schmitt, I. Varfolomeyev and W. Böhme</i>	45
Evolution of the Charpy-V Test from a Quality Control Test to a Materials Evaluation Tool for Structural Integrity Assessment <i>K. Wallin, P. Nevasmaa, T. Planman and M. Valo</i>	57
Micromechanisms	
Determination of Ductile Crack Initiation by Magnetic Emission and Potential Drop Techniques Using Pre-Cracked Charpy Specimens <i>Z. Radaković, A. Sedmak, Gy.B. Lenkey and V. Grabulov</i>	71
Influence of Ductile Tearing on Cleavage Triggering in Ductile-to-Brittle Transition of A508 Steel <i>P. Haušild, P. Bompard, C. Berdin, C. Prioul and M. Karlík</i>	79
Correlation Between Impact Resistance and Fracture Toughness in Aged Duplex Stainless Steels <i>L. Sánchez and F. Gutiérrez-Solana</i>	87
Instrumented Testing of Simulated Charpy Specimens Made of Microalloyed Mn-Ni-V Steel <i>S. Cvetkovski, T. Adzjev, G. Adzjev and A. Sedmak</i>	95
On the Utilization of the Instrumented Charpy Impact Test for Characterizing the Flow and Fracture Behavior of Reactor Pressure Vessel Steels <i>R. Chaouadi and A. Fabry</i>	103
Ductile-Brittle Transition Evaluation of Japanese Sword and Weld Metals Using Miniaturized Impact Specimens <i>T. Misawa and S.I. Komazaki</i>	119

Polymers

Application of Electric Emission Technique for Determining the Dynamic Fracture Toughness of Polymers <i>Gy. B. Lenkey and Z. Major</i>	129
Determination of Rate Dependent Fracture Toughness of Plastics Using Precracked Charpy Specimens <i>Z. Major and R.W. Lang</i>	137
Determination of Geometry-Independent Fracture Mechanics Values of Polymers <i>W. Grellmann, R. Lach and S. Seidler</i>	145
Instrumented Impact Testing of Polymers <i>S. Morita, K. Hosoi and T. Kobayashi</i>	155

Test Procedures

Development in the Instrumented Impact Test – Computer Aided Instrumented Impact Testing Systems <i>T. Kobayashi</i>	165
Analysis of Test Data Obtained from Charpy V and Impact Tensile Test <i>T. Kobayashi, H. Toda and T. Masuda</i>	173
The Validation of the Draft Standard for Instrumented Impact Testing (IIT) of Metallic Materials – Version 10:1994 <i>R.K. Varma and M.S. Loveday</i>	181
Results of a DVM Round Robin on Instrumented Charpy Testing <i>W. Böhme</i>	189
Some Historical Aspects and the Development of the Charpy Test in Russia <i>N.A. Makhutov, E.M. Morozov and Yu. G. Matvienko</i>	197
Instrumented Charpy Test Review and Application to Structural Integrity <i>W.L. Server</i>	205
Problems Related to the Measurement of Load Signal in the Instrumented Charpy Impact Test <i>S. Morita, M. Otani and T. Kobayashi</i>	213
Studies Toward Optimum Instrumented Striker Designs <i>M.P. Manahan Sr. and R.B. Stonesifer</i>	221
Observations on Differences Between the Energy Determined Using an Instrumented Striker and Dial/Encoder Energy <i>M.P. Manahan Sr., R.B. Stonesifer, T.A. Siewert, C.N. McCowan and D.P. Vigliotti</i>	229
Dynamic Fracture Toughness Determination Using Precracked Charpy Specimens <i>D.M. Shuter</i>	237
Use of Instrumented Charpy Impact Tests for the Determination of Fracture Toughness Values <i>H.-W. Viehrig, J. Boehmert and J. Dzugan</i>	245

Discussion of Testing Procedures for the Determination of the Toughness Properties of Laser Welded Joints	253
<i>M. Nagel, P. Langenberg, F. Lüder, W. Bleck and U. Dilthey</i>	
Use of Charpy Impact Testing to Evaluate Crack Arrest Fracture Toughness	263
<i>K. Müller and G. Pusch</i>	
Predicting Crack Arrest Behaviour of Structural Steels Using Small-Scale Material Characterisation Tests	271
<i>C. Gallo, J.A. Álvarez, F. Gutiérrez-Solana and J.A. Polanco</i>	
Fracture Mechanics Based Scaling Criteria for Miniature and Sub-Size Charpy-V Specimens	279
<i>K. Wallin, T. Planman and M. Valo</i>	
Applications	
Correlations Between Charpy Energy and Crack Initiation Parameters of the J-Integral-Concept	289
<i>P. Hübner and G. Pusch</i>	
Fracture Toughness Determination in the Ductile-to-Brittle Transition Regime – Pre-cracked Charpy Specimens Compared with Standard Compact Specimens	297
<i>J. Heerens and D. Hellmann</i>	
Correlating Charpy and J-Fracture Toughness Parameters in Structural Integrity Assessments	307
<i>J.R. Tarpani and D. Spinelli</i>	
Dynamic J_R Curves of 308 Stainless Steel Weld from Instrumented Impact Test of Unpre-cracked Charpy V-Notch Specimens	315
<i>P.R. Sreenivasan, S.K. Ray and S.L. Mannan</i>	
Correlation Between J and CVN in Upper Shelf	325
<i>W.R. Tyson, S. Xu and R. Bouchard</i>	
Validation of Idealised Charpy Impact Energy Transition Curve Shape	333
<i>H.G. Pisarski, B. Hayes, J. Olbricht, P. Lichter and C.S. Wiesner</i>	
Conventional and Fracture Mechanical Valuation of Structural Steels with High Toughness for Heavy Plates	341
<i>P. Trubitz, P. Hübner, G. Pusch and T. Brecht</i>	
Correlations Between Charpy V and Crack Tip Opening Displacement as well as Drop Weight Tear Test Results	349
<i>J. Dziubiński and P. Adamiec</i>	
Statistical Treatment of Fracture Mechanics Data and Correlation with Charpy Energy	357
<i>A. Mannsfeld, P. Langenberg and W. Dahl</i>	
An Application of Charpy V Testing: The Pressure Vessel Surveillance Program of Nuclear Pressurised Water Reactor in Operation	365
<i>N. Rupa, A. Baché, J. Bourgoin and D. Buisine</i>	
European Pipeline Research Group Studies on Ductile Crack Propagation in Gas Transmission Pipelines	377
<i>R.M. Andrews and V. Pistone</i>	

The Toughness Transition Curve of a Ship Steel <i>J. Morrison and X. Wu</i>	385
Materials Qualification for the Shipbuilding Industry <i>W. Wistance, P.H. Pumphrey and D.J. Howarth</i>	393
Modelling	
The Calculation of Dynamic J_R -Curves from 2D and 3D Finite Element Analyses of a Charpy Test Using a Rate-Dependent Damage Model <i>A. Eberle, D. Klingbeil, W. Baer, P. Wossidlo and R. Häcker</i>	403
Fracture Mechanics Analysis of Charpy Test Results Based on the Weibull Stress Criterion <i>F. Minami, M. Iida and W. Takahara</i>	411
Modelling Charpy Property Changes Due to Irradiation Damage <i>R. Moskovic</i>	419
Improved Charpy Test Evaluation for the Toughness Characterisation of High Strength Steels and Their Weldments <i>F. Mudry and T. Sturel</i>	427
3D Charpy Specimen Analyses for Welds <i>V. Tvergaard and A. Needleman</i>	437
Charpy Impact Test Modelling and Local Approach to Fracture <i>A. Rossoll, C. Berdin and C. Prioul</i>	445
Experimental Analysis of Charpy V-Notch Specimens <i>B. Tanguy, R. Piques and A. Pineau</i>	453
Numerical Modeling of Charpy V-Notch Tests <i>B. Tanguy, J. Besson, R. Piques and A. Pineau</i>	461
Finite Element Simulations of Sub-Size Charpy Tests and Associated Transferability to Toughness Results <i>C. Poussard, C. Sainte Catherine, P. Galon and P. Forget</i>	469
Author Index	479
Keyword Index	481

PREFACE

Georges Charpy was born in 1865. He was 20 when he succeeded in the competitive examination to enter “École Polytechnique”, the most prestigious engineering school in France. After graduating, instead of starting a career in high administration, the normal route for “polytechniciens”, he prepared a Ph.D. thesis in chemistry on the properties of saline solutions. In 1892 he joined the Naval Central Laboratory where he began his career as a metallurgist. He was a pioneer in the use of ternary diagrams; and also developed sleeve bearing alloys.

In 1898 he moved into industry as a research engineer at the Châtillon-Commentry factory in Montluçon where he became director in 1916. Later he moved to Paris to join the “Marine et Homecourt” company as deputy director. In 1922 he was elected as a member of the Academy of Sciences and was chosen as professor at the School of Mines of Paris showing that, in spite of his industrial responsibilities, he had not abandoned scientific research. He also became professor of chemistry at École Polytechnique, a partial return to his first endeavour. He remained very active until his death in 1945 at the age of 80.

A boss in industry and an academic, Georges Charpy had many talents. The emphasis of this book will be on his scientific achievements. However, it must be mentioned that he was very interested by the scientific organisation of labour and that he was one of the proponents of Taylorism in French industry.

An important, although little known, contribution of Georges Charpy concerns the development of silicon steel sheets for magnetic applications. He studied these steels to improve their characteristics in relation to the grain size. A balance needed to be found to obtain good magnetic properties and rolling capacities at the same time; Georges Charpy found the convenient compositions to produce this balance.

However, the name of Charpy remains associated with impact testing on notched specimens. At a time when many steam engines exploded, engineers were preoccupied with studying the resistance of steels to impact loading. Drop weight tests only gave qualitative indications but in the U.S., S.B. Russel may have been the first to invent a test using a pendulum. It allowed the measurement of the energy spent in breaking a specimen, by calculating the difference between the height of the striker before and after the shock. It had also been realised, by Considère and by André Le Chatelier in particular, that notched specimens were needed to increase the sensibility of the tests. However, Georges Charpy thoroughly investigated the various parameters of the test so as to obtain reproducible results. As an example, he realised that the machining of the notch was of crucial importance. In order to locate the machining grooves parallel to the length of the specimen to avoid their additional notch effect, he invented the key-hole notch. He published his results in 1901 at a congress in Budapest, as well as in the Société des Ingénieurs Civils de France. Later he was extremely active in international workshops and standardisation commissions. It is thus well justified that in laboratories all over the world the daily testing of the resilience of steels bears the name of Georges Charpy.

The Charpy test has provided invaluable indications on the impact properties of materials. It revealed the brittle ductile transition of ferritic steels. Did the engineers who built the Titanic know that the steel sheets they used had a brittle ductile transition temperature above 0°C, explaining the catastrophe which took place when she hit the iceberg? The lesson was certainly unknown to the builders of the Liberty Ships, so many of which failed during World War II. The Charpy test is able to provide more quantitative results by instrumenting the striker, which allows the evolution of the applied load during the impact to be determined. The Charpy test is of great importance to evaluate the embrittlement of steels by irradiation in nuclear reactors. Progress in computer programming has allowed for a computer model of the test to be developed; a difficult task in view of its dynamic, three dimensional, adiabatic nature. Together with precise observations of the processes of fracture, this opens the possibility of transferring quantitatively the results of Charpy tests to real components. This test has also been extended to materials other than steels, and is also frequently used to test polymeric materials.

Thus the Charpy test is a tool of great importance and is still at the root of a number of investigations; this is the reason why it was felt that the centenary of the Charpy test had to be celebrated. The Société Française de Métallurgie et de Matériaux decided to organise an international conference which was put under the auspices of the European Society for the Integrity of Structures (ESIS).

This Charpy Centenary Conference (CCC 2001) was held in Poitiers, at Futuroscope, a scientific park, from October 2 to 5, 2001. More than 150 participants from 17 countries took part in the discussions and about one hundred presentations were given. An exhibition of equipment showed, not only present day testing machines, but also one of the first Charpy pendulums, brought all the way from Imperial College in London.

The present book puts together a number of significant contributions. They are classified into 6 headings:

- Keynote lectures,
- Micromechanisms,
- Polymers,
- Testing procedures,
- Applications,
- Modelling.

A number of papers might not fall precisely into the above classifications. We hope that this will not be too troublesome.

We believe that this book will be useful to students, scientists and engineers and that it will still be read in 2101!

Keynote Lectures

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHARPY TEST

L.Tóth*, H.-P. Rossmanith**, and T.A. Siewert***

* Bay Zoltán Applied Research Foundation, Institute for Logistics and Production Systems,
Miskolc, Hungary

** Vienna University of Technology, Institute of Mechanics, Vienna, Austria

*** National Institute for Standards and Technology, Boulder, Colorado, USA

ABSTRACT

The impact test method based on a pendulum, generally called the Charpy test, is one of the more cost-effective material testing procedures, both with respect to acceptance of products and to surveillance. This contribution attempts to present a brief historical review about the general development of material testing, starting at the beginning of the intense industrialisation in the second half of the 19th century, and tries to point out the role and the position of impact testing during this period. Several periods in the evolution of impact testing based on a pendulum are discussed in detail.

KEYWORDS

Charpy impact testing, history of material testing, instrumented impact testing, pendulum impact testing

INTRODUCTION

It has been said (Harvey, 1984) that “No man is civilised or mentally adult until he realises that the past, the present, and the future are indivisible.” This statement applies equally to all fields of science and technology, including material testing.

This contribution focuses on the development of material testing using the Charpy test method, which is based on the use of a pendulum to apply an impact force to a specimen. Some of the milestones in the development of this technique have been outlined in a recent conference on *Fracture Mechanics in Design and Service - Living with Defects* by the Royal Society in 1979, where the important role of the impact pendulum test machine was highlighted. The present history-oriented contribution illuminates the development of impact testing from a material toughness characterisation point of view.

Historically, the impact-pendulum test method and associated apparatus were suggested (in nearly their current forms) by S. B. Russell in 1898 (Russell, 1898) and G. Charpy in 1901 (Charpy, 1901a, b). A. G. A. Charpy (Fig.1) presented his fundamental idea in France in the June issue of the *Journal of the Soc. Ing. Civ. de Francais* and in the Proceedings of the Congress of the International Association for Testing of Materials, which was held in Budapest in September 1901 (see Fig.2.) The impact-test procedure seems to have become known as the Charpy test in the first half of the

1900's, through the combination of Charpy's technical contributions and his leadership in developing the procedures to where they became a robust, engineering tool.

The consideration of material behaviour in the design of different types of construction that operate at very different conditions is as old as the material test procedures themselves, because the science



Figure 1

Augustin Georges Albert Charpy
Born 1 September 1865 in Ouillis, Rhone
Died 25 November, 1945 in Paris




Figure 2

Title page of Charpy's paper
at the VIIth Congress of the
International Assoc. For Testing of
Materials in Budapest, 8-13
September 1901

and technology of failure prevention is intimately associated with failures and accidents. From this, it follows that the development of new material-testing procedures occurred in close connection with the history of engineering science. It is unfortunate that many engineers still derive a large body of their knowledge from accidents, although *learning from failures and accidents* is regarded as the most costly way to improve one's skills and technologies.

The early development of material testing was driven by the rapid expansion of the railway network between about 1830 and 1900. Figures 3 and 4 compare the development of the railway network in Germany and in the whole world. The world's first public railway was opened in northern England




Figure 3. The growth of railway network in Germany




Figure 4. The growth of railway network in the world

between Stockton and Darlington on 27 September 1825, whereas the first public railway in Germany was operated on June 12 in 1835 between the city of Nuremberg and the neighbouring city of Fürth. The first railroad in the U.S., the Baltimore and Ohio, began in 1828 serving Baltimore and points west, and by 1835, Boston was the first railroad hub in the U.S., serving as the terminus of three railroads. In the territory of present Hungary, the first railway line (39 km) was installed on July 15, 1846 connecting the cities of Budapest and Vác. The situation was similar in most other countries, and by 1900 there was an extensive railway network serving most of Europe. By 1900, the total length of railway network in the world was in excess of 800.000 km, with an annual increase of more than 10.000 km (a quarter of the circumference of the globe).

The development of all aspects of engineering science during this time was strongly motivated and promoted by the rapid expansion of the global railway network, through the enormous demand for rails, locomotives, cars, tunnels, bridges, dams, railway stations and other mechanical and civil engineering structures. In the field of material testing and behaviour, a basic understanding was developed of the load-carrying capacity of a component and its critical fracture stress.

The characterisation of brittle and ductile behaviour of materials, as well as the clarification of the ductile-brittle transition behaviour of metals, was driven by the large number of failures of rails and axles that began to catch people's attention during the 19th century in all industrialised countries. As early as 1836 or 1838, Stendhal, a French writer, mentioned a serious problem related to fatigue damage in his novel "Mémoires d'un touriste". Unexpected and unexplained breakages continued to increase between 1840 and 1860. Most of these failures caused catastrophic accidents without any warning because they were brittle failures, i.e., the fractures were not preceded by noticeable plastic deformation to serve as a warning of incipient fracture.

The situation became still more serious when it was found that machine components could also fail at stress levels well below the critical fracture stress. All that was necessary for this type of failure to occur was the presence of cyclic load fluctuations, either random or periodic. It was observed (although the reason was not understood until later) that a fracture would originate and initiate at certain locations and slowly, then more rapidly, propagate into the material and finally rupture the component, most often in a brittle fashion. Thus, a new type of failure, *fatigue*, was identified. Once it was recognized that fatigue damage propagated by the growth of a sharp crack through a component, a variety of notch configurations were added to specimens to evaluate how their performance was degraded by such damage. A contributing factor to the rapid rise in unexpected failures was the increase in the use of metals, instead of the construction materials (wood, brick, stone, etc.) previously used, for which design guidelines, service history, and maintenance procedures were well known. The relative use of metals for construction changed from approximately 20 % at the beginning of the industrial revolution to about 80 % at the turn of the last century.

Material testing procedures were developed to collect information about the behaviour of various materials, predominantly metals, operating at different external conditions. This information was then processed to characterise these materials for engineering purposes.

This, in turn served as the driving force for:

- the general development of engineering science, especially the disciplines of mechanics and strength of materials;
- the construction and manufacture of large engineering structures (such as bridges, ships, steam engines, railway stations, towers.);
- the development, in materials science, of new types of materials, metals, steel-producing technologies, etc.;

- the appearance of new disciplines (metallography, description of the different types of metallurgical processes, micro-structures, etc.);
- the appearance of new material testing methods, procedures, equipment, etc.

During the second industrial revolution in the 19th century, England and Germany played dominant roles. A major part of the research efforts in these two countries was focused on developing an understanding of unexpected fracture failures. Top priority was devoted to avoiding, or at least limiting and controlling these unexpected failures (Braithwaite 1853; Mann 1970; Rankie 1843; Rolt 1970; Schütz 1970; Wöhler 1858). Ever since, there has been a steady stream of results, experiences, new developments and inventions in the field of fatigue in the leading technical journals (Bauschinger 1896; Kirkaldy 1862; Paris 1982; Rossmannith 1997; Sedov et al 1972; Timoshenko 1953). The importance of the subject can best be appreciated by the rapid increase of technical papers associated with fatigue failures, as shown in Fig 5.




Figure 5. Total number of publications related to fatigue failures in the 19th century

In spite of the huge efforts being applied towards eliminating the failures that take place under conditions of general yielding, there was no generally accepted and agreed-upon method of testing for the characterisation of ductile and brittle material behaviour of metals over a range of working conditions. Unexpected and unexplainable failures of rails, axles, etc. were observed all around the world. As a result of this, a new type of material – steel – was developed around the middle of the 19th century, new testing equipment was created, and new, independent (private) testing laboratories emerged. In 1858, D. Kirkaldy was the first to open a private public material testing laboratory in Southwark in London and developed a quality seal for his test documents, to differentiate his measurements from those developed with older procedures. Kirkaldy also suggested the introduction of the *true stress at the moment of fracture* and *percentage reduction of area* as quantities most useful for the characterisation of metals subjected to tensile loading. The results of various test methods performed in the Kirkaldy testing works were summarised in an excellent book (Kirkaldy, 1862) and his conclusive remarks were fully supported by the experiments. Todhunter and Pearson (1886), in their three-volume treatise on the development of elasticity and materials testing, frequently refer to Kirkaldy's work, but do not mention the behaviour of materials under dynamic loading conditions.

Within the development of materials testing, the following important milestones can be identified:

- the development of fatigue testing techniques,
- the founding of research institutes and testing laboratories,
- the observation and clarification of the nature of metal fatigue,

- the determination of material properties that can be used for elimination (decrease of risk) of fatigue of railway axles,
- the development of new steel-making technologies,
- the founding of the first private material-testing laboratory,
- the development of tensile test methods for the characterisation of material behaviour.

Table 1 in Appendix A features a partial sequence of selected important events in the historical development of materials testing.

EVOLUTION OF THE MATERIAL TESTING COMMUNITY

While metals were gaining increasing importance in engineering, two needs became apparent:

- mechanical engineers wanted to determine the behaviour of metals with respect to a variety of external working conditions, and
- a strong demand was developing for unifying the various proposed material characterisation procedures, as a way of accurately defining shipping and acceptance conditions.

Both needs served as excellent bases for the organisation of specialist meetings. Johann Bauschinger in Munich was the first to clearly recognise this opportunity and organised the first of a series of (so-called *Bauschinger*) *Conferences* in Munich in 1884 with a participation of 79 specialists from all over the world. The second *Bauschinger Conference* was organised in Dresden in 1886, the third one in Berlin in 1890, and the last one, the fourth in Vienna in 1893, just before his death. The translation of the proceedings of the *Bauschinger Conferences* into English and publication by the U.S. Government Printing Office in Washington D.C. reflect the importance of these conferences. A group of material testing experts, derived from the attendees at the Bauschinger Conferences, participated at the World Exhibition in Paris in 1889. This team was a technical committee of the “Applied Mechanics Section” and was led by Johann Bauschinger. The need for international co-operation and organisation in the field of material testing became immediately clear. In reality, the *Bauschinger Conferences* had already enjoyed an international character, a fact that was noticed in the *Resolutions of the Conventions* held at Munich, Dresden, Berlin and Vienna (Bauschinger 1896):

“Not only has there been an increase in the number of delegates from countries already represented (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Switzerland, Russia), but delegates have come from other countries (France, America, Norway, Holland, Italy, Spain), so conventions have assumed a truly international character”.

The sudden death of Bauschinger in 1893 left the job of founding a new international association to Ludwig von Tetmajer (born 14 July 1850 in Krompach, Austrian-Hungarian Empire, died 31 January 1905 in Vienna) who had previously founded the Eidgenössische Materialprüfungs-Anstalt (EMPA) in Zurich and was serving as director at the time. He took over the responsibility of continuing the *Bauschinger Conferences* and, during the conference that he organised in Zurich during the period 9 to 11 September 1895, founded the *International Association for Testing of Materials* (IATM). This conference is regarded the “first” international conference on material testing. If the previous Bauschinger Conferences are included, the Zurich Conference is the 5th *Bauschinger Conference*. The international conferences of the *International Association for Testing of Materials* were held periodically: 1897 in Stockholm, 1901 in Budapest, 1906 in Brussels, 1909 in Copenhagen, 1912 in New York, 1915 in St. Petersburg, and 1927 in Amsterdam. After World War I, the association lost its technical focus and became much more political. Mirko Ross, who served as director of the EMPA, re-established the society now named *New International Association for the Testing of Materials* = *Neuer Internationaler Verband für Materialprüfungen* =

Nouvelle Association Internationale pour l'Essai des Matériaux. The new organisation held its first conference during 11 to 16 September 1931 in Zurich; the proceedings of this meeting, however, were published one year earlier (!) in 1930 (Rosenhain 1930).

EVOLUTION OF IMPACT TESTING

The evolution of impact testing may be divided into the following four periods:

- Early developments: up to the time of standardisation of testing procedures,
- The stage of brittle fracture: period up to the beginning of the 1950s including the brittle-fracture story and the transition-temperature concepts (Liberty ships),
- The development of fracture mechanics: up to the early 1980s including the correlation between the absorbed energy measured with CVN and other fracture-mechanics parameters, (covered in other papers in this publication)
- The current stage: including instrumented impact testing, testing on sub-size specimens, etc. (covered in another keynote lecture)

Early Developments in Impact Testing

The question "How can the results of static and dynamic material tests be correlated?" was not addressed in the first edition of the book by Kirkaldy in 1862. Questions of this kind were first raised only later in the 19th century. In his 1901 paper, Charpy noted that the lack of correlation between the static and dynamic testing results may have been addressed for the first time by Mr. Lebasteur in his book *Les métaux à L'exposition de 1878*. Impact testing of rails using the drop-weight test method had become an unofficially accepted standard method in Germany. This is noted in the *Resolutions of the Conventions held at Munich, Dresden, Berlin and Vienna* (see paragraph 10 of the General Provisions: 13-16).

The status of impact-testing technology was summarised in the International Association for Testing of Materials *Steering Committee Report for the period of 1879-1901* by L. Tetmajer. In the following years, the characteristic features of the impact-testing procedure continued to be developed by specialists in IATM, and their reports were discussed at the conferences held following 1901. The development of consistent impact procedures was recognized to be of such importance by about 1905 that the impact testing activities were taken out of Committee 22 (on uniform methods of testing materials), and used as the basis for a new committee, Committee 26 (with impact testing as its only focus). The meetings brought a truly international group of experts to a single location, facilitated the exchange of ideas, and allowed the formulation of research plans for reports at the next meeting. Also, by 1905, Charpy had proposed a machine design that is remarkably similar to present designs, and the literature contained the first references to "the Charpy test" and "the Charpy method".

A.G.A. Charpy became the chair of the impact-testing activity after the 1906 IATM Congress in Brussels, and presided over some very lively discussions on whether impact-testing procedures would ever be sufficiently reproducible to serve as a standard test method. The activities within IATM at this time are covered in more detail in the following paragraphs because this is the period in which the Charpy test developed substantially into its present form, under the able leadership of A. G. A. Charpy. The discussions centred around the importance of the geometry of the notch (depth, root radius), impact velocity, specimen size, and the possibilities of practical application of

the impact testing (i.e., transferability of results to machine parts, life predictions, etc.). Highlights of these meetings included:

a) *Report by A.G.A. Charpy at the Brussels Conference in 1906:*

- The pendulum impact test method was being used by the National Marine for testing of armour plate,
- Boiler steels tested and the testing results published by Yarrow et al. in the *Journal of Engineering* on 18 April 1902; the main conclusion of the paper was that the Charpy test method could be employed to categorise the notch toughness (or conversely, the brittleness) of boiler steels.
- Two types of pendulum impact machines have been accepted:
 - Machine type 1 was characterised by the impact velocity of 7,8 m/s and the impact energy level of 200 kg-m (approximately 2000 J);
 - Machine type 2 was characterised by the impact velocity of 5,28 m/s and the impact energy level of 30 kg-m (approximately 300 J).
- Two types of notches were in use: sharp notches and rounded ones.
- The effect of impact velocity was investigated by dropping the striker from various heights: 3.3 m, 2.3 m and 1.1 m. The dynamic drop test results were compared with those of quasistatic bending tests. It was found, that the effect of impact velocity on the absorbed energy was much higher in the case of sharply notched specimens.
- A Technical Committee was established for analysing the results of Charpy tests. The members included Martens, Stibek, Lasche, and Ehrensberg.

b) *Report by A.G.A. Charpy at the Copenhagen Conference in 1909:*

- the discussion of the Report of the Technical Committee mentioned above (published by E. Ehrensberger) during the meeting of the German Material Testing Association on 5 October, 1907 (republished in *Stahl und Eisen*, 50 and 51, 1907, (Blumenauer)).
- The current state of practical use of impact testing was reviewed, discussed and reported in different countries. The report by Simonot (1907) was discussed at the common meeting of the French and Belgian members of ISTM on 1 June 1907. Breuill (1908) published a paper on material testing procedures in the *Revue de Mechanique*. In England, Stanton and Baristow (1908) reported in the Institution of Mechanical Engineers on impact testing of metals and Harbord (1908) reported on impact testing methods using notched specimens.
- The experiences of Hatt published by ASTM in 1904 were analysed.
- An intense discussion developed about the topic of ductile-brittle phenomena.
- The effect of strain rate on the behaviour of metals was discussed.
- Requirements for impact testing machines were defined.
- The information content of impact testing was analysed.
- Different kinds of practical applications were reported (naval applications, metallurgical plants, engineering works, etc.).

c) *Report by A.G.A. Charpy at the New York Conference in 1912:*

- A Technical Committee was formed in 1910, composed of international experts
- Two types of specimens were suggested:
 - ⇒ 30x30x160 mm³ with a notch depth of 15 mm, notch root radius of 2 mm and span length of 120 mm;
 - ⇒ 10x10x53 mm³ with a notch depth of 5 mm, a notch root radius of 0,6 mm and a span length of 40 mm.

- Experiments conducted by Charpy, Ehrensberger and Bartel showed a size effect: the specific absorbed energy (kgm/m^2) was larger for smaller specimens.
- The law of similarity for the behaviour of different specimen sizes was accepted. It was published in the following journals: Memorial de l'Artillerie Navale Francaise, 10, 11, and 12/1910 and Revue d'Artillerie Francaise, 7/1911. (It is interesting to note that, later in 1921, Stanton and Batson conducted tests featuring the breakdown of the law of similarity in notched-bar impact tests! (Stanton et al. 1921)).
- The requirements of the impact-testing equipment and machines to assure comparability of the testing results were discussed. The Commission proposed establishing a standard impact procedure that would assure that the results produced by two separate machines are comparable. Some of the procedural details that they proposed to control included:
 - ⇒ the depth and radius of the notch,
 - ⇒ limits on the velocity of the striker,
 - ⇒ a minimum ratio of anvil mass to the mounting base (to reduce vibrational losses),
 - ⇒ recognition of the need to limit frictional losses, and
 - ⇒ recognition of the artificial increase in energy as ductile specimens deform around the edges of a wide striker.
- The Technical Committee recommended that the following topics be discussed at the next IATM conference:
 - ⇒ comparability of the testing results
 - ⇒ establishment of a database with respect to technical parameters of the existing impact testing machines
 - ⇒ definition of possible fields of application for impact testing.

Charpy's drive toward standardization and practical application of the impact test procedure are revealed in some of his comments in the later IATM reports, such as (A.G.A. Charpy, 1912). Near the beginning of this report to the IATM leadership and to the other Committees, he reiterates the main goals of Committee 26 as to "fix the conditions to be fulfilled by two distinct tests in order that the results may be comparable and to correlate these numerically definite results to the qualities determining the practical values of a material for different uses". Toward the end of the report, Charpy made his view of the situation even more clear.

"Consequently, ...the investigation of the conditions which the impact testing machines should fulfill in order that they may furnish comparable results, should commence with the establishment of a method of standardization and verification..."

While Charpy continued to guide the work in IATM, until at least 1914, much was happening within individual countries and at machine manufacturers. A number of machine designs and procedures were under consideration at this time, and in 1907 the German Association for Testing Materials adopted one developed by Ehrensberger (1907). Because the pendulum machine had not yet achieved dominance, designers and manufacturers of impact machines offered three major types; Drop Weight (Fremont, Hatt-Turner, and Olsen), Pendulum Impact (Amsler, Charpy, Dow, Izod, Olsen, and Russell), and Flywheel (Guillery). By 1909, there was broad recognition of a difference between static and dynamic loading, but little understanding of how to measure it, or even what to call it (fragility? resilience?).

Meanwhile, national chapters of the IATM were being formed in countries or countries were organizing separate standardization societies, apparently because the international Congresses met too infrequently to bring about the desired progress on the development of procedures to meet pressing national needs. A national standardisation institution was founded in Germany in 1896. In

1898. the national chapter of IATM in the U.S. became the nucleus for the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). These organizations worked in parallel with IATM and other national organizations to standardise the Charpy impact test procedure. Unfortunately, the different groups chose some slightly different approaches to meeting the standardization needs. As a result of many such choices by the different standards organizations over the years, we now find some remaining variation in impact test procedures around the world. Certainly, world-wide comparison of test data would be simplified if the procedures could be further harmonized between countries and between the various standards.

The rapid development of impact testing around the turn of the last century is documented in a bibliography on impact tests and impact testing machines by Hatt and Marburg published in the 1902 Volume of the Proceedings of ASTM. This bibliography listed more than 100 contemporary papers on impact testing published in the U.S., France, and Germany. Supporters of some of the different machine and specimen designs participated in the different standardization groups, leading to the variations between the standards mentioned above.

Meanwhile in Germany, the extensive report by E. Heyn (1901) concerning the presentation by A.G.A. Charpy at the Budapest Congress on Materials Testing in 1901, led to the establishment of a comprehensive program by the *Deutscher Verband für Materialprüfungen der Technik* to evaluate the facilities for notch impact bending testing (1901). A detailed review of the activities on the new Charpy method during the first three decades of the 20th century was prepared by F. Fettweis (1919). The difficulty in harmonising the different procedures is clearly reflected in the German Encyclopaedia on Material Testing edited and published in 1961, where 27 types of impact specimens are still mentioned.

However, even while the procedural details were under discussion, the Charpy impact test was demonstrating its value in reducing the risks of service failures in components. In 1912, Derihon reported that factories in Liege and Jeumont were performing 10,000 impact tests each month. They were able to correlate the components that gave brittle results to various attributes of the steel: the composition (especially high levels of phosphorus and sulphur), casting defects (especially piping), and heat treatments. After revising their production procedures and acceptance criteria, they were able to reduce the amount of material rejected due to brittleness in the impact tests from as much as 40 % to only 0.3 %.

Serious work on standardising the procedures resumed after World War I. ASTM Committee E-1 on Methods for Testing sponsored a Symposium in 1922 on Impact Testing of Materials as a part of the 25th Annual Meeting of the Society, in Atlantic City, New Jersey. The Preface of the Symposium lists the goals as "*study the impact testing of materials more definitely and intensely...considering not only the details of methods...and possible standardization of methods, but inquiring into the true significance of the impact test...and the applicability of the data obtained to problems of engineering design and construction.*" The Symposium included a history of the developments in this area, a review of work done by the British Engineering Standards Association, and several technical presentations.

Also at this symposium, Warwick presented the results of a survey sent to 64 U.S. testing laboratories. Twenty-three respondents to the survey offered detailed information on topics such as the types of machines in use, the specimen dimensions, and procedures. In addition, many responded positively to a question about their willingness to develop an ASTM standard for impact testing.

The group interested in developing an ASTM Standard Procedure finally published a tentative procedure, E 23-33T, in 1933. As experience was developed with the tentative procedure, the group

continued to make revisions. The minutes of the 1939 and 1940 meetings for the Impact Subcommittee of E-1 state that the striker radius was discussed, and a survey was made of the geometries used in the United Kingdom and in France. Those countries were found to be using radii of 0.57 mm and 2 mm, respectively. For reasons that were not recorded, the members of the Subcommittee agreed to a radius of 8 mm at the 1940 meeting and ASTM E 23 was revised and reissued as E 23-41T. Two other changes that occurred with this revision were that metric units became the preferred units, and keyhole and U notches were added for Charpy test specimens.

Similar discussions were occurring in standardisation bodies around the world in the 1930s and 1940s, although the exact dates of certain changes to the impact testing procedures in the some countries could not be located. The discussions included the types of specimens (Charpy U, Charpy keyhole, Izod, etc.), the testing method (Charpy or Izod) and the geometry of the striking edge (i.e. the geometry of the striker or *tup*). Although many contradictory opinions were put forward at these discussions, standardised testing procedures were established.

Evolution of the Impact Testing up to the Beginning of the 1950s

Impact testing seems to have been adopted for internal use by some organisations around the world, but was not a common requirement in purchase specifications and construction standards until the recognition of its ability to detect the ductile-to-brittle transition in steel. Probably the greatest single impetus toward implementation of impact testing in fabrication standards and material specifications came as a result of the large number of failures in Liberty ships (a U.S. design) that occurred during World War II. These fractures occurred without any remarkable plastic deformation. Understanding the circumstances and elimination of these failures became a national effort during the war and a large research project was launched where impact testing was found to reveal a brittle-ductile transition behaviour of steels. These problems were so severe that the Secretary of the U.S. Navy convened a Board of Investigation to determine the causes and to make recommendations to correct them. The final report of this Board stated that of 4694 welded-steel merchant ships studied from February 1942 to March 1946, 970 (over 20 %) suffered some fractures that required repairs (Anon 1947). The magnitudes of the fractures ranged from minor fractures that could be repaired during the next stop in port, to 8 fractures that were sufficiently severe to force abandonment of these ships at sea. Remedies included changes to the design, changes in the fabrication procedures and retrofits, as well as impact requirements on the materials of construction. The time pressures of the war effort did not permit thorough documentation of the effect of these remedies in technical reports at that time; however, assurance that these remedies were successful is documented by the record of ship fractures that showed a consistent reduction in fracture events from over 130 per month in March 1944 to fewer than 5 per month in March 1946, even though the total number of these ships in the fleet increased from 2600 to 4400 during this same period (Anon 1947).

After the war, the U.S. National Bureau of Standards released its report on an investigation of fractured plates removed from some of the ships that exhibited these structural failures and so provided the documentation of the importance of impact testing (Williams et al. 1948). The NBS study included chemical analysis, tensile tests, microscopic examination, Charpy impact tests, and reduction in thickness along the actual fracture plane in the ship plates. A notable conclusion of the report was that the plates in which the fracture arrested had consistently higher impact energies and lower transition temperatures than those in which the fractures originated. This was particularly important because there was no similar correlation with chemical composition, static tensile properties (all steels met the ABS strength requirements), or microstructure. In addition, the report first established 15 ft-lb (often rounded to 20 J for metric requirements) as a minimum toughness requirement, and recommended that "some criterion of notch sensitivity should be included in the