

INSTABILITY THROUGH POROUS MEDIUM OF TWO VISCOUS SUPERPOSED CONDUCTING FLUIDS

R.C. SHARMA and K.P. THAKUR

Department of Mathematics, Himachal Pradesh University, Simla-171005, India.

(Received July 11, 1979 and in revised form December 10, 1980)

ABSTRACT. The stability of the plane interface separating two viscous superposed conducting fluids through porous medium is studied when the whole system is immersed in a uniform horizontal magnetic field. The stability analysis is carried out for two highly viscous fluids of equal kinematic viscosities, for mathematical simplicity. It is found that the stability criterion is independent of the effects of viscosity and porosity of the medium and is dependent on the orientation and magnitude of the magnetic field. The magnetic field is found to stabilize a certain wave number range of the unstable configuration. The behaviour of growth rates with respect to viscosity, porosity and medium permeability are examined analytically.

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES. *Instability, porous medium, conducting fluids.*

1980 MATHEMATICS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION CODES. 76E25, 76W05

1. INTRODUCTION.

The instability of the plane interface between two fluids, under varying assumptions of hydrodynamics and hydromagnetics, has been discussed by Chandrasekhar [1]. Bhatia [2] has studied the influence of viscosity on the stability of the plane interface separating two incompressible superposed conducting fluids of

uniform densities, when the whole system is immersed in a uniform horizontal magnetic field. He has carried out the stability analysis for two highly viscous fluids of equal kinematic viscosities and different uniform densities. When the fluid slowly percolates through the pores of the rock, the gross effect is represented by Darcy's law which states that the usual viscous term in the equations of fluid motion is replaced by the resistance term $(\mu/k_1) \vec{q}$, where μ is the viscosity of the fluid, k_1 the permeability of the medium and \vec{q} the velocity of the fluid. Wooding [3] has experimentally observed, in the absence of viscous dissipation and considering only Darcy resistance, that convection sets on as a fairly regular cellular pattern in the horizontal. This problem in the case of a conducting fluid considering both Darcy and viscous resistances has been investigated by Prabhamani and Rudraiah [4]. Saville [5] has studied the stability of motions involving fluid interfaces in porous media. Various problems of fluid flows through porous medium have been treated by Saffman and Taylor [6], Chouke et al [7], Scheidegger [8], Yih [9], Nayfeh [10] and Rudraiah and Prabhamani [11].

The instability of two viscous superposed conducting fluids through porous medium may find applications in geophysics. It is therefore the motivation of this study to examine the effects of viscosity and medium permeability on the stability of the plane interface separating two incompressible superposed conducting fluids of uniform densities, when the whole system is immersed in a uniform horizontal magnetic field. We examine the roles of viscosity, medium permeability and magnetic field on the instability problem. This aspect forms the subject matter of the present study wherein we have carried out the stability analysis for two highly viscous fluids of equal kinematic viscosities and different uniform densities.

2. PERTURBATION EQUATIONS.

Consider the motion of an incompressible, infinitely conducting viscous fluid (of variable viscosity $\mu_0(z)$) in the presence of a uniform magnetic field $\vec{H}(H_x, H_y, 0)$. Let $\vec{q}(u, v, w)$, $\delta\rho$, δp and $\vec{h}(h_x, h_y, h_z)$ denote the perturbations in velocity, density ρ , pressure p and magnetic field \vec{H} respectively. Then the linearized perturbation equations of a fluid flowing through a porous medium when both Darcy as well as viscous resistances are present are:

$$\frac{\rho}{\epsilon} \frac{\partial \vec{q}}{\partial t} = -\nabla \delta p + \vec{g} \delta \rho + \frac{1}{4\pi} (\nabla \times \vec{h}) \times \vec{H} - \frac{\rho v}{k_1} \vec{q} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} [\mu \nabla^2 \vec{q} + (\nabla \vec{q}) \cdot \nabla \mu + (\nabla \mu \cdot \nabla) \vec{q}], \quad (2.1)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \vec{q} = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot \vec{h} = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\epsilon \frac{\partial \vec{h}}{\partial t} = \nabla \times (\vec{q} \times \vec{H}), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\epsilon \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \delta \rho + (\vec{q} \cdot \nabla) \rho = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

Equation (4) ensures that the density of every particle remains unchanged as we follow it with its motion. $\nu (= \mu/\rho)$ denotes the kinematic viscosity of the fluid, ϵ is porosity ($0 < \epsilon < 1$) and \vec{g} (0,0,-g) is the acceleration due to gravity. $\epsilon \rightarrow 1$ and $k_1 \rightarrow \infty$ correspond to nonporous medium. Analyzing the disturbances into normal modes, we assume that the perturbed quantities have the space (x,y,z) and time (t) dependence of the form

$$f(z) \exp(ik_x x + ik_y y + nt), \quad (2.5)$$

where k_x, k_y are horizontal wave numbers ($k^2 = k_x^2 + k_y^2$), n is the growth rate of the harmonic disturbance and $f(z)$ is some function of z .

For perturbations of the form (2.5), equations (2.1)-(2.4) give

$$\rho \left(\frac{n}{\epsilon} + \frac{\nu}{k_1} \right) u + \frac{H_y}{4\pi} (ik_x h_y - ik_y h_x) = - ik_x \delta p + \frac{1}{\epsilon} [\mu (D^2 - k^2) u + (D\mu) (ik_y w + Du)], \quad (2.6)$$

$$\rho \left(\frac{n}{\epsilon} + \frac{\nu}{k_1} \right) v + \frac{H_x}{4\pi} (ik_y h_x - ik_x h_y) = - ik_y \delta p + \frac{1}{\epsilon} [\mu (D^2 - k^2) v + (D\mu) (ik_x w + Dv)], \quad (2.7)$$

$$\rho \left(\frac{n}{\epsilon} + \frac{\nu}{k_1} \right) w + \frac{H_x}{4\pi} (Dh_x - ik_x h_z) + \frac{H_y}{4\pi} (Dh_y - ik_y h_z) = - D\delta p - g\delta\rho + \frac{1}{\epsilon} [\mu (D^2 - k^2) w + 2(D\mu) (Dw)], \quad (2.8)$$

$$ik_x u + ik_y v + Dw = 0, \quad ik_x h_x + ik_y h_y + Dh_z = 0, \quad (2.9)$$

$$n\delta\rho = - w(D\rho)/\epsilon, \quad (2.10)$$

$$n\vec{h} = (ik_x H_x + ik_y H_y) \vec{q}/\epsilon, \quad (2.11)$$

where $D = d/dz$.

Multiplying (2.6) and (2.7) by $-ik_x$ and $-ik_y$ respectively and adding, using (2.9)-(2.11) and finally, eliminating δp between the resulting equation and (2.8), we obtain the equation in w :

$$\begin{aligned} & [k^2 \rho \left(\frac{n}{\epsilon} + \frac{\nu}{k_1} \right) w - D \left\{ \rho \left(\frac{n}{\epsilon} + \frac{\nu}{k_1} \right) Dw \right\}] - \frac{gk^2}{n\epsilon} (D\rho) w - \frac{1}{4\pi n\epsilon} (k_x H_x + k_y H_y)^2 (D^2 - k^2) w \\ & + \frac{1}{\epsilon} [\mu (D^2 - k^2)^2 w + 2(D\mu)(D^2 - k^2) Dw + (D^2 \mu)(D^2 + k^2) w] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

3. TWO SUPERPOSED VISCOUS FLUIDS OF UNIFORM DENSITIES.

Here we consider the case when two superposed fluids of uniform densities ρ_1 and ρ_2 and uniform viscosities μ_1 and μ_2 are separated by a horizontal boundary at $z = 0$. The subscripts 1 and 2 distinguish the lower and upper fluids respectively. Then, in each region of constant ρ_1 , μ_1 and constant ρ_2 , μ_2 , equation (2.12) becomes

$$(D^2 - k^2)(D^2 - K^2)w = 0, \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$K^2 = k^2 + \frac{n}{\nu} \left\{ 1 + \frac{\nu\epsilon}{nk_1} + \frac{1}{4\pi n^2 \rho} (k_x H_x + k_y H_y)^2 \right\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Since w must vanish both when $z \rightarrow -\infty$ (in the lower fluid) and $z \rightarrow +\infty$ (in the upper fluid), the solutions appropriate to the two regions can be written as

$$w_1 = A_1 e^{+kz} + B_1 e^{+K_1 z} \quad (z < 0), \quad (3.3)$$

$$w_2 = A_2 e^{-kz} + B_2 e^{-K_2 z} \quad (z > 0), \quad (3.4)$$

where A_1 , B_1 , A_2 , B_2 are constants,

$$K_1 = \sqrt{k^2 + \frac{n}{\nu_1} \left\{ 1 + \frac{\nu_1 \epsilon}{nk_1} + \frac{1}{4\pi n^2 \rho_1} (k_x H_x + k_y H_y)^2 \right\}}, \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$K_2 = \sqrt{k^2 + \frac{n}{\nu_2} \left\{ 1 + \frac{\nu_2 \epsilon}{nk_1} + \frac{1}{4\pi n^2 \rho_2} (k_x H_x + k_y H_y)^2 \right\}}. \quad (3.6)$$

In writing the solutions (3.3) and (3.4) it is assumed that K_1 and K_2 are so defined that their real parts are positive. The solutions (3.3) and (3.4) must satisfy certain boundary conditions. The boundary conditions to be satisfied at the interface $z = 0$ are (Chandrasekhar [1], p.432)

$$w, \tag{3.7}$$

$$Dw, \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$\mu(D^2+k^2)w, \tag{3.9}$$

must be continuous.

Integrating (2.12) across the interface $z = 0$, we obtain another condition

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \rho_2 \left(\frac{n}{\epsilon} + \frac{v_2}{k_1} \right) Dw_2 - \frac{\mu_2}{\epsilon} (D^2-k^2)Dw_2 + \frac{1}{4\pi n\epsilon} (k_x H_x + k_y H_y)^2 Dw_2 \right\}_{z=0} \\ & - \left\{ \rho_1 \left(\frac{n}{\epsilon} + \frac{v_1}{k_1} \right) Dw_1 - \frac{\mu_1}{\epsilon} (D^2-k^2)Dw_1 + \frac{1}{4\pi n\epsilon} (k_x H_x + k_y H_y)^2 Dw_1 \right\}_{z=0} \\ & = - \frac{gk^2}{n\epsilon} (\rho_2 - \rho_1)w_0 - \frac{2k^2}{\epsilon} (\mu_2 - \mu_1) (Dw)_0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where w_0 and $(Dw)_0$ are the unique values of these quantities at $z = 0$.

Applying the conditions (3.7)-(3.10) to the solutions (3.3) and (3.4), we obtain

$$A_1 + B_1 = A_2 + B_2, \tag{3.11}$$

$$kA_1 + K_1 B_1 = -kA_2 - K_2 B_2, \tag{3.12}$$

$$\mu_1 \{2k^2 A_1 + (K_1^2 + k^2) B_1\} = \mu_2 \{2k^2 A_2 + (K_2^2 + k^2) B_2\}, \tag{3.13}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & -k\rho_2 \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} + \frac{v_2}{nk_1} \right) A_2 - k\rho_1 \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} + \frac{v_1}{nk_1} \right) A_1 - (kA_1 + kA_2) \frac{1}{4\pi n^2 \epsilon} (k_x H_x + k_y H_y)^2 \\ & = - \frac{gk^2}{2n^2 \epsilon} (\rho_2 - \rho_1) (A_1 + B_1 + A_2 + B_2) + \frac{k^2}{n\epsilon} (\mu_1 - \mu_2) (kA_1 + K_1 B_1 - kA_2 - K_2 B_2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Eliminating the constants A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 from (3.11)-(3.14), we obtain

$$\begin{vmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ k & K_1 & k & K_2 \\ 2k^2\mu_1 & \mu_1(K_1^2+k^2) & -2k^2\mu_2 & -\mu_2(K_2^2+k^2) \\ \left[\frac{1}{2}R-C-\frac{\alpha_1}{\epsilon}\right] & \left[\frac{1}{2}R-C\frac{K_1}{k}\right] & \left[\frac{1}{2}R+C-\frac{\alpha_2}{\epsilon}-\frac{\alpha_2 v_2}{nk_1}\right] & \left[\frac{1}{2}R+C\frac{K_2}{k}\right] \\ -\frac{\alpha_1 v_1}{nk_1}-\frac{1}{n}(\vec{k}\cdot\vec{V}_A)^2 & +\frac{\alpha_1 v_1}{n}\frac{K_1}{k_1} & -\frac{1}{n}(\vec{k}\cdot\vec{V}_A)^2 & +\frac{\alpha_2 v_2}{n}\frac{K_2}{k_1} \end{vmatrix} = 0, \quad (3.15)$$

where

$$\alpha_{1,2} = \frac{\rho_{1,2}}{\rho_1+\rho_2}, \quad (\vec{k}\cdot\vec{V}_A)^2 = \frac{(k_x H_x + k_y H_y)^2}{4\pi(\rho_1+\rho_2)\epsilon}.$$

$$R = \frac{gk}{\epsilon n^2} (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1), \quad C = \frac{k^2}{n\epsilon} \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{\rho_1 + \rho_2} = \frac{k^2}{n\epsilon} (\alpha_1 v_1 - \alpha_2 v_2),$$

and \vec{V}_A is the Alfvén velocity vector.

Evaluating the determinant (3.15), we obtain the following characteristic equation

$$\begin{aligned} & (K_1 - k) \left[2k^2 (\alpha_1 v_1 - \alpha_2 v_2) \left\{ \frac{C}{k} (K_2 - k) + \alpha_2 \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} + \frac{v_2}{nk_1} \right) + \frac{1}{n} (\vec{k}\cdot\vec{V}_A)^2 \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left\{ \alpha_2 n + \frac{\alpha_2 v_2 \epsilon}{k_1} + \frac{\epsilon}{n} (\vec{k}\cdot\vec{V}_A)^2 \right\} \left\{ R - \frac{1}{\epsilon} - \frac{(\alpha_1 v_1 + \alpha_2 v_2)}{nk_1} - \frac{2}{n} (\vec{k}\cdot\vec{V}_A)^2 \right\} \right] \\ & - 2k \left[\left\{ \alpha_1 n + \frac{\alpha_1 v_1 \epsilon}{k_1} + \frac{\epsilon}{n} (\vec{k}\cdot\vec{V}_A)^2 \right\} \left\{ \alpha_2 \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} + \frac{v_2}{nk_1} \right) + \frac{C}{k} (K_2 - k) + \frac{1}{n} (\vec{k}\cdot\vec{V}_A)^2 \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left\{ \alpha_2 n + \frac{\alpha_2 v_2 \epsilon}{k_1} + \frac{\epsilon}{n} (\vec{k}\cdot\vec{V}_A)^2 \right\} \left\{ \alpha_1 \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} + \frac{v_1}{nk_1} \right) - \frac{C}{k} (K_1 - k) + \frac{1}{n} (\vec{k}\cdot\vec{V}_A)^2 \right\} \right] \\ & + (K_2 - k) \left[\left\{ \alpha_1 n + \frac{\alpha_1 v_1 \epsilon}{k_1} + \frac{\epsilon}{n} (\vec{k}\cdot\vec{V}_A)^2 \right\} \left\{ R - \frac{1}{\epsilon} - \frac{\alpha_1 v_1 + \alpha_2 v_2}{nk_1} - \frac{2}{n} (\vec{k}\cdot\vec{V}_A)^2 \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - 2k^2 (\alpha_1 v_1 - \alpha_2 v_2) \left\{ \alpha_1 \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} + \frac{v_1}{nk_1} \right) - \frac{C}{k} (K_1 - k) + \frac{1}{n} (\vec{k}\cdot\vec{V}_A)^2 \right\} \right] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Since K_1 and K_2 involve square roots, the dispersion relation (3.16) is quite complex. We therefore carry out the stability analysis for highly viscous fluids.

Under this assumption of highly viscous fluids, we have

$$K = k \left[1 + \frac{n}{\nu k^2} + \frac{\epsilon}{k^2 k_1} + \frac{\epsilon(k_x H_x + k_y H_y)^2}{4\pi\rho\nu k^2} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$= k \left[1 + \frac{n}{2\nu k^2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2k^2 k_1} + \frac{\epsilon(\rho_1 + \rho_2)}{2nk^2 \rho\nu} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 \right], \tag{3.17}$$

so that

$$K_1 - k = \frac{n}{2\nu_1 k} + \frac{\epsilon}{2kk_1} + \frac{\epsilon}{2nk\alpha_1 \nu_1} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2, \tag{3.18}$$

and

$$K_2 - k = \frac{n}{2\nu_2 k} + \frac{\epsilon}{2kk_1} + \frac{\epsilon}{2nk\alpha_2 \nu_2} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2. \tag{3.19}$$

Substituting the values of K_1 and K_2 from (3.18), (3.19) in (3.16) and putting $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu$ (the case of equal kinematic viscosities, for mathematical simplicity, as in Chandrasekhar [1]), we obtain the following dispersion relation

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon} n^6 + \left[\frac{3\nu}{k_1} + \frac{2\alpha_1 \alpha_2}{\epsilon} + (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{k^2 \nu}{\epsilon} \frac{1}{2 - \epsilon} \right) \right] n^5 + \left[\frac{(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2}{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} + A + \frac{3\nu^2 \epsilon}{k_1^2} + \frac{4k^2 \nu^2}{k_1} (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 \right]$$

$$\times (1 - \epsilon) + \frac{\nu}{k_1} \{ 4\alpha_1 \alpha_2 + \epsilon (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 \} n^4 + \left[\frac{\nu \epsilon}{k_1} \left\{ 2A + \frac{\nu^2 \epsilon}{k_1^2} + \frac{2k^2 \nu^2}{k_1} (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 (1 - \epsilon) + 2\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \nu + \frac{\nu \epsilon}{2k_1} \right. \right.$$

$$\left. + (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 \left\{ 2 + \frac{\epsilon}{2\alpha_1 \alpha_2} (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 + \frac{2\nu \epsilon}{k_1 \alpha_1 \alpha_2} + \frac{2k^2 \nu}{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 (1 - \epsilon) \right\} \right] n^3$$

$$+ \left[\frac{\epsilon (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2}{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} \left\{ A + (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 + \frac{\nu^2 \epsilon}{k_1^2} (\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2) + \frac{2k^2 \nu^2}{k_1} (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 (1 - \epsilon) \right\} \right]$$

$$+ \frac{\nu \epsilon}{k_1} \left\{ 2(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 \left(1 + \frac{\nu \epsilon}{k_1} \right) + \frac{\nu \epsilon A}{k_1} + \frac{\epsilon}{2\alpha_1 \alpha_2} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 \right\} n^2$$

$$+ \left[\epsilon (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^4 \left\{ 2 + \frac{\epsilon}{2\alpha_1 \alpha_2} (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 \right\} + \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 \left\{ \frac{\nu \epsilon}{k_1} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 + \frac{\nu \epsilon A}{k_1} \right. \right.$$

$$+ \frac{2k^2 v (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2}{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} (1 - \epsilon)] n + \frac{\epsilon^2 A}{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^4 = 0, \quad (3.20)$$

where we have written $2(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 + \frac{gk}{\epsilon} (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) = A$.

(i) Stable case

For the potentially stable arrangement $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$, we find by applying Hurwitz' criterion to (3.20), that (as all the coefficients in (3.20) are then positive) all the roots of n are either real and negative or there are complex roots with negative real parts. The system is therefore stable in each case. The potentially stable configuration, therefore, remains stable whether the effects of viscosity and medium porosity are included or not.

(ii) Unstable case

For the potentially unstable arrangement $\alpha_2 > \alpha_1$, the system is unstable in the hydrodynamic case for all wave numbers k in the presence of viscosity effects and in the absence of porosity effects (Chandrasekhar [1]). Also the system, in the present case, is unstable if

$$2(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 < \frac{gk}{\epsilon} (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1).$$

In the present hydromagnetic case we find, by applying Hurwitz' criterion to (3.20) when $\alpha_2 > \alpha_1$, that the system is stable for all wave numbers which satisfy the inequality

$$2(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 > \frac{gk}{\epsilon} (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1), \quad (3.21)$$

$$\text{i.e. } 2k(V_1 \cos \theta + V_2 \sin \theta)^2 > \frac{g}{\epsilon} (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1), \quad (3.22)$$

where V_1 and V_2 are the Alfvén velocities in the x and y directions and θ is the angle between \vec{k} and H_x .

The stability criterion (3.22) is independent of the effects of viscosity and medium porosity. The magnetic field stabilizes a certain wave number range $k > k^*$ where

$$k^* = g(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) / 2\epsilon(V_1 \cos\theta + V_2 \sin\theta)^2, \tag{3.23}$$

of the unstable configuration even in the presence of the effects of viscosity and medium porosity. The critical wave number k^* , above which the system is stabilized, is dependent on the magnitudes V_1 and V_2 of the magnetic field as well as the orientation of the magnetic field θ .

We now examine the behaviour of growth rates with respect to viscosity, porosity and medium permeability analytically. Since for $\alpha_2 > \alpha_1$ and $2(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 < \frac{gk}{\epsilon}(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)$, (3.20) has one positive root, let n_o denote the positive root. Then (3.20) is satisfied if n_o is substituted in place of n . To study the behaviour of growth rates with respect to viscosity and medium permeability, we examine the natures of $dn_o/d\nu$ and dn_o/dk_1 . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & (6A_6 n_o^5 + 5A_5 n_o^4 + 4A_4 n_o^3 + 3A_3 n_o^2 + 2A_2 n_o + A_1) \frac{dn_o}{dk_1} \\ &= \frac{3\nu}{k_1^2} n_o^5 + \frac{1}{k_1^2} \left\{ \frac{6\nu^2 \epsilon}{k_1} + 4k^2 \nu^2 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 (1 - \epsilon) + \nu \{4\alpha_1 \alpha_2 + \epsilon(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2\} \right\} n_o^4 \\ &+ \frac{1}{k_1^2} \left\{ \frac{2\nu\epsilon}{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 - 2A\nu\epsilon + \frac{3\nu^3 \epsilon^2}{k_1^2} + \frac{4k^2 \nu^3 \epsilon (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 (1 - \epsilon)}{k_1} + 2\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \nu^2 \epsilon + \frac{\nu^2 \epsilon^2}{k_1} \right\} n_o^3 \\ &+ \left[\frac{2\nu^2 \epsilon (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2}{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 k_1^2} \left\{ \frac{\epsilon(\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2)}{k_1} + k^2 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 (1 - \epsilon) \right\} + 2(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 \frac{\nu\epsilon}{k_1^2} \left(1 + \frac{2\nu\epsilon}{k_1}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{2\nu^2 \epsilon^2 A}{k_1^3} + \frac{\nu\epsilon^2}{2\alpha_1 \alpha_2 k_1} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 \right] n_o^2 \\ &+ \left[\frac{\epsilon}{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 k_1^2} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 \{ \nu\epsilon (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 - \nu\epsilon A \} \right] n_o, \tag{3.24} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$- (6A_6 n_o^5 + 5A_5 n_o^4 + 4A_4 n_o^3 + 3A_3 n_o^2 + 2A_2 n_o + A_1) \frac{dn_o}{d\nu} =$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left[\frac{3}{k_1} + \frac{k^2}{\epsilon} (2-\epsilon)(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 \right] n_o^5 + \left[\frac{6\nu\epsilon}{k_1^2} + \frac{8\nu k^2}{k_1} (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 (1-\epsilon) + \frac{1}{k_1} \{4\alpha_1\alpha_2 + \epsilon(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2\} \right] n_o^4 \\
&+ \left[\frac{3\epsilon^2\nu^2}{k_1^2} - \frac{2A\epsilon}{k_1} + \frac{6k^2\epsilon\nu^2}{k_1^2} (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 (1-\epsilon) + \frac{4\alpha_1\alpha_2\epsilon\nu}{k_1} + \frac{\nu\epsilon^2}{k_1^2} + \frac{2\epsilon(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2}{\alpha_1\alpha_2 k_1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{2k^2(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2(1-\epsilon)}{\alpha_1\alpha_2} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 \right] n_o^3 \\
&+ \frac{2\nu\epsilon^2(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2}{\alpha_1\alpha_2 k_1^2} (\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2) + \frac{4\nu k^2\epsilon(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2}{\alpha_1\alpha_2 k_1} (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 (1-\epsilon) + 2(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 \frac{\epsilon}{k_1} \\
&\quad + \frac{4\nu\epsilon^2}{k_1^2} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 - \frac{2\nu\epsilon^2 A}{k_1^2} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2k_1\alpha_1\alpha_2} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 \Big] n_o^2 \\
&+ \left[\frac{\epsilon^2}{\alpha_1\alpha_2 k_1} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^4 - \frac{\epsilon^2 A}{\alpha_1\alpha_2 k_1} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^2 + \frac{2k^2\epsilon}{\alpha_1^2\alpha_2^2} (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{V}_A)^4 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 (1-\epsilon) \right] n_o, \tag{3.25}
\end{aligned}$$

where A_5 , A_4 , A_3 , A_2 and A_1 are the coefficients of n_o^5 , n_o^4 , n_o^3 , n_o^2 and n_o respectively in (3.20) where n_o is substituted for n . It is evident from (3.24) and (3.25) that dn_o/dk_1 and $dn_o/d\nu$ may be both positive or negative. Similarly it can be shown that $dn_o/d\epsilon$ may be both positive or negative. Thus the growth rates both increase or decrease with the increase in viscosity, porosity, and medium permeability. The viscosity, porosity, and medium permeability therefore have both stabilizing as well as destabilizing tendencies on the growth rates.

REFERENCES

1. CHANDRASEKHAR, S. Hydrodynamic and Hydromagnetic Stability. Oxford University Press, London, Chap. X, 1961.
2. BHATIA, P.K. Rayleigh-Taylor instability of two viscous superposed conducting fluids, Nuovo Cimento **19B**, 161-168, 1974.
3. WOODING, R.A. Rayleigh instability of a thermal boundary layer in flow through a porous medium, J. Fluid Mech. **9**, 183-192, 1960.
4. PRABHAMANI, P.R. and RUDRAIAH, N. Stability of hydromagnetic thermoconvective flow through porous medium, J. Appl. Mech. Ser. E, **40**, 879-884, 1973.
5. SAVILLE, D.A. Stability of motions involving fluid interfaces in porous media, Phys. Fluids **12**, 2438-2440, 1969.

6. SAFFMAN, P.G. and TAYLOR, G.I. The penetration of a fluid into a porous medium or Hele-Shaw cell containing a more viscous liquid, Proc. Roy. Soc. A245, 321-329, 1958.
7. CHOUKE, R.L., VAN MEURS, P. and VAN DER POEL, C. The instability of slow, immiscible, viscous liquid-liquid displacement in permeable media, Trans. AIME 216, 188-194, 1959.
8. SCHEIDEGGER, A.E. The Physics of Flow through Porous Media. University of Toronto Press, Macmillan, 1960.
9. YIH, C.S. Stratified Flows. Academic Press, 1980.
10. NAYFEH, A.H. Stability of liquid interfaces in porous media, Phys. Fluids 15, 1751-1754, 1972.
11. RUDRAIAH, N. and PRABHAMANI, P.R. Thermal diffusion and convective stability of a two component fluid in a porous medium, 5th International Heat Transfer Conference, Tokyo, Japan, CT 3.1, 79-82, 1974.

Present Address of the first author:

Dr. R.C. Sharma
Department of Physics
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Canada
T6G 2J1