

Rotational Isomers of the 1Fluoro2haloethanes

M. F. El Bermani and Neville Jonathan

Citation: *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **49**, 340 (1968); doi: 10.1063/1.1669828

View online: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.1669828>

View Table of Contents: <http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/jcp/49/1?ver=pdfcov>

Published by the [AIP Publishing](#)

Articles you may be interested in

[Photochemistry of fluorotrifluoromethylbenzenes. III Photoisomerization of 1fluoro2, 1fluoro3, and 1 fluoro4trifluoromethylbenzenes in the gas phase](#)

J. Chem. Phys. **58**, 5073 (1973); 10.1063/1.1679096

[Molecular Acoustic and Spectroscopic Studies on the Internal Rotation in 1Fluoro1,1,2,2 tetrachloroethane](#)

J. Chem. Phys. **49**, 5349 (1968); 10.1063/1.1670056

[Internal Rotation in Liquid 1Fluoro1,1,2,2Tetrachloroethane](#)

J. Chem. Phys. **47**, 3130 (1967); 10.1063/1.1712364

[Rotational Isomerism in 1Fluoro1,1,2,2Tetrachloroethane](#)

J. Chem. Phys. **29**, 680 (1958); 10.1063/1.1744568

[Note on the Rotational Isomers of 1,2Dihalogenoethanes](#)

J. Chem. Phys. **18**, 1516 (1950); 10.1063/1.1747530



Rotational Isomers of the 1-Fluoro-2-haloethanes

M. F. EL BERMANI AND NEVILLE JONATHAN

Chemistry Department, The University, Southampton, Hants., England

(Received 11 January 1968)

The infrared spectra of 1-chloro-2-fluoroethane, 1-bromo-2-fluoroethane, and 1-fluoro-2-iodoethane have been obtained in the solid, liquid, and vapor states. Raman spectra of the liquids are also presented. A complete vibrational-frequency assignment has been made for each of the molecules. The results indicate that the *gauche* isomer is the more stable in the liquid state whereas the *trans* form is more stable in the vapor. Enthalpy differences have been determined for each of the molecules in the liquid and vapor states except for gaseous 1-fluoro-2-iodoethane.

INTRODUCTION

The vibrational spectra of 1,2-disubstituted ethanes have been extensively studied with particular reference to the problem of hindered internal rotation.^{1,2} Normally these investigations have shown that the molecules exist in the gaseous and liquid states as equilibrium mixtures of the *gauche* and *trans* isomers. However in the solid state it is usually found that only the more stable isomer, i.e., the form of lower potential energy, remains.

In all studies which have been made of 1,2-dihaloethanes of the type $X \cdot CH_2 \cdot CH_2 \cdot X$ or $X \cdot CH_2 \cdot CH_2 \cdot Y$ it has been found that the *gauche* form is less stable than, or approximately equally stable with the *trans* form in the liquid and gaseous states, except in the case of 1-chloro-2-fluoroethane where the *gauche* form was found to be the more stable in the liquid phase.³ Apart from the above study, a comprehensive study of 1,2-difluoroethane,⁴ and a partial one of 1-bromo-2-fluoroethane,⁵ no detailed vibrational spectroscopic investigations of this series of molecules appear to have been made.

The present investigation was therefore undertaken in an attempt to detect the presence of rotational isomers and to measure enthalpy differences between the isomers in both the liquid and vapor phases. It was also hoped to make a vibrational-frequency assignment for each of the molecules since it was felt that only by studying such a series as this can one hope to make a reasonable vibrational-frequency assignment for any member of the series.

EXPERIMENTAL

The infrared spectra of the compounds were obtained on a Grubb-Parsons G.S. 2A infrared spectrometer over the range 4000–425 cm^{-1} .

Spectra of the liquids were obtained using capillary films between potassium bromide plates. Solid-state spectra were obtained by condensing the vapor from

the volatile liquids on to a potassium bromide plate cooled to approximately $-170^\circ C$. Care was taken to avoid fast condensation which in some cases may lead to freezing out of a mixture of two isomers.⁶ Room-temperature vapor-phase spectra were obtained using the equilibrium vapor pressure of the appropriate liquid in a 10-cm glass cell. Vapor spectra at higher temperatures were obtained using a similar but insulated cell which was heated by means of Nichrome wire. The temperature was controlled to $\pm 1^\circ C$ by means of an Ether 12-91 anticipatory potentiometric controller and an iron-constantan thermocouple.

Temperature-dependence studies of the liquids were more difficult than is usual owing to the high volatility of this series of compounds. Room temperature was the highest which could conveniently be used. The studies were made using a standard R.I.I.C. cold cell, the temperature of which was varied with dry-ice-acetone mixtures. In practice it proved possible to maintain temperatures to an accuracy of $\pm 1^\circ C$ over the studied range by the occasional addition of small amounts of dry ice. Care was taken to ensure that the spectral bandwidth was less than $\frac{1}{5}$ of the band half-width in each case.⁷ Each band was run at least five times at each temperature and the mean value was taken. A minimum of five runs was also made for the vapor studies.

The Raman spectra of the liquids were recorded in the region 2700–70 cm^{-1} using a Cary Laser Raman Model 81 photoelectric recording spectrometer. Unfortunately this spectrometer was not equipped for obtaining Raman spectra at higher than 2700 cm^{-1} but this is not a region where rotational isomers are expected to show unique spectra.

1-Chloro-2-fluoroethane was prepared by the method of Saunders, Stacey, and Wilding⁸ from thionyl chloride and 2-fluoroethanol. The boiling point after fractionation was $53^\circ C$ (lit bp 51° – $53^\circ C$).

1-Bromo-2-fluoroethane was prepared from potassium fluoride and 1,2-dibromoethane using Hoffman's

¹ S. Mizushima, *Structure of Molecules and Internal Rotation* (Academic Press Inc., New York, 1954).

² N. Sheppard, *Advan. Spectry.* **1**, 288 (1959).

³ P. A. Bazhulin and L. P. Osipova, *Opt. Spectry.* **6**, 406 (1959).

⁴ P. Klaboe and J. Nielsen, *J. Chem. Phys.* **33**, 1764 (1960).

⁵ D. Simpson and E. K. Plyler, *J. Res. Natl. Bur. Std.* **50**, 223 (1953).

⁶ V. A. Pozdyshev, Y. A. Pentin, and V. M. Tatevskii, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **114**, 583 (1957).

⁷ D. A. Ramsay, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **74**, 72 (1952).

⁸ B. C. Saunders, G. J. Stacey, and I. G. E. Wilding, *J. Chem. Soc.* **1949**, 773.

TABLE I. Vibrational frequencies and assignments of fundamental modes of vibration of the *gauche* isomers (cm⁻¹).

Cl·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F				Br·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F				I·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F				Assignment
Infrared			Raman	Infrared			Raman	Infrared			Raman	
Vapor	Liquid	Solid	Liquid	Vapor	Liquid	Solid	Liquid	Vapor	Liquid	Solid	Liquid	
2978 s	2962 m	2966 s		2978 s	2976 m	2980 s		2992 m	2973 m	2981 } 2971 }	m	$\nu_a(\text{CH}_2)$
		2918 wsh			2951 sh	2960 s			2948 sh	2948 m		$\nu_a(\text{CH}_2)$
2915 } 2894 }	2898 mw	2897 m		2898 m	2888 m	2895 s		2901 mw	2907 mw	2898 m		$\nu_s(\text{CH}_2)$
1459 w	1458 m	1458 m	1461 (1)	1457 } 1448 }	1458 mw	1458 s	1462 (1)	1467 sh	1459 mw	1461 m	1462 (½)	$b(\text{CH}_2)$
1429 w	1428 s	1428 s	1429 (1)	1434 } 1429 } 1417 }	1421 m	1419 vs	1424 (1)	1426 } 1416 }	1412 m	1409 s	1415 (½)	$b(\text{CH}_2)$
1390 w	1390 mw	1390 m	1394 (½)	1395 } 1383 } 1375 }	1386 mw	1385 s	1399 (1)	1396 } 1386 }	1382 m	1383 m	1383 (½)	$w(\text{CH}_2)$
1310 } 1305 } 1295 }	1299 vs	1299 vs	1301 (1)	1291 } 1284 } 1278 }	1280 vs	1278 vs	1280 (2)	1277 } 1272 } 1265 }	1264 vs	1266 vs	1264 (2)	$w(\text{CH}_2)$
1263 } 1257 } 1250 }	1250 vw	1250 w	1252 (1)	1238 w	1229 mw	1226 m	1231 (2)	1206 } 1193 }	1193 ms	1196 } 1188 }	1195 (2)	$tw(\text{CH}_2)$
1197 vw	1194 m	1197 m	1196 (1)	1183 w	1180 w	1177 s	1181 (1)	1175 } 1167 }	1169 m	1167 m	1170 (2)	$tw(\text{CH}_2)$
1073 } 1056 }	1075 vs	1073 vs	1072 (1)	1073 } 1062 }	1070 vs	1063 vs	1067 (1)	1063 } 1054 }	1063 vs brd	1052 vs	1060 (½)	$\nu(\text{CC})$
1040 } 1026 }	1030 vs	1032 vs	1028 (1)	1035 sh 1026 vs	1004 vs brd	994 vs	1004 (2)	1018 } 1009 }	979 vs brd	978 s	980 (1)	$\nu(\text{CF})$

TABLE I (Continued)

Cl·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F				Br·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F				I·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F			
Infrared		Raman		Infrared		Raman		Infrared		Raman	
Vapor	Liquid	Solid	Liquid	Vapor	Liquid	Solid	Liquid	Vapor	Liquid	Solid	Liquid
963 vw	956 mw	955 m	958 (1)	959 952 w 946	943 s	938 s	944 (1)	940 vw sh	930 m	922 vs	931 (4)
851 845 w 838	839 s	837 s	840 (2)	821 vw	821 s	821 s	822 (1)	794 782 w 769	789 mw	788 vs	790 (4)
693 685 m 678	668 s	667 vs	668 (10)	593 588 w 580	573 m	568 vs	573 (10)	526 vw 513	517 m	517 s	517 (10)
469 464 m 456	465 m	469 vs	468 (1)	451 s	449 s	454 vs	451 (3)	431 s	431 s	430 s	431 (7)
			290 (2)				264 (2)				244 (2)
			142 (1)				126 (4)				116 (4)
											torsion

method.⁹ After fractional distillation the boiling point was 73°–74°C (lit bp=71°–74°C).

The preparation of 1-fluoro-2-iodoethane was carried out using the method of Hine and Ghirardelli¹⁰ using sodium iodide and 1-bromo-2-fluoroethane. After purification by fractional distillation the boiling point was 94.5°–96.5°C (lit bp=96.5°–97°C).

RESULTS

Each isomer of the molecules in this series should possess 18 fundamental modes of vibration, each of which should be infrared and Raman active. Hence 36 distinct fundamental bands are theoretically possible. In practice this number of bands is never found since the corresponding vibrational modes in the two isomers usually have virtually identical frequencies which result in an infrared or Raman band common to both species. Hence it is usually found that the solid-state spectrum of a disubstituted ethane of the type X·CH₂·CH₂·X is simplified by the loss of perhaps three or four bands compared with the liquid-state spectrum.

A frequency assignment for the approximate modes of vibration for the *gauche* isomers is given in Table I and the bands unique to the *trans* isomers are given in Table II. Table II illustrates the above point that very little simplification of the spectra occurs on passing to the solid state. Overtone and combination tones are given in Table III.

Assignments such as these must be tentative particularly with reference to the modes of vibration involving the (CH₂) groups. We have adopted the usual scheme for assigning these vibrations in order of decreasing frequency, i.e., $\nu(\text{CH}_2) > d(\text{CH}_2) > w(\text{CH}_2) > tw(\text{CH}_2) > r(\text{CH}_2)$. The only previous attempt at a vibrational-frequency assignment for any of these molecules was that made for 1-bromo-2-fluoroethane.⁵ However, that assignment was made without the aid of solid-state spectra and is considerably different from the present one. In particular many of the bands which were previously assigned to the *trans* isomer are now assigned as arising from both isomers since they did not disappear on solidification of the sample. The present assignment also has the advantage of having been made for three very similar molecules. One can see from Tables I and II that the assignments are internally consistent but since they must be to some extent arbitrary they will not be discussed in detail except for a few specific points.

All bands above 500 cm⁻¹ which have been assigned to the *trans* molecule disappeared in the solid state and hence such assignments are not in doubt. Assignment of bands unique to the *gauche* isomer are less easy. Normally this has been accomplished by observing intensity changes in solvents of various polarities. The more polar isomer is favored in more polar solvents. This rule

⁹ F. W. Hoffmann, J. Org. Chem. **15**, 425 (1950).

¹⁰ J. Hine and R. G. Ghirardelli, J. Org. Chem. **23**, 1550 (1958).

TABLE II. Vibrational frequencies and assignments of fundamental modes of vibration unique to the *trans* isomer (cm⁻¹).

Cl·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F				Br·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F				I·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F					Assignment
Infrared			Raman	Infrared			Raman	Infrared			Raman		
Vapor	Liquid	Solid	Liquid	Vapor	Liquid	Solid	Liquid	Vapor	Liquid	Solid	Liquid		
1469 w	1458* m	1458* m	1461* (1)		1458* mw	1458* s	1462* (1)	~1480 sh	1467 wsh		1462* ($\frac{1}{2}$)	<i>b</i> (CH ₂)	
1445 } 1438 } _w				1457 } 1448 } _{mw}	1450 wsh			1452 } 1442 } _{mw}	1438 mw		1440 (< $\frac{1}{2}$)	<i>b</i> (CH ₂)	
1390 w*	1390* mw	1390* m	1368 (< $\frac{1}{2}$)	1395 } 1383 } 1375 } _{mw}	1386* mw	1385* s	1373 (< $\frac{1}{2}$)	1371 } 1362 } _{wsh}	1367 vw		1372 (< $\frac{1}{2}$)	<i>w</i> (CH ₂)	
1232 vw	1232 vw			1223 } 1211 } _m	1218 wsh		1222 sh ($< \frac{1}{2}$)	1206 } 1193 } _m	1193* ms	1196 } 1188 } _s	1195* (2)	<i>tw</i> (CH ₂)	
1092 sh	1075* vs	1073* vs	1072* (1)	1094 } 1081 } _{msh}	1070* vs	1063* vs	1067* (1)	1089 } 1076 } _{msh}	1063* vs	1052* vs	1060* ($\frac{1}{2}$)	ν (CF)	
1040 } 1026 } _{vs}	1013 msh		1012 sh ($\frac{1}{2}$)	1035 sh } 1026 vs } _*	1004* vs brd	994* vs	1004* (2)	1018 } 1009 } _{vs}	979* vs brd	978* s	980* (1)	r (CH ₂)	
781 } 777 } 769 } _s	759 m		760 (1)	695 } 687 } _s	681 m		683 (3)	640 } 631 } _s	631 m		631 (3)	ν (CX)	
			383 (2)				338 (3)				313 (4)	<i>b</i> (CCF)	
			262 (< $\frac{1}{2}$)				226 (< $\frac{1}{2}$)				204 (1)	<i>b</i> (CCX)	

 * Asterisks indicate bands which are also *gauche* fundamentals.

TABLE IV. Sum rule agreement for the 1-fluoro-2-haloethanes using liquid-phase values.

Molecules	State	Mizushima sum rule			Bernstein and Pullin sum rule		
		<i>gauche</i> $\sum_i \nu_i^2 \times 10^{-7}$	<i>trans</i> $\sum_i \nu_i^2 \times 10^{-7}$	% Difference	<i>gauche</i> $\sum_i \nu_i \times 10^{-4}$	<i>trans</i> $\sum_i \nu_i \times 10^{-4}$	% Difference
Cl·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F	liquid	3.255	3.266	0.34	1.934	1.936	0.10
Br·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F	liquid	4.084	4.093	0.22	2.202	2.200	0.09
I·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F	liquid	4.050	4.058	0.20	2.178	2.175	0.14

be consistent with the others. One anticipates that the carbon-halogen stretching vibration of the *trans* isomer should occur at a higher frequency than that of the *gauche* form because this frequency in isomers of substituted ethanes has been found to increase as the electronegativity of the grouping which is *trans* to it increases.¹²

A check on the assignments may be made from the Mizushima sum rule¹⁴ and also from the empirical sum rule derived by Bernstein and Pullin.¹⁵ It can be seen from Table IV that the agreement is satisfactory. However it is worth pointing out that these sum rules are not particularly rigorous tests of assignments in these cases, since most of the bands unique to a particular isomer occur at low frequencies.

Enthalpy differences between the isomers have been calculated in the vapor and liquid states using the distinct carbon-halogen stretching vibrations. The en-

thalpy differences were calculated from the formula

$$\frac{\ln(\text{optical density of } trans \text{ band})}{\ln(\text{optical density of } gauche \text{ band})} = \text{constant} \exp(-\Delta H/RT). \quad (1)$$

In the case of the vapor measurements the area under the bands were used rather than the peak height optical densities used for the liquids. This procedure was adopted for the vapor measurements because there were some indications of structure on the bands which made it difficult to obtain accurate peak-height measurements. The measurements are given in Tables V and VI and the calculated enthalpy differences along with those for related molecules are given in Table VII. Unfortunately we were unable to measure the enthalpy difference of 1-fluoro-2-iodoethane in the vapor state because the $\nu(\text{CI})$ band arising from the *gauche* isomer

TABLE V. Temperature dependence of the optical densities of the $\nu(\text{C-X})$ bands (where X = Cl, Br, or I) for liquid 1-fluoro-2-haloethanes.

Compound	Temperature (°C)	Optical density of <i>trans</i> band	Optical density of <i>gauche</i> band	$\log_{10} \frac{\text{O.D. } trans}{\text{O.D. } gauche}$
Cl·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F	7	0.338	0.0550	0.789
	-12	0.361	0.0520	0.840
	-18	0.380	0.0499	0.882
	-29	0.444	0.0505	0.944
	-51	0.459	0.0476	0.984
Br·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F	22	0.395	0.344	0.0601
	6	0.455	0.351	0.113
	-11	0.519	0.353	0.168
	-28	0.392	0.249	0.196
	-44	0.452	0.248	0.266
I·CH ₂ ·CH ₂ ·F	23	0.134	0.357	-0.426
	0	0.161	0.401	-0.396
	-16	0.186	0.431	-0.365
	-38	0.196	0.415	-0.325
	-53	0.206	0.392	-0.278
	-67	0.198	0.333	-0.225

¹⁴ S. Mizushima, T. Shimanouchi, I. Nakagawa, and A. Miyake, J. Chem. Phys. **21**, 215 (1953).

¹⁵ H. J. Bernstein and A. D. A. Pullin, J. Chem. Phys. **21**, 2188 (1953).

TABLE VI. Temperature dependence of the areas of the $\nu(\text{C-X})$ bands (where $\text{X} = \text{Cl}$ or Br) for gaseous 1-chloro-2-fluoroethane and 1-bromo-2-fluoroethane.

Compound	Temperature (°C)	Area of <i>trans</i> band (arbitrary units)	Area of <i>gauche</i> band (arbitrary units)	$\log_{10} \frac{\text{Area}_{\text{trans}}}{\text{Area}_{\text{gauche}}}$
$\text{Cl}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{F}$	28	1.84	1.38	0.124
	45	1.67	1.27	0.119
	63	1.51	1.17	0.109
	84	1.36	1.07	0.104
	103	1.19	0.95	0.099
$\text{Br}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{F}$	28	3.62	0.87	0.618
	41	3.30	0.82	0.603
	62	3.06	0.79	0.589
	83	2.74	0.71	0.584
	103	2.47	0.66	0.572

was too weak to allow accurate measurements. However, by comparison of the ratio of the areas of the optical-density plots of the *trans* and *gauche* $\nu(\text{Cl})$ bands (15:1) in the vapor spectrum with the ratios for the corresponding bands for both liquid and vapor phases (Tables V and VI), it would appear that the vapor-phase enthalpy difference for 1-fluoro-2-iodoethane is greater than for the other two compounds.

It is interesting to observe from Table VII that in the case of each of the 1-fluoro-2-haloethane molecules there is a reversal in stability on passing from the liquid to the gaseous phase. To the best of our knowledge this is the only series of substituted ethanes for which there is

experimental evidence for this type of behavior. It is true to say, however, that the ratio of the more polar isomer to the less polar isomer is always increased on passing from the vapor to the liquid phase. This has been accounted for experimentally in terms of an electrostatic effect¹ which may be described by the Onsager equation. According to this equation, when a molecule of dipole moment μ is transferred from a vacuum into a medium of dielectric constant ϵ , it loses potential energy by an amount E such that

$$E = (\epsilon - 1) / (2\epsilon + 1) (\mu^2 / a^3), \quad (2)$$

where a is the molecular radius. Obviously in the case of rotational isomers the loss of potential energy will be greater for the more polar form and consequently it will have an increased stability in the liquid phase. In the vapor phase the effects governing stability are likely to be a combination of electrostatic and steric effects. From Table VII it would appear that the predominating effect is that of steric repulsion since the enthalpy differences increase with increasing mass of the halogen atoms. Unless there is a specific intramolecular interaction such as hydrogen bonding in the gaseous phase as in the case of the 2-haloethanols¹⁶ it would appear most unlikely that the *gauche* isomer will be the more stable form. However, in the liquid state, the intermolecular electrostatic forces will have a large effect on the relative stabilities and in extreme cases such as the 1-fluoro-2-haloethanes, they may even cause a reversal in the stability. These results indicate the limited value of enthalpy differences measured in the liquid state or in solution since the values obtained are unlikely to be indicative of the intramolecular forces.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to thank C. J. Vear and A. J. Woodward for obtaining some of the experimental data.

¹⁶ P. J. Krueger and H. D. Mettee, Can. J. Chem. **42**, 326 (1964).

TABLE VII. Enthalpy differences of 1,2-dihaloethanes.

Molecule	Phase	ΔH for <i>trans</i> - <i>gauche</i> equilibrium kcal/mole	Reference
$\text{F}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{F}$	Gas	0.0 ± 0.2	4
$\text{Cl}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{F}$	Gas	0.2 ± 0.08	present work
	Gas	0.06 ± 0.04	3
	Gas	0.48	a
$\text{Br}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{F}$	Gas	0.3 ± 0.08	present work
$\text{I}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{F}$
$\text{Cl}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{Cl}$	Gas	1.24 ± 0.05	b
	Gas	1.15 ± 0.15	c
$\text{Br}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{Cl}$	Gas	1.43 ± 0.1	d
$\text{Br}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{Br}$	Gas	1.77 ± 0.15	e
$\text{F}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{F}$	Liquid	~ -0.9	4
$\text{Cl}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{F}$	Liquid	-1.01 ± 0.20	present work
	Liquid	-0.47 ± 0.06	3
$\text{Br}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{F}$	Liquid	-0.92 ± 0.20	present work
$\text{I}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{F}$	Liquid	-0.61 ± 0.15	present work
$\text{Cl}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{Cl}$	Liquid	0*	1
$\text{Br}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{Cl}$	Liquid	0.49 ± 0.10	f
$\text{Br}\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{CH}_2\cdot\text{Br}$	Liquid	0.72^*	1

^a A. D. Giacomo and C. P. Smyth, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **77**, 1361 (1955).

^b H. J. Bernstein, J. Chem. Phys. **17**, 258 (1949).

^c Y. A. Pentin and V. M. Tatevskii, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **108**, 290 (1956).

^d J. Powling and H. J. Bernstein, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **73**, 1815 (1951).

^e H. J. Bernstein, J. Chem. Phys. **18**, 897 (1950).

^f J. K. Wilmshurst and H. J. Bernstein, Can. J. Chem. **35**, 734 (1957).

* Average of what we consider the most reliable values.