

352(2): Simplification of the Vorticity Equation

The vorticity equation is:

$$\nabla \times \underline{w} = R (\underline{v} \times \underline{w} - (\underline{v} \cdot \nabla) \underline{v}) - (1)$$

Now use the vector identity (VAPS Problem 8.23):

$$\underline{v} = (\underline{v} \cdot \nabla) \underline{v} = \frac{1}{2} \nabla v^2 - \underline{v} \times (\nabla \times \underline{v}) - (2)$$

So:

$$\nabla \times \underline{w} = R (\underline{v} \times \underline{w} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla v^2 + \underline{v} \times \underline{w}) - (3)$$

$$\boxed{\nabla \times \underline{w} = R (2 \underline{v} \times \underline{w} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla v^2)}$$

where $\underline{w} = \nabla \times \underline{v} - (4)$

Therefore:

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned} \nabla \times (\nabla \times \underline{v}) &= \nabla (\nabla \cdot \underline{v}) - \nabla^2 \underline{v} \\ &= R (2 \underline{v} \times (\nabla \times \underline{v}) - \frac{1}{2} \nabla v^2) \end{aligned}} - (5)$$

For Beltrami flows:

$$\nabla \times \underline{v} = R \underline{v} - (6)$$

So

$$\underline{v} \times (\nabla \times \underline{v}) = \underline{0} - (7)$$

because $\nabla \times \underline{v}$ is parallel to \underline{v} . So for Beltrami flows:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \times (\nabla \times \underline{v}) &= \nabla (\nabla \cdot \underline{v}) - \nabla^2 \underline{v} \\ &= -\frac{R}{2} \nabla v^2 \end{aligned} - (8)$$

2) i.e. $\nabla^2 \underline{v} - \nabla(\nabla \cdot \underline{v}) = -\frac{R}{2} \nabla v^2 - (9)$

for Beltrami flows.

So Beltrami flows in general are governed by eq. (9).

If the Beltrami flow is incompressible then:

$$\nabla^2 \underline{v} = \frac{R}{2} \nabla v^2 - (10)$$

From problem 8-32 of VAPS there exists the following identity:

$$\underline{v} \cdot \nabla \times \underline{v} = \underline{v} \cdot \underline{w} = (\underline{v} \times \nabla) \cdot \underline{v} - (11)$$

For a uniform vorticity:

$$\underline{w} = \nabla \times \underline{v} - (12)$$

then: $\underline{v} = \frac{1}{2} \underline{w} \times \underline{r} - (13)$

is direct analogy to:

$$\underline{B} = \nabla \times \underline{A} - (14)$$

$$\underline{A} = \frac{1}{2} \underline{B} \times \underline{r} - (15)$$

and

in the old electrodynamics. From eqs. (11) and (13):

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{v} \cdot \nabla \times \underline{v} &= \frac{1}{2} \underline{w} \times \underline{r} \cdot \underline{w} = \frac{1}{2} \underline{w} \times \underline{w} \cdot \underline{r} \\ &= 0 \end{aligned} - (16)$$

Therefore for uniform vorticity:

$$3) \quad \underline{v} \cdot \underline{\nabla} \times \underline{v} = 0 \quad - (17)$$

So for uniform vorticity:

$$\underline{v} \cdot \underline{w} = \underline{v} \cdot \underline{\nabla} \times \underline{v} = (\underline{v} \times \underline{\nabla}) \cdot \underline{v} = 0 \quad - (18)$$

i.e. \underline{w} is perpendicular to \underline{v} .

In order to convert these equations to fluid electrodynamics, we:

$$\underline{v} = \frac{f}{\rho_m} \underline{w} \quad - (19)$$

$$\text{and } \underline{w} = \frac{f}{\rho_m} \underline{B} \quad - (20)$$

so the vorticity equation of fluid electrodynamics is:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\nabla} \times \left(\frac{f}{\rho_m} \underline{B} \right) &= R \left(2 \underline{v} \times \left(\frac{f}{\rho_m} \underline{B} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \underline{\nabla} \left(\frac{f}{\rho_m} \underline{w} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= R \left(2 \frac{f}{\rho_m} \underline{w} \times \left(\frac{f}{\rho_m} \underline{B} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \underline{\nabla} \left(\frac{f}{\rho_m} \underline{w} \right)^2 \right) \quad - (21) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where } \underline{B} = \underline{\nabla} \times \underline{w} \quad - (22)$$

In general:

$$\underline{\nabla} \times \left(\frac{f}{\rho_m} \underline{B} \right) = \frac{f}{\rho_m} \underline{\nabla} \times \underline{B} + \underline{\nabla} \left(\frac{f}{\rho_m} \right) \times \underline{B} \quad - (22)$$

7) If it is assumed that ρ/ρ_m is independent of distance then:

$$\underline{\nabla} \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_m} \right) = 0 \quad - (23)$$

In Q's case eq. (21) simplifies to:

$$\underline{\nabla} \times \underline{B} = \frac{\rho}{\rho_m} R \left(2 \underline{W} \times (\underline{\nabla} \times \underline{W}) - \frac{1}{2} \underline{\nabla} W^2 \right) \quad - (24)$$

so if there is a circuit in contact with vacuum, and if:

$$\underline{W} = \underline{W}(\text{vac}) \quad - (25)$$

it is possible that a magnetic flux density \underline{B} appears in the circuit from a turbulent vacuum.