

Critical evaluation of the neoclassical model for the poloidal electrostatic field in a tokamak

Robert W. Johnson*

Atlanta, GA 30238, USA

(Dated: March 11, 2019)

Abstract

The neoclassical prescription to use an equation of motion to determine the electrostatic field within a tokamak plasma is fraught with difficulties. Herein, we examine two popular expressions for the poloidal electrostatic field so determined and show that one fails to withstand a formal scrutiny thereof and the other makes a prediction for the electron temperature profile which does not compare well to that commonly seen in a tokamak discharge. Reconsideration of the justification for the presence of the poloidal electric field indicates that no field is needed for a neutral plasma when all bound currents are considered.

PACS numbers: 28.52.-s, 52.30.Ex, 52.55.Fa

arXiv:0806.0780v2 [physics.plasm-ph] 3 Oct 2008

*rob.johnson@gatech.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

The neoclassical prescription to use an equation of motion to determine the electrostatic field within a tokamak plasma, rather than Gauss's law or Poisson's equation [1, 2, 3, 4], is fraught with difficulties [5]. Herein, we examine two popular expressions for the poloidal electrostatic field so determined and show that one fails to withstand a formal scrutiny thereof and the other makes a prediction for the electron temperature profile which does not compare well to that commonly seen in a tokamak discharge. Reconsideration of the justification for the presence of the poloidal electric field indicates that no field is needed for a neutral plasma when all bound currents are considered. A field-theoretic perspective implies that the electrostatic field within a tokamak plasma must either vanish or result from external sources for a model based upon the physics of a neutral fluid.

II. POLOIDAL FIELD FROM THE ELECTRON EQUATION OF MOTION

Some geometric nomenclature and vector identities are given in the Appendix. The first poloidal electrostatic field under consideration is that given by the Georgia Tech Fusion Research Center (GT-FRC) model of the last sixteen years [6, 7, 8, 9], determined by integration of the electron poloidal equation of motion in the large aspect ratio, concentric circular flux surface approximation. The use of concentric circular flux surfaces with a toroidal integrating measure is pursued herein to remain consistent with the model as presented in the literature, as are the order of expansion and initial assumptions. Reference [8] writes the poloidal equation of motion for arbitrary species s as $n_s m_s [(\mathbf{V}_s \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{V}_s]_\theta + \left[\nabla \cdot \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\Pi}_s \right]_\theta + \partial p_s / r \partial \theta - F_{s\theta} + n_s e_s (V_{sr} B_\phi - E_\theta) = 0$, and takes the poloidal electrostatic field on a flux surface at r as given by

$$E_\theta \equiv -\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \Phi(r, \theta)}{\partial \theta} = -\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \Phi^0(r) (1 + \Phi^c(r) \cos \theta + \Phi^s(r) \sin \theta) \quad (1)$$

$$= -\frac{\Phi^0(r)}{r} (\Phi^s(r) \cos \theta - \Phi^c(r) \sin \theta), \quad (2)$$

where Φ is the electrostatic potential, indicating an expansion around $\Phi^0(r) \equiv -\int_a^r dr E_r^0 \neq 0$ for a last closed flux surface at $r = a$. The resulting evaluation of the flux surface unity, cosine, and sine moments of the electron poloidal equation of motion $\mathcal{F}_e \partial n_e / r \partial \theta = -en_e E_\theta$ (other terms are assumed negligible at equilibrium), defined by the expressions $\langle A \rangle_{U,C,S} \equiv$

$\oint d\theta\{1, \cos\theta, \sin\theta\}(1 + \varepsilon \cos\theta)A/2\pi$, yields three equations which have only trivial solution. (The evaluation of these moments is best accomplished without recourse to the logarithmic derivative.) Specifically, for $n_e = n_e^0(1 + n_e^c \cos\theta + n_e^s \sin\theta)$, we have the equations

$$U : \quad \varepsilon F_e n_e^s = e\Phi^0(\varepsilon\Phi^s + n_e^c\Phi^s - n_e^s\Phi^c), \quad (3)$$

$$C : \quad F_e n_e^s = e\Phi^0(4\Phi^s + 3\varepsilon n_e^c\Phi^s - \varepsilon n_e^s\Phi^c)/4, \quad (4)$$

$$S : \quad F_e n_e^c = e\Phi^0(4\Phi^c + \varepsilon n_e^c\Phi^c - \varepsilon n_e^s\Phi^s)/4, \quad (5)$$

valid $\forall \varepsilon, n_e^c, n_e^s$. Solution in pairs given finite (fixed) Φ^0 yields inconsistent values of $\Phi^{c,s}$ for this overdetermined system, which therefor has no solution, thus the poloidal electrostatic field in the GT-FRC model, which fails to consider the unity moment equation and the $O(\varepsilon)$ terms, is unphysical. Failing to include the $O(\varepsilon)$ terms indicates expressions applicable only on the magnetic axis $r = 0$, where $\varepsilon \equiv r/R_0 = 0$ for $R_0 \neq \infty$, yet the GT-FRC model is commonly used to address the physics near the edge of the confinement region [9]. These equations may be linearized and have the formal solution $(1/\Phi^0, \Phi^c, \Phi^s) \equiv (0, 0, 0)$, which we interpret to mean exactly what it says, that they are solved when $\Phi^0(r) \equiv \infty$, displaying its unphysical definition. As non-vanishing $\Phi^{c,s}$ are an integral part of the development of the GT-FRC model, appearing in both the poloidal and toroidal equations of motion, the validity of its conclusions is in jeopardy. Note that a putative non-vanishing radial electrostatic field without poloidal variation demands the existence of *no* poloidal electrostatic field, else the poloidal variation to the potential ruins the poloidal symmetry of the radial field; if that radial field is determined from a radial equation of motion then the associated poloidal field is determined by the poloidal dependence of that equation.

III. POLOIDAL FIELD FROM THE OHM'S LAW EQUATION

A. Derivation

An alternative treatment of the problem begins with the consideration of the poloidal line integral of the electric field, $\oint d\hat{l} \cdot \mathbf{E} \equiv \oint r d\theta E_\theta = 0$ at equilibrium. Examining the expression of another leading contender for the poloidal electrostatic field [10] evaluated from the Ohm's law equation,

$$E_\theta = \frac{\langle E_\phi B_\phi / B_\theta \rangle B^2}{\langle B^2 / B_\theta \rangle B_\theta} - \frac{E_\phi B_\phi}{B_\theta} + RB_\phi p' \eta_{\parallel} \left(\frac{\langle 1/B_\theta \rangle B^2}{\langle B^2 / B_\theta \rangle B_\theta} - \frac{1}{B_\theta} \right), \quad (6)$$

one may put it in the form

$$E_\theta = E_\theta^{(2)} [2\varepsilon \cos \theta - (\varepsilon^2/2) \cos 2\theta], \quad (7)$$

when the Shafranov shift is neglected, as in the concentric circular flux surface approximation of the GT-FRC model (and others), upon application of Stokes' theorem to Faraday's law [11], *ie* by requiring $\oint d\theta E_\theta = 0$. Inserting that expression into the electron poloidal equation of motion and taking the flux surface Fourier moments yields three equations which have a nontrivial solution only when expanded to order $O(\varepsilon^3)$, given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} n_e^c \\ n_e^s \\ E_\theta^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon^3/(6\varepsilon^2 - 8) \\ \pm \varepsilon \sqrt{3\varepsilon^4 - 168\varepsilon^2 + 192}/(18\varepsilon^2 - 24) \\ \pm 4(\mathcal{F}_e/eR_0)/\varepsilon \sqrt{3\varepsilon^4 - 168\varepsilon^2 + 192} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

thus the presence of a poloidal electrostatic field of that form should be accompanied by a potentially measurable shift in the electron density profile. Note that the derivation immediately preceding is slightly inconsistent, as the associated electrostatic potential $\Phi_{axi} = \Phi_0(2\varepsilon \sin \theta - (\varepsilon^2/4) \sin 2\theta)$ is of the correct harmonic form [12, 13, 14, 15] for axial geometry, as is easily verified in $(Z = -r \sin \theta, R = R_0 + r \cos \theta, z)$ coordinates via application of the axial Laplacian $\nabla_{axi}^2 \equiv \partial^2/\partial Z^2 + \partial^2/\partial R^2$ to $\Phi_{axi} = \Phi_0 Z[(R - R_0)/2R_0^2 - 2/R_0]$, yet the flux surface average is done in toroidal geometry. Note that this Φ_0 is *not* the Φ^0 of the preceding section but is a unit bearing constant which sets the scale.

In order to achieve the correct harmonic form for tokamak geometry, the potential must satisfy the toroidal Laplacian, which in cylindrical coordinates [1, 11, 16] is given by $\nabla_{tor}^2 \equiv \nabla_{axi}^2 + \partial/R\partial R$ (note that the expression for Δ^* given by Hopcraft in Dendy's textbook [4] is *not* the toroidal Laplacian and differs by the sign of the additional term), and the form of the additional geometric term hints at the solution. Direct integration yields the toroidal potential $\Phi_{tor} \equiv \Phi_{axi}(R \rightarrow \ln R)$, from which $E_Z = -\Phi_0[(\ln R - R_0)/2R_0^2 - 2/R_0]$ and $E_R = -\Phi_0 Z/2RR_0^2$, noting that the introduction of the logarithm breaks the usually obvious relation between the symbol for the magnitude of a quantity and the units associated with that quantity—carefully pulling the units beside the leading coefficients of expressions ensures that they are respected. From these, we determine the poloidal field to be

$$E_\theta \equiv -\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \theta} = \left(\frac{-\Phi_0}{r} \right) \left(\frac{\partial Z}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial Z} + \frac{\partial R}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial R} \right) \frac{\Phi}{\Phi_0} = E_\theta^{(2)} \left[(R - R_0) \frac{E_Z}{\Phi_0} - Z \frac{E_R}{\Phi_0} \right], \quad (9)$$

where we identify $E_{r,\theta}^{(2)} \equiv -\Phi_0/r$, and the corresponding radial field is

$$E_r \equiv -\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial r} = \left(\frac{-\Phi_0}{r}\right) r \left(\frac{\partial Z}{\partial r} \frac{\partial}{\partial Z} + \frac{\partial R}{\partial r} \frac{\partial}{\partial R}\right) \frac{\Phi}{\Phi_0} = E_r^{(2)} \left[-Z \frac{E_Z}{\Phi_0} - (R - R_0) \frac{E_R}{\Phi_0}\right]. \quad (10)$$

In (r, θ, ϕ) coordinates, we have $\Phi_{tor} = \Phi_0 r \sin \theta [-\ln(R_0 + r \cos \theta) + 5R_0]/2R_0^2$, and

$$E_\theta(r, \theta) = \frac{\Phi_0}{2rR_0^2} \left\{ r \cos \theta [\ln(R_0 + r \cos \theta) - 5R_0] - \frac{r^2 \sin^2 \theta}{R_0 + r \cos \theta} \right\}, \quad (11)$$

$$E_r(r, \theta) = \frac{\Phi_0}{2rR_0^2} \left\{ r \sin \theta [\ln(R_0 + r \cos \theta) - 5R_0] + \frac{r^2 \cos \theta \sin \theta}{R_0 + r \cos \theta} \right\}. \quad (12)$$

As this is an electrostatic field within a neutral medium (*ie* one for which the net charge on a differential volume element vanishes), Maxwell's equations $\nabla \times \mathbf{E} = 0$ and $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = 0$ are satisfied.

As electrostatic fields necessarily require a supporting charge density [11, 17, 18, 19, 20], one may very well ask where these charges are. As the solution to Laplace's equation is uniquely determined by the boundary condition, we might as well put them on the boundary of the region under consideration, which in this case is the R/R_0 weighted circle representing our outermost flux surface at normalized minor radius $r/a = 1$ upon collapse of the toroidal dimension, giving us an inverse Dirichlet problem, which is usually defined as solving for the potential given the boundary condition. As the current in a tokamak is observed in the toroidal direction, we suppose in this section that the plasma behaves as a dielectric in the plane orthogonal to the current, and take the polarization to be proportional to the electrostatic field, $\mathbf{P} \propto \mathbf{E}$, an admittedly crude approximation but one which satisfies the requirement of no volumetric bound charge density, $\rho_b = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{P} = 0$. Were the plasma conductive in the $(Z, R) \cong (r, \theta)$ plane, no electrostatic field could be supported [11]. To find the surface bound charge density, we take $\sigma_b = \mathbf{P} \cdot \hat{r}$, noting that quantity represents the charge density on the weighted circle, so to get the physical charge density on a poloidal circle of the toroidal flux surface we take $\sigma_b \rightarrow \sigma_b R_0/R$. We note that usually it is an applied electric field which drives the polarization of dielectrics, but for a magnetized plasma other effects might support such polarization.

From the expression for the poloidal field, one may determine a prediction for the associated electron temperature profile by solving the flux surface Fourier moments of the poloidal equation of motion as in the previous section. With electron density $n_e = n_e^0(1 + n_e^c \cos \theta + n_e^s \sin \theta)$ and temperature $kT_e \equiv \mathcal{F}_e$, and the unity, cosine, and sine moments defined by the expressions $\langle A \rangle_{U,C,S} \equiv \oint d\theta \{1, \cos \theta, \sin \theta\} (1 + \varepsilon \cos \theta) A / 2\pi$, we solve

$\langle \mathcal{F}_e \partial n_e / r \partial \theta + n_e e E_\theta \rangle_{U,C,S} = 0$ for (the pure numbers) n_e^c, n_e^s , and $E_\theta^{(2)}$, given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} n_e^c \\ n_e^s \\ E_\theta^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 3\varepsilon^3/G_2 \\ \pm\sqrt{6}\varepsilon G_1/2(F+2)G_2 \\ \pm 8\sqrt{6}\mathcal{F}_e/e\varepsilon G_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

where $F \equiv 5R_0 - \ln R_0$, in terms of the functions $G_2(r) \equiv [(6F-1)\varepsilon^2 - 8F]$ and

$$G_1(r) \equiv \sqrt{(F+2)[\{16F[4F - (1+3F)\varepsilon^2]\} + 9\varepsilon^4]}, \quad (14)$$

from which we obtain $\Phi_0 = \mp 8\sqrt{6}R_0\mathcal{F}_e/eG_1$. Note that the quantities appearing in, between, and following Equations (13) and (14) carry no units, as the units cancel out of the system of equations solved. The factor of R_0 appearing as a scale factor in Φ_0 has a physical interpretation—for an equivalent supporting charge density and minor radius, as one scales the system by R_0 , the magnitude of the charge distribution on the weighted circle increases as the major circumference of the torus, thus increasing the magnitude of the potential by a numerical factor of R_0 . As Φ_0 is constant $\forall r$, the explicit $r \equiv \varepsilon R_0$ dependence of G_1 must cancel the implicit r dependence of $\mathcal{F}_e(r)$, allowing us to write $\mathcal{F}_e(r)/G_1(r) \equiv \mathcal{F}_e(0)/G_1(0)$, thus G_1 determines the r dependence of the electron temperature as a prediction of the hypothesis that the electrostatic field in a tokamak is of a form similar to that of Equation (7). Note that a similar prediction obtains from the bottommost of Equations (8) given by the radical factor.

B. Presentation

The following presents the results of a numerical evaluation of the expressions in the preceding subsection. The scale is set by $R_0 = 2$ and $\mathcal{F}_e(0)/e = 1$, and r/a is the normalized minor radius. Some useful geometry is presented in the Appendix. The toroidal electrostatic potential, Φ_{tor} , is shown in Figure 1—note the correct harmonic form of a stretched circular membrane (*eg* a drum-head put on a hoop given by the boundary condition), consistent with the physics of potential theory [12, 13], and the obvious lack of bumps or poles, consistent with a neutral medium (the term “pole” actually means something physical [11, 13, 14], namely the effect on the potential of an isolated flux-source which ultimately is quantized in units of the charge). We stress that these are multiple views of the same single object

and that the boundary is determined by the potential and not *vice versa*. In Figure 2 we display the magnitude of the associated electrostatic field, and in Figure 3 we display the electrostatic field and the associated supporting charge density.

The normalized electron temperature profile in a tokamak often compares favorably (from unpublished results of the analysis behind Reference [8]) with the formula $\mathcal{T}_e(r)/\mathcal{T}_e(0) \approx (1 - r^4)^2$, which misses the effect of the pedestal but works surprisingly well for $r/a < .8$, and so that is the assumed profile to which we will make our comparison in Figure 4. The normalized predicted profile for the temperature is $G_1(r)/G_1(0)$ and fails to fall sufficiently quickly to match the shape of the expected temperature profile. Thus, while comparison with our approximate formula hardly qualifies as a true experimental test of the hypothesis [21], the existence of an electrostatic field of form similar to that of Equation (7) is not supported by this analysis.

IV. REEXAMINATION OF THE OHM'S LAW EQUATION IN LIGHT OF MAGNETIZATION

The difficulties encountered above by the neoclassical model result from the misapplication of the Ohm's law equation, which itself is derived from the electron and ion equations of motion. For a neutral, hydrogenic plasma of species $s \in \{e, i\}$ with total particle density $n \equiv n_e + n_i = 2n_0$, mass density $\rho_m \equiv \sum_s n_s m_s$, mass flow velocity $\rho_m \mathbf{V}_m \equiv \sum_s n_s m_s \mathbf{V}_s$, current density $\mathbf{J} \equiv \sum_s n_s e_s \mathbf{V}_s$, and pressure $p \equiv n\mathcal{F} \equiv \sum_s n_s \mathcal{F}_s \equiv \sum_s p_s$, the equilibrium $\partial/\partial t \equiv 0$ equations of motion neglecting viscosity and magnetization read

$$n_s m_s (\mathbf{V}_s \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{V}_s + \nabla p_s - n_s e_s \mathbf{V}_s \times \mathbf{B} = n_s e_s \mathbf{E} + \mathbf{C}_{sk} , \quad (15)$$

where $k \neq s$ for the collision term $\mathbf{C}_{ei} = -\mathbf{C}_{ie} = \nu_{ei} m_e \mathbf{J}/e$. From the definitions of the current and flow velocity we may exchange our motional degrees of freedom $\{\mathbf{V}_e, \mathbf{V}_i\}$ for the pair $\{\mathbf{V}_m, \mathbf{J}\}$ via

$$\begin{bmatrix} \rho_m \mathbf{V}_m \\ \mathbf{J} \end{bmatrix} = n_0 \begin{bmatrix} m_e & m_i \\ -e & e \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}_e \\ \mathbf{V}_i \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}_e \\ \mathbf{V}_i \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{V}_m + \frac{\mathbf{J}}{e\rho_m} \begin{bmatrix} -m_i \\ m_e \end{bmatrix} . \quad (16)$$

The sum of Equations (15) gives the equilibrium force balance equation

$$n_0 [m_i (\mathbf{V}_i \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{V}_i + m_e (\mathbf{V}_e \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{V}_e] + \nabla p - \mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B} = 0 , \quad (17)$$

and their difference the generalized Ohm's law equation

$$n_0 [m_i (\mathbf{V}_i \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{V}_i - m_e (\mathbf{V}_e \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{V}_e] + \nabla (p_i - p_e) - n_0 e (\mathbf{V}_i + \mathbf{V}_e) \times \mathbf{B} = 2 [n_0 e \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{C}_{ei}] , \quad (18)$$

where $-n_0 e (\mathbf{V}_i + \mathbf{V}_e) = n_0 (m_i - m_e) \mathbf{J} / \rho_m - 2n_0 e \mathbf{V}_m$ and the convective terms are given by

$$[m_i (\mathbf{V}_i \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{V}_i + m_e (\mathbf{V}_e \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{V}_e] = (m_i + m_e) \left[(\mathbf{V}_m \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{V}_m + \frac{m_e m_i}{e^2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{J}}{\rho_m} \cdot \nabla \right) \frac{\mathbf{J}}{\rho_m} \right] , \quad (19)$$

$$[m_i (\mathbf{V}_i \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{V}_i - m_e (\mathbf{V}_e \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{V}_e] = (m_i - m_e) \left[(\mathbf{V}_m \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{V}_m - \frac{m_e m_i}{e^2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{J}}{\rho_m} \cdot \nabla \right) \frac{\mathbf{J}}{\rho_m} \right] , \quad (20)$$

$$+ 2 \frac{m_e m_i}{e} \left[(\mathbf{V}_m \cdot \nabla) \frac{\mathbf{J}}{\rho_m} + \left(\frac{\mathbf{J}}{\rho_m} \cdot \nabla \right) \mathbf{V}_m \right] , \quad (21)$$

which we compare to those given by Sturrock [22] $\mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B} / n_0 e = \mathbf{E} - \eta \mathbf{J}$, and by Wesson [10] $-\mathbf{V}_m \times \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{E} - \eta \mathbf{J}$, and to that given by Elliot [4] $-\mathbf{V}_m \times \mathbf{B} + (\mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B} - \nabla p_e) / n_0 e = \mathbf{E} - \eta \mathbf{J}$, for resistivity $\eta = m_e \nu_{ei} / n_0 e^2$. Note that the Ohm's law equation may only be solved in isolation for \mathbf{J} when the flow velocity is known to vanish, as for a material conductor held fixed, or is determined by independent experimental measurement; otherwise it must be taken as part of the system of 6 scalar equations defined in conjunction with the equilibrium force balance equation to determine the 6 scalar degrees of freedom given by $\{\mathbf{V}_m, \mathbf{J}\}$, with other factors either known by assumption or measurement or determined from other equations, and thus the application of a conductivity tensor derived with the absence of any terms appearing in Equation (18) is suspect. From a particle physicist's field theoretic perspective [17, 18, 19, 23, 24], the Maxwell field tensor $F^{\mu\nu} \equiv \partial^{[\mu} A^{\nu]}$ is known to have only 4 scalar degrees of freedom, not 3 for each of the electric and magnetic fields, embodied by the four-potential $A^\mu \equiv (\Phi/c, \mathbf{A})$ and coupled to sources given by the four-current $J^\mu \equiv (c\rho_e, \mathbf{J})$ through the inhomogeneous Maxwell equations $\partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu} = \mu_0 J^\nu$, and the homogeneous equations are recognized as the Bianchi identity given by the field equation for the dual tensor and are satisfied identically when written in terms of the electromagnetic potential hence do not determine any degrees of freedom, thus the electrostatic potential is determined by the space charge density $\rho_e \equiv \sum_s n_s e_s$ and not by an equation of motion [5].

The motivation for the existence of the Pfirsch-Schlüter current leading to the poloidal electric field of the preceding section is the cancellation of charge accumulation arising from the pressure gradient driven diamagnetic current $\mathbf{J}_{\nabla p} = -\nabla p \times \mathbf{B} / B^2$ in toroidal geometry [10], $\nabla_{tor} \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\nabla p} = -\partial \rho_{\nabla p} / \partial t \neq 0$. However, $\mathbf{J}_{\nabla p}$ is but one component of the total diamagnetic current, defined as the curl of the magnetization $\mathbf{J}_{dia} \equiv \nabla \times \mathbf{M}$ where

$\mathbf{M} \equiv -(p/B^2)\mathbf{B}$, which includes the effects of the pressure gradient driven current as well as the curvature and ∇B drift currents [25] and remains divergence-free regardless of the geometry, thus there is no space charge accumulation and no motivation for a cancelling current. As we have seen, the associated potential may be put into harmonic form in the large aspect ratio limit, which requires the presence of a static space charge distribution on the boundary of the neutral medium rather than a current, which would act to cancel the supporting charge distribution as the charge carriers reposition themselves. The error here lies in not fully distinguishing the free and bound charges and currents as they appear in the Maxwell equations and in trying to treat the fully ionized medium as both a conductor and dielectric at zero frequency.

V. CONCLUSION

From the preceding analysis, we find that the use of an equation of motion to determine the poloidal electrostatic field leads to inconsistencies, either internally or with expected experimental measurement of the electron temperature profile. Part of the problem lies in treating the poloidal and radial components of the field separately, when there is only one electrostatic potential from which both components may be determined. The remainder lies in the neglect of Gauss's law popularly established within the plasma physics community [1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31], which relegates the defining relation for the electrostatic field to a position of subsidiary moment. Any model which treats the plasma as a neutral, conducting fluid, where neutrality is understood to hold down to some scale smaller than the differential volume element used to define the continuum quantities, needs to respect *all* of Maxwell's laws, which are manifestly Lorentz covariant. Taking a field-theoretic perspective implies that the electrostatic field within a neutral medium at equilibrium must either vanish or result from sources external to that medium. In conclusion, we determine that we are unsatisfied by the neoclassical model for the poloidal electrostatic field within a tokamak plasma, which should be determined by the application of the Poisson equation and should vanish in the neutral fluid limit.

APPENDIX

There are (at least) three useful sets of coordinate axes to describe a toroidal magnetic confinement device with concentric circular flux surfaces, namely (Z, R, ϕ) , (r, θ, ϕ) , and (r, \perp, \parallel) , and in the infinite aspect ratio limit ($R_0 \rightarrow \infty$) we have the axial coordinate axes (Z, R, z) and (r, θ, z) , Figure 5. (Note that the term “toroidal coordinates” means something very different to a mathematician than those commonly applied to a tokamak, which we call “tokamak coordinates.”) For a plasma with coaxial applied electric and magnetic fields and free current, we note that $(r, \theta, z) = (-\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}/EB, -\mathbf{E} \times (\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B})/E^2B, \mathbf{E}/E)$ and $(r, \perp, \parallel) = (-\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}/EB, -\mathbf{B} \times (\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B})/EB^2, \mathbf{B}/B)$. Cylindrical coordinates (Z, R, ϕ) relate to tokamak coordinates (r, θ, ϕ) via $Z = -r \sin \theta$ and $R = R_0 + r \cos \theta$ in the concentric circular approximation, where \hat{r} , $\hat{\theta}$, and $\hat{\phi}$ give the radial, poloidal, and toroidal directions, respectively. The outermost minor radius of the confined plasma, given in meters by a , defines the normalized minor radius $\rho = r/a$, and R_a is its centroid. The magnetic field \mathbf{B} and current density \mathbf{J} lie in isobaric surfaces given by $\nabla p = \mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B}$ for a stationary equilibrium, defining the “flux surface” at radius r . In general, the nested flux surfaces are neither circular nor concentric. The relationship between vectors in the tokamak coordinates $(Z, R, \phi) \leftarrow (r, \theta, \phi) \leftarrow (r, \perp, \parallel)$ may be succinctly expressed by

$$\begin{bmatrix} F_Z \\ F_R \\ F_\phi \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\sin \theta & -\cos \theta & 0 \\ \cos \theta & -\sin \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b_\phi & b_\theta \\ 0 & -b_\theta & b_\phi \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} F_r \\ F_\perp \\ F_\parallel \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A22})$$

where $\hat{\parallel} \equiv \mathbf{B}/B \equiv \hat{b} \equiv (0, b_\theta, b_\phi)$. Various operators in tokamak coordinates are

$$\nabla f \equiv \hat{Z} \frac{\partial f}{\partial Z} + \hat{R} \frac{\partial f}{\partial R} + \hat{\phi} \frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi} \equiv \hat{r} \frac{\partial f}{\partial r} + \hat{\theta} \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta} + \hat{\phi} \frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi}, \quad (\text{A23})$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{F} \equiv \frac{\partial F_Z}{\partial Z} + \frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial R F_R}{\partial R} + \frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial F_\phi}{\partial \phi} \equiv \frac{1}{rR} \frac{\partial r R F_r}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{rR} \frac{\partial R F_\theta}{\partial \theta} + \frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial F_\phi}{\partial \phi}, \quad (\text{A24})$$

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{F} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial R F_\phi}{\partial R} - \frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial F_R}{\partial \phi} \\ \frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial F_Z}{\partial \phi} - \frac{\partial F_\phi}{\partial Z} \\ \frac{\partial F_R}{\partial Z} - \frac{\partial F_Z}{\partial R} \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{rR} \frac{\partial R F_\phi}{\partial \theta} - \frac{1}{rR} \frac{\partial r F_\theta}{\partial \phi} \\ \frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial F_r}{\partial \phi} - \frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial R F_\phi}{\partial r} \\ \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial r F_\theta}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial F_r}{\partial \theta} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A25})$$

$$\nabla^2 f \equiv \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial Z^2} + \frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial}{\partial R} R \frac{\partial f}{\partial R} + \frac{1}{R^2} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \phi^2} \equiv \frac{1}{rR} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} r R \frac{\partial f}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r^2 R} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} R \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta} + \frac{1}{R^2} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \phi^2}, \quad (\text{A26})$$

where some useful relationships are

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= -r \sin \theta , & \partial Z / \partial r &= Z / r , & \partial Z / \partial \theta &= -(R - R_0) , \\ R - R_0 &= r \cos \theta , & \partial R / \partial r &= (R - R_0) / r , & \partial R / \partial \theta &= Z , \end{aligned} \tag{A27}$$

and for the logarithm, we have $\partial \ln R / \partial R = 1/R$ where the units on the left are carried by the operator and the units on the right are carried by the result, which shows that the $\ln R$ is a pure number which carries no units.

-
- [1] D. L. Book, Tech. Rep. 3332, Naval Research Laboratory (1977), see National Technical Information Service Document No. ADA041545.
 - [2] S. I. Braginskii, in *Review of Plasma Physics*, edited by M. Leontovich (Consultants Bureau, New York, U.S.A., 1965), vol. 1 of *Review of Plasma Physics*, pp. 201–311.
 - [3] F. F. Chen, *Introduction to Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion* (Springer, 1984), ISBN 0306413329.
 - [4] R. Dendy, *Plasma Physics: an Introductory Course* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1993).
 - [5] R. W. Johnson, Phys. Plasmas (2008), in preparation.
 - [6] W. M. Stacey, Physics of Fluids B: Plasma Physics **4**, 3302 (1992).
 - [7] W. M. Stacey, Contributions to Plasma Physics **46**, 597 (2006).
 - [8] W. M. Stacey, R. W. Johnson, and J. Mandrekas, Phys. Plasmas **13** (2006).
 - [9] W. M. Stacey and R. J. Groebner, Physics of Plasmas **15**, 012503 (pages 11) (2008).
 - [10] J. Wesson, *Tokamaks* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2004), 3rd ed.
 - [11] D. Griffiths, *Introduction to Electrodynamics* (Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA, 1989), 2nd ed., ISBN 0-13-481367-7.
 - [12] G. F. Simmons, *Differential Equations with Applications and Historical Notes* (McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, NY, 1991), 2nd ed.
 - [13] F. J. Flanigan, *Complex Variables: Harmonic and Analytic Functions* (Aliyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, MA, 1972).
 - [14] K. J. Binns, P. J. Lawrenson, and C. W. Trowbridge, *The Analytical and Numerical Solution of Electric and Magnetic Fields* (John Wiley and Sons, 1992).
 - [15] E. W. Weisstein, *Laplace's equation*, From MathWorld—A Wolfram Web Resource (2008).

- [16] E. W. Weisstein, *Cylindrical coordinates*, From MathWorld—A Wolfram Web Resource (2008).
- [17] F. Mandl and G. Shaw, *Quantum Field Theory, Revised Edition* (John Wiley & Sons Inc, 1993), ISBN 0471941867.
- [18] L. H. Ryder, *Quantum Field Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- [19] P. Ramond, *Field Theory: A Modern Primer* (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1990), 2nd ed., ISBN 0-201-54611-6.
- [20] J. C. Maxwell, Royal Society Transactions **155** (1864).
- [21] D. S. Sivia, *Data Analysis: A Bayesian Tutorial (Oxford Science Publications)* (Oxford University Press, 1996), ISBN 0198518897.
- [22] P. A. Sturrock, *Plasma Physics: An Introduction to the Theory of Astrophysical, Geophysical and Laboratory Plasmas* (Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- [23] F. Halzen and A. D. Martin, *Quarks and Leptons* (Wiley, 1985).
- [24] W. R. Davis, *Classical Fields, Particles, and the Theory of Relativity* (Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, 1970).
- [25] R. D. Hazeltine and F. L. Waelbroeck, *The Framework of Plasma Physics* (Westview Press, 2004).
- [26] A. Dinklage, T. Klinger, G. Marx, and L. Schweikhard, eds., *Plasma Physics: Confinement, Transport and Collective Effects* (Springer, 2005).
- [27] W. M. Stacey, *Fusion Plasma Physics* (Wiley-VCH, 2005).
- [28] M. G. Kivelson and C. T. Russell, *Introduction to Space Physics* (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- [29] J. Büchner, C. T. Dum, and M. Scholer, eds., *Space Plasma Simulation* (Springer, 2003).
- [30] M.-B. Kallenrode, ed., *Space Physics: An Introduction to Plasmas and Particles in the Heliosphere and Magnetospheres* (Springer, 2004).
- [31] R. J. Goldston and P. H. Rutherford, *Introduction to Plasma Physics* (CRC Press, 1995).




FIG. 1: (Color online.) The toroidal electrostatic potential Φ_{tor} seen from multiple views.




FIG. 2: (Color online.) The magnitude of the associated electrostatic field seen from multiple views.




FIG. 3: (Color online.) The electrostatic field and associated supporting charge density seen from multiple views.




FIG. 4: Comparison of the neoclassical prediction for the normalized electron temperature profile, G_1 , versus an approximation to that found in tokamak experiments, $(1 - r^4)^2$.




FIG. 5: Cylindrical coordinates (Z, R, ϕ) and tokamak coordinates (r, θ, ϕ) .