Section 3 of Paper 79

From discussion it appears that the NaCl crystals were not charged initially, so there was no Coulomb type interaction. This means that initially:

$$\underline{E}^{a} = cA^{(0)}\,\underline{I}^{a}(\text{orbital}). \quad -(1)$$

The electric field $\underline{E}^{a}$ sets up an orbital motion. The constant of proportionality $cA^{(0)}$ is the voltage. It appears that changing the sign of $\underline{E}^{a}$ by reversing the polarity does not change the sign of $\underline{I}^{a}(\text{orbital})$. This means that the sign of $A^{(0)}$ must be reversed.

Assuming that the NaCl crystals then become electrostatically charged, there is an additional:

$$\underline{\nabla}\cdot\underline{E}^{a} = \mu_0 c\,\tilde{J}^{a0}_{em} \quad -(2)$$

causing the usual translational attraction of the inverse square law. This attraction takes place between the charged salt particles and a charged terminal. There is also the possibility of repulsion of like charges. The standard model can explain this but it cannot explain the rotation.