

Re: Explanation of Amps

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.basics/2005-01/1233.html>

From: John Fields (jfields_at_austininstruments.com)

Date: 01/18/05

Date: Tue, 18 Jan 2005 17:17:42 -0600

On Tue, 18 Jan 2005 21:36:14 GMT, Miles Harris <mazzer@yahoo.com> wrote:

>On Tue, 18 Jan 2005 09:38:16 -0600, John Fields

><jfields@austininstruments.com> wrote:

>

>>On Tue, 18 Jan 2005 14:41:26 GMT, Miles Harris <mazzer@yahoo.com>

>>wrote:

>

>>>I'm talking about a *_perfect_ current source, Junior. Surely even*

>>>**you* must have worked that out.*

>>

>>----

>>Well, maroon, in the context of the thread, everybody knows there's no

>>perfect current source, so when you don't explicitly state that that's

>>what you're talking about, the default becomes real current sources

>>which, like lead-acid batteries and diodes, we can add to the

>>inventory of devices you've demonstrated you know little about.

>>----

>

>Wrong again, Junior. It was John Popelish that introduced the current

>source in his first response on this thread. It was clear that he was

>also talking about a perfect current source:

>

>JP:

>>If you have a current source (that provides as many volts as it takes

>>to push a fixed current through a resistance), then, yes.

As far as I can tell, JP was expounding on the *_concept_* of a current source, which does assume ideal conditions, much like the impossible-to-find massless lever, weightless string, and frictionless air.

Moreover, John clearly defined his terms in order to, ostensibly, remove any ambiguity from his argument, so his meaning was perfectly clear.

You, on the other hand, with your sloppy:

"However, it's confusing to introduce a newbie to the concept of the current source. It doesn't exist in the real world as we know."

Are claiming that the current source (any current source) doesn't

sci.electronics.basics: Re: Explanation of Amps

exist in the real world. You seem to be reasonably adept with the language, and if you had meant otherwise I find it difficult to believe that you would have deliberately omitted the 'perfect' from:
"How