

Re: Dipole antenna

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.basics/2006-01/msg00321.html>

- *From:* "Anthony Fremont" <spam@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 09 Jan 2006 13:38:23 GMT
-

"Phil Allison" <philallison@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:42f55iF1epb6aU1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

>
> "Anthony Fremont"
>
> = a congenital autistic cretin
>
>
>> "thejim"
>
>> What do we mean by saying that a dipole antenna is electrically
short?
>>
>> It means that the antenna is exhibiting capacitive reactance to the
>> signal being applied.
>
>
> ** Idiot.

Speak for yourself phil. Oh, I guess you already are.

> It means the dipole antenna's width is less than a half wavelength of
the
> frequency.

Electrically that is, not necessarily physically. You do know about
velocity factor, right phil?

>> Adding inductance can cancel that out.
>
>
> ** Has no impact on the fact it is "electrically short" and hence an
> inefficient radiator.

Radiation efficiency has very little to do with any of this. You're way
out of your element on this one phil, but keep going though. I'd really
like to see what kind of nonsense you can spew on antenna and
transmission line theory.

> You fucking brainless Texas Twat.

Who's stalking now?

.

- *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Dipole antenna**

- ◆ *From:* Phil Allison

- *References:*

- ◆ **Dipole antenna**

- ◆ *From:* thejim

- ◆ **Re: Dipole antenna**

- ◆ *From:* Anthony Fremont

- ◆ **Re: Dipole antenna**

- ◆ *From:* Phil Allison

- Prev by Date: **Re: Dipole antenna**

- Next by Date: **Re: How can I subtract one frequency from another ???**

- Previous by thread: **Re: Dipole antenna**

- Next by thread: **Re: Dipole antenna**

- Index(es):

- ◆ **Date**

- ◆ **Thread**