

Re: MOVs and surge suppressors

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.basics/2007-09/msg00158.html>

- *From:* bud-- <remove.BudNews@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 05 Sep 2007 10:26:30 -0500
-

w_tom wrote:

More of Bud's intentional lies. For example, irrelevant is what happens to surge on neutral wire.

And the lie was what???

w_ asked where the surge went. I explained that any of the surge that enters on the neutral is directly earthed by the neutral-ground-earth bond. w_ apparently doesn't want an explanation of where the surge goes.

The same surge on black wire is still seeking earth ground. Make no difference whether that surge is on any other wire. That surge is still on black wire and still seeking earth ground inside a building. Bud knew that.

I said that for the surge on the hot wires there is arc-over at the service panel at about 6000V that dumps most of the surge to earth. w_ has a disability where he can't understand anything that does not conform to his quack views.

He intentionally lies knowing that confusion causes the reader to ignore technical reality and to only believe popular urban myths.

And the lie was what???

I posted links to reputable sources on plug-in suppressors which I recommend you read. w_ only has his own bizarre ideas.

Since Bud is promoting for plug-in protector manufacturers

Re: MOVs and surge suppressors

To quote w_ "It is an old political trick. When facts cannot be challenged technically, then attack the messenger." My only association with surge protectors is I have some.

With no technical arguments, w_ has to discredit those that oppose him.

since those protectors have no earthing wire, then Bud must spin myths and intentionally lie to confuse the importance of earthing.

And the lie was what???

Because it does not conform to his quack views, w_ cannot understand when the IEEE guide explains plug-in suppressors work primarily by clamping the voltage on all wires (power and signal) to the common ground at the suppressor. And that earthing occurs elsewhere.

The protector is only as effective as its earth ground.

The required statement of religious belief in earthing.

Why did the adjacent TV on Page 42 Figure 8 get damaged by a surge seeking earth ground? According to Bud, surge was not seeking earth ground because the neutral wire was earthed.

Poor w_ has lost the ability to think. Earthing the neutral is not terribly relevant to the IEEE illustration. The illustration, for the IEEE and anyone who can think, is that "to protect TV2, a second multipoint protector located at TV2 is required."

The guide says that with the problem shown in the illustration, a ground wire from a cable entry block that is too long, "the only effective way of protecting the equipment is to use a multipoint protector." Long ground/bond wires are a problem in many homes.

And w_ has still not explained how a service panel suppressor would protect either TV in the illustration. Perhaps that is because a service panel suppressor would provide no protection.

Bud repeatedly cites Martzloff – but only the parts that promote his half truths. Meanwhile even Martzloff says plug-in (point of use) protectors may create appliance damage. A point so important in Martzloff's 1996 IEEE paper that the point is conclusion number one:

Re: MOVs and surge suppressors

I don't repeatedly cite Martzloff.

w_ quotes only what he thinks promotes his half truths. w_ forgets to mention that Martzloff said in the same 1994 (not 1996) document:

"Mitigation of the threat can take many forms. One solution, illustrated in this paper, is the insertion of a properly designed surge reference equalizer [multiport plug-in surge suppressor]."

In 2001 Martzloff wrote the NIST guide which says plug-in suppressors work.

Because plug-in suppressors violate w_'s religious belief in earthing he has to twist what Martzloff says about them.

What are the destructive surges that Martzloff studies? Its not transverse mode. They are made irrelevant by protection inside appliances.

w_ has not explained how a common mode surge gets past the neutral/ground/earth bond at US service panels.

Everyone is in favor of earthing. The only question is whether plug-in suppressors work. Martzloff and the IEEE and NIST guides say plug in suppressors are effective.

Still no link from another lunatic that says plug-in suppressors are NOT effective. All you get is w_'s quack views based on his religious beliefs.

As always no answers to simple questions:

- Why do the only 2 examples of protection in the IEEE guide use plug-in suppressors?
- Why does the NIST guide says plug-in suppressors are "the easiest solution"?
- How would a service panel suppressor provide any protection in the IEEE example, pdf page 42?
- Why does the IEEE Emerald book include plug-in suppressors as an effective surge protection device.
- Why did Martzloff say in his paper "One solution, illustrated in this paper, is the insertion of a properly designed surge reference equalizer [multiport plug-in surge suppressor]."

Why no answers w_?

Bizarre claim - plug-in surge suppressors don't work

Never any sources that say plug-in suppressors are NOT effective.

Twists opposing sources to say the opposite of what they really say.

Invents opinions and attributes them to others.

Attempts to discredit opponents.

w_ is a prevaricator and a purveyor of junk science.

--

bud--

.