

## Re: eer

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.misc/2004-09/0610.html>

---

**From:** Tim Auton (*tim.auton\_at\_uton.groupSexWithoutTheY*)

**Date:** 09/25/04

Date: Sat, 25 Sep 2004 21:46:11 +0100

feerguy9@cs.com (FEerguy9) wrote:

>> "FEerguy9" <feerguy9@cs.com> wrote in message

>> news:20040918044818.27462.00000234@mb-m01.news.cs.com...

>>

>>> *I was just setting the stage for cap use+.+.+.+.read on, and I go to*

>> *LENGTHS*

>>> *TO EXPLAIN how to keep the pLATE SMALL+.*

>>

>> *I've never seen you explain HOW to make the plates smaller.*

>

> *Not smaLler – but with vastly INCREASED MATCHING SURFACE AREA IN CONTACT WITH*

> *OPPOSING Plate.+ By digging down to the moLECular LEVEL+.*

A worthy idea. One worth investigating. Sadly for you it doesn't take much investigation (for those skilled in the relevant arts) to show that it's not really as effective a solution as it may initially seem. Those skilled in the arts have explained to you numerous times in this group why this solution will not provide the energy density you hope it will. The science you're using (more surface area = more capacitance) breaks down at the scales you are proposing.

I'm sure that with capacitor plates manufactured to molecular tolerances we could improve energy density compared to existing capacitors. It would not still not beat fuel cells, internal combustion or chemical batteries.

Tim

--

Guns Don't Kill People, Rappers Do.