

Re: Wind-energy customers pay less than those buying fossil-fuel power

Re: Wind-energy customers pay less than those buying fossil-fuel power

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy.hydrogen/2005-10/msg00423.html>

- *From:* "JMA" <jmDOTa@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 28 Oct 2005 16:22:03 +0100
-

"Dan Bloomquist" <public21@xxxxxxxxxxxx> escreveu na mensagem
[news:ME88f.518\\$lg.43@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:ME88f.518$lg.43@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

>

>

> JMA wrote:

>> "Dan Bloomquist" <public21@xxxxxxxxxxxx> escreveu na mensagem

>> [news:AhY7f.410\\$lg.34@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:AhY7f.410$lg.34@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

>>>The reactive component gets reflected, it doesn't simply 'flow'.

>>

>> It flows and gets reflected in a sine-wave.

>

> No, it is real while 'flowing'. Imaginary power does not exist. The

> imaginary component is an attribute of impedance, not 'flow'.

If so, how do you explain that a current above nominal flows
due to the imaginary component ?

The imaginary current is very real and that's why suppliers must
have windings designed to that higher current value above the
working nominal current could flow.

Only current in phase produces work.

Current flowing out of phase produces reactive power.

Such reactive current flows as a sine-wave.

It is "reflected" or created by the machine excitation
magnetic field.

It is real (exists), it is measured, and it causes troubles.

>> Does a spinning magnet radiate?

>

> Yes.

Yes because Maxwell says so and because Maxwell
has never been proved wrong.

Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power

- > or induces?
- >
- > That is something else.

I agree.

- >> It is said that magnetic forces does no work.
- >> Also it is said that gravitic force does no work.
- >> Now hold on an weight of 25 Kg each arm during
- >> several hours. No work is done, you should hold
- >> 50 kg forever since no work is being done.
- >
- > What is your point?

My point is that theory says that no work is being done, nor any energy is being consumed, to hold an heavy weight with the arms.
Nevertheless experience tells me that nor you, nor anybody else could hold 25 Kg each arm during several hours.
So, what's wrong with the picture ?
Why people get tired if no work is being done ?

- >> And how about the description, so that every nine
- >> readers in ten could understand how a motor
- >> generator works ?
- >
- > If FL/T is over the readers head, so be it.

Power = Force x speed
Not enough to have a full description.

- >> My description is about the air–gap surface.
- >> Not just only a revolving line.
- >> The magnetic field surface, sine–wave shaped
- >> inducing and being induced.
- >
- > Looks like a lot of words to me.

Working on a surface (an area A).
Magnetic flux = Magnetic flux density x Area = BA.

- >> A surface of magnetism does no work.
- >> But it does a good description of the working
- >> mechanism. So I like it very much and can
- >> be used for all types of motors/generator:

Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power

Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power

>> Synchronous, asynchronous and doubly–fed.

>

> Do you really know what you are talking about?

Yes I do.

I'm talking about magnetic fields mediating the power conversion, between your force and the velocity. It is something like saying that magnetic fields are "producing" the work, even if it doesn't look so, like in the above situation that no work is being done to hold an heavy weight with the arms.

Your FL/T approach is based on ««The relativistic motion of the electrons create an electrostatic force.»».

How do you explain that a permanent magnet in relativistic motion causes electrons motion too ?

My analysis is based on induction, coils storing energy, magnetic poles North and South rotating, and so on.

It is not the standard but I'm not alone.
Actually the maglev train wouldn't exist if people didn't think like I did.

• *Follow–Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power**
◇ From: Dan Bloomquist

• *References:*

- ◆ **Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power**
◇ From: JMA
- ◆ **Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power**
◇ From: Paul Vader
- ◆ **Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power**
◇ From: JMA
- ◆ **Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power**
◇ From: Don Lancaster
- ◆ **Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power**
◇ From: JMA
- ◆ **Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power**
◇ From: Dan Bloomquist
- ◆ **Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power**

Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power

Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power

◇ *From: JMA*

◆ ***Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power***

◇ *From: Dan Bloomquist*

◆ ***Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power***

◇ *From: JMA*

◆ ***Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power***

◇ *From: Dan Bloomquist*

◆ ***Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power***

◇ *From: Dan Bloomquist*

◆ ***Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power***

◇ *From: JMA*

◆ ***Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power***

◇ *From: Dan Bloomquist*

◆ ***Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power***

◇ *From: Dan Bloomquist*

- Prev by Date: ***Re: SHEC Labs the leader in Hydrogen Manufacturing***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Wind–energy customers pay less than those buying fossil–fuel power***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***