

Re: Is electromagnetic field theory unified?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-03/0221.html>

From: JM Albuquerque (*jm.aREM.OVE_at_sapo.pt*)

Date: 02/28/05

Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 16:30:28 -0000

"Bjoern Feuerbacher" <feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de> escreveu na mensagem news:cvv2v1\$85\$1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de...

> *JM Albuquerque wrote:*

>

> *[snip]*

>

>

> > *Let's focus on the important.*

> > *So far you both fail to explain two main subjects which I cannot*

> > *neglect nor I will go away without knowing for sure if you do*

> > *know the answer, or not.*

>

> *You missed two important words above. The sentence should have started "So far you both failed to explain two main subjects *to me* ..."* (correction of the spelling as a free service here)

>

>

>

>

> > *I – If a spinning magnet radiates and radiation carries energy*

> > *that could be picked up at long distance, the question is:*

> > *What is the source for such energy? (Radiation)*

> > *So far all that you both could say was a single word, namely*

> > *"kinetic" energy.*

>

> *Indeed. And what on earth is your problem with that?*

Kinetic energy is a potential like a mass on a top of a table has a gravitic potential. Speed must change in order to energy be transmitted.

> > *At first both of you discard the said energy requirements*

>

> *Either you have severe memory problems, or you are lying. None of*

> *us *ever* said that no energy is required.*

You have refuted that torque must be present.

sci.physics: Re: Is electromagnetic field theory unified?

- > > *but I've insisted and you both spell "kinetic energy".*
- > > *I've tried to explain that kinetic energy is nothing but a potential.*
- >
- > *Try to understand the difference between "explain" and "claim".*
- &