The death of electric current

A contribution to electromagnetic theory

by Ivor Catt CAM Consultants

Conventionally a signal can be understood either in terms of electricity in conductors, with associated fields, or in terms of electric and magnetic fields terminating on those conductors. In this article the author steps outside the accepted dualism and proposes a mechanism of signal transmission based on Oliver Heaviside's 'energy current' without recourse to 'conductors' in their conventional role.

A major advance in electromagnetic theory, which I shall call the transition from Theory N to Theory H, was made by Oliver Heaviside a century ago. What is proposed here is a transition from Theory H to a third theory, Theory C. It is to be hoped that the response to Theory C will be more perceptive than was the general response to Theory H a century ago, as typified by Sprague, quoted in this article. Until it was revived recently by CAM Consultants, Theory H had been ignored and then suppressed for a century. It was revived because of its great value in digital electronic design.[1,2]

Theory C has major implications across a whole spectrum of subjects. It could trigger an exciting renaissance in many fields of endeavour.

Whereas the conventional approach to electromagnetic theory is to concentrate on the electric current in wires, with some additional consideration of voltages between wires, Heaviside concentrates primarily on what he calls 'energy current', this being the electromagnetic field which travels in the dielectric between the wires. It has an amplitude equal to the Poynting Vector, $E \times H$. Heaviside's phrase, "We reverse this"; points to the great watershed in the history of electromagnetic theory – between the 'ethereals', who with Heaviside believe that the signal is an 'energy current' which travels in the dielectric between the wires, and the 'practical electricians', who like Sprague believe that the signal is an electric current which travels down copper wires, and that if there *is* a 'field' in the space between the wires, this is only a result of what is happening in the conductors.

Oliver Heaviside announced Theory H a century ago[3]:

"Now in Maxwell's theory there is the potential energy of the displacement produced in the dielectric parts by the electric force, and there is the kinetic or magnetic energy of the magnetic induction due to the magnetic force in all parts of the field, including the conducting parts. They are supposed to be set up by the current in the wire. We reverse this; the current in the wire is set up by the energy transmitted through the medium around it . . ."

The importance of Heaviside's phrase, "We reverse this;" cannot be overstated. It points to the watershed between the 'practical electricians', who have held sway for the last half century, promulgating their theory – which we shall call 'Theory N', the Normal Theory: that the cause is electric currents in wires and electromagnetic fields are merely an effect – and the 'ethereals', who believe what we shall call 'Theory H': that the travelling field is the cause, and electric currents are merely an effect of these fields.

Opposition to any attempted change from the familiar Theory N to Theory H was forceful and successful for the next century. Sprague, a 'practical electrician' wedded to Theory N, with its retention of a phlogiston-like 'fluid'*, electricity, at the centre of the electromagnetic stage, wrote[4]:

"A new doctrine is becoming fashionable of late years, devised chiefly in order to bring the now important phenomena of alternating currents under the mathematical system. It is purely imaginery . . . based upon Clerk-Maxwell's electromagnetic theory of light, itself described by a favourable reviewer as 'a daring stroke of scientific speculation,' alleged to be proved by the very little understood experiments of Hertz, and supported by a host of assumptions and assertions for which no kind of evidence is offered; but its advocates now call it the 'orthodox' theory.

"This theory separates the two factors of electricity . . ., and declares that the 'current', the material action, is carried by the 'so-called conductor' (which according to Dr Lodge contains nothing, not even an impulse, and according to Mr O. Heaviside is to be regarded as an obstructor), but the energy leaves the 'source' (battery or dynamo) 'radiant in exactly the same sense as light is radiant', according to Professor Silvanus P. Thompson, and is carried in space by the ether: that it then 'swirls' round (cause for such swirling no one explains) and finds its way to the conductor in which it then produces the current which is apparently merely an agency for clearing the ether of energy which tends to 'choke' it, while the conductor serves no other purpose than that of a 'waste pipe' to get rid of this energy . . .

"This much, however, is certain; that if the 'ether' or medium, or di-electrics carry the energy, the practical electrician must not imagine he can get nature to do his work for him; the ether, &c., play no part whatever in the calculations he has to make; whether copper wire is a conductor or a waste pipe, that is what he has to provide in quantity and quality to do the work; if gutta percha, &c., really carry the energy, he need not trouble about providing *for that purpose;* he must see to it that he provides it according to the belief that it prevents loss of current. In other words, let theoretical mathematicians devise what new theories they please, the practical electrician must work upon the old theory that the conductor does his work and the insulation prevents its being wasted. Ohm's law (based on the old theory) is still his safe guide.

"For this reason I would urge all practical electricians, and all students who desire to gain a clear conception of the actual operations of electricity, to dismiss from their minds the new unproved hypotheses about the ether and the abstract theory of conduction, and to completely master the old, the practical, and common sense theory which links matter and energy together, . . . "

Sprague accurately described Theory N.

One of the few supporters of Theory H was J. A. Fleming, who wrote[5]:

"It is important that the student should bear in mind that, although we are accustomed to speak of the current as *flowing in the wire* in one direction or the other, this is a mere form of words. What we call *the current* in the wire is, to a very large extent, a process going on in the space or material outside the wire. Just as we familiarly speak of the sun rising and setting, when the effect is really due to the rotation of the earth, so the ordinary language we use in speaking about electric currents flowing in conductors retains the form impressed upon it by older and erroneous assumptions as to their nature."

Heaviside's view

As time went by, support for Theory H gradually died out. Let us end Theory H with a long discussion by its originator[6]:

"Consider the electric current, how it flows. From London to Manchester, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and hundreds of other places, day and night, are sent with great velocity, in rapid succession, backwards and forwards, electric currents, to effect mechanical motions at a distance, and thus serve the material interests of man.

* Phlogiston was a 'subtle fluid' postulated by the German chemist G. E. Stahl (1660-1734). It was thought to be combined with a 'calx' or ash in combustible materials and to be given off by these materials in the process of burning, leaving the ash behind. This hypothesis was strongly held in the 18th century but was eventually upset by Lavoisier's deductions leading to the theory of the conservation of mass. – Ed.

"By the way, is there such a thing as an electric current? Not that it is intended to cast any doubt upon the existence of a phenomenon so called; but is it a current – that is, something moving through a wire? Now, although nothing but very careful inculation at a tender age, continued unremittingly up to maturity, of the doctrine of the materiality of electricity, and its motion from place to place, would have made me believe it, still, there is so much in electric phenomena to support the idea of electricity being a distinct entity, and the force of habit is so great, that it is not easy to get rid of the idea when once it has been formed. In the historical development of science, static phenomena came first. In them the apparent individuality of electricity, in the form of charges upon conductors, is most distinctly indicated. The fluids may be childish notions, appropriate to the infancy of science; but still electric charges are easily imaginable to be quantities of a something, though not matter, which can be carried about from place to place. In the most natural manner possible, when dynamic electricity came under investigation, the static ideas were transferred to the electric current, which became the actual motion of electricity through a wire. This has reached its fullest development in the hands of the German philosophers, from Weber to Clausius, resulting in ingenious explanations of electric phenomena based upon forces acting at a distance between moving or fixed individual elements of electricity.

"Return to our wire from London to Edinburgh with a steady current from the battery in London. The energy is poured out of the battery *sideways* into the dielectric at a steady rate. Divide into tubes bounded by lines of energy-current. They pursue in general solenoidal paths in the dielectric, and terminate in the conductor. The amount of energy entering a given length of the conductor is the same wherever that length may be situated. The lines of energy-current are the intersections of the magnetic and electric equipotential surfaces. Most of the energy is transmitted parallel to the wire nearly, with a slight slant towards the wire in the direction of propagation; thus the lines of energy-current meet the wire very obliquely. But some of the outer tubes go out into space to an immense distance, especially those which terminate on the further end of the wire. Others pass between the wire and the earth, but none in the earth itself from London to Edinburgh, or vice versa, although there is a small amount of energy entering the earth straight downwards, especially at the earth "plates". If there is an instrument in circuit at Edinburgh, it is worked by energy that has travelled wholly through the dielectric, then finding its way into the instrument . . ."

If we keep to Theory H, the theory that the field $E \times H$, travelling along between the wires at the speed of light – what Heaviside called the 'energy current', is the cause, then electric charge and electric current are merely what define the *edge* of an energy current. If electric current is that which defines the side of an energy current, then we may with equal justification postulate 'displacement current' as that which defines the front face of a step of energy current[1].

Now let us move on to Theory C, when we drop the dualism – circuit and field – that has until now been the foundation of electromagnetic theory. First we shall discuss the reed relay pulse generator, which illustrates some of the ideas underlying Theory C.

The reed relay pulse generator was a means of generating a fast pulse using rather primitive methods. A one-metre section of 50-ohm coaxial cable AB was charged up to a steady 10 volts (say) via a one megohm resistor, and then suddenly discharged into a long piece of coax BC by the closure of two switches.



A five-volt pulse two metres wide was found to travel off to the right at the speed of light for the dielectric on closure of the switches, leaving the section AB completely discharged. (The practical device lacked the second, lower switch at B, which is added in the diagram to simplify the argument).

The curious point is that the width of the pulse travelling off down BC is twice as much as the time delay for a signal between A and B. Also, the voltage is half of what one would expect. It appears that after the switch was closed, some energy current must have started off to the *left, away* from the now closed switch; bounced off the open circuit at A, and then returned all the way back to the switch at B and beyond.



This paradox, that when the switches are closed, energy current promptly rushes *away* from the path suddenly made available, is understandable if one postulates that a steady charged capacitor is not steady at all; it contains energy current, half of it travelling to the right at the speed of light, and the other half travelling to the left at the speed of light.

Now it becomes obvious that when the switches are closed, the right-wards travelling energy current will exit down BC first, immediately followed by the leftwards travelling energy current after it has bounced off the open circuit at A.

We are driving towards the principle that *energy (current) $E \times H$ cannot stand still; it can only travel at the speed of light.* Any apparently steady field is a combination of two energy currents travelling in opposite directions at the speed of light[7].

E and H always travel together in fixed proportion Z_0.

Electric charge does not exist according to Theory C. The so-called electric charge is merely the edge of two reciprocating energy currents. In the case of the so-called steady charged capacitor, the electric fields of the two energy currents add but the magnetic fields cancel, so that it has come to be thought that a charged capacitor is devoid of magnetic field.

Now let us consider a simple circuit with battery and resistor. Two conductors guide the energy current from battery to resistor. It enters the resistor *sideways*



(Kip 1962)[6]. 'Electric current' is merely the side of a wave of energy current. If a 'conductor' is perfect, the energy current has a sharp side; the so-called 'electric current' has infinite density in the outside surface of the 'electric conductor', which Heaviside called an obstructor.

Energy current penetrates an imperfect conductor in the same way as it enters a resistor, from the side. In this case, the region containing a variation in energy current density, the so-called 'electric current', widens and penetrates into the conductor; skin depth is no longer zero.

Nothing exists behind a mirror; nothing happens there. The velocity of the 'things' behind a mirror does not depend on the medium, or material, behind the mirror[8].

As Maxwell's equations show,[9] 'electric current' is always derivable as the gradient on the side of a wave of energy current. Unlike energy current (but like the images in a mirror), electric current contains no energy, it has no function, and it explains nothing. Electric current does not exist.

Although a cloud cannot exist without edges, the *edges* of a cloud do not exist. They have no width, volume, or materiality. However, the *edges* of a cloud can be drawn. Their shapes can be manipulated graphically and mathematically. The same is true of the so-called 'electric current'.

In the following analogies, the sheep represent energy, the dogs electricity.

Theory N. The sheep are forced out of the pen by the sheep-dogs. The dogs then run alongside the sheep. There can only be a forward flow if sheep-dogs first advance on both sides of the flow of sheep, which the dogs direct and cause.

Theory H. The sheep rush out of the pen into the great open spaces. They will go forward regardless, but their direction is actively guided by the sheep-dogs running alongside, the front of the line of dogs always keeping level with the foremost sheep.

Theory C. There are no sheep-dogs. The sheep leave the pen and flow out into the great open spaces. Some of the space is rougher. (This rough space was previously thought to be the terrain preferred by the dogs.) Here fewer sheep go, and their rate of advance is slower. Some ground is very obstructive, nearly impassable for sheep.

Although it might appear that the sheep are actively guided by the rough terrain towards the smooth terrain, this is not so. Neither does a grease mark on blotting paper actively guide the ink towards the ungreasy areas. There is no active guidance mechanism; greasy paper is merely bad blotting paper with poor capillary action, passively guiding the ink.

The excision of sheep-dogs from the theory is a giant simplification. Nothing flows in the conductor; nothing happens therein. Heaviside was right to call it an obstructor. Half of the primitives in electromagnetic theory disappear, and it ceases to be a dualistic theory. ρ and J disappear, becoming merely the physically non-existent results of the mathematical manipulation of E and H, with no more significance than "circularity"' (Letters, June 1979 issue, p. 82).

The direct transition from Theory N to Theory C is similar to the change in combustion theory from phlogiston to oxidation, but is more difficult. Phlogiston is very similar to electricity, being a strange 'fluid' which permeates solids. But whereas the oxygen which 'replaced' phlogiston was still within the same body, the energy current which replaces electricity is not where the electricity was; it is where it was not. This is a very difficult transition. If the idea of replacing the well known phlogiston by oxygen caused mirth at High Table, we have to expect Theory C to generate widespread hilarity.

I would like to thank David Walton and Malcolm Davidson of CAM Consultants for their dogged support for six years. This article is taken from the book Electromagnetic Theory Vol 2, pub. CAM Publishing, 17 King Harry Lane, St. Albans, England.

References

1. Catt, I., Davidson and Walton 1979, The History of Displacement Current, *Wireless World*, March 1979, pp.67-68.
2. Catt, I., 1979, The Heaviside Signal, *Wireless World*, July 1979, pp.72-74.
3. Heaviside, O., 1892, Electrical Papers Vol 1, p.438.
4. Sprague, J. T., 1892, Electricity: Its Theory, Sources and Applications, p.239.
5. Fleming, J. A. 1898, Magnets and Electric Currents, p.80.
6. Heaviside, O., 1892, ibid, p.434. Kip, A. F., 1962, Fundamentals of Electricity and Magnetism, pub. McGraw-Hill, p.327.
7. Catt, I., Walton and Davidson, 1979, Digital Electronic Design Vol 2, pub. CAM Publishing, p.248.
8. Catt, I., 1979, Electromagnetic Theory Vol 1, pub. CAM Publishing, p.93.
9. Bell, D. A., 1980, *Wireless World*, September 1980, p.50, first sentence.

Appendix

Definition of a perfect conductor: $\epsilon=\infty$.
It follows that velocity of energy current

$$=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu\epsilon}}=0$$

Impedance $Z_0=\sqrt{(\mu/\epsilon)}=0$

In an imperfect conductor, ϵ is very high.
Impedance $(=Z_0)\rightarrow 0$
Penetration velocity is very slow. □

Solid-state level meter – further notes

Several points were not fully explained in Quentin Rice's article on his level indicator in the August issue. The peak hold function was a late addition. Achieved by taking a terminal adjacent to R_4 to 0V, this effectively switches off the decay voltage and is extremely useful for peak detection. Although the unit has no graduations, the author says it is a linear and accurate piece of equipment, and the user can employ whatever scaling is required. The attack time of the circuit is about 2ms f.s.d., which is well within any p.p.m. specification, but if this is felt to be too fast, increase the value of R_9.

When the unit was used with an oriental cassette recorder of dubious electronic integrity (expensive but no input h.f. rolloff, and no monitoring facility), intermodulation occurred because the meter was taken directly from the medium-impedance record output. This is overcome in such cases by using a buffer to isolate the signal and to provide adequate gain to bring the signal up to a useable level. With low impedance lines, this presents no problems.

Mention was made of the LM3915 and 3916 devices. As the data are quite recent, no consideration for these was made in the original design. The LM3915 may be cascaded like the 3914, giving twenty steps of 3dB, but an extra op-amp is required to provide 30dB gain and offset. The regulator is changed for a 24V type, and D_6 is changed to 12V. It should be borne in mind that the decay is no longer linear as it follows the law of the display. The LM3916 is not cascadable, but it can be used with the LM3915 to give a mixed law display with a 40dB range, albeit with only 19 l.e.ds and without the linear decay. In this circuit, the dot/bar mode select is difficult to implement. For further information, consult the National Semiconductor literature. □



Circuit for 60dB display range, left, uses LW3915 V_{cc} 24V, V_{gg} 12V. Buffer circuit, above, and board patterns are for use with medium-impedance outputs. V_{cc} can be 15 to 30V, unregulated. In the p.c.b. pattern on page 32 (August issue), pins b & 7 of IC_3 should be linked to pins 4 & 8 of IC_4.