

The electromagnetic "memory" of a dc-conducting resistor

Emanuel Gluskin

Galilean Sea Academic College, Ort Braude Academic College (Carmiel). Holon Institute of Technology, Electrical Engineering Department of the Ben-Gurion University, Beer-Sheva 84105, Israel. gluskin@ee.bgu.ac.il

Abstract: A circuit-field problem is considered. A resistor conducting a constant current is argued to be associated with electromagnetic energy accumulated in the surrounded space, though contrary to the case of an inductor or a capacitor, this energy is always associated with *both* magnetic and electrical fields, not with a single respective classical state-variable, -- either current or voltage. The circuit-theory point of view that a resistor has no electromagnetic memory is accepted, but the necessarily involved (in view of the field argument) capacitance and inductiveness are argued then also not be associated with any memory. The mutually completing circuit and physical arguments are presented in the form of dialog between a physicist and an electrical engineer. A teacher can find the work be pedagogically useful.

1. Introduction

It is both a point of principle and a quite practical and pedagogical item to well understand the physical foundations of circuit theory, at least in the basic scope in which Kirchhoff's equations appear from Maxwell's equations. The present work can be seen as related to this scope, though no bulky equations or expressions associated with any PDE-s appear here, i.e. the discussion is a qualitative one. We focus on the interesting aspect of energy accumulated in the space around a conductive (with electrical current flowing through it) resistor. The unusual slant of our discussion is in "equalizing the rights" of the circuit theory and the physical field outlooks that are nrepresented as completing each other. Physical and circuit-theory arguments are combined throughout the work, and such a "mixed" physical-circuit style and position is seen to be pedagogically useful.

Making the meaning of the words clear, we reject the well-known opinion that a resistor does not accumulate electromagnetic energy, while the opinion that a resistor does not have electromagnetic memory is supported. The presented material can complete circuit theory textbooks that often over-simplify the physical situation regarding real circuits, and the material should not be missed by those who teach electrical engineering (perhaps also physics) students.

From the circuit-theory point of view resistor is an element that realizes the characteristic $v = Ri$ (or $v = f(i)$), and only with this feature it is included in circuit theory that is, essentially, a mathematical discipline, -- so why should one think about physics here? There is, however, a good reason for the latter, which is never stressed in the circuit theory, -- *though the concepts of voltage drop v on an element and of electrical current i flowing via this element are clearly defined, -- these parameters/variables cannot relate only to the conducting resistor. The very existence of v and i indicates the presence of (necessity in) some other elements.*

Let us consider the following imaginary dialog between a physicist (**P**) and an electrical engineer or a circuit-theory specialist (**EE**).

2. The traditional circuit-theory argument and the physical reality

EE: The concept of memory is very important in modern electronics systems. For a causal system, -- and only such systems should interest physicists, -- memory means the dependence of the state of a system on the initial conditions given somewhere in the past. When speaking only of simple elements, dynamic electronic systems are composed of inductors, capacitors and resistors. Inductors and capacitors have electromagnetic "memories", but resistors do not. However, the resistors can prevent the inductors and capacitors from remembering their past, and thus "kill" their memory. Thus, a dynamic system, i.e. one that *can* have memory of its past, does not always really have it.

P: You speak about mutual influence of the elements, using not physical, but in some information terms. I do not know what you mean, but dislike like your statement that resistor has no electromagnetic memory. Just because of the mutual influence of the elements in a connection – it has the memory.

EE: *Of course, resistor has not any memory.* Let us compare it with inductor and capacitor which have memories. The respective physical laws of these elements are, $v = L di/dt$ and $i = C dv/dt$, including *time-derivatives*, and thus Kirchhoff's equations for circuits including such elements are *differential equations* whose general solutions include constants to be found from the initial conditions. This connection of the process/state at $t > 0$ with the initial state at $t = 0$ obviously means a memory.

Another expression of the memory is given by the accumulated energy. The inductor and the capacitor accumulate, respectively, the energies $W_L = Li^2/2$ and $W_C = Cv^2/2$, and since the process of energy accumulation depends on the processes $v(t)$ and $i(t)$ during the time period passed, -- the accumulated energy too means a memory, even if in a partial sense.

Contrary to that, no influence of any initial conditions is seen in the algebraic relation $v = Ri$, and where is there an accumulated electromagnetic energy that might be taken back from the resistor as one can take back the energy accumulated in a capacitor or an inductor? A resistor just generates thermal losses. In terms of analytical mechanics, the instantaneous *power* of the resistor $p_R = vi = Ri^2$ is not any "full differential" (while the powers $(L di/dt)i \sim d(i^2)/dt$ and $vC dv/dt \sim d(v^2)/dt$ are such) and thus we have no integral of movement.

P: I see that you want to understand all in terms of Kirchhoff's laws related to lumped elements circuit. Be sure that for me as a physicist this is finally unsatisfactorily. However, also I can say something in these terms. For a series L - R connection we have

$$p_R = Ri^2 \equiv (2R/L)(Li^2/2) \sim W_L ,$$

i.e. immediate connection with the magnetic energy W_L of the inductor, and for oscillatory R - L - C circuit we have, as you can easily check

$$p_R = - d(Li^2/2 + Cv^2/2)/dt \quad (1)$$

i.e. p_R can be the full differential of some *electromagnetic* energy, including both i and v . That is, p_R is an evidence of the energy accumulated in the capacitor, and thus is, informationally and physically associated with a memory.

EE. Why not to consider the resistor separately? Where are these L and C elements in the E - R circuit, including only battery E and the resistor, which all EE students learn first, before they know anything about transients in first-order, LR or CR , circuits, or the oscillatory processes in RLC circuits? Ohm's law is always studied for a pure resistor directly connected to a battery.

P. I strongly disagree with your position. The physical situation certainly allows us to introduce some C and L , and in my explanation, which follows, I shall use only some very basic electrodynamics concepts that you can find, e.g., in [1,2]. Let us look at $v = Ri$ (or any $v = f(i)$ that would be relevant for a nonlinear resistor) as physicists. **The very fact of the presence of voltage and current means the presence of electromagnetic fields that you are ignoring.** Indeed, since according to Ampere's law, the current necessarily causes a magnetic field \mathbf{H} around the resistor, and according to the boundary condition of continuity of the tangential component of the electrical field \mathbf{E} that is associated with voltage v , there is also necessarily some electrical field around the conductor. Figure 1 shows that close to the surface of the resistor the Poynting's vector of these fields, $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{H}$, is oriented towards the resistor and, e.g. for the simple cylindrical form of the resistor, the flow of the energy through the surface $2\pi rd$ is

$$p = S2\pi rd = EH 2\pi rd = [(v/d) i/(2\pi r)] 2\pi rd = vi = p_R.$$

For a linear resistor, $v = Ri$, $p_R = vi = ri^2$, but the above derivation holds also for any nonlinear resistor, since no certain $v = f(i)$ is used in it.




Fig. 1: The energy (power) enters the resistor from outside because of the fields \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{H} , and thus $p_R = Ri^2$ (or, more generally, vi) is obtained. The length of the resistor is d , and the radius r ; thus the relevant part of the surface of the resistor is $2\pi rd$. The d.c. state is in the focus.

Figure 1 schematically shows that the energy propagates from the source via the surrounding space and enters the resistor. That both \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{H} must be *nonzero* is obvious.

However, Poynting's vector is the flow of electromagnetic energy, and, as any "flow", it must be equal to the density of the flowing substance multiplied by its velocity, which means here [1,2]

$$\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{n}c_m(w_E + w_H) = \mathbf{n}c_m(\varepsilon E^2/2 + \mu H^2/2), \quad (2)$$

where the unit vector \mathbf{n} is in the direction of the flow, and $c_m = c(\varepsilon\mu)^{-1/2}$ is the light-velocity in the medium. Comparing (2) with the previous equation, we see that $p_R \sim (w_E + w_H)$.

The next step is to note that since the complete electromagnetic energy W is the integral of $w_E + w_H$ over the given volume:

$$W = \iiint (w_E + w_H) dV,$$

we also have that

$$p_R \sim W.$$

The connection between $S = p_R$ and W can be seen via the very general concept of *boundary*, and it is a *conductive* boundary here.

Notice that we cannot speak about an "E-R circuit" from the very moment of closing the switch; one can do this after the initial transient associated with the field processes will be ended, while the latter depends on the circuit's whole physical structure. This is ignored in the textbooks; the description always starts from $t = 0$, without any reservations, which seems to be a serious miss.

To complete the physical description of the circuit I should notice that *inside* the resistor with the flowing current there also is some magnetic field, but there is nothing qualitatively new in this for my point after the external magnetic field is already taken into consideration, and I can leave you to calculate how significant the latter energy can be, when compared to the energy accumulated in the inductor.

Thus, contrary to what you say, the power consumed by a resistor in a "d.c. process" *can be* associated with some *static* electromagnetic energy accumulated in the system!

Regarding the circuit model, I think that some chain-type *LC* model circuits could well represent the system after closing the switch, when a quick transient occurs and we have, in fact, not yet a lumped, but a distributed system. The inductance and the capacitance are not associated only with the resistor per se, -- these may be the circuit's "stray" parameters defined by its configuration. That is, when, after some time, the steady situation is established, the model can remain, with all of the capacitors in it being finally charged. You may find it strange, but in view of the physical description, the "simple" "E-R" circuit should be modeled by a much more complicated circuit. However let us focus on physics.

EE: The role of the accumulated electromagnetic energy *in the d.c. state*, is unexpected for me. Though I am *sure* that any resistor has no electromagnetic "memory", your explanation certainly causes me to understand the real circuit better.

Regarding the initial transient, I can suggest the following argument in circuit terms. Before the switch that connects E and R is closed, the current in the circuit was zero. When ignoring the non-lumped L and C elements that, as you argue, are present, we have, upon closing the switch, the momentary jump of $i(t)$ from the zero value to the value E/R . Such a jumpy *time-function* $i(t)$ has an infinite frequency spectrum, including the high frequencies which are associated, in terms of electromagnetic waves, with some *short* wavelengths that do not satisfy the known [3,4] conditions of a lumped circuit. That is, electromagnetic waves are radiated out of the circuit, -- just like the radiation which makes many industrial switched circuits "noisy", -- and together with the radiation of the energy out of the circuit, the energy also starts to enter the resistor.

Thus I could predict, as I see now, that an electromagnetic field should appear at the initial stage, and that during the initial transient the circuit was not E - R , it was E - R - L - C . However, you show that the electromagnetic energy inevitably *exists* also in the final d.c. E - R circuit, which was unexpected for me.

P. The accumulated electromagnetic energy reminds us about the initial period of the transient leading to the steady state. Isn't this a kind of "memory"?

EE. For me, "memory" associated with a circuit is a dynamic one, and such that I can *use* the energy accumulated in the space. I can discharge a capacitor when I want, and it is not difficult to use the accumulated energy because it is *localized* in the capacitor. For instance, the capacitor can be discharged via some load, which is very common in power electronics.

P. Well, you can open in the dc circuit the switch that connects the resistor to the battery, and get a *pulse of radiation*, which for R known can be used as an indication (measurement) of the level of charge of the battery. This seems to me to be not so far from the use of $Li^2/2$ or $Cv^2/2$ by means of lumped elements, though in this application \mathbf{E} or \mathbf{H} are not separated and we use \mathbf{S} .

EE: I have a problem with just with the latter. Circuit theory teaches us to think in terms of "state-variables" [3,4]. The "memory" that you, as it seems, try to ascribe to the resistor is directly associated with the specific (strange) combination of the fields $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{H}$, which is finally equivalent to the specific combination $vi = p_R$ of the usual state-variables v and i . By themselves, \mathbf{S} and p_R are not any standard state-variables.

P: Yes, but "inductance" and "inductor" (choke), as well as "capacitance" and "capacitor" are not the same. Field energy can be accumulated by a fixture that is not created for this accumulation, i.e. is not a standard lumped element to be found in an electronics store. I have argued that $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{H}$ and $vi = p_R$ do not appear by themselves, -- they are necessarily caused by accumulated electrical and magnetic energies in which v and i can be seen separately, as usual, in an extended circuit model. Thus, I believe that there is no contradiction here with what you are adjusted to see.

However you said at the start that in such a circuit the resistor can "kill" the memory of the L and C elements. What does this mean?

EE: To explain this point it is sufficient to consider the equation for an L - R - E circuit:

$$Ldi/dt + Ri = E$$

from which

$$i(t) = [i_o - E/R] \exp\{-t/\tau\} + E/R. \quad (3)$$

The asymptotic term E/R , as well as the time-constant $\tau = L/R$, exists only for a nonzero R .

The equation relevant to the case of $R = 0$:

$$L di/dt = E$$

would lead to linearly increasing $i(t)$:

$$i(t) = i_o + (E/L) t.$$

Even here, the situation with the memory about i_o is not quite simple since the memory tends to zero as time passes, because the ratio of the first term to the second one is $\sim 1/t$, i.e. it becomes *more and more difficult to measure* the constant term i_o in $i(t)$. However in (3) the situation re memory is much more dramatic, -- the relative weight of the term $i_o \exp\{-t/\tau\}$ very quickly decays at $t \gg \tau$, and this is done by the nonzero R ! The inductor very soon forgets its initial current forever. This is what I mean by saying that R "kills" the dynamic memory in L . Some "killed memory" should be feature of any dissipative system, caused by the energy consuming elements.

All this is relevant to your scheme/model of the d.c. circuit. Even though there are, as you explain, some L and C elements in the composed E - R circuit, these elements are without memory in the dynamic sense. The whole d.c. circuit, including your "field" additions, does not possess any dynamic memory. This is the point that you should not miss, if you are ready to see the circuit-theory side concerned with logical aspects of the engineering applications.

P: Well, I see that now we better understand each other. On my side, I suggest you to also look at works [5-10], both for the dc state and the transient behavior. Such a discussion, and these references can be interesting for your students.

Let us conclude by the following list of the main points, of which 1-3 are our formal conclusions and 4-7 some problems for the Reader, to further think things out and consolidate his understanding.

1. The physical background of the most simple electrical E - R circuit is not trivial; it includes several pedagogically (heuristically) important points worth considering in the classroom.

2. The power-consuming R is necessarily associated with a field problem, or, in circuit terms, with some L and C parameters. Though contrary to L and C the resistance *by itself* is not any source of either electrical or magnetic energies, when it is heated by current then the electromagnetic energy exists, and in quite usual forms. Thus, the statement that resistor is not associated with electromagnetic energy is wrong. However when, because of the resistor, the d.c. state is finally established, the current and voltage function do not depend on the initial conditions, and despite the presence of the some dynamic elements associated with the accumulated electromagnetic energy there is no dynamic (associated with the initial conditions)

"memory" in the system, just some "memory" about the initially occurred transient process.

3. The resistor can be considered as a part of a *boundary* for the electromagnetic field; a conductive boundary. The voltage drop on the resistor and the conditions of the continuity of the tangential component of E direct the Poynting's vector of the field so that the needed energy, Ri^2 (or vi) enters the resistor.

4. Draw the vector field of the Poynting's vector *in the whole space* (i.e. complete Fig. 1), starting from the battery.

5. Compare the final d.c. situation with an/the initial process of establishment of the steady-state, when we have some wave-propagation. Though near the boundary the ratio of E_t to H depends on R , consider whether or not it is possible that in the d.c. state the amount of electrostatic energy accumulated in the space (*not* inside the batteries, of course) precisely equals the amount of accumulated magnetic static energy.

6. Consider attempts at "blocking" the fields by using a screen placed between the source and the resistor, for the cases of grounded and ungrounded screen.

7. Consider the resistor to be a *lamp*, either incandescent or (then it is a nonlinear resistor) a fluorescent one [11].

Acknowledgments

Thinking out, from my positions, the suggestions of the pedagogical lecture devoted to teaching Faraday's law, given at our HIT Physics Seminar by Professor Amnon Fruchtman, was the motivation to write the present work. A conversation with Professor Ben-Zion Kaplan (EE. BGU) was also useful.

References

- [1] E.M. Purcell, "*Electricity and magnetism*", Berkeley Physics Course, vol. 2, McGraw Hill, New York, 1965.
- [2] J.D. Jackson, "*Classical Electrodynamics*", John Willey & Sons, New-York, 1975.
- [3] Ch.A. Desoer, E. Kuh, "*Basic Circuit Theory*", McGraw Hill, Tokyo, 1969.
- [4] L.O Chua, A. Desoer, E. Kuh, "*Linear and Nonlinear Circuits*", McGraw Hill, New York, 1987.
- [5] J.D Jackson, "Surface charges on circuit wires and resistors play their role", *Am. J. of Physics*, **64**, 855-870 (1996)

- [6] N.W Preyer, "Transient behavior of simple RC circuit", *Am. J. of Physics*, **70**, 1187-1193 (2002),
- [7] J.D Jackson, "How the antenna launches its input power into radiation: The pattern of the Poynting vector at and near an antenna", *Am. J. of Phys.*, **74**, 280-288 (2006).
- [8] W.G.V. Rosser, "What makes the electrical current flow?", *Am. J. Phys.* **31**, 884-885, (1963).
- [9] I. Galili, E. Goihbarg, "Energy transfer in electrical circuits: A qualitative account", *Am. J. of Physics*, **73**, no.2, Feb. 2005, 141-144.
- [10] Ruth Chabay and Bruce Sherwood, "Matter and Interactions", John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2007.
- [11] E. Gluskin, "The fluorescent lamp circuit", *Circuits & Systems Expositions, IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems, Part I: Fundamental Theory and Applications*, 46(5), 1999 (529-544).