
Subject: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Mon, 23 Dec 2019 22:56:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CBS News reported

.. Secretaries are projected to suffer the biggest job losses of any profession over the next decade.

.. "Pink-collar" jobs, long a stepping stone into the middle class for many women, are increasingly being handled by technology.

.. Globally, some 160 million women may need to find new occupations because of the impact of automation

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-decimation-of-pink-collar-office-jobs-like-secretaries-and-administrative-assistants/>

I remember when I began my job my office had five secretaries.
Now there are none. Typewriters are piled up in a corner unwanted.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Tue, 24 Dec 2019 00:18:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:

> CBS News reported

>

> . Secretaries are projected to suffer the biggest job losses of any
> profession over the next decade.

>

> . "Pink-collar" jobs, long a stepping stone into the middle class for
> many women, are increasingly being handled by technology.

>

> . Globally, some 160 million women may need to find new occupations
> because of the impact of automation

>

>

> <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-decimation-of-pink-collar-office-jobs-like-secretaries-and-administrative-assistants/>

>

> I remember when I began my job my office had five secretaries.

> Now there are none. Typewriters are piled up in a corner

> unwanted.

>

It's becoming a tsunami of lost jobs. Electric cars require half the labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul truckers out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess workers?

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 24 Dec 2019 01:03:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700, Peter Flass
<peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:
>> CBS News reported
>>
>> . Secretaries are projected to suffer the biggest job losses of any
>> profession over the next decade.
>>
>> . "Pink-collar" jobs, long a stepping stone into the middle class for
>> many women, are increasingly being handled by technology.
>>
>> . Globally, some 160 million women may need to find new occupations
>> because of the impact of automation
>>
>>
>> <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-decimation-of-pink-collar-office-jobs-like-secretaries-and-administrative-assistants/>
>>
>> I remember when I began my job my office had five secretaries.
>> Now there are none. Typewriters are piled up in a corner
>> unwanted.
>>
>
> It's becoming a tsunami of lost jobs. Electric cars require half the
> labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul truckers
> out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess workers?

The "Green New Deal" with it's updated WPA will save us all, at least until the money runs out.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Tue, 24 Dec 2019 06:34:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700
Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> It's becoming a tsunami of lost jobs. Electric cars require half the
> labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul
> truckers out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess
> workers?

"Excess workers" that sounds like a PR phrase - how about how are we going to provide leisure and meaningful activity that isn't work to fill the time and enhance the life of the people who don't need to work.

When I was a child there was talk of automation freeing people from the tyranny of labour. This still seems like a good idea. We need to learn that life is not about working it is about living and that life can be richer when you don't spend 30% or more of it doing boring shite.

The average working week has got shorter during my life and I hope it continues to get shorter still as we manage things such that we don't need 80% of us working flat out to keep everything running.

Of course we need to abandon the idea that people have to work to live and can only have what they "earn" and "deserve" and embrace the idea that society exists to enable people to live.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith	Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN	A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins.	licences available see
You lose and Bill collects.	http://www.sohara.org/

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Tue, 24 Dec 2019 18:06:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

> On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700
> Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>> It's becoming a tsunami of lost jobs. Electric cars require half the
>> labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul
>> truckers out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess
>> workers?

- >
- > "Excess workers" that sounds like a PR phrase - how about how are
- > we going to provide leisure and meaningful activity that isn't work to fill
- > the time and enhance the life of the people who don't need to work.

Sounds good, doesn't it. A few years ago 60 Minutes had a special on a Dutch program to provide "meaningful activity" to unemployed workers. Apparently a lot of them thought art would be great, and the government bought their work. The special showed warehouses full of unsaleable paintings. They might as well have burned them, or shredded the canvases as package filler.

The average person has no talent for leisure activities, and I include myself. Unemployed people wind up on streetcorners drinking beer out of paper bags and getting into trouble.

- >
- > When I was a child there was talk of automation freeing people from
- > the tyranny of labour. This still seems like a good idea. We need to learn
- > that life is not about working it is about living and that life can be
- > richer when you don't spend 30% or more of it doing boring shite.
- >
- > The average working week has got shorter during my life and I hope
- > it continues to get shorter still as we manage things such that we don't
- > need 80% of us working flat out to keep everything running.
- >
- > Of course we need to abandon the idea that people have to work to
- > live and can only have what they "earn" and "deserve" and embrace the idea
- > that society exists to enable people to live.
- >

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Tue, 24 Dec 2019 21:26:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2019-12-24, Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:

- > On 2019-12-24, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
- >
- > [snip]
- >
- >> Of course we need to abandon the idea that people have to work to

>> live and can only have what they "earn" and "deserve" and embrace the idea
>> that society exists to enable people to live.
>
> *applause*

+1

Just watch out for pushback from the Powers That Be.

--

/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\ / <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Tue, 24 Dec 2019 22:31:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tue, 24 Dec 2019 11:06:26 -0700
Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>> On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700

>> "Excess workers" that sounds like a PR phrase - how about how
>> are we going to provide leisure and meaningful activity that isn't work
>> to fill the time and enhance the life of the people who don't need to
>> work.

>
> Sounds good, doesn't it. A few years ago 60 Minutes had a special on a
> Dutch program to provide "meaningful activity" to unemployed workers.
> Apparently a lot of them thought art would be great, and the government
> bought their work.

Fails right there - that's employment by another name with no
incentive to good work.

> The special showed warehouses full of unsaleable paintings.

Yep no point in producing things nobody wants, that's not
meaningful. Try looking at all the things that need doing that nobody wants
to pay to have done and getting some community spirit going.

> The average person has no talent for leisure activities, and I include

and little talent for work.

> myself. Unemployed people wind up on streetcorners drinking beer out of
> paper bags and getting into trouble.

Yep we're crap at providing things to do that aren't work or
wasting time, we need to get good at it.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 24 Dec 2019 23:03:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Tue, 24 Dec 2019 11:06:26 -0700, Peter Flass
<peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>> On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700
>> Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>>> It's becoming a tsunami of lost jobs. Electric cars require half the
>>> labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul
>>> truckers out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess
>>> workers?
>>
>> "Excess workers" that sounds like a PR phrase - how about how are
>> we going to provide leisure and meaningful activity that isn't work to fill
>> the time and enhance the life of the people who don't need to work.
>
> Sounds good, doesn't it. A few years ago 60 Minutes had a special on a
> Dutch program to provide "meaningful activity" to unemployed workers.
> Apparently a lot of them thought art would be great, and the government
> bought their work. The special showed warehouses full of unsaleable
> paintings. They might as well have burned them, or shredded the canvases as
> package filler.
>
> The average person has no talent for leisure activities, and I include
> myself. Unemployed people wind up on streetcorners drinking beer out of
> paper bags and getting into trouble.

When I've been unemployed I generally ended up playing video games and

getting fat.

>> When I was a child there was talk of automation freeing people from
>> the tyranny of labour. This still seems like a good idea. We need to learn
>> that life is not about working it is about living and that life can be
>> richer when you don't spend 30% or more of it doing boring shite.
>>
>> The average working week has got shorter during my life and I hope
>> it continues to get shorter still as we manage things such that we don't
>> need 80% of us working flat out to keep everything running.
>>
>> Of course we need to abandon the idea that people have to work to
>> live and can only have what they "earn" and "deserve" and embrace the idea
>> that society exists to enable people to live.
>>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 24 Dec 2019 23:04:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On 24 Dec 2019 21:26:05 GMT, Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:

> On 2019-12-24, Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>
>> On 2019-12-24, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>>
>> [snip]
>>
>>> Of course we need to abandon the idea that people have to work to
>>> live and can only have what they "earn" and "deserve" and embrace the idea
>>> that society exists to enable people to live.
>>
>> *applause*
>
> +1
>
> Just watch out for pushback from the Powers That Be.

The real concern isn't pushback from the Powers That Be--Caesar didn't seem to mind paying for bread and circuses. The real concern is the people who decide that the dole they are getting isn't big enough or that they are being oppressed in some other way, and with plenty of leisure time they have ample opportunity to find trouble to get into.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Wed, 25 Dec 2019 01:00:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

> On Tue, 24 Dec 2019 11:06:26 -0700, Peter Flass
> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>>> On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700
>>> Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> It's becoming a tsunami of lost jobs. Electric cars require half the
>>>> labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul
>>>> truckers out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess
>>>> workers?
>>>
>>> "Excess workers" that sounds like a PR phrase - how about how are
>>> we going to provide leisure and meaningful activity that isn't work to fill
>>> the time and enhance the life of the people who don't need to work.
>>>
>> Sounds good, doesn't it. A few years ago 60 Minutes had a special on a
>> Dutch program to provide "meaningful activity" to unemployed workers.
>> Apparently a lot of them thought art would be great, and the government
>> bought their work. The special showed warehouses full of unsaleable
>> paintings. They might as well have burned them, or shredded the canvases as
>> package filler.
>>
>> The average person has no talent for leisure activities, and I include
>> myself. Unemployed people wind up on streetcorners drinking beer out of
>> paper bags and getting into trouble.
>>
> When I've been unemployed I generally ended up playing video games and
> getting fat.

I managed to get payed and not work the summer of 72.
It was glorious.
I went to the beach every chance I got.

I've never been fat.
A little soft after age 40.
Retirement has been good to me, more time for exercise.
Not soft now.

I've been a pinball addict for a long time, I played whether I was
employed or not.

I think we're pretty far from forced unemployment becoming a problem.

The official unemployment rate is pretty low.

Maybe people can learn to drink beer and not get in trouble.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 25 Dec 2019 08:55:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Kerr-Mudd,John

On Wed, 25 Dec 2019 01:00:18 GMT, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>
>> On Tue, 24 Dec 2019 11:06:26 -0700, Peter Flass
>> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>>> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>>>> On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700
>>>> Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > It's becoming a tsunami of lost jobs. Electric cars require
>>>> > half the labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put
>>>> > long-haul truckers out of work, etc. What is going to be done with
>>>> > all the excess workers?
>>>>
>>>> "Excess workers" that sounds like a PR phrase - how about how
>>>> are
>>>> we going to provide leisure and meaningful activity that isn't work
>>>> to fill the time and enhance the life of the people who don't need
>>>> to work.
>>>
>>> Sounds good, doesn't it. A few years ago 60 Minutes had a special
>>> on a Dutch program to provide "meaningful activity" to unemployed
>>> workers. Apparently a lot of them thought art would be great, and the
>>> government bought their work. The special showed warehouses full of
>>> unsaleable paintings. They might as well have burned them, or
>>> shredded the canvases as package filler.
>>>
>>> The average person has no talent for leisure activities, and I
>>> include myself. Unemployed people wind up on streetcorners drinking
>>> beer out of paper bags and getting into trouble.
>>
>> When I've been unemployed I generally ended up playing video games

>> and getting fat.
>
> I managed to get payed and not work the summer of 72.
> It was glorious.
> I went to the beach every chance I got.
>
> I've never been fat.
> A little soft after age 40.
> Retirement has been good to me, more time for exercise.
> Not soft now.
>
> I've been a pinball addict for a long time, I played whether I was
> employed or not.
>
> I think we're pretty far from forced unemployment becoming a problem.
> The official unemployment rate is pretty low.
>
> Maybe people can learn to drink beer and not get in trouble.
>
It's what I do.

--

Bah, and indeed, Humbug.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Andreas Eder](#) on Wed, 25 Dec 2019 11:00:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tue 24 Dec 2019 at 06:34, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

> On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700
> Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>> It's becoming a tsunami of lost jobs. Electric cars require half the
>> labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul
>> truckers out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess
>> workers?
>
> "Excess workers" that sounds like a PR phrase - how about how are
> we going to provide leisure and meaningful activity that isn't work to fill
> the time and enhance the life of the people who don't need to work.
>
> When I was a child there was talk of automation freeing people from
> the tyranny of labour. This still seems like a good idea. We need to learn
> that life is not about working it is about living and that life can be
> richer when you don't spend 30% or more of it doing boring shite.

>
> The average working week has got shorter during my life and I hope
> it continues to get shorter still as we manage things such that we don't
> need 80% of us working flat out to keep everything running.
>
> Of course we need to abandon the idea that people have to work to
> live and can only have what they "earn" and "deserve" and embrace the idea
> that society exists to enable people to live.

+1

'andreas

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 25 Dec 2019 16:12:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On Tue, 24 Dec 2019 11:06:26 -0700, Peter Flass
<peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>> On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700
>> Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>

>>> labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul
>>> truckers out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess
>>> workers?
>>
>> "Excess workers" that sounds like a PR phrase - how about how are
>> we going to provide leisure and meaningful activity that isn't work to fill
>> the time and enhance the life of the people who don't need to work.
>

> Apparently a lot of them thought art would be great, and the government
> bought their work. The special showed warehouses full of unsaleable
> paintings. They might as well have burned them, or shredded the canvases as
> package filler.
>
> The average person has no talent for leisure activities, and I include
> myself. Unemployed people wind up on streetcorners drinking beer out of
> paper bags and getting into trouble.

I've been unemployed, and never done that. Even the time I was

unemployed for 2 years after Hurricane Katrina.

--

Jim

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 25 Dec 2019 16:16:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On Tue, 24 Dec 2019 20:00:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>

>> On Tue, 24 Dec 2019 11:06:26 -0700, Peter Flass

>> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

>>

>>> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

>>>> On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700

>>>> Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul

>>>> > truckers out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess

>>>> > workers?

>>>>

>>>> "Excess workers" that sounds like a PR phrase - how about how are

>>>> we going to provide leisure and meaningful activity that isn't work to fill

>>>> the time and enhance the life of the people who don't need to work.

>>>>

>>> Apparently a lot of them thought art would be great, and the government

>>> bought their work. The special showed warehouses full of unsaleable

>>> paintings. They might as well have burned them, or shredded the canvases as

>>> package filler.

>>>

>>> The average person has no talent for leisure activities, and I include

>>> myself. Unemployed people wind up on streetcorners drinking beer out of

>>> paper bags and getting into trouble.

>>>

>> When I've been unemployed I generally ended up playing video games and

>> getting fat.

>

> I managed to get payed and not work the summer of 72.

> It was glorious.

> I went to the beach every chance I got.
>
> I've never been fat.
> A little soft after age 40.
> Retirement has been good to me, more time for exercise.
> Not soft now.
>
> I've been a pinball addict for a long time, I played whether I was
> employed or not.
>
> I think we're pretty far from forced unemployment becoming a problem.
> The official unemployment rate is pretty low.
>
> Maybe people can learn to drink beer and not get in trouble.

The official numbers are mostly incorrect as people who have tried and given up, are not counted in the U.S.

I tried for 2 years after my employer left town, after Katrina. I did eventually found work. Around half the businesses in the county were damaged or destroyed.

It was worth the wait as the job the best paying one I ever had.

--
Jim

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Andreas Kohlbach](#) on Wed, 25 Dec 2019 18:15:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tue, 24 Dec 2019 22:31:33 +0000, Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:

>
> On Tue, 24 Dec 2019 11:06:26 -0700
>
>> The special showed warehouses full of unsaleable paintings.
>
> Yep no point in producing things nobody wants, that's not
> meaningful. Try looking at all the things that need doing that nobody wants
> to pay to have done and getting some community spirit going.

You only need to tell people they want it. Like when the newest smartphone is about to hit the market many through their only two year old device away and camp out the night in front of the store. None of these really needs a new iPhone every two years, but they buy them like hot cake.

To get on topic: I wonder if the camping already happened in the 1980s. For example when the newest TRS-80 or Apple][versions came out. If not, when started this?

--

Andreas

My random thoughts and comments
<https://news-commentaries.blogspot.com/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Wed, 25 Dec 2019 21:19:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Wed, 25 Dec 2019 13:15:33 -0500
Andreas Kohlbach <ank@spamfence.net> wrote:

> To get on topic: I wonder if the camping already happened in the
> 1980s. For example when the newest TRS-80 or Apple][versions came
> out.

Certainly not in the UK, there were at times people waiting for the next model or some upgrade but they tended to have booked their slot in the queue early (with a deposit) and be waiting a call rather than queuing up outside the door.

> If not, when started this?

Long queues outside the cinema to see the latest blockbuster film on the opening night (or even in the opening week at the peak), camping overnight for Harrod's sale, Wimbledon tickets ...

It's been going on for ages, it's just that it's only recently made it to electronic widgets.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith		Directable Mirror Arrays
C:>WIN		A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins.		licences available see
You lose and Bill collects.		http://www.sohara.org/

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Thu, 26 Dec 2019 01:50:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JimP <solosam90@gmail.com> writes:

> On Tue, 24 Dec 2019 20:00:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
> wrote:
>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>
>>> On Tue, 24 Dec 2019 11:06:26 -0700, Peter Flass
>>> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>>>> > On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700
>>>> > Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> It's becoming a tsunami of lost jobs. Electric cars require half the
>>>> >> labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul
>>>> >> truckers out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess
>>>> >> workers?
>>>> >
>>>> > "Excess workers" that sounds like a PR phrase - how about how are
>>>> > we going to provide leisure and meaningful activity that isn't work to fill
>>>> > the time and enhance the life of the people who don't need to work.
>>>>
>>>> Sounds good, doesn't it. A few years ago 60 Minutes had a special on a
>>>> Dutch program to provide "meaningful activity" to unemployed workers.
>>>> Apparently a lot of them thought art would be great, and the government
>>>> bought their work. The special showed warehouses full of unsaleable
>>>> paintings. They might as well have burned them, or shredded the canvases as
>>>> package filler.
>>>>
>>>> The average person has no talent for leisure activities, and I include
>>>> myself. Unemployed people wind up on streetcorners drinking beer out of
>>>> paper bags and getting into trouble.
>>>
>>> When I've been unemployed I generally ended up playing video games and
>>> getting fat.
>>
>> I managed to get payed and not work the summer of 72.
>> It was glorious.
>> I went to the beach every chance I got.
>>
>> I've never been fat.
>> A little soft after age 40.
>> Retirement has been good to me, more time for exercise.
>> Not soft now.
>>
>> I've been a pinball addict for a long time, I played whether I was
>> employed or not.
>>
>> I think we're pretty far from forced unemployment becoming a problem.

>> The official unemployment rate is pretty low.
>>
>> Maybe people can learn to drink beer and not get in trouble.
>
> The official numbers are mostly incorrect as people who have tried and
> given up, are not counted in the U.S.

As you probably know, there are the official numbers, and then a whole bunch of other official numbers. There are many ways to count the unemployed. I don't think any of those ways indicate a problem.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Thu, 26 Dec 2019 18:38:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: googlegroups jmfbahciv

On Monday, December 23, 2019 at 8:03:51 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:

> On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700, Peter Flass
> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>> <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:
>>> CBS News reported
>>>
>>> . Secretaries are projected to suffer the biggest job losses of any
>>> profession over the next decade.
>>>
>>> . "Pink-collar" jobs, long a stepping stone into the middle class for
>>> many women, are increasingly being handled by technology.
>>>
>>> . Globally, some 160 million women may need to find new occupations
>>> because of the impact of automation
>>>
>>>
>>> <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-decimation-of-pink-collar-office-jobs-like-secretaries-and-administrative-assistants/>
>>>
>>> I remember when I began my job my office had five secretaries.
>>> Now there are none. Typewriters are piled up in a corner
>>> unwanted.
>>>
>>
>> It's becoming a tsunami of lost jobs. Electric cars require half the
>> labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul truckers

>> out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess workers?
>
> The "Green New Deal" with it's updated WPA will save us all, at least
> until the money runs out.

You are smoking weed,.....aren't you? The GND will eliminate all electronics.

/BAH

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Thu, 26 Dec 2019 19:06:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Thu, 26 Dec 2019 10:38:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv
<jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Monday, December 23, 2019 at 8:03:51 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>> On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700, Peter Flass
>> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>>> <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:
>>>> CBS News reported
>>>>
>>>> . Secretaries are projected to suffer the biggest job losses of any
>>>> profession over the next decade.
>>>>
>>>> . "Pink-collar" jobs, long a stepping stone into the middle class for
>>>> many women, are increasingly being handled by technology.
>>>>
>>>> . Globally, some 160 million women may need to find new occupations
>>>> because of the impact of automation
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-decimation-of-pink-collar-office-jobs-like-secretaries-and-administrative-assistants/>
>>>>
>>>> I remember when I began my job my office had five secretaries.
>>>> Now there are none. Typewriters are piled up in a corner
>>>> unwanted.
>>>>
>>>
>>> It's becoming a tsunami of lost jobs. Electric cars require half the
>>> labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul truckers
>>> out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess workers?

>>
>> The "Green New Deal" with it's updated WPA will save us all, at least
>> until the money runs out.
>
> You are smoking weed,.....aren't you? The GND will eliminate all
> electronics.

I suppose I should have included a sarcasm warning.

However I am curious as to the reasoning by which it would eliminate all electronics--that is a criticism that I have not seen before.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Thu, 26 Dec 2019 21:45:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Monday, December 23, 2019 at 7:18:04 PM UTC-5, Peter Flass wrote:

> <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:
>> CBS News reported
>>
>> . Secretaries are projected to suffer the biggest job losses of any
>> profession over the next decade.
>>
>> . "Pink-collar" jobs, long a stepping stone into the middle class for
>> many women, are increasingly being handled by technology.
>>
>> . Globally, some 160 million women may need to find new occupations
>> because of the impact of automation
>>
>>
>> <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-decimation-of-pink-collar-office-jobs-like-secretaries-and-administrative-assistants/>
>>
>> I remember when I began my job my office had five secretaries.
>> Now there are none. Typewriters are piled up in a corner
>> unwanted.
>>
>
> It's becoming a tsunami of lost jobs. Electric cars require half the
> labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul truckers
> out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess workers?

After WW II, Kurt Vonnegut wrote a book about automation and unemployment. So many workers were unneeded there was a govt program for them, nicknamed the wrecks.

On the one hand, we've always had mechanization for centuries.

Manual labor has always been automated as new technology came out making it affordable.

We used to have armies of clerks manning adding machines and bookkeeping machines that were made surplus by computers. But new jobs were created by a growing economy. Indeed, the Bell System used to brag that it had more operators serving an automated network than it did when it was all manual thanks to growth.

HOWEVER, it seems job growth has been stagnate. More significantly, wage growth is poor.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Thu, 26 Dec 2019 21:51:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Wednesday, December 25, 2019 at 11:17:01 AM UTC-5, JimP wrote:

> The official numbers are mostly incorrect as people who have tried and
> given up, are not counted in the U.S.

Another uncounted factor are people who are forced to take a lesser job than what they used to do. I knew a fellow who worked for General Electric. He was squeezed out and ended up working retail.

In addition, I think another uncounted factor is the cutback in fringe benefits. While benefits varied quite a bit from employer to employer, most white collar workers had some benefits. These days, many employers have cut back on them. Many workers have no benefits at all--they were converted to contractor status. If they need to miss work they don't get paid. They have to pay for their own health insurance and retirement which employers used to cover. Those expenses are substantial.

I could understand certain struggling employers cutting back in order to keep the company going. But many employers cry poverty when in fact they're earring record profits.

As mentioned, the business page of the newspaper had two articles on American Airlines. In one, they were bragging about record profits. In another, they were crying poverty to a judge to let them abrogate pension contractual obligations.

Lots of companies do that. They juggle the books with subsidiaries so as to look prosperous when it's helpful or be impoverished when it's helpful. Worked get screwed.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sat, 28 Dec 2019 04:19:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
> On Wed, 25 Dec 2019 13:15:33 -0500
> Andreas Kohlbach <ank@spamfence.net> wrote:
>
>> To get on topic: I wonder if the camping already happened in the
>> 1980s. For example when the newest TRS-80 or Apple][versions came
>> out.
>
> Certainly not in the UK, there were at times people waiting for the
> next model or some upgrade but they tended to have booked their slot in the
> queue early (with a deposit) and be waiting a call rather than queuing up
> outside the door.
>
>> If not, when started this?
>
> Long queues outside the cinema to see the latest blockbuster film on
> the opening night (or even in the opening week at the peak), camping
> overnight for Harrod's sale, Wimbledon tickets ...
>
> It's been going on for ages, it's just that it's only recently made
> it to electronic widgets.
>

A sad story - dentists in Phoenix got together to offer free dental work over a couple of weekends, and people camped out overnight. It doesn't seem that people should not be able to afford to get their teeth fixed.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 28 Dec 2019 13:00:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Fri, 27 Dec 2019 20:19:02 -0800, Peter Flass
<peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>> On Wed, 25 Dec 2019 13:15:33 -0500
>> Andreas Kohlbach <ank@spamfence.net> wrote:
>>
>>> To get on topic: I wonder if the camping already happened in the
>>> 1980s. For example when the newest TRS-80 or Apple][versions came
>>> out.
>>
>> Certainly not in the UK, there were at times people waiting for the
>> next model or some upgrade but they tended to have booked their slot in the
>> queue early (with a deposit) and be waiting a call rather than queuing up
>> outside the door.
>>
>>> If not, when started this?
>>
>> Long queues outside the cinema to see the latest blockbuster film on
>> the opening night (or even in the opening week at the peak), camping
>> overnight for Harrod's sale, Wimbledon tickets ...
>>
>> It's been going on for ages, it's just that it's only recently made
>> it to electronic widgets.
>>
>
> A sad story - dentists in Phoenix got together to offer free dental work
> over a couple of weekends, and people camped out overnight. It doesn't seem
> that people should not be able to afford to get their teeth fixed.

One of those things that Medicare doesn't cover (one of my objections
to "Medicare for all") and that is not a required coverage under the
ACA. In Arizona Medicaid does cover dental for children but for
adults it's only "emergency dental", not preventive.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 28 Dec 2019 20:36:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On 26 Dec 2019 21:06:43 GMT, Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
> On 2019-12-26, googlegroups jmfbaheiv <jmfbaheiv102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>> On Monday, December 23, 2019 at 8:03:51 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>
> [snip]
>

>>> The "Green New Deal" with it's updated WPA will save us all, at least
>>> until the money runs out.
>>
>> You are smoking weed,.....aren't you? The GND will eliminate all
>> electronics.
>
> Jesus, but you're an idiot.

The claim is around different media, but I haven't seen any proof that will happen.

--
Jim

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 29 Dec 2019 00:14:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JimP <solosam90@gmail.com> writes:

> On 26 Dec 2019 21:06:43 GMT, Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>> On 2019-12-26, googlegroups jmfahciv <jmfah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>> On Monday, December 23, 2019 at 8:03:51 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>>
>> [snip]
>>
>>>> The "Green New Deal" with it's updated WPA will save us all, at
>>>> least until the money runs out.
>>>
>>> You are smoking weed,.....aren't you? The GND will eliminate all
>>> electronics.
>>
>> Jesus, but you're an idiot.
>
> The claim is around different media, but I haven't seen any proof that
> will happen.

<https://www.factcheck.org/2019/02/the-facts-on-the-green-new-deal/>

Tweet:

I think it is very important for the Democrats to press forward with their Green New Deal. It would be great for the so-called "Carbon Footprint" to permanently eliminate all Planes, Cars, Cows, Oil, Gas & the Military – even if no other country would do the same. Brilliant!

— Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) February 9, 2019

Rep. Liz Cheney of Wyoming made similar claims when she warned in a subcommittee hearing on Feb. 12 that the Green New Deal would “outlaw” plane travel, gasoline, cars and “probably the entire U.S. military.”

I think it's fair to say, the source(s) substantiate the assertion of idiocy.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 29 Dec 2019 04:13:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> JimP <solosam90@gmail.com> writes:

>

>> On 26 Dec 2019 21:06:43 GMT, Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:

>>> On 2019-12-26, googlegroups jmfbahciv <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:

>>>> On Monday, December 23, 2019 at 8:03:51 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:

>>>

>>> [snip]

>>>

>>>> > The "Green New Deal" with it's updated WPA will save us all, at

>>>> > least until the money runs out.

>>>>

>>>> You are smoking weed,.....aren't you? The GND will eliminate all

>>>> electronics.

>>>

>>> Jesus, but you're an idiot.

>>

>> The claim is around different media, but I haven't seen any proof that

>> will happen.

>

> <https://www.factcheck.org/2019/02/the-facts-on-the-green-new-deal/>

>

> Tweet:

>

> I think it is very important for the Democrats to press forward with

> their Green New Deal. It would be great for the so-called “Carbon

> Footprint” to permanently eliminate all Planes, Cars, Cows, Oil, Gas

> & the Military – even if no other country would do the

> same. Brilliant!

>

> — Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) February 9, 2019
>
>
> Rep. Liz Cheney of Wyoming made similar claims when she warned in a
> subcommittee hearing on Feb. 12 that the Green New Deal would “outlaw”
> plane travel, gasoline, cars and “probably the entire U.S. military.”
>
>
> I think it's fair to say, the source(s) substantiate the assertion of idiocy.
>

I think they should outlaw plane travel by bloviating politicians who fly around the country making speeches about how we need to reduce our carbon footprint. Try leading by example instead of “do as I say, not as I do.”

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 29 Dec 2019 05:25:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sat, 28 Dec 2019 20:13:54 -0800, Peter Flass
<peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>> JimP <solosam90@gmail.com> writes:
>>
>>> On 26 Dec 2019 21:06:43 GMT, Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>>>> On 2019-12-26, googlegroups jmfbahciv <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> > On Monday, December 23, 2019 at 8:03:51 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>>>>
>>>> [snip]
>>>>
>>>> >> The "Green New Deal" with it's updated WPA will save us all, at
>>>> >> least until the money runs out.
>>>> >
>>>> > You are smoking weed,.....aren't you? The GND will eliminate all
>>>> > electronics.
>>>>
>>>> Jesus, but you're an idiot.
>>>
>>> The claim is around different media, but I haven't seen any proof that
>>> will happen.
>>

>> <https://www.factcheck.org/2019/02/the-facts-on-the-green-new-deal/>
>>
>> Tweet:
>>
>> I think it is very important for the Democrats to press forward with
>> their Green New Deal. It would be great for the so-called "Carbon
>> Footprint" to permanently eliminate all Planes, Cars, Cows, Oil, Gas
>> & the Military – even if no other country would do the
>> same. Brilliant!
>>
>> — Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) February 9, 2019
>>
>>
>> Rep. Liz Cheney of Wyoming made similar claims when she warned in a
>> subcommittee hearing on Feb. 12 that the Green New Deal would "outlaw"
>> plane travel, gasoline, cars and "probably the entire U.S. military."
>>
>>
>> I think it's fair to say, the source(s) substantiate the assertion of idiocy.
>>
>
> I think they should outlaw plane travel by bloviating politicians who fly
> around the country making speeches about how we need to reduce our carbon
> footprint. Try leading by example instead of "do as I say, not as I do."

Also by certain ex-politician billionaires.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 29 Dec 2019 12:54:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:

> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>> JimP <solosam90@gmail.com> writes:
>>
>>> On 26 Dec 2019 21:06:43 GMT, Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>>>> On 2019-12-26, googlegroups jmfbahciv <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> > On Monday, December 23, 2019 at 8:03:51 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>>>>
>>>> [snip]
>>>>
>>>> >> The "Green New Deal" with it's updated WPA will save us all, at
>>>> >> least until the money runs out.
>>>> >
>>>> > You are smoking weed,.....aren't you? The GND will eliminate all
>>>> > electronics.

>>>>
>>>> Jesus, but you're an idiot.
>>>
>>> The claim is around different media, but I haven't seen any proof
>>> that will happen.
>>
>> [https://www.factcheck.org/2019/02/the-facts-on-the-green-new -deal/](https://www.factcheck.org/2019/02/the-facts-on-the-green-new-deal/)
>>
>> Tweet:
>>
>> I think it is very important for the Democrats to press forward
>> with their Green New Deal. It would be great for the so-called
>> "Carbon Footprint" to permanently eliminate all Planes, Cars,
>> Cows, Oil, Gas & the Military – even if no other country would do
>> the same. Brilliant!
>>
>> — Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) February 9, 2019
>>
>>
>> Rep. Liz Cheney of Wyoming made similar claims when she warned in a
>> subcommittee hearing on Feb. 12 that the Green New Deal would
>> "outlaw" plane travel, gasoline, cars and "probably the entire
>> U.S. military."
>>
>>
>> I think it's fair to say, the source(s) substantiate the assertion of
>> idiocy.
>
> I think they should outlaw plane travel by bloviating politicians who
> fly around the country making speeches about how we need to reduce our
> carbon footprint. Try leading by example instead of "do as I say, not
> as I do."

Deep thoughts.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Niklas Karlsson](#) on Mon, 30 Dec 2019 22:27:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2019-12-25, Andreas Kohlbach <ank@spamfence.net> wrote:
> On Tue, 24 Dec 2019 22:31:33 +0000, Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:
>>
>> Yep no point in producing things nobody wants, that's not
>> meaningful. Try looking at all the things that need doing that nobody wants

>> to pay to have done and getting some community spirit going.
>
> You only need to tell people they want it. Like when the newest
> smartphone is about to hit the market many through their only two year
> old device away and camp out the night in front of the store. None of
> these really needs a new iPhone every two years, but they buy them like
> hot cake.

What I've found with iPhones is that the charging port wears out mechanically, maybe not after two years, but certainly three or so - eventually making the phone impossible to charge as it won't make contact unless you sit there pressing the plug in continuously.

This certainly happened with my 6, and is starting to happen now with my 7. I think I'm going Android next.

This could well be a form of planned obsolescence by Apple. Wouldn't surprise me.

Niklas

--

It's no worse than having the Pope celebrate the Eucharist while his assisting Cardinals razz him about the mistakes he's making. This is sufficient to cause a sizable nuclear explosion, which inevitably results from having assembled a critical Mass. -- Mike Andrews

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Tue, 31 Dec 2019 10:31:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 30 Dec 2019 22:27:46 GMT
Niklas Karlsson <anksil@yahoo.se> wrote:

> This certainly happened with my 6, and is starting to happen now with my
> 7. I think I'm going Android next.

Look for something with a USB-C socket it's by far the best designed small connector currently in use.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Tue, 31 Dec 2019 19:07:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Niklas Karlsson <anksil@yahoo.se> wrote:

> On 2019-12-25, Andreas Kohlbach <ank@spamfence.net> wrote:
>> On Tue, 24 Dec 2019 22:31:33 +0000, Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:
>>>
>>> Yep no point in producing things nobody wants, that's not
>>> meaningful. Try looking at all the things that need doing that nobody wants
>>> to pay to have done and getting some community spirit going.
>>
>> You only need to tell people they want it. Like when the newest
>> smartphone is about to hit the market many through their only two year
>> old device away and camp out the night in front of the store. None of
>> these really needs a new iPhone every two years, but they buy them like
>> hot cake.
>
> What I've found with iPhones is that the charging port wears out
> mechanically, maybe not after two years, but certainly three or so -
> eventually making the phone impossible to charge as it won't make
> contact unless you sit there pressing the plug in continuously.

I just got rid of my iPhone 3 and never had a problem. Unfortunately
T-Mobile wouldn't let me trade it in for a free iPhone 10.

>
> This certainly happened with my 6, and is starting to happen now with my
> 7. I think I'm going Android next.
>
> This could well be a form of planned obsolescence by Apple. Wouldn't
> surprise me.
>
> Niklas

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by blmbm@myrealbox.com on Tue, 31 Dec 2019 21:13:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article <8407123d-6843-4d45-9f6c-efaf44386915@googlegroups.com>,
googlegroups jmfbaheiv <jmfbahe102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>

> On Monday, December 23, 2019 at 8:03:51 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>> On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700, Peter Flass
>> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
[snip]

> You are smoking weed,.....aren't you? The GND will eliminate all
> electronics.
>

Ah yes. I missed you when you weren't participating, but I'm remembering now why it seemed, um, duller. :-)?

(Mean-spirited thing to say this time of year, I guess. On the whole I'm glad you're back!)

--

B. L. Massingill

ObDisclaimer: I don't speak for my employers; they return the favor.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Niklas Karlsson](#) on Wed, 01 Jan 2020 17:56:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2019-12-31, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Niklas Karlsson <anksil@yahoo.se> wrote:
>>
>> What I've found with iPhones is that the charging port wears out
>> mechanically, maybe not after two years, but certainly three or so -
>> eventually making the phone impossible to charge as it won't make
>> contact unless you sit there pressing the plug in continuously.
>
> I just got rid of my iPhone 3 and never had a problem. Unfortunately
> T-Mobile wouldn't let me trade it in for a free iPhone 10.

Yeah, the 3 had the old pre-Lightning connector. I never had any problems with that either. It was rather large, though, so it's understandable you'd want to develop something smaller.

Niklas

--

'Damn and blast British Telecom,' shouted Dirk, the words coming easily from force of habit.

-- Dirk Gently's Holistic Detective Agency

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Wed, 01 Jan 2020 18:54:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Niklas Karlsson <anksil@yahoo.se> wrote:

> On 2019-12-31, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

>> Niklas Karlsson <anksil@yahoo.se> wrote:

>>>

>>> What I've found with iPhones is that the charging port wears out
>>> mechanically, maybe not after two years, but certainly three or so -
>>> eventually making the phone impossible to charge as it won't make
>>> contact unless you sit there pressing the plug in continuously.

>>

>> I just got rid of my iPhone 3 and never had a problem. Unfortunately

>> T-Mobile wouldn't let me trade it in for a free iPhone 10.

>

> Yeah, the 3 had the old pre-Lightning connector. I never had any

> problems with that either. It was rather large, though, so it's

> understandable you'd want to develop something smaller.

>

> Niklas

I think the quest to ensmallen everything had gone crazy. For example, my iPhone 10 is bigger than older models, but I have to constantly retype stuff because my fingers are too fat for the on-screen keyboard. This iPad is better, but still problematic.

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Fri, 03 Jan 2020 17:57:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: googlegroups jmfbahciv

On Thursday, December 26, 2019 at 2:06:03 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:

> On Thu, 26 Dec 2019 10:38:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv

> <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:

>

>> On Monday, December 23, 2019 at 8:03:51 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:

>>> On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700, Peter Flass

>>> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>> <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:

>>>> > CBS News reported

>>>> >

>>>> > . Secretaries are projected to suffer the biggest job losses of any
>>>> > profession over the next decade.
>>>> >
>>>> > . "Pink-collar" jobs, long a stepping stone into the middle class for
>>>> > many women, are increasingly being handled by technology.
>>>> >
>>>> > . Globally, some 160 million women may need to find new occupations
>>>> > because of the impact of automation
>>>> >
>>>> >
>>>> > <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-decimation-of-pink-collar-office-jobs-like-secretaries-and-administrative-assistants/>
>>>> >
>>>> > I remember when I began my job my office had five secretaries.
>>>> > Now there are none. Typewriters are piled up in a corner
>>>> > unwanted.
>>>> >
>>>> >
>>>> > It's becoming a tsunami of lost jobs. Electric cars require half the
>>>> > labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul truckers
>>>> > out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess workers?
>>>> >
>>> > The "Green New Deal" with it's updated WPA will save us all, at least
>>> > until the money runs out.
>>> >
>> > You are smoking weed,.....aren't you? The GND will eliminate all
>> > electronics.
>> >
> > I suppose I should have included a sarcasm warning.

I tend to miss sarcasm when it's between the lines :-)

>
> > However I am curious as to the reasoning by which it would eliminate
> > all electronics--that is a criticism that I have not seen before.

1. Limiting transportation. AOC has stated that all airplanes will be grounded. She also doesn't like trucking. No trucking will result in no interest (\$\$\$) for maintaining infrastructure. This will eliminate knowledge of how to make and do all of that work. This is just the beginning. You can think about it and figure out a lot more scenarios of what might happen.

2. If transportation is limited, then the ability of people, who do work for a living, to get to that work. Note that a lot of daily work has to do with food, housing, sanitation, and indoor plumbing with all the work required to provide the parts, tools, lubrication, etc. This is physical work and

cannot be done via the internet. You can look around you and see things and services which had to be created with physical labor.

3. If transportation is limited, the tourist industry is completely gone. Many governments depend on that infusion of money to pay for the work which provides services to the people who live in their jurisdictions.

4-n. there are many, many, many more. It's a living nightmare.

Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs. The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge a national security risk at the highest level.

/BAH

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Fri, 03 Jan 2020 19:21:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

googlegroups jmfbahciv <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> writes:
> On Thursday, December 26, 2019 at 2:06:03 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:

>>>> The "Green New Deal" with it's updated WPA will save us all, at least
>>>> until the money runs out.

>>>

>>> You are smoking weed,.....aren't you? The GND will eliminate all
>>> electronics.

>> =20

>> I suppose I should have included a sarcasm warning.

>

> I tend to miss sarcasm when it's between the lines :-)

>

>> =20

>> However I am curious as to the reasoning by which it would eliminate
>> all electronics--that is a criticism that I have not seen before.

>

> 1. Limiting transportation. AOC has stated that all airplanes will
> be grounded.

The Green New Deal doesn't say anything about airplanes being grounded. Goofballs like you have made that up.

> She also doesn't like trucking.

Leaving aside the fact that Electric trucks are currently in production (including long-haul), your statement is flat out silly. Leaving aside that fact that the congresswoman has never stated that "she doesn't like trucking"

Another lie from Barb (probably picked up from Faux news or Rush limebag).

>

> 2. If transportation is limited, then the ability of people,

Transportation isn't limited. It's just using a different form of energy instead of burning limited fossil fuels.

Rest of Barb's completely bogus points (she's obviously never actually read the congressional resolution, but rather relies on right-wing media for her false facts) elided.

It's right here: < <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-resolution/109/text>>

read it before you make unsubstantiated assertions about it, please.

It starts (HINT: It doesn't ban trucks or air travel):

(1) it is the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal\2014

(A) to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions through a fair and just transition for all communities and workers;

(B) to create millions of good, high-wage jobs and ensure prosperity and economic security for all people of the United States;

(C) to invest in the infrastructure and industry of the United States to sustainably meet the challenges of the 21st century;

(D) to secure for all people of the United States for generations to come\2014

(i) clean air and water;

(ii) climate and community resiliency;

(iii) healthy food;

(iv) access to nature; and

(v) a sustainable environment; and

(2) the goals described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (1) (referred to in this resolution as the “Green New Deal goals”) should be accomplished through a 10-year national mobilization (referred to in this resolution as the “Green New Deal mobilization”) that will require the following goals and projects

(A) building resiliency against climate change-related disasters, such as extreme weather, including by leveraging funding and providing investments for community-defined projects and strategies;

(B) repairing and upgrading the infrastructure in the United States, including

(i) by eliminating pollution and greenhouse gas emissions as much as technologically feasible;

(ii) by guaranteeing universal access to clean water;

(iii) by reducing the risks posed by climate impacts; and

(iv) by ensuring that any infrastructure bill considered by Congress addresses climate change;

(C) meeting 100 percent of the power demand in the United States through clean, renewable, and zero-emission energy sources, including

(i) by dramatically expanding and upgrading renewable power sources; and

(ii) by deploying new capacity;

(D) building or upgrading to energy-efficient, distributed, and “smart” power grids, and ensuring affordable access to electricity;

(E) upgrading all existing buildings in the United States and building new buildings to achieve maximum energy efficiency, water efficiency, safety, affordability, comfort, and durability, including through electrification;

(F) spurring massive growth in clean manufacturing in the United States and removing pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing and industry as much as is technologically feasible, including by expanding renewable energy manufacturing and investing in existing manufacturing and industry;

(G) working collaboratively with farmers and ranchers in the United States to remove pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from the agricultural sector as much as is technologically feasible, including

(i) by supporting family farming;

(ii) by investing in sustainable farming and land use practices that increase soil health; and

(iii) by building a more sustainable food system that ensures universal access to healthy food;

(H) overhauling transportation systems in the United States to remove pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector as much as is technologically feasible, including through investment in\u2014

(i) zero-emission vehicle infrastructure and manufacturing;

(ii) clean, affordable, and accessible public transit; and

(iii) high-speed rail;

(I) mitigating and managing the long-term adverse health, economic, and other effects of pollution and climate change, including by providing funding for community-defined projects and strategies;

(J) removing greenhouse gases from the atmosphere and reducing pollution by restoring natural ecosystems through proven low-tech solutions that increase soil carbon storage, such as land preservation and afforestation;

(K) restoring and protecting threatened, endangered, and fragile ecosystems through locally appropriate and science-based projects that enhance biodiversity and support climate resiliency;

(L) cleaning up existing hazardous waste and abandoned sites, ensuring economic development and sustainability on those sites;

(M) identifying other emission and pollution sources and creating solutions to remove them; and

(N) promoting the international exchange of technology, expertise, products, funding, and services, with the aim of making the United States the international leader on climate action, and to help other countries achieve a Green New Deal;

(3) a Green New Deal must be developed through transparent and inclusive consultation, collaboration, and partnership with frontline and vulnerable communities, labor unions, worker cooperatives, civil society groups, academia, and businesses; and

(4) to achieve the Green New Deal goals and mobilization, a Green New Deal will require the following goals and projects\u2014

(A) providing and leveraging, in a way that ensures that the public receives appropriate ownership stakes and returns on investment, adequate capital (including through community grants, public banks, and other public financing), technical expertise, supporting policies, and other forms of assistance to communities, organizations, Federal, State, and local government agencies, and businesses working on the Green New Deal mobilization;

(B) ensuring that the Federal Government takes into account the complete environmental and social costs and impacts of emissions through\u2014

(i) existing laws;

(ii) new policies and programs; and

(iii) ensuring that frontline and vulnerable communities shall not be adversely affected;

(C) providing resources, training, and high-quality education, including higher education, to all people of the United States, with a focus on frontline and vulnerable communities, so that all people of the United States may be full and equal participants in the Green New Deal mobilization;

(D) making public investments in the research and development of new clean and renewable energy technologies and industries;

(E) directing investments to spur economic development, deepen and diversify industry and business in local and regional economies, and build wealth and community ownership, while prioritizing high-quality job creation and economic, social, and environmental benefits in frontline and vulnerable communities, and deindustrialized communities, that may otherwise struggle with the transition away from greenhouse gas intensive industries;

(F) ensuring the use of democratic and participatory processes that are inclusive of and led by frontline and vulnerable communities and workers to plan, implement, and administer the Green New Deal mobilization at the local level;

(G) ensuring that the Green New Deal mobilization creates high-quality union jobs that pay prevailing wages, hires local workers, offers training and advancement opportunities, and guarantees wage and benefit parity for workers affected by the transition;

(H) guaranteeing a job with a family-sustaining wage, adequate family and medical leave, paid vacations, and retirement security to all people of the United States;

(I) strengthening and protecting the right of all workers to organize, unionize, and collectively bargain free of coercion, intimidation, and harassment;

(J) strengthening and enforcing labor, workplace health and safety, antidiscrimination, and wage and hour standards across all employers, industries, and sectors;

(K) enacting and enforcing trade rules, procurement standards, and border adjustments with strong labor and environmental protections\u2014

(i) to stop the transfer of jobs and pollution overseas; and

(ii) to grow domestic manufacturing in the United States;

(L) ensuring that public lands, waters, and oceans are protected and that eminent domain is not abused;

(M) obtaining the free, prior, and informed consent of indigenous peoples for all decisions that affect indigenous peoples and their traditional territories, honoring all treaties and agreements with

indigenous peoples, and protecting and enforcing the sovereignty and land rights of indigenous peoples;

(N) ensuring a commercial environment where every businessperson is free from unfair competition and domination by domestic or international monopolies; and

(O) providing all people of the United States with\

(i) high-quality health care;

(ii) affordable, safe, and adequate housing;

(iii) economic security; and

(iv) clean water, clean air, healthy and affordable food, and access to nature.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 00:12:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

scott@slp53.sl.home (Scott Lurndal) writes:

> googlegroups jmfbahciv <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> writes:
>> On Thursday, December 26, 2019 at 2:06:03 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>
>>>> > The "Green New Deal" with it's updated WPA will save us all, at
>>>> > least until the money runs out.
>>>>
>>>> You are smoking weed,.....aren't you? The GND will eliminate all
>>>> electronics.
>>> =20
>>> I suppose I should have included a sarcasm warning.
>>
>> I tend to miss sarcasm when it's between the lines :-)
>>
>>> =20
>>> However I am curious as to the reasoning by which it would eliminate
>>> all electronics--that is a criticism that I have not seen before.
>>
>> 1. Limiting transportation. AOC has stated that all airplanes will
>> be grounded.
>
> The Green New Deal doesn't say anything about airplanes being
> grounded. Goofballs like you have made that up.

Here is at least one of the goofballs:

(politifact)

<http://tinyurl.com/yxn4z3mr>

The Democrats' Green New Deal includes "working towards ending air travel."

— Rick Scott on Monday, February 25th, 2019 in an Orlando Sentinel op-ed

No, the Green New Deal doesn't aim to end air travel, as Florida Sen. Rick Scott says

We've entered a strange new age where a big segment of the population has decided their lies are better than facts.

So, BAH didn't make that up, she just decided it's okay to repeat lies.

So she posted here 3 or 4 times with the new id before she decided to start trouble. Same idiot. The only thing that "works" is ignore.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 01:47:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Thursday, December 26, 2019 at 2:06:03 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>> On Thu, 26 Dec 2019 10:38:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv
>> <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>> On Monday, December 23, 2019 at 8:03:51 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>>>> On Mon, 23 Dec 2019 17:18:02 -0700, Peter Flass
>>>> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> ><hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:
>>>> >> CBS News reported
>>>> >>
>>>> >> . Secretaries are projected to suffer the biggest job losses of any
>>>> >> profession over the next decade.
>>>> >>

>>>> >> . "Pink-collar" jobs, long a stepping stone into the middle class for
>>>> >> many women, are increasingly being handled by technology.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> . Globally, some 160 million women may need to find new occupations
>>>> >> because of the impact of automation
>>>> >>
>>>> >>
>>>> >> <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-decimation-of-pink-collar-office-jobs-like-secretaries-and-administrative-assistants/>
>>>> >>
>>>> >> I remember when I began my job my office had five secretaries.
>>>> >> Now there are none. Typewriters are piled up in a corner
>>>> >> unwanted.
>>>> >>
>>>> >
>>>> >It's becoming a tsunami of lost jobs. Electric cars require half the
>>>> >labor as gas-powered cars. Self-driving trucks will put long-haul truckers
>>>> >out of work, etc. What is going to be done with all the excess workers?
>>>>
>>>> The "Green New Deal" with it's updated WPA will save us all, at least
>>>> until the money runs out.
>>>
>>> You are smoking weed,.....aren't you? The GND will eliminate all
>>> electronics.
>>
>> I suppose I should have included a sarcasm warning.
>
> I tend to miss sarcasm when it's between the lines :-)
>
>>
>> However I am curious as to the reasoning by which it would eliminate
>> all electronics--that is a criticism that I have not seen before.
>
> 1. Limiting transportation. AOC has stated that all airplanes will
> be grounded.

Has she? Where did she state that?

> She also doesn't like trucking. No trucking will
> result in no interest (\$\$\$) for maintaining infrastructure.
> This will eliminate knowledge of how to make and do all of that
> work. This is just the beginning. You can think about it and
> figure out a lot more scenarios of what might happen.

What she's said is that she wants to build out rail to the point where flying is not needed, and replace internal combustion with electric power.

> 2. If transportation is limited, then the ability of people,
> who do work for a living, to get to that work. Note that a lot
> of daily work has to do with food, housing, sanitation, and
> indoor plumbing with all the work required to provide the
> parts, tools, lubrication, etc. This is physical work and
> cannot be done via the internet. You can look around you and
> see things and services which had to be created with physical
> labor.

If transportation is that limited everybody who doesn't live on a farm
is going to starve anyway. Of course whoever brought that situation
about will be lynched long before everybody starves.

> 3. If transportation is limited, the tourist industry is
> completely gone. Many governments depend on that infusion
> of money to pay for the work which provides services to the
> people who live in their jurisdictions.

If it's that limited. Not using fossil fuels does not mean that
transportation is impossible. There are electric trains that run over
300 mph.

>
> 4-n. there are many, many, many more. It's a living nightmare.
>
> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
> a national security risk at the highest level.

Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.

>
> /BAH
>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 03:20:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv
> <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge

>> a national security risk at the highest level.

>

> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.

Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:

(home depot)

<http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>

I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.

The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.

Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.

Lighting has improved dramatically.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 04:01:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>

>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbaheiv

>> <jmfbaheiv102162@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.

>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge

>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge

>>> a national security risk at the highest level.

>>

>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10

>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.

>

> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:

>

> (home depot)

>
> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>

So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing facilities in the US.

> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>
> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>
> Lighting has improved dramatically.

I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am very happy that it is dying the death.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 14:07:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
> wrote:
>
>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>
>>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbaheiv
>>> <jmfbaheiv102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>
>>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>
>> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>
>> (home depot)
>>
>> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>
> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
> facilities in the US.

>
>> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>
>> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>
>> Lighting has improved dramatically.
>
> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
> very happy that it is dying the death.

Disagree on at least 2 counts.

1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced and used less power. While they had some minor drawbacks they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp. The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere near with incandescents.

2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 14:13:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

> On 2020-01-04, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>> Lighting has improved dramatically.
>
> That depends on how you define "improved".
>
> Oh, for the long-gone happy days when I kept one kind of lightbulb in
> three different wattages. And now I have a spreadsheet and a freeking
> ginormous box of spares in 6 different kinds of connector, 3 different
> technologies, 5 different shapes (that one's a guess) and Ghod knows
> how many different luminosities, sizes & colour temperatures. Just
> threw away the two R45 SES incandescent reflectors in the guest
> bedroom because I couldn't be arsed to source a replacement for the
> failed one, and replaced them with candle SES LEDs bought for some
> fittings we don't have any more. This is progress?

Wow, you really have to dig to find a reason to be unhappy.

How many LEDs have you had to replace?

For me, none so far. In fact, for my latest upgrades, my kitchen ceiling and all the outside house lights, there is no bulb to replace. If the light ever stops working, I have to replace the fixture.

Looks like the manufacturer expects the light to last just as long as the rest of the fixture.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 14:18:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

> On 2020-01-04, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:
>
> [snip]
>
>> Yes, closing factories attacks us all. Average income is rising, but I
>> doubt that anybody reading this is seeing it much, the 1% is getting
>> most of it.
>
> Ah, yes, the sure indicator of innumeracy; when people mention an
> arbitrary percentage and blame them for everything. I'm greatly
> amused by the way this number has got smaller and smaller over the
> years as people realise that *they* are in the evil 'x'%. I'd
> be prepared to wager a small amount that everyone on the this 'froup
> is in "the 10%", most of them in "the 5%" and a significant proportion
> in "the 1%". Most of the world is poor, and most Westerners are well
> off by comparison.

Just read an interesting statistic:

As of 2010, 388 individuals possessed as much household wealth as the lower half of the world's population combined. Today, Oxfam estimates that number as 26.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 15:26:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 09:07:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>

>> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>> wrote:

>>

>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>>>

>>>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbaheiv
>>>> <jmfbaheiv102162@gmail.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> >Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.

>>>> >The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge

>>>> >should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge

>>>> >a national security risk at the highest level.

>>>>

>>>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.

>>>

>>> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:

>>>

>>> (home depot)

>>>

>>> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>

>>

>> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>> facilities in the US.

>>

>>> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.

>>> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.

>>>

>>> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.

>>>

>>> Lighting has improved dramatically.

>>

>> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>> very happy that it is dying the death.

>

> Disagree on at least 2 counts.

>

> 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
> and used less power.

Which doesn't make them any less crap. As light sources they suck.

> they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
> The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
> near with incandescents.

Lucky you.

> 2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.

What specifically? There was no law requiring LEDs, it was just a ban on incandescents. If the politicians had not banned incandescents we would not now be filling up landfills with mercury--when LEDs came along they would have started taking over the market as actually providing better illumination than incandescents.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 17:04:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 09:07:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
> wrote:
>
>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>
>>> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>> > On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv
>>>> > <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >>Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> >>The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> >>should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> >>a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >
>>>> > Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> > years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>>
>>>> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:

>>>>
>>>> (home depot)
>>>>
>>>> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>>>
>>> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>>> facilities in the US.
>>>
>>>> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>>>> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>>
>>>> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>>
>>>> Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>
>>> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>>> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>> very happy that it is dying the death.
>>
>> Disagree on at least 2 counts.
>>
>> 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
>> and used less power.
>
> Which doesn't make them any less crap. As light sources they suck.
>
>> they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
>> The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
>> near with incandescents.
>
> Lucky you.
>
>> 2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.
>
> What specifically? There was no law requiring LEDs, it was just a ban
> on incandescents.

Actually, that's wrong.

There was never any law banning incandescent bulbs:

In December 2007, the federal government enacted the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA), which set maximum power consumption requirements for all general-service light bulbs producing 310–2600 lumens of light.

> If the politicians had not banned incandescents we
> would not now be filling up landfills with mercury--when LEDs came
> along they would have started taking over the market as actually

> providing better illumination than incandescents.

Sorry, wrong.

The government did a pretty good job of pushing lighting manufacturers to come up with more efficient lighting. The first thing to come up were CFLs. They reduced pollution, including mercury pollution by requiring less power to operate.

I don't know how many wound up in landfills vs. being correctly recycled, but there is a very small amount of mercury in a CFL and I'd rather have the mercury in a landfill than in the air where it ends up when you burn coal to make power.

So, specifically, the same law that created CFLs also created LED lighting.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 17:16:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

> On 2020-01-04, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

>>

>>> On 2020-01-04, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:

>>>

>>> [snip]

>>>

>>>> Yes, closing factories attacks us all. Average income is rising, but I
>>>> doubt that anybody reading this is seeing it much, the 1% is getting
>>>> most of it.

>>>

>>> Ah, yes, the sure indicator of innumeracy; when people mention an
>>> arbitrary percentage and blame them for everything. I'm greatly
>>> amused by the way this number has got smaller and smaller over the
>>> years as people realise that *they* are in the evil 'x'%. I'd
>>> be prepared to wager a small amount that everyone on the this 'froup
>>> is in "the 10%", most of them in "the 5%" and a significant proportion
>>> in "the 1%". Most of the world is poor, and most Westerners are well
>>> off by comparison.

>>

>> Just read an interesting statistic:

>>
>> As of 2010, 388 individuals possessed as much household wealth as the
>> lower half of the world's population combined. Today, Oxfam estimates
>> that number as 26.
>
> Interesting. IOW, if I've understood this correctly, the size of the
> 'evil percentage' has fallen 90% in the last decade?

The article I quoted was a Scientific American article called
"The Inescapable Casino".

According to the article, physicists and mathematicians have
worked out models that show that our current economic systems
inevitably lead to concentration of wealth in the few.

So, according to this, unless something changes, the disparity
is only going to get worse.

Whether this is "evil" is a matter of opinion.
Personally, I think creating a dynasty where your offspring never have
to work again is a really bad idea.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 17:47:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 12:04:27 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>
>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 09:07:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>
>>>> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> >J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >

>>>> >> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv
>>>> >> <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>>Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> >>>The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> >>>should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> >>>a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> >> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>> >
>>>> >Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>> >
>>>> >(home depot)
>>>> >
>>>> ><http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>>>>
>>>> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>>>> facilities in the US.
>>>>
>>>> >I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>>>> >The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>> >
>>>> >Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>> >
>>>> >Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>>
>>>> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>>>> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>>> very happy that it is dying the death.
>>>
>>> Disagree on at least 2 counts.
>>>
>>> 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
>>> and used less power.
>>>
>> Which doesn't make them any less crap. As light sources they suck.
>>
>>> they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
>>> The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
>>> near with incandescents.
>>>
>> Lucky you.
>>
>>> 2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.
>>>
>> What specifically? There was no law requiring LEDs, it was just a ban
>> on incandescents.

- >
- > Actually, that's wrong.
- > There was never any law banning incandescent bulbs:
- >
- > In December 2007, the federal government enacted the Energy
- > Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA), which set maximum power
- > consumption requirements for all general-service light bulbs producing
- > 310–2600 lumens of light.

Fine, achieve the required power consumption with an incandescent and get back to me. A back-door ban is still a ban.

- >
- >> If the politicians had not banned incandescents we
- >> would not now be filling up landfills with mercury--when LEDs came
- >> along they would have started taking over the market as actually
- >> providing better illumination than incandescents.
- >
- > Sorry, wrong.
- >
- > The government did a pretty good job of pushing lighting manufacturers
- > to come up with more efficient lighting.

With their ban. There was nothing that specifically encouraged LEDs.

- > The first thing to come up
- > were CFLs. They reduced pollution, including mercury pollution by
- > requiring less power to operate.

Bullshit. Incandescents contain no mercury and mercury is not used to generate electricity. It is used in CF bulbs though.

- > I don't know how many wound up in landfills vs. being correctly
- > recycled, but there is a very small amount of mercury in a CFL and
- > I'd rather have the mercury in a landfill than in the air where it ends
- > up when you burn coal to make power.

OK, work out how much mercury is released to generate the power to run an incandescent bulb vs the mercury released in tossing a CF.

- > So, specifically, the same law that created CFLs also created LED
- > lighting.

That law did not "create" anything but a pain in the butt. CF existed before the law. So did LED.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 12:16:33 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

>

>> On 2020-01-04, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

>>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

>>>

>>>> On 2020-01-04, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> [snip]

>>>>

>>>> > Yes, closing factories attacks us all. Average income is rising, but I
>>>> > doubt that anybody reading this is seeing it much, the 1% is getting
>>>> > most of it.

>>>>

>>>> Ah, yes, the sure indicator of innumeracy; when people mention an
>>>> arbitrary percentage and blame them for everything. I'm greatly
>>>> amused by the way this number has got smaller and smaller over the
>>>> years as people realise that *they* are in the evil 'x'%. I'd
>>>> be prepared to wager a small amount that everyone on the this 'froup
>>>> is in "the 10%", most of them in "the 5%" and a significant proportion
>>>> in "the 1%". Most of the world is poor, and most Westerners are well
>>>> off by comparison.

>>>

>>> Just read an interesting statistic:

>>>

>>> As of 2010, 388 individuals possessed as much household wealth as the
>>> lower half of the world's population combined. Today, Oxfam estimates
>>> that number as 26.

>>

>> Interesting. IOW, if I've understood this correctly, the size of the
>> 'evil percentage' has fallen 90% in the last decade?

>

> The article I quoted was a Scientific American article called
> "The Inescapable Casino".

>

> According to the article, physicists and mathematicians have
> worked out models that show that our current economic systems
> inevitably lead to concentration of wealth in the few.

>

> So, according to this, unless something changes, the disparity
> is only going to get worse.

>

> Whether this is "evil" is a matter of opinion.
> Personally, I think creating a dynasty where your offspring never have
> to work again is a really bad idea.

All three of them?

The question is not "is there a disparity", it is "are the poorest
poor worse off than they were previously".

Personally I like living in a world where Elon Musk can fund a private
space program that makes the government look like a bunch of chumps.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 19:20:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 12:04:27 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
> wrote:
>
>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>
>>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 09:07:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>> > On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> > wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >>J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbaheiv
>>>> >>> <jmfbaheiv102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>>>Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> >>>>The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> >>>>should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> >>>>a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> >>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>> >>
>>>> >>Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>(home depot)

>>>> >>
>>>> >><http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>>>> >
>>>> > So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>>>> > facilities in the US.
>>>> >
>>>> >>I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>>>> >>The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>> >>
>>>> >>Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>> >>
>>>> >>Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>> >
>>>> > I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>>>> > politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>>> > very happy that it is dying the death.
>>>>
>>>> Disagree on at least 2 counts.
>>>>
>>>> 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
>>>> and used less power.
>>>>
>>> Which doesn't make them any less crap. As light sources they suck.
>>>
>>>> they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
>>>> The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
>>>> near with incandescents.
>>>>
>>> Lucky you.
>>>
>>>> 2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.
>>>>
>>> What specifically? There was no law requiring LEDs, it was just a ban
>>> on incandescents.
>>>
>> Actually, that's wrong.
>> There was never any law banning incandescent bulbs:
>>
>> In December 2007, the federal government enacted the Energy
>> Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA), which set maximum power
>> consumption requirements for all general-service light bulbs producing
>> 310–2600 lumens of light.
>>
> Fine, achieve the required power consumption with an incandescent and
> get back to me. A back-door ban is still a ban.
>>
>>> If the politicians had not banned incandescents we
>>> would not now be filling up landfills with mercury--when LEDs came

>>> along they would have started taking over the market as actually
>>> providing better illumination than incandescents.
>>
>> Sorry, wrong.
>>
>> The government did a pretty good job of pushing lighting manufacturers
>> to come up with more efficient lighting.
>
> With their ban. There was nothing that specifically encouraged LEDs.
>
>> The first thing to come up
>> were CFLs. They reduced pollution, including mercury pollution by
>> requiring less power to operate.
>
> Bullshit. Incandescents contain no mercury and mercury is not used to
> generate electricity. It is used in CF bulbs though.
>
>> I don't know how many wound up in landfills vs. being correctly
>> recycled, but there is a very small amount of mercury in a CFL and
>> I'd rather have the mercury in a landfill than in the air where it ends
>> up when you burn coal to make power.
>
> OK, work out how much mercury is released to generate the power to run
> an incandescent bulb vs the mercury released in tossing a CF.
>
>> So, specifically, the same law that created CFLs also created LED
>> lighting.
>
> That law did not "create" anything but a pain in the butt. CF existed
> before the law. So did LED.

Well, you are just going to keep pointlessly arguing.

In the USA, lots of coal is burned to create electricity.
If the RWNJs had their way, a lot more coal would be burned.
Burning coal puts lots of bad things in the atmosphere,
including mercury.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 19:27:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 14:20:00 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>
>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 12:04:27 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>
>>>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 09:07:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> >J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >
>>>> >> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> >> wrote:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>>J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbaheiv
>>>> >>>> <jmfbaheiv102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>>Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> >>>>>The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> >>>>>should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> >>>>>a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> >>>>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>>Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>>(home depot)
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>><http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>>>> >>
>>>> >> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>>>> >> facilities in the US.
>>>> >>
>>>> >>>>I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>>>> >>>>>The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>>Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>>Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the

>>>> >> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>>> >> very happy that it is dying the death.
>>>> >
>>>> >Disagree on at least 2 counts.
>>>> >
>>>> >1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
>>>> >and used less power.
>>>>
>>>> Which doesn't make them any less crap. As light sources they suck.
>>>>
>>>> >they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
>>>> >The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
>>>> >near with incandescents.
>>>>
>>>> Lucky you.
>>>>
>>>> >2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.
>>>>
>>>> What specifically? There was no law requiring LEDs, it was just a ban
>>>> on incandescents.
>>>
>>> Actually, that's wrong.
>>> There was never any law banning incandescent bulbs:
>>>
>>> In December 2007, the federal government enacted the Energy
>>> Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA), which set maximum power
>>> consumption requirements for all general-service light bulbs producing
>>> 310–2600 lumens of light.
>>
>> Fine, achieve the required power consumption with an incandescent and
>> get back to me. A back-door ban is still a ban.
>>>
>>>> If the politicians had not banned incandescents we
>>>> would not now be filling up landfills with mercury--when LEDs came
>>>> along they would have started taking over the market as actually
>>>> providing better illumination than incandescents.
>>>
>>> Sorry, wrong.
>>>
>>> The government did a pretty good job of pushing lighting manufacturers
>>> to come up with more efficient lighting.
>>
>> With their ban. There was nothing that specifically encouraged LEDs.
>>
>>> The first thing to come up
>>> were CFLs. They reduced pollution, including mercury pollution by
>>> requiring less power to operate.
>>

>> Bullshit. Incandescents contain no mercury and mercury is not used to
>> generate electricity. It is used in CF bulbs though.
>>
>>> I don't know how many wound up in landfills vs. being correctly
>>> recycled, but there is a very small amount of mercury in a CFL and
>>> I'd rather have the mercury in a landfill than in the air where it ends
>>> up when you burn coal to make power.
>>
>> OK, work out how much mercury is released to generate the power to run
>> an incandescent bulb vs the mercury released in tossing a CF.
>>
>>> So, specifically, the same law that created CFLs also created LED
>>> lighting.
>>
>> That law did not "create" anything but a pain in the butt. CF existed
>> before the law. So did LED.
>
> Well, you are just going to keep pointlessly arguing.
>
> In the USA, lots of coal is burned to create electricity.
> If the RWNJs had their way, a lot more coal would be burned.
> Burning coal puts lots of bad things in the atmosphere,
> including mercury.

So how much coal is used, on average, to run one light bulb over the
lifetime of that light bulb? How much mercury is in a CF bulb?

Saying "lots of coal is used" is evading the question. Coal is on the
way out, natural gas is on the way in, the largest single source of
electric power in the US is natural gas.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 19:46:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
> wrote:
>
>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>
>>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv
>>> <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge

>>>> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>
>>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>
>> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>
>> (home depot)
>>
>> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>
> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
> facilities in the US.
>
>> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>
>> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>
>> Lighting has improved dramatically.
>
> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
> very happy that it is dying the death.
>

+1

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 19:46:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>
>> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>
>>>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv
>>>> <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.

>>>> > The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> > should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> > a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>>
>>>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>
>>> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>
>>> (home depot)
>>>
>>> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>>
>> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>> facilities in the US.
>>
>>> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>>> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>
>>> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>
>>> Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>
>> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>> very happy that it is dying the death.
>
> Disagree on at least 2 counts.
>
> 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
> and used less power. While they had some minor drawbacks
> they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
> The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
> near with incandescents.

The never lasted me as long as claimed, and I could buy two or three
incandescents for the price of a CFL.

>
> 2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.
>

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 19:46:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

>

>> On 2020-01-04, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:

>>

>> [snip]

>>

>>> Yes, closing factories attacks us all. Average income is rising, but I

>>> doubt that anybody reading this is seeing it much, the 1% is getting

>>> most of it.

>>

>> Ah, yes, the sure indicator of innumeracy; when people mention an

>> arbitrary percentage and blame them for everything. I'm greatly

>> amused by the way this number has got smaller and smaller over the

>> years as people realise that *they* are in the evil 'x'%. I'd

>> be prepared to wager a small amount that everyone on the this 'froup

>> is in "the 10%", most of them in "the 5%" and a significant proportion

>> in "the 1%". Most of the world is poor, and most Westerners are well

>> off by comparison.

>

> Just read an interesting statistic:

>

> As of 2010, 388 individuals possessed as much household wealth as the

> lower half of the world's population combined. Today, Oxfam estimates

> that number as 26.

>

So 362 families got poorer

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 19:46:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>

>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 09:07:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>

>> wrote:

>>

>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>>>
>>>> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >
>>>> >> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv
>>>> >> <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> >>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> >>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> >>> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> >> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>> >
>>>> > Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>> >
>>>> > (home depot)
>>>> >
>>>> > <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>>>>
>>>> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>>>> facilities in the US.
>>>>
>>>> > I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>>>> > The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>> >
>>>> > Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>> >
>>>> > Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>>
>>>> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>>>> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>>> very happy that it is dying the death.
>>>
>>> Disagree on at least 2 counts.
>>>
>>> 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
>>> and used less power.
>>>
>> Which doesn't make them any less crap. As light sources they suck.
>>
>>> they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
>>> The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
>>> near with incandescents.
>>>
>>

>> Lucky you.
>>
>>> 2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.
>>
>> What specifically? There was no law requiring LEDs, it was just a ban
>> on incandescents.
>
> Actually, that's wrong.
> There was never any law banning incandescent bulbs:
>
> In December 2007, the federal government enacted the Energy
> Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA), which set maximum power
> consumption requirements for all general-service light bulbs producing
> 310–2600 lumens of light.
>
>> If the politicians had not banned incandescents we
>> would not now be filling up landfills with mercury--when LEDs came
>> along they would have started taking over the market as actually
>> providing better illumination than incandescents.
>
> Sorry, wrong.
>
> The government did a pretty good job of pushing lighting manufacturers
> to come up with more efficient lighting. The first thing to come up
> were CFLs. They reduced pollution, including mercury pollution by
> requiring less power to operate.
>
> I don't know how many wound up in landfills vs. being correctly
> recycled, but there is a very small amount of mercury in a CFL and
> I'd rather have the mercury in a landfill than in the air where it ends
> up when you burn coal to make power.

What is the correct way to recycle them? I gave up trying to do the right thing and just binned them. Fortunately I have no CFLs in the new place.

>
> So, specifically, the same law that created CFLs also created LED
> lighting.
>

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

>

>> On 2020-01-04, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

>>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

>>>>

>>>> On 2020-01-04, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>> [snip]

>>>>>

>>>>> > Yes, closing factories attacks us all. Average income is rising, but I
>>>>> > doubt that anybody reading this is seeing it much, the 1% is getting
>>>>> > most of it.

>>>>>

>>>>> Ah, yes, the sure indicator of innumeracy; when people mention an
>>>>> arbitrary percentage and blame them for everything. I'm greatly
>>>>> amused by the way this number has got smaller and smaller over the
>>>>> years as people realise that *they* are in the evil 'x'%. I'd
>>>>> be prepared to wager a small amount that everyone on the this 'froup
>>>>> is in "the 10%", most of them in "the 5%" and a significant proportion
>>>>> in "the 1%". Most of the world is poor, and most Westerners are well
>>>>> off by comparison.

>>>>

>>>> Just read an interesting statistic:

>>>>

>>>> As of 2010, 388 individuals possessed as much household wealth as the
>>>> lower half of the world's population combined. Today, Oxfam estimates
>>>> that number as 26.

>>>>

>>>> Interesting. IOW, if I've understood this correctly, the size of the
>>>> 'evil percentage' has fallen 90% in the last decade?

>>>>

>>>> The article I quoted was a Scientific American article called
>>>> "The Inescapable Casino".

>>>>

>>>> According to the article, physicists and mathematicians have
>>>> worked out models that show that our current economic systems
>>>> inevitably lead to concentration of wealth in the few.

>>>>

>>>> So, according to this, unless something changes, the disparity
>>>> is only going to get worse.

>>>>

>>>> Whether this is "evil" is a matter of opinion.
>>>> Personally, I think creating a dynasty where your offspring never have
>>>> to work again is a really bad idea.

>>>>

This doesn't have to happen. Warren Buffett is giving away most of his money specifically to avoid this. People like Andrew Carnegie gave away lots of money and did a lot of good with it,.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 19:50:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 12:16:33 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
> wrote:
>
>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:
>>
>>> On 2020-01-04, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:
>>>>
>>>> > On 2020-01-04, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> > [snip]
>>>> >
>>>> >> Yes, closing factories attacks us all. Average income is rising, but I
>>>> >> doubt that anybody reading this is seeing it much, the 1% is getting
>>>> >> most of it.
>>>> >
>>>> > Ah, yes, the sure indicator of innumeracy; when people mention an
>>>> > arbitrary percentage and blame them for everything. I'm greatly
>>>> > amused by the way this number has got smaller and smaller over the
>>>> > years as people realise that *they* are in the evil 'x'%. I'd
>>>> > be prepared to wager a small amount that everyone on the this 'froup
>>>> > is in "the 10%", most of them in "the 5%" and a significant proportion
>>>> > in "the 1%". Most of the world is poor, and most Westerners are well
>>>> > off by comparison.
>>>>
>>>> Just read an interesting statistic:
>>>>
>>>> As of 2010, 388 individuals possessed as much household wealth as the
>>>> lower half of the world's population combined. Today, Oxfam estimates
>>>> that number as 26.
>>>
>>> Interesting. IOW, if I've understood this correctly, the size of the
>>> 'evil percentage' has fallen 90% in the last decade?

>>
>> The article I quoted was a Scientific American article called
>> "The Inescapable Casino".
>>
>> According to the article, physicists and mathematicians have
>> worked out models that show that our current economic systems
>> inevitably lead to concentration of wealth in the few.
>>
>> So, according to this, unless something changes, the disparity
>> is only going to get worse.
>>
>> Whether this is "evil" is a matter of opinion.
>> Personally, I think creating a dynasty where your offspring never have
>> to work again is a really bad idea.
>
> All three of them?
>
> The question is not "is there a disparity", it is "are the poorest
> poor worse off than they were previously".
>
> Personally I like living in a world where Elon Musk can fund a private
> space program that makes the government look like a bunch of chumps.
>

+1

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 19:50:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>
>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 12:04:27 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>
>>>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 09:07:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >
>>>> >> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>

>>>> >> wrote:

>>>> >>

>>>> >>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbaheiv
>>>> >>>> <jmfbaheiv102162@gmail.com> wrote:

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.

>>>> >>>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge

>>>> >>>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge

>>>> >>>>> a national security risk at the highest level.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10

>>>> >>>>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> (home depot)

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>

>>>> >>

>>>> >> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing

>>>> >> facilities in the US.

>>>> >>

>>>> >>> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.

>>>> >>> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> Lighting has improved dramatically.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the

>>>> >> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am

>>>> >> very happy that it is dying the death.

>>>> >

>>>> > Disagree on at least 2 counts.

>>>> >

>>>> > 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced

>>>> > and used less power.

>>>>

>>>> Which doesn't make them any less crap. As light sources they suck.

>>>>

>>>> > they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.

>>>> > The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere

>>>> > near with incandescents.

>>>>

>>>> Lucky you.

>>>>

>>>> > 2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.
>>>>
>>>> What specifically? There was no law requiring LEDs, it was just a ban
>>>> on incandescents.
>>>
>>> Actually, that's wrong.
>>> There was never any law banning incandescent bulbs:
>>>
>>> In December 2007, the federal government enacted the Energy
>>> Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA), which set maximum power
>>> consumption requirements for all general-service light bulbs producing
>>> 310–2600 lumens of light.
>>
>> Fine, achieve the required power consumption with an incandescent and
>> get back to me. A back-door ban is still a ban.
>>>
>>>> If the politicians had not banned incandescents we
>>>> would not now be filling up landfills with mercury--when LEDs came
>>>> along they would have started taking over the market as actually
>>>> providing better illumination than incandescents.
>>>
>>> Sorry, wrong.
>>>
>>> The government did a pretty good job of pushing lighting manufacturers
>>> to come up with more efficient lighting.
>>
>> With their ban. There was nothing that specifically encouraged LEDs.
>>
>>> The first thing to come up
>>> were CFLs. They reduced pollution, including mercury pollution by
>>> requiring less power to operate.
>>
>> Bullshit. Incandescents contain no mercury and mercury is not used to
>> generate electricity. It is used in CFL bulbs though.
>>
>>> I don't know how many wound up in landfills vs. being correctly
>>> recycled, but there is a very small amount of mercury in a CFL and
>>> I'd rather have the mercury in a landfill than in the air where it ends
>>> up when you burn coal to make power.
>>
>> OK, work out how much mercury is released to generate the power to run
>> an incandescent bulb vs the mercury released in tossing a CFL.
>>
>>> So, specifically, the same law that created CFLs also created LED
>>> lighting.
>>
>> That law did not "create" anything but a pain in the butt. CFL existed
>> before the law. So did LED.

>
> Well, you are just going to keep pointlessly arguing.
>
> In the USA, lots of coal is burned to create electricity.
> If the RWNJs had their way, a lot more coal would be burned.
> Burning coal puts lots of bad things in the atmosphere,
> including mercury.
>

I think more energy is wasted in transmission than is used productively.
Until we achieve room-temperature superconductivity we need to put the
source closer to the end-user. Small neighborhood nukes might be a good
solution.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 20:06:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sat, 4 Jan 2020 12:50:25 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
wrote:

> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>
>>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 12:04:27 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>> > On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 09:07:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> > wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> >>> wrote:
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv
>>>> >>>>> <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >>>>>

>>>> >>>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> >>>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> >>>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> >>>>> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> >>>>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> (home depot)
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>>>> >>>>> facilities in the US.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>>>> >>>>> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>>>> >>>>> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>>> >>>>> very happy that it is dying the death.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> Disagree on at least 2 counts.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
>>>> >>>>> and used less power.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> Which doesn't make them any less crap. As light sources they suck.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
>>>> >>>>> The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
>>>> >>>>> near with incandescents.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> Lucky you.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> 2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> What specifically? There was no law requiring LEDs, it was just a ban
>>>> >>>>> on incandescents.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> Actually, that's wrong.
>>>> >>>>> There was never any law banning incandescent bulbs:

>>>>
>>>> In December 2007, the federal government enacted the Energy
>>>> Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA), which set maximum power
>>>> consumption requirements for all general-service light bulbs producing
>>>> 310–2600 lumens of light.
>>>
>>> Fine, achieve the required power consumption with an incandescent and
>>> get back to me. A back-door ban is still a ban.
>>>>
>>>> > If the politicians had not banned incandescents we
>>>> > would not now be filling up landfills with mercury--when LEDs came
>>>> > along they would have started taking over the market as actually
>>>> > providing better illumination than incandescents.
>>>>
>>>> Sorry, wrong.
>>>>
>>>> The government did a pretty good job of pushing lighting manufacturers
>>>> to come up with more efficient lighting.
>>>
>>> With their ban. There was nothing that specifically encouraged LEDs.
>>>
>>>> The first thing to come up
>>>> were CFLs. They reduced pollution, including mercury pollution by
>>>> requiring less power to operate.
>>>
>>> Bullshit. Incandescents contain no mercury and mercury is not used to
>>> generate electricity. It is used in CF bulbs though.
>>>
>>>> I don't know how many wound up in landfills vs. being correctly
>>>> recycled, but there is a very small amount of mercury in a CFL and
>>>> I'd rather have the mercury in a landfill than in the air where it ends
>>>> up when you burn coal to make power.
>>>
>>> OK, work out how much mercury is released to generate the power to run
>>> an incandescent bulb vs the mercury released in tossing a CF.
>>>
>>>> So, specifically, the same law that created CFLs also created LED
>>>> lighting.
>>>
>>> That law did not "create" anything but a pain in the butt. CF existed
>>> before the law. So did LED.
>>
>> Well, you are just going to keep pointlessly arguing.
>>
>> In the USA, lots of coal is burned to create electricity.
>> If the RWNJs had their way, a lot more coal would be burned.
>> Burning coal puts lots of bad things in the atmosphere,
>> including mercury.

>>
>
> I think more energy is wasted in transmission than is used productively.
> Until we achieve room-temperature superconductivity we need to put the
> source closer to the end-user. Small neighborhood nukes might be a good
> solution.

Sounds like a disaster waiting to happen. Actual energy loss in transmission and distribution is about 6% in the US.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 20:08:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sat, 4 Jan 2020 12:46:22 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>
>>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 09:07:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>> > On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> > wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbaheiv
>>>> >>> <jmfbaheiv102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> >>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> >>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> >>>> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> >>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> >>> >>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>> >>>
>>>> >> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>> >>
>>>> >> (home depot)
>>>> >>

>>>> >> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>

>>>> >

>>>> > So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing

>>>> > facilities in the US.

>>>> >

>>>> >> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.

>>>> >> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Lighting has improved dramatically.

>>>> >

>>>> > I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the

>>>> > politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am

>>>> > very happy that it is dying the death.

>>>>

>>>> Disagree on at least 2 counts.

>>>>

>>>> 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced

>>>> and used less power.

>>>

>>> Which doesn't make them any less crap. As light sources they suck.

>>>

>>>> they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.

>>>> The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere

>>>> near with incandescents.

>>>

>>> Lucky you.

>>>

>>>> 2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.

>>>

>>> What specifically? There was no law requiring LEDs, it was just a ban

>>> on incandescents.

>>

>> Actually, that's wrong.

>> There was never any law banning incandescent bulbs:

>>

>> In December 2007, the federal government enacted the Energy

>> Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA), which set maximum power

>> consumption requirements for all general-service light bulbs producing

>> 310–2600 lumens of light.

>>

>>> If the politicians had not banned incandescents we

>>> would not now be filling up landfills with mercury--when LEDs came

>>> along they would have started taking over the market as actually

>>> providing better illumination than incandescents.

>>

>> Sorry, wrong.

>>
>> The government did a pretty good job of pushing lighting manufacturers
>> to come up with more efficient lighting. The first thing to come up
>> were CFLs. They reduced pollution, including mercury pollution by
>> requiring less power to operate.
>>
>> I don't know how many wound up in landfills vs. being correctly
>> recycled, but there is a very small amount of mercury in a CFL and
>> I'd rather have the mercury in a landfill than in the air where it ends
>> up when you burn coal to make power.
>
> What is the correct way to recycle them? I gave up trying to do the right
> thing and just binned them. Fortunately I have no CFLs in the new place.

In the town it is my misfortune to inhabit hazardous waste may be
turned in at a location whose address is not disclosed on two
Saturdays a year from 8 AM to noon.

>
>>
>> So, specifically, the same law that created CFLs also created LED
>> lighting.
>>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 20:09:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sat, 4 Jan 2020 12:46:21 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
wrote:

> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:
>>
>>> On 2020-01-04, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> [snip]
>>>
>>>> Yes, closing factories attacks us all. Average income is rising, but I
>>>> doubt that anybody reading this is seeing it much, the 1% is getting
>>>> most of it.
>>>
>>> Ah, yes, the sure indicator of innumeracy; when people mention an
>>> arbitrary percentage and blame them for everything. I'm greatly
>>> amused by the way this number has got smaller and smaller over the
>>> years as people realise that *they* are in the evil 'x'%. I'd

>>> be prepared to wager a small amount that everyone on the this 'froup
>>> is in "the 10%", most of them in "the 5%" and a significant proportion
>>> in "the 1%". Most of the world is poor, and most Westerners are well
>>> off by comparison.
>>
>> Just read an interesting statistic:
>>
>> As of 2010, 388 individuals possessed as much household wealth as the
>> lower half of the world's population combined. Today, Oxfam estimates
>> that number as 26.
>>
>
> So 362 families got poorer

Or 26 got richer faster. It's not a zero-sum game.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 21:43:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: googlegroups jmfbahciv

On Friday, January 3, 2020 at 11:56:50 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

> On 1/3/2020 11:57 AM, googlegroups jmfbahciv wrote:
>
> I'm not going to address the other silliness, but...
>
>>
>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>
> Of course the US knows how to manufacture light bulbs. Incandescent,
> vapor discharge, fluorescent, and LED. Incandescents are mostly
> obsolete these days (inefficient and short lifetime), though. The
> issue is, we mostly don't make them, because it's cheaper to make them
> somewhere else.

If you check, there are no more incandescent manufacturers in the US.
They shut down the plant and had a fire sale. My source was a news
report on "market watch".

I cannot use LEDs. They emit so much UV that my eyes hurt and
I get headaches; the pain is similar to looking directly at the
sun. There are no stores in this area which sells incandescent

bulbs.

- >
- > On a larger scale, losing manufacturing knowledge has happened because
- > of vulture capitalists, who buy companies to liquidate them for
- > personal profit (e.g. Sears), consolidation (how many aircraft
- > companies do we have these days? mostly Boeing, who's shot themselves
- > in the feet by having the bean counters design the aircraft, do you
- > remember when there were 5 or 6 major companies?), and the US MBA
- > glut, where management thinks that an MBA qualifies you to manage
- > anything, but mostly they're only concerned about the quarterly
- > numbers and their personal bonus. (Want to predict where a US company
- > will move its headquarters to? It's usually where the new CEO lives.)
- > There's short-term personal profit to shipping your manufacturing jobs
- > to China (though now places like Bangladesh and Vietnam are becoming
- > attractive, given their lower wages and Trump's trade war).

There are other reasons that manufacturing has closed down. Unions have been helping a lot.

- >
- > Yes, closing factories attacks us all. Average income is rising, but I
- > doubt that anybody reading this is seeing it much, the 1% is getting
- > most of it.

Factory workers made a lot more than I did. Manufacturing employees were the middle class. We were talking about the disappearance of the middle class about 2 or 3 years ago.

/BAH

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding -> CFLs
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 23:17:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:

- > What is the correct way to recycle them? I gave up trying to do the right
- > thing and just binned them. Fortunately I have no CFLs in the new place.

All Home Depot stores in New Jersey have an orange CFL collection box at the front of the store where you can drop off used CFLs. Simply place the bulb in one of the plastic bags provided and seal the bag before dropping it into the orange box provided. This service is completely free.

So, there, you have to come to New Jersey.

Just kidding, I'm sure Google will yield a lot of nearby places for you.
It did for me.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 23:37:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 14:20:00 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
> wrote:
>
>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>
>>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 12:04:27 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>> > On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 09:07:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> > wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >>J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> >>> wrote:
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>>>J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfahciv
>>>> >>>>> <jmfah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>>>Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> >>>>>>The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> >>>>>>should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> >>>>>>a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> >>>>>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>>>Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>> >>>>>

>>>> >>>>(home depot)
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>><http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>>>> >>> facilities in the US.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>>>> >>>>The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>>>> >>> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>>> >>> very happy that it is dying the death.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>Disagree on at least 2 counts.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
>>>> >>>>and used less power.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>> Which doesn't make them any less crap. As light sources they suck.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
>>>> >>>>The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
>>>> >>>>near with incandescents.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>> Lucky you.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>> What specifically? There was no law requiring LEDs, it was just a ban
>>>> >>>> on incandescents.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>> Actually, that's wrong.
>>>> >>>> There was never any law banning incandescent bulbs:
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>> In December 2007, the federal government enacted the Energy
>>>> >>>> Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA), which set maximum power
>>>> >>>> consumption requirements for all general-service light bulbs producing
>>>> >>>> 310–2600 lumens of light.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>> Fine, achieve the required power consumption with an incandescent and
>>>> >>>> get back to me. A back-door ban is still a ban.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>> >>>> If the politicians had not banned incandescents we

>>>> > would not now be filling up landfills with mercury--when LEDs came
>>>> > along they would have started taking over the market as actually
>>>> > providing better illumination than incandescents.
>>>>
>>>> Sorry, wrong.
>>>>
>>>> The government did a pretty good job of pushing lighting manufacturers
>>>> to come up with more efficient lighting.
>>>
>>> With their ban. There was nothing that specifically encouraged LEDs.
>>>
>>>> The first thing to come up
>>>> were CFLs. They reduced pollution, including mercury pollution by
>>>> requiring less power to operate.
>>>
>>> Bullshit. Incandescents contain no mercury and mercury is not used to
>>> generate electricity. It is used in CF bulbs though.
>>>
>>>> I don't know how many wound up in landfills vs. being correctly
>>>> recycled, but there is a very small amount of mercury in a CFL and
>>>> I'd rather have the mercury in a landfill than in the air where it ends
>>>> up when you burn coal to make power.
>>>
>>> OK, work out how much mercury is released to generate the power to run
>>> an incandescent bulb vs the mercury released in tossing a CF.
>>>
>>>> So, specifically, the same law that created CFLs also created LED
>>>> lighting.
>>>
>>> That law did not "create" anything but a pain in the butt. CF existed
>>> before the law. So did LED.
>>
>> Well, you are just going to keep pointlessly arguing.
>>
>> In the USA, lots of coal is burned to create electricity.
>> If the RWNJs had their way, a lot more coal would be burned.
>> Burning coal puts lots of bad things in the atmosphere,
>> including mercury.
>
> So how much coal is used, on average, to run one light bulb over the
> lifetime of that light bulb? How much mercury is in a CF bulb?

A quick back-of-the-envelope calculation, assuming 8 billion CFLS (4mg Hg) have been disposed of improperly (I suspect it's much smaller), CFLs would have introduced 32 metric tons of Hg to the environment (albeit in a sanitary landfill, not spewing into the air) over the entire period of CFL usage.

Each year coal fired plants emit 50 english tons of Hg into the atmosphere

in the USA alone.

<https://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/fs095-01/fs095-01.html>

<https://www.epa.gov/mercury/basic-information-about-mercury>

Dan is correct.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 23:41:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:

> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>>

>>> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>

>>> wrote:

>>>

>>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>>>>

>>>> > On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbaheiv

>>>> > <jmfbaheiv102162@gmail.com> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.

>>>> >> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge

>>>> >> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge

>>>> >> a national security risk at the highest level.

>>>> >

>>>> > Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10

>>>> > years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.

>>>>

>>>> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:

>>>>

>>>> (home depot)

>>>>

>>>> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>

>>>>

>>> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing

>>> facilities in the US.

>>>

>>>> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.

>>>> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.

>>>>

>>>> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.

>>>>

>>>> Lighting has improved dramatically.

>>>>

>>> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>>> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>> very happy that it is dying the death.
>>
>> Disagree on at least 2 counts.
>>
>> 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
>> and used less power. While they had some minor drawbacks
>> they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
>> The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
>> near with incandescents.
>
> The never lasted me as long as claimed, and I could buy two or three
> incandescents for the price of a CFL.
>

FOr the most part, that's caused by people who don't RTFM. CFL's weren't suitable for certain usages (unventilated enclosures, for example) or mounting orientations (base up, in some cases); Improperly mounted or enclosed, the ballast electronics would overheat and fail prematurely.

I've several CFLs that have lasted a decade in intermittent and regular use; I've had others fail prematurely, usually due to use not recommended by the manufacturer.

It's a moot point, however, since modern LED's are far superior in every single way to both incandescent and CFL technologies.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 23:48:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

> So how much coal is used, on average, to run one light bulb over the
> lifetime of that light bulb? How much mercury is in a CF bulb?
>
> Saying "lots of coal is used" is evading the question.

Yeah, you caught me, I was too lazy to get the numbers, I was just going by my memory. I read or heard it somewhere but can't remember where. Well, lets see if I can figure this out.

This site is a good start:

<https://www.epa.gov/cfl/what-are-connections-between-mercury-and-cfls>

In the U.S., burning coal at power plants results in a little more than 40% of all mercury emissions from man-made sources

On average, CFLs contain about four milligrams of mercury sealed within the glass tubing. By comparison, older thermometers contain about 500 milligrams of mercury

Then Popular Mechanics;

<https://www.popularmechanics.com/home/reviews/a1733/4217864/>

In 2006, coal-fired power plants produced 1,971 billion kilowatt hours (kwh) of electricity, emitting 50.7 tons of mercury into the air—the equivalent amount of mercury contained in more than 9 billion CFLs (the bulbs emit zero mercury when in use or being handled).

Approximately 0.0234 mg of mercury—plus carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide—releases into the air per 1 kwh of electricity that a coal-fired power plant generates. Over the 7500-hour average range of one CFL, then, a plant will emit 13.16 mg of mercury to sustain a 75-watt incandescent bulb but only 3.51 mg of mercury to sustain a 20-watt CFL (the lightning equivalent of a 75-watt traditional bulb). Even if the mercury contained in a CFL was directly released into the atmosphere, an incandescent would still contribute 4.65 more milligrams of mercury into the environment over its lifetime.

Looks pretty clear, CFLs reduce mercury released compared to incandescents.

- > Coal is on the way out, natural gas is on the way in, the largest
- > single source of electric power in the US is natural gas.

I know coal is being replaced by natural gas. At the same time our CFLs are being replaced by LEDs. People should recycle, it's not that hard.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Sat, 04 Jan 2020 23:55:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

googlegroups jmfbahciv <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> writes:
> On Friday, January 3, 2020 at 11:56:50 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>> On 1/3/2020 11:57 AM, googlegroups jmfbahciv wrote:
>>
>> I'm not going to address the other silliness, but...

>>
>>>
>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>
>> Of course the US knows how to manufacture light bulbs. Incandescent,
>> vapor discharge, fluorescent, and LED. Incandescents are mostly
>> obsolete these days (inefficient and short lifetime), though. The
>> issue is, we mostly don't make them, because it's cheaper to make them
>> somewhere else.
>
> If you check, there are no more incandescent manufacturers in the US.
> They shut down the plant and had a fire sale. My source was a news
> report on "market watch".

Most of them moved offshore even before CFLs, simply for cost reasons. There are still specialty manufacturers that make incandescent bulbs (e.g. for theatrical use and other industrial uses) in the country.

>
>
> I cannot use LEDs. They emit so much UV that my eyes hurt and
> I get headaches; the pain is similar to looking directly at the
> sun. There are no stores in this area which sells incandescent
> bulbs.
>

You must be confusing LEDs with CFLs. CFL's emit UV. LED's don't.

"Although most types of LED lighting do not emit any UV light, brilliant blues do emit a small amount. However, the phosphor reduces this to such a small fraction of the already small amount, the amount emitted is essentially negligible. There is no need for a filter and this is why they are used in many environments where photosensitivity is a concern."

One is generally advised to "not look directly at the sun".

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 00:11:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sat, 4 Jan 2020 13:43:43 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Friday, January 3, 2020 at 11:56:50 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

>> On 1/3/2020 11:57 AM, googlegroups jmfbahciv wrote:

>>

>> I'm not going to address the other silliness, but...

>>

>>>

>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.

>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge

>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge

>>> a national security risk at the highest level.

>>>

>> Of course the US knows how to manufacture light bulbs. Incandescent,

>> vapor discharge, fluorescent, and LED. Incandescents are mostly

>> obsolete these days (inefficient and short lifetime), though. The

>> issue is, we mostly don't make them, because it's cheaper to make them

>> somewhere else.

>

> If you check, there are no more incandescent manufacturers in the US.

> They shut down the plant and had a fire sale. My source was a news

> report on "market watch".

>

>

> I cannot use LEDs. They emit so much UV that my eyes hurt and

> I get headaches; the pain is similar to looking directly at the

> sun. There are no stores in this area which sells incandescent

> bulbs.

What leads you to believe that LEDs emit UV? Most show pretty near zero emission above 400 nm.

>> On a larger scale, losing manufacturing knowledge has happened because

>> of vulture capitalists, who buy companies to liquidate them for

>> personal profit (e.g. Sears), consolidation (how many aircraft

>> companies do we have these days? mostly Boeing, who's shot themselves

>> in the feet by having the bean counters design the aircraft, do you

>> remember when there were 5 or 6 major companies?), and the US MBA

>> glut, where management thinks that an MBA qualifies you to manage

>> anything, but mostly they're only concerned about the quarterly

>> numbers and their personal bonus. (Want to predict where a US company

>> will move its headquarters to? It's usually where the new CEO lives.)

>> There's short-term personal profit to shipping your manufacturing jobs

>> to China (though now places like Bangladesh and Vietnam are becoming

>> attractive, given their lower wages and Trump's trade war).

>

> There are other reasons that manufacturing has closed down. Unions

> have been helping a lot.
>
>>
>> Yes, closing factories attacks us all. Average income is rising, but I
>> doubt that anybody reading this is seeing it much, the 1% is getting
>> most of it.
>
> Factory workers made a lot more than I did. Manufacturing employees
> were the middle class. We were talking about the disappearance
> of the middle class about 2 or 3 years ago.
>
>
> /BAH
>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 00:23:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 18:48:31 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>
>> So how much coal is used, on average, to run one light bulb over the
>> lifetime of that light bulb? How much mercury is in a CF bulb?
>>
>> Saying "lots of coal is used" is evading the question.
>
> Yeah, you caught me, I was too lazy to get the numbers, I was just going
> by my memory. I read or heard it somewhere but can't remember where.
> Well, lets see if I can figure this out.
>
> This site is a good start:
>
> <https://www.epa.gov/cfl/what-are-connections-between-mercury-and-cfls>
>
> In the U.S., burning coal at power plants results in a little more
> than 40% of all mercury emissions from man-made sources
>
> On average, CFLs contain about four milligrams of mercury sealed
> within the glass tubing. By comparison, older thermometers contain
> about 500 milligrams of mercury
>
> Then Popular Mechanics;

>
> <https://www.popularmechanics.com/home/reviews/a1733/4217864/>
>
> In 2006, coal-fired power plants produced 1,971 billion kilowatt hours
> (kwh) of electricity, emitting 50.7 tons of mercury into the air—the
> equivalent amount of mercury contained in more than 9 billion CFLs
> (the bulbs emit zero mercury when in use or being handled).
>
> Approximately 0.0234 mg of mercury—plus carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide
> and nitrogen oxide—releases into the air per 1 kwh of electricity that
> a coal-fired power plant generates. Over the 7500-hour average range
> of one CFL, then, a plant will emit 13.16 mg of mercury to sustain a
> 75-watt incandescent bulb but only 3.51 mg of mercury to sustain a
> 20-watt CFL (the lightning equivalent of a 75-watt traditional
> bulb). Even if the mercury contained in a CFL was directly released
> into the atmosphere, an incandescent would still contribute 4.65 more
> milligrams of mercury into the environment over its lifetime.
>
> Looks pretty clear, CFLs reduce mercury released compared to
> incandescents.
>
>> Coal is on the way out, natural gas is on the way in, the largest
>> single source of electric power in the US is natural gas.
>
> I know coal is being replaced by natural gas. At the same time our CFLs
> are being replaced by LEDs. People should recycle, it's not that hard.

So where do you personally take CFLs to recycle them?

Here's what I have to put up with
<<https://enfield-ct.gov/397/Hazardous-Waste>>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anne & Lynn Wheel](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 02:20:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

googlegroups jmfbaahciv <jmfbaah102162@gmail.com> writes:
> Factory workers made a lot more than I did. Manufacturing employees
> were the middle class. We were talking about the disappearance
> of the middle class about 2 or 3 years ago.

starting nearly decade ago, references to destruction of the middle
class fr

Destruction of Middle Class

<http://www.nytimes.com/imagepages/2011/09/04/opinion/04reich-graphic.html?ref=sunday>
<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/04/opinion/sunday/jobs-will-f>

ollow-a-strengthening-of-the-middle-class.html

The Real Reason Wages Have Stagnated: Our Economy Is Optimized For Financialization

<http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2017-09-08/real-reason-wages-have-stagnated-our-economy-optimized-financialization>

How GE, GM, Coca-Cola And Kodak Put Shareholders Ahead Of Employees

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/stevedenning/2017/06/29/how-ge-gm-coca-cola-kodak-put-shareholders-ahead-of-employees/>

.... from here, productivity/pay gap (updated July2019)

<http://www.epi.org/productivity-pay-gap/>

in the 80s, corporations with large number of workers were being reorganized into parent company, subsidiary company with most of the workers, and a different subsidiary where most of the profit was booked (part of union negotiating tactic). auto shifted to making its money from loans, airlines shifted profit into computerized ticketing (with operations near break even). In the early 90s, there was period where airline operations were operating at a loss (spike in fuel costs), but parent company was showing significant profit ... profit from selling tickets more than offset the loss from airline operations. Airline even declared bankruptcy on operations and offloaded all its pensions on PBGC (and benefits take 2/3rd cut)
<https://www.pbgc.gov/>

After turn of century, they discovered that they could move the corporation where all the profit is booked, to offshore tax haven.

<https://www.icij.org/investigations/luxembourg-leaks/>

poster child is US maker of heavy equipment that sold and delivered in the US. They then created a distributorship in offshore tax haven the equipment is transferred to the distributorship books at cost then sells to US customers and all the profit is booked offshore, but the equipment (and money) never actually leaves the US.

recnt reference after turn of century, large corporations bringing large number of illegal works ... that helps drive down wages

<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2019e.html#47> king sized ash tray "the good life" 1967 job ad

some past posts mentioning PBGC

<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2008.html#65> As Expected, Ford Falls From 2nd Place in U.S. Sales

<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2010b.html#24> Happy DEC-10 Day

<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2010d.html#46> search engine history, was Happy DEC-10 Day

<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2014m.html#8> weird apple trivia

<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2016b.html#83> Qbasic - lies about Medicare

<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2016b.html#98> Qbasic - lies about Medicare

<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2016e.html#98> E.R. Burroughs

<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2017f.html#4> [CM] What was your first home computer?

--

virtualization experience starting Jan1968, online at home since Mar1970

--

virtualization experience starting Jan1968, online at home since Mar1970

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Roger Blake](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 04:19:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-04, Scott Lurndal <scott@slp53.sl.home> wrote:

> It's a moot point, however, since modern LED's are far superior in every
> single way to both incandescent and CFL technologies.

I don't care for LEDs or CFLs and still use incandescent bulbs inside and outside the house. (I also don't care about "saving energy" - there is no shortage and no crisis.) Even if incandescents were to be pulled from the market I have plenty of them socked away for future use.

--

Roger Blake (Posts from Google Groups killfiled due to excess spam.)

The US Census vs. privacy -- <http://censusfacts.info>

Don't talk to cops! -- <http://www.DontTalkToCops.com>

Badges don't grant extra rights -- <http://www.CopBlock.org>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 04:21:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 18:48:31 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
> wrote:

>

>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>>

>>> So how much coal is used, on average, to run one light bulb over the
>>> lifetime of that light bulb? How much mercury is in a CF bulb?

>>>

>>> Saying "lots of coal is used" is evading the question.

>>

>> Yeah, you caught me, I was too lazy to get the numbers, I was just going
>> by my memory. I read or heard it somewhere but can't remember where.

>> Well, lets see if I can figure this out.
>>
>> This site is a good start:
>>
>> <https://www.epa.gov/cfl/what-are-connections-between-mercury-and-cfls>
>>
>> In the U.S., burning coal at power plants results in a little more
>> than 40% of all mercury emissions from man-made sources
>>
>> On average, CFLs contain about four milligrams of mercury sealed
>> within the glass tubing. By comparison, older thermometers contain
>> about 500 milligrams of mercury
>>
>> Then Popular Mechanics;
>>
>> <https://www.popularmechanics.com/home/reviews/a1733/4217864/>
>>
>> In 2006, coal-fired power plants produced 1,971 billion kilowatt hours
>> (kwh) of electricity, emitting 50.7 tons of mercury into the air—the
>> equivalent amount of mercury contained in more than 9 billion CFLs
>> (the bulbs emit zero mercury when in use or being handled).
>>
>> Approximately 0.0234 mg of mercury—plus carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide
>> and nitrogen oxide—releases into the air per 1 kwh of electricity that
>> a coal-fired power plant generates. Over the 7500-hour average range
>> of one CFL, then, a plant will emit 13.16 mg of mercury to sustain a
>> 75-watt incandescent bulb but only 3.51 mg of mercury to sustain a
>> 20-watt CFL (the lightning equivalent of a 75-watt traditional
>> bulb). Even if the mercury contained in a CFL was directly released
>> into the atmosphere, an incandescent would still contribute 4.65 more
>> milligrams of mercury into the environment over its lifetime.
>>
>> Looks pretty clear, CFLs reduce mercury released compared to
>> incandescents.
>>
>>> Coal is on the way out, natural gas is on the way in, the largest
>>> single source of electric power in the US is natural gas.
>>
>> I know coal is being replaced by natural gas. At the same time our CFLs
>> are being replaced by LEDs. People should recycle, it's not that hard.
>
> So where do you personally take CFLs to recycle them?

Home Depot.

> Here's what I have to put up with
> <<https://enfield-ct.gov/397/Hazardous-Waste>>

Pretty sure my town accepts this stuff. Not sure what the rules are.

I just found a site that claims that all US Home Depot stores accept CFLs.

Just leave them by your door and take them with you the next time you need something at HD. They take batteries too.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 07:48:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sun, 5 Jan 2020 01:18:06 -0600
Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:

- > LEDs are better and
- > cheaper now but weren't available at the beginning, and nobody knew
- > how long it would be until they were economically effective.

Or even if they ever would be, the ever promising OLEDs aren't but might have been if silicon LEDs hadn't become so good so fast.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 07:50:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 12:49:02 -0500
J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

- > The question is not "is there a disparity", it is "are the poorest
- > poor worse off than they were previously".

Agreed that is the important question, and as far as I can make out the poorest of the poor have been getting steadily better off for a long time.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 08:16:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sun, 5 Jan 2020 01:36:38 -0600
Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:

> Are you sure it's UV that's your problem? Could it be flicker? I don't
> know, but it's possible LEDs flicker more (they don't have the thermal

LEDs run on DC usually from some variant of a switch-mode regulator
(constant current is best) so they shouldn't flicker. OTOH cheap
fittings ...

> buffering vs. incandescents) but there are probably (maybe more
> expensive) LEDs that flicker less.

The most effective LED lighting IME is also the cheapest - LED
strips with high efficiency 5630 or 2835 chips run from a good 12 volt
supply. No fittings just careful wiring and self-adhesive strips. It helps
that I wired this house without fittings in the first place. They'll have
to be replaced as part of redecorating - but they're way cheaper than the
paint!

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 13:05:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
> On Sat, 4 Jan 2020 12:46:22 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
>> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>
>>>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 09:07:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >
>>>> >> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> >> wrote:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbaheiv
>>>> >>>> <jmfbaheiv102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> >>>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> >>>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> >>>>> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> >>>>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> (home depot)
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>>>> >>
>>>> >> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>>>> >> facilities in the US.
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>>>> >>> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>>>> >> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>>> >> very happy that it is dying the death.
>>>> >
>>>> > Disagree on at least 2 counts.
>>>> >
>>>> > 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
>>>> > and used less power.
>>>>

>>>> Which doesn't make them any less crap. As light sources they suck.
>>>>
>>>> > they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
>>>> > The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
>>>> > near with incandescents.
>>>>
>>>> Lucky you.
>>>>
>>>> > 2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.
>>>>
>>>> What specifically? There was no law requiring LEDs, it was just a ban
>>>> on incandescents.
>>>
>>> Actually, that's wrong.
>>> There was never any law banning incandescent bulbs:
>>>
>>> In December 2007, the federal government enacted the Energy
>>> Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA), which set maximum power
>>> consumption requirements for all general-service light bulbs producing
>>> 310–2600 lumens of light.
>>>
>>>> If the politicians had not banned incandescents we
>>>> would not now be filling up landfills with mercury--when LEDs came
>>>> along they would have started taking over the market as actually
>>>> providing better illumination than incandescents.
>>>
>>> Sorry, wrong.
>>>
>>> The government did a pretty good job of pushing lighting manufacturers
>>> to come up with more efficient lighting. The first thing to come up
>>> were CFLs. They reduced pollution, including mercury pollution by
>>> requiring less power to operate.
>>>
>>> I don't know how many wound up in landfills vs. being correctly
>>> recycled, but there is a very small amount of mercury in a CFL and
>>> I'd rather have the mercury in a landfill than in the air where it ends
>>> up when you burn coal to make power.
>>
>> What is the correct way to recycle them? I gave up trying to do the right
>> thing and just binned them. Fortunately I have no CFLs in the new place.
>
> In the town it is my misfortune to inhabit hazardous waste may be
> turned in at a location whose address is not disclosed on two
> Saturdays a year from 8 AM to noon.

That's about it. One time I took some stuff to the landfill, trying to do
the right thing, only to be told "we don't take that" for several things.
They went into the dumpster after we left. Since we no longer can send our

trash to China, the city of Phoenix has gotten very picky about how they handle recycling. Because of "contamination" our condo complex no longer accepts plastic or steel cans - only paper and aluminum cans - so as a result the amount of stuff we're tossing in the trash has increased greatly.

People are willing to do some work for recycling, but they shouldn't have to jump thru hoops.

>>
>>>
>>> So, specifically, the same law that created CFLs also created LED
>>> lighting.
>>>
>

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 13:05:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

googlegroups jmfbaheiv <jmfbahe102162@gmail.com> wrote:
> On Friday, January 3, 2020 at 11:56:50 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>> On 1/3/2020 11:57 AM, googlegroups jmfbaheiv wrote:
>>
>> I'm not going to address the other silliness, but...
>>
>>>
>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>
>> Of course the US knows how to manufacture light bulbs. Incandescent,
>> vapor discharge, fluorescent, and LED. Incandescents are mostly
>> obsolete these days (inefficient and short lifetime), though. The
>> issue is, we mostly don't make them, because it's cheaper to make them
>> somewhere else.
>
> If you check, there are no more incandescent manufacturers in the US.
> They shut down the plant and had a fire sale. My source was a news
> report on "market watch".

I could still buy them if I wanted them - Home Depot stocks them. I buy LEDs now for most things, but there are some specialized applications where you need incandescents, for example oven lights or candelabra bulbs.

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding -> CFLs

Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 13:05:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:

>

>> What is the correct way to recycle them? I gave up trying to do the right
>> thing and just binned them. Fortunately I have no CFLs in the new place.

>

> All Home Depot stores in New Jersey have an orange CFL collection box at
> the front of the store where you can drop off used CFLs. Simply place
> the bulb in one of the plastic bags provided and seal the bag before
> dropping it into the orange box provided. This service is completely
> free.

>

> So, there, you have to come to New Jersey.

>

> Just kidding, I'm sure Google will yield a lot of nearby places for you.

> It did for me.

>

Thanks, I'd do that, but I no longer have any CFLs.

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 13:05:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>

>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 18:48:31 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>> wrote:

>>

>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>>>
>>>> So how much coal is used, on average, to run one light bulb over the
>>>> lifetime of that light bulb? How much mercury is in a CF bulb?
>>>>
>>>> Saying "lots of coal is used" is evading the question.
>>>
>>> Yeah, you caught me, I was too lazy to get the numbers, I was just going
>>> by my memory. I read or heard it somewhere but can't remember where.
>>> Well, lets see if I can figure this out.
>>>
>>> This site is a good start:
>>>
>>> <https://www.epa.gov/cfl/what-are-connections-between-mercury-and-cfls>
>>>
>>> In the U.S., burning coal at power plants results in a little more
>>> than 40% of all mercury emissions from man-made sources
>>>
>>> On average, CFLs contain about four milligrams of mercury sealed
>>> within the glass tubing. By comparison, older thermometers contain
>>> about 500 milligrams of mercury
>>>
>>> Then Popular Mechanics;
>>>
>>> <https://www.popularmechanics.com/home/reviews/a1733/4217864/>
>>>
>>> In 2006, coal-fired power plants produced 1,971 billion kilowatt hours
>>> (kwh) of electricity, emitting 50.7 tons of mercury into the air—the
>>> equivalent amount of mercury contained in more than 9 billion CFLs
>>> (the bulbs emit zero mercury when in use or being handled).
>>>
>>> Approximately 0.0234 mg of mercury—plus carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide
>>> and nitrogen oxide—releases into the air per 1 kwh of electricity that
>>> a coal-fired power plant generates. Over the 7500-hour average range
>>> of one CFL, then, a plant will emit 13.16 mg of mercury to sustain a
>>> 75-watt incandescent bulb but only 3.51 mg of mercury to sustain a
>>> 20-watt CFL (the lightning equivalent of a 75-watt traditional
>>> bulb). Even if the mercury contained in a CFL was directly released
>>> into the atmosphere, an incandescent would still contribute 4.65 more
>>> milligrams of mercury into the environment over its lifetime.
>>>
>>> Looks pretty clear, CFLs reduce mercury released compared to
>>> incandescents.
>>>
>>>> Coal is on the way out, natural gas is on the way in, the largest
>>>> single source of electric power in the US is natural gas.
>>>
>>> I know coal is being replaced by natural gas. At the same time our CFLs
>>> are being replaced by LEDs. People should recycle, it's not that hard.

>>
>> So where do you personally take CFLs to recycle them?
>
> Home Depot.
>
>> Here's what I have to put up with
>> <<https://enfield-ct.gov/397/Hazardous-Waste>>
>
> Pretty sure my town accepts this stuff. Not sure what the rules are.
>
> I just found a site that claims that all US Home Depot stores accept
> CFLs.
>
> Just leave them by your door and take them with you the next time you
> need something at HD. They take batteries too.
>

Good to know. I used to take batteries to Radio Shack, but I don't think there are too many around any more. Best Buy has a bin for batteries by the front door. I think the last one I dropped off was a big lead-acid battery from my UPS.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 13:05:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 12:49:02 -0500
> J. Clarke <jjclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>> The question is not "is there a disparity", it is "are the poorest
>> poor worse off than they were previously".
>
> Agreed that is the important question, and as far as I can make out
> the poorest of the poor have been getting steadily better off for a long
> time.
>

The poorest poor today live better than most royalty in the middle ages.

--
Pete

Subject: Light 'Bulbs'

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 13:12:59 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Kerr-Mudd,John

On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 13:05:02 GMT, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

>
> I could still buy them if I wanted them - Home Depot stocks them. I
> buy LEDs now for most things, but there are some specialized
> applications where you need incandescents, for example oven lights

-----^

Grandfather rights?

> or candelabra bulbs.

>

Not IME; candle-shaped LEDs are available.

I can't see why an oven light would need to be incandescent.

--

Bah, and indeed, Humbug.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 13:56:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 5 Jan 2020 10:20:19 GMT

Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:

> Depends if you like dim green light and mercury, I guess.

The ones I used before LEDs had decent light with a selection of colour temperatures and the 30W ones kicked out a lot of light, mostly I used the 22W ones which were decent enough. I did have to hunt around for decent ones though, there was an awful lot of crud on the market and the suggested ones were ridiculously under-powered in order to push the energy savings which were real but not as good as advertised.

LEDs are a vast improvement, I look forward to the next iteration.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith

C:\>WIN

| Directable Mirror Arrays
| A better way to focus the sun

The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Light 'Bulbs'
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 14:02:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sun, 5 Jan 2020 13:12:59 -0000 (UTC)
"Kerr-Mudd,John" <notsaying@invalid.org> wrote:

> I can't see why an oven light would need to be incandescent.

It has to operate in an unreasonably harsh environment for something based on semiconductors held together with solder on a GRP board and trying to dissipate some heat.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Light 'Bulbs'
Posted by [Andy Burns](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 14:11:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kerr-Mudd,John wrote:

> I can't see why an oven light would need to be incandescent.

SMD components de-soldering themselves when you crank the oven up?

Subject: Re: Light 'Bulbs'
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 14:40:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Kerr-Mudd,John

On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 14:02:12 GMT, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

> On Sun, 5 Jan 2020 13:12:59 -0000 (UTC)
> "Kerr-Mudd,John" <notsaying@invalid.org> wrote:
>

>> I can't see why an oven light would need to be incandescent.
>
> It has to operate in an unreasonably harsh environment for
> something based on semiconductors held together with solder on a GRP
> board and trying to dissipate some heat.
>

OK; thanks.

--

Bah, and indeed, Humbug.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 15:21:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

> On 2020-01-05, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:
>> On 1/3/2020 10:01 PM, J. Clarke wrote:
>>> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>> > On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbaheiv
>>>> > <jmfbaheiv102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> >> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> >> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> >> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >
>>>> > Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> > years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>>
>>>> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>>
>>>> (home depot)
>>>>
>>>> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>>>>
>>> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>>> facilities in the US.
>>>
>>>> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.

>>>> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>>
>>>> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>>
>>>> Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>
>>> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>>> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>> very happy that it is dying the death.
>>>
>> I don't see why people are so down on CFLs
>
> Depends if you like dim green light and mercury, I guess.

We've already established that they _reduced_ mercury emissions.

Green light? Not in my experience.

Of course, if you are one of those RWNJs that has laid in a 100
year supply of incandescent lights, you have no choice but to
try to justify your paranoia.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 15:25:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> writes:

> On 1/4/2020 3:43 PM, googlegroups jmfbaheiv wrote:
>> I cannot use LEDs. They emit so much UV that my eyes hurt and
>> I get headaches; the pain is similar to looking directly at the
>> sun. There are no stores in this area which sells incandescent
>> bulbs.
>
> Are you sure it's UV that's your problem? Could it be flicker? I don't
> know, but it's possible LEDs flicker more (they don't have the thermal
> buffering vs. incandescents) but there are probably (maybe more
> expensive) LEDs that flicker less.

Geez, can't any of you recognize RWNJ paranoia for what it is?

--
Dan Espen

Subject: whooshed, was: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [danny burstein](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 15:30:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In <qusv62\$1hl\$2@dont-email.me> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> writes:

> Geez, can't any of you recognize RWNJ paranoia for what it is?

umm, Right Wingnuts of New Jersey?

--

Knowledge may be power, but communications is the key
dannyb@panix.com
[to foil spammers, my address has been double rot-13 encoded]

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 15:36:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On Sun, 5 Jan 2020 06:05:02 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> googlegroups jmfbahciv <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:

>> On Friday, January 3, 2020 at 11:56:50 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

>>> On 1/3/2020 11:57 AM, googlegroups jmfbahciv wrote:

>>>

>>> I'm not going to address the other silliness, but...

>>>

>>>>

>>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.

>>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge

>>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge

>>>> a national security risk at the highest level.

>>>>

>>> Of course the US knows how to manufacture light bulbs. Incandescent,

>>> vapor discharge, fluorescent, and LED. Incandescent are mostly

>>> obsolete these days (inefficient and short lifetime), though. The

>>> issue is, we mostly don't make them, because it's cheaper to make them

>>> somewhere else.

>>

>> If you check, there are no more incandescent manufacturers in the US.

>> They shut down the plant and had a fire sale. My source was a news

>> report on "market watch".

>

> I could still buy them if I wanted them - Home Depot stocks them. I buy
> LEDs now for most things, but there are some specialized applications where
> you need incandescents, for example oven lights or candelabra bulbs.

So does Wal-Mart and Lowes. A company in Mexico makes them. So
incandescents are still available.

--

Jim

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 15:39:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On Sun, 5 Jan 2020 06:05:05 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
wrote:

> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 12:49:02 -0500

>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>> The question is not "is there a disparity", it is "are the poorest

>>> poor worse off than they were previously".

>>

>> Agreed that is the important question, and as far as I can make out

>> the poorest of the poor have been getting steadily better off for a long

>> time.

>>

>

> The poorest poor today live better than most royalty in the middle ages.

Hmm. Well, I doubt it. No servants, but the poor do have problems
making ends meet. The 'payday loan' places adore the poor and take
advantage of them.

--

Jim

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 15:52:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 5 Jan 2020 06:05:00 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>> On Sat, 4 Jan 2020 12:46:22 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>> > On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 09:07:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> > wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> >>> wrote:
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbaheiv
>>>> >>>>> <jmfbaheiv102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> >>>>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> >>>>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> >>>>>> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> >>>>>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> (home depot)
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>>>> >>>>>> facilities in the US.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>>>> >>>>>> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the

>>>> >>> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>>> >>> very happy that it is dying the death.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> Disagree on at least 2 counts.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
>>>> >> and used less power.
>>>> >
>>>> > Which doesn't make them any less crap. As light sources they suck.
>>>> >
>>>> >> they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
>>>> >> The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
>>>> >> near with incandescents.
>>>> >
>>>> > Lucky you.
>>>> >
>>>> >> 2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.
>>>> >
>>>> > What specifically? There was no law requiring LEDs, it was just a ban
>>>> > on incandescents.
>>>>
>>>> Actually, that's wrong.
>>>> There was never any law banning incandescent bulbs:
>>>>
>>>> In December 2007, the federal government enacted the Energy
>>>> Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA), which set maximum power
>>>> consumption requirements for all general-service light bulbs producing
>>>> 310–2600 lumens of light.
>>>>
>>>> > If the politicians had not banned incandescents we
>>>> > would not now be filling up landfills with mercury--when LEDs came
>>>> > along they would have started taking over the market as actually
>>>> > providing better illumination than incandescents.
>>>>
>>>> Sorry, wrong.
>>>>
>>>> The government did a pretty good job of pushing lighting manufacturers
>>>> to come up with more efficient lighting. The first thing to come up
>>>> were CFLs. They reduced pollution, including mercury pollution by
>>>> requiring less power to operate.
>>>>
>>>> I don't know how many wound up in landfills vs. being correctly
>>>> recycled, but there is a very small amount of mercury in a CFL and
>>>> I'd rather have the mercury in a landfill than in the air where it ends
>>>> up when you burn coal to make power.
>>>>
>>> What is the correct way to recycle them? I gave up trying to do the right
>>> thing and just binned them. Fortunately I have no CFLs in the new place.

>>
>> In the town it is my misfortune to inhabit hazardous waste may be
>> turned in at a location whose address is not disclosed on two
>> Saturdays a year from 8 AM to noon.
>
> That's about it. One time I took some stuff to the landfill, trying to do
> the right thing, only to be told "we don't take that" for several things.
> They went into the dumpster after we left. Since we no longer can send our
> trash to China, the city of Phoenix has gotten very picky about how they
> handle recycling. Because of "contamination" our condo complex no longer
> accepts plastic or steel cans - only paper and aluminum cans - so as a
> result the amount of stuff we're tossing in the trash has increased
> greatly.
>
> People are willing to do some work for recycling, but they shouldn't have
> to jump thru hoops.

Exactly.

CT has now banned shopping bags because the recyclers won't take them.

IMO, Congress should commission NIST to develop a standard recycling load that includes plastic bags, pizza boxes, and other items that recyclers today are too cheap or lazy or incompetent to find a way to deal with and require Federal certification of all recyclers of municipal trash, while also establishing a moratorium on mandatory recycling until there are at least two companies in business that can process the standard load with no surcharge for any item in it.

>>>> So, specifically, the same law that created CFLs also created LED
>>>> lighting.
>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 15:57:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 10:21:07 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
wrote:

> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:
>
>> On 2020-01-05, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:
>>> On 1/3/2020 10:01 PM, J. Clarke wrote:

>>>> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >
>>>> >> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv
>>>> >> <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> >>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> >>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> >>> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> >> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>> >
>>>> > Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>> >
>>>> > (home depot)
>>>> >
>>>> > <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>>>>
>>>> >> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>>>> >> facilities in the US.
>>>>
>>>> > I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>>>> > The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>> >
>>>> > Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>> >
>>>> > Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>>
>>>> >> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>>>> >> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>>> >> very happy that it is dying the death.
>>>>
>>> >> I don't see why people are so down on CFLs
>>>
>>> >> Depends if you like dim green light and mercury, I guess.
>>>
>>> > We've already established that they _reduced_ mercury emissions.
>>>
>>> > Green light? Not in my experience.
>>>
>>> > Of course, if you are one of those RWNJs that has laid in a 100
>>> > year supply of incandescent lights, you have no choice but to
>>> > try to justify your paranoia.

So anybody who doesn't agree with you is insane? This attitude is why we are very likely to have 4 more years of He Whose Name Starts Flamewars. Get over yourself.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 15:57:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 10:25:54 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> writes:

>

>> On 1/4/2020 3:43 PM, googlegroups jmfbahciv wrote:

>>> I cannot use LEDs. They emit so much UV that my eyes hurt and

>>> I get headaches; the pain is similar to looking directly at the

>>> sun. There are no stores in this area which sells incandescent

>>> bulbs.

>>

>> Are you sure it's UV that's your problem? Could it be flicker? I don't

>> know, but it's possible LEDs flicker more (they don't have the thermal

>> buffering vs. incandescents) but there are probably (maybe more

>> expensive) LEDs that flicker less.

>

> Geez, can't any of you recognize RWNJ paranoia for what it is?

Geez, can't you recognize that calling other people names is not constructive?

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 15:59:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Melzzzzz

On 2020-01-05, J Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 10:25:54 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>

> wrote:

>

>> Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> writes:

>>

>>> On 1/4/2020 3:43 PM, googlegroups jmfbahciv wrote:

>>>> I cannot use LEDs. They emit so much UV that my eyes hurt and

>>>> I get headaches; the pain is similar to looking directly at the
>>>> sun. There are no stores in this area which sells incandescent
>>>> bulbs.
>>>
>>> Are you sure it's UV that's your problem? Could it be flicker? I don't
>>> know, but it's possible LEDs flicker more (they don't have the thermal
>>> buffering vs. incandescents) but there are probably (maybe more
>>> expensive) LEDs that flicker less.
>>
>> Geez, can't any of you recognize RWNJ paranoia for what it is?
>
> Geez, can't you recognize that calling other people names is not
> constructive?
Yeah calling people crazy is lame...

--

press any key to continue or any other to quit...

Svi smo svedoci - oko 3 godine intenzivne propagande je dovoljno da jedan narod poludi -- Zli
Zec
Na divljem zapadu i nije bilo tako puno nasilja, upravo zato jer su svi
bili naoruzani. -- Mladen Gogala

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 16:06:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 5 Jan 2020 06:05:02 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
wrote:

> googlegroups jmfbahciv <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>> On Friday, January 3, 2020 at 11:56:50 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>> On 1/3/2020 11:57 AM, googlegroups jmfbahciv wrote:
>>>
>>> I'm not going to address the other silliness, but...
>>>
>>>>
>>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>>
>>> Of course the US knows how to manufacture light bulbs. Incandescent,
>>> vapor discharge, fluorescent, and LED. Incandescents are mostly
>>> obsolete these days (inefficient and short lifetime), though. The

>>> issue is, we mostly don't make them, because it's cheaper to make them
>>> somewhere else.
>>
>> If you check, there are no more incandescent manufacturers in the US.
>> They shut down the plant and had a fire sale. My source was a news
>> report on "market watch".
>
> I could still buy them if I wanted them - Home Depot stocks them. I buy
> LEDs now for most things, but there are some specialized applications where
> you need incandescents, for example oven lights or candelabra bulbs.

Next time you go to Home Depot take a careful look at their candelabra bulbs--the store near me has 35 different LED candelabra bulb listings. Most of them are made to resemble bare-filament clear incandescent bulbs and work on most dimmers. Or if you are willing to sacrifice a bit of appearance to get an insane amount of control you can get Philips Hue Color at Best Buy that is equivalent to about a 55 watt incandescent.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 16:23:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 10:21:07 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
> wrote:
>
>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:
>>
>>> On 2020-01-05, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:
>>>> On 1/3/2020 10:01 PM, J. Clarke wrote:
>>>> > On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> > wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbaheiv
>>>> >>> <jmfbaheiv102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> >>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> >>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> >>>> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> >>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> >>> >>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.

```

>>>> >>
>>>> >> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>> >>
>>>> >> (home depot)
>>>> >>
>>>> >> http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg
>>>> >
>>>> > So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>>>> > facilities in the US.
>>>> >
>>>> >> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>>>> >> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>> >
>>>> > I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>>>> > politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>>> > very happy that it is dying the death.
>>>> >
>>>> I don't see why people are so down on CFLs
>>>
>>> Depends if you like dim green light and mercury, I guess.
>>
>> We've already established that they _reduced_ mercury emissions.
>>
>> Green light? Not in my experience.
>>
>> Of course, if you are one of those RWNJs that has laid in a 100
>> year supply of incandescent lights, you have no choice but to
>> try to justify your paranoia.
>
> So anybody who doesn't agree with you is insane? This attitude is why
> we are very likely to have 4 more years of He Whose Name Starts
> Flamewars. Get over yourself.

```

Appears I've hit too close to home.

Sorry, if you went out and bought a lifetime supply of incandescents because the liberals were taking away your bulbs you may just be a RWNJ.

It doesn't necessarily cross the line to mental illness:

Paranoia: An unrealistic distrust of others or a feeling of being persecuted. Extreme degrees may be a sign of mental illness.

So, I wouldn't call just stocking the bulbs, extreme.

On the other hand claiming that you're being blinded by UV...

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: whooshed, was: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 16:30:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

danny burstein <dannyb@panix.com> writes:

> In <qusv62\$1hl\$2@dont-email.me> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> writes:
>
>> Geez, can't any of you recognize RWNJ paranoia for what it is?
>
> umm, Right Wingnuts of New Jersey?

So close.
Whoosh no more.
First hit on Google.

As for the term being fair, how would you describe a party that spent 6 years passing Obama Care repeals and then finally gained control of all 3 branches of government and couldn't pass the bill again?

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 16:32:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 10:25:54 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
> wrote:
>
>> Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> writes:
>>
>>> On 1/4/2020 3:43 PM, googlegroups jmfahciv wrote:
>>>> I cannot use LEDs. They emit so much UV that my eyes hurt and
>>>> I get headaches; the pain is similar to looking directly at the
>>>> sun. There are no stores in this area which sells incandescent
>>>> bulbs.
>>>

>>> Are you sure it's UV that's your problem? Could it be flicker? I don't
>>> know, but it's possible LEDs flicker more (they don't have the thermal
>>> buffering vs. incandescents) but there are probably (maybe more
>>> expensive) LEDs that flicker less.

>>

>> Geez, can't any of you recognize RWNJ paranoia for what it is?

>

> Geez, can't you recognize that calling other people names is not

> constructive?

Neither is explaining that LEDs don't emit UV.
Just ignore it.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 16:33:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:23:29 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>

>> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 10:21:07 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>

>> wrote:

>>

>>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

>>>

>>>> On 2020-01-05, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:

>>>> > On 1/3/2020 10:01 PM, J. Clarke wrote:

>>>> >> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>

>>>> >> wrote:

>>>> >>

>>>> >>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbaheiv

>>>> >>>> <jmfbaheiv102162@gmail.com> wrote:

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.

>>>> >>>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge

>>>> >>>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge

>>>> >>>>> a national security risk at the highest level.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> >>>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> (home depot)
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>>>> >>>
>>>> >> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>>>> >> facilities in the US.
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>>>> >>> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>>>> >> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>>> >> very happy that it is dying the death.
>>>> >>
>>>> > I don't see why people are so down on CFLs
>>>>
>>>> Depends if you like dim green light and mercury, I guess.
>>>
>>> We've already established that they _reduced_ mercury emissions.
>>>
>>> Green light? Not in my experience.
>>>
>>> Of course, if you are one of those RWNJs that has laid in a 100
>>> year supply of incandescent lights, you have no choice but to
>>> try to justify your paranoia.
>>
>> So anybody who doesn't agree with you is insane? This attitude is why
>> we are very likely to have 4 more years of He Whose Name Starts
>> Flamewars. Get over yourself.
>
> Appears I've hit too close to home.

So you're just going to pour gas on the fire?

> Sorry, if you went out and bought a lifetime supply of incandescents because
> the liberals were taking away your bulbs you may just be a RWNJ.

Or someone who preferse incandescents to the alternatives.

> It doesn't necessarily cross the line to mental illness:

So one can be a "nut job" without being mentally ill? Do tell.

> Paranoia: An unrealistic distrust of others or a feeling of being
> persecuted. Extreme degrees may be a sign of mental illness.

You should talk to somebody about that.

> So, I wouldn't call just stocking the bulbs, extreme.
> On the other hand claiming that you're being blinded by UV...

We don't know what the real issue is. With LEDs it's unlikely to actually be UV, but I think it would be better to make an effort to find out what the real problem is than to simply be dismissive and insulting.

Telling someone who claims that LEDs make their eyes hurt that they are an "RWNJ" doesn't do anything to address the problem, but it does convince them that you are more interested in your precious ideology than in actually helping people.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 16:36:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:32:21 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>
>> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 10:25:54 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> writes:
>>>
>>>> On 1/4/2020 3:43 PM, googlegroups jmfbaheiv wrote:
>>>> > I cannot use LEDs. They emit so much UV that my eyes hurt and
>>>> > I get headaches; the pain is similar to looking directly at the
>>>> > sun. There are no stores in this area which sells incandescent
>>>> > bulbs.
>>>>
>>>> Are you sure it's UV that's your problem? Could it be flicker? I don't
>>>> know, but it's possible LEDs flicker more (they don't have the thermal
>>>> buffering vs. incandescents) but there are probably (maybe more

>>>> expensive) LEDs that flicker less.
>>>
>>> Geez, can't any of you recognize RWNJ paranoia for what it is?
>>
>> Geez, can't you recognize that calling other people names is not
>> constructive?
>
> Neither is explaining that LEDs don't emit UV.
> Just ignore it.

Determining that they don't emit UV is one step toward finding out what the real problem is.

It may be that BAH is unwilling to work toward identifying the actual cause of her issues with LEDs, but I would rather she state or demonstrate that than hurl insults on general principle.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 16:36:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

> On Sun, 5 Jan 2020 06:05:00 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>>> On Sat, 4 Jan 2020 12:46:22 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> > J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >
>>>> >> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 09:07:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> >> wrote:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>>> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> >>>> wrote:
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv
>>>> >>>>>> <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.

>>>> >>>>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> >>>>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> >>>>>> a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10
>>>> >>>>>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> (home depot)
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing
>>>> >>>>>> facilities in the US.
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.
>>>> >>>>>> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>>>> >>>>>> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>>> >>>>>> very happy that it is dying the death.
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> Disagree on at least 2 counts.
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
>>>> >>>>>> and used less power.
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> Which doesn't make them any less crap. As light sources they suck.
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
>>>> >>>>>> The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
>>>> >>>>>> near with incandescents.
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> Lucky you.
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> 2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> What specifically? There was no law requiring LEDs, it was just a ban
>>>> >>>>>> on incandescents.
>>>> >>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>> Actually, that's wrong.
>>>> >>>>>> There was never any law banning incandescent bulbs:
>>>> >>>>>>

>>>> > In December 2007, the federal government enacted the Energy
>>>> > Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA), which set maximum power
>>>> > consumption requirements for all general-service light bulbs producing
>>>> > 310–2600 lumens of light.
>>>> >
>>>> >> If the politicians had not banned incandescents we
>>>> >> would not now be filling up landfills with mercury--when LEDs came
>>>> >> along they would have started taking over the market as actually
>>>> >> providing better illumination than incandescents.
>>>> >
>>>> > Sorry, wrong.
>>>> >
>>>> > The government did a pretty good job of pushing lighting manufacturers
>>>> > to come up with more efficient lighting. The first thing to come up
>>>> > were CFLs. They reduced pollution, including mercury pollution by
>>>> > requiring less power to operate.
>>>> >
>>>> > I don't know how many wound up in landfills vs. being correctly
>>>> > recycled, but there is a very small amount of mercury in a CFL and
>>>> > I'd rather have the mercury in a landfill than in the air where it ends
>>>> > up when you burn coal to make power.
>>>>
>>>> What is the correct way to recycle them? I gave up trying to do the right
>>>> thing and just binned them. Fortunately I have no CFLs in the new place.
>>>>
>>> In the town it is my misfortune to inhabit hazardous waste may be
>>> turned in at a location whose address is not disclosed on two
>>> Saturdays a year from 8 AM to noon.
>>
>> That's about it. One time I took some stuff to the landfill, trying to do
>> the right thing, only to be told "we don't take that" for several things.
>> They went into the dumpster after we left. Since we no longer can send our
>> trash to China, the city of Phoenix has gotten very picky about how they
>> handle recycling. Because of "contamination" our condo complex no longer
>> accepts plastic or steel cans - only paper and aluminum cans - so as a
>> result the amount of stuff we're tossing in the trash has increased
>> greatly.
>>
>> People are willing to do some work for recycling, but they shouldn't have
>> to jump thru hoops.
>
> Exactly.
>
> CT has now banned shopping bags because the recyclers won't take them.
>
> IMO, Congress should commission NIST to develop a standard recycling
> load that includes plastic bags, pizza boxes, and other items that
> recyclers today are too cheap or lazy or incompetent to find a way to

- > deal with and require Federal certification of all recyclers of
- > municipal trash, while also establishing a moratorium on mandatory
- > recycling until there are at least two companies in business that can
- > process the standard load with no surcharge for any item in it.

Hmm, my Stop and Shop takes back plastic bags.

Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: whooshed, was: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 16:36:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:30:33 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
wrote:

- > danny burstein <dannyb@panix.com> writes:
- >
- >> In <qusv62\$1hl\$2@dont-email.me> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> writes:
- >>
- >>> Geez, can't any of you recognize RWNJ paranoia for what it is?
- >>
- >> umm, Right Wingnuts of New Jersey?
- >
- > So close.
- > Whoosh no more.
- > First hit on Google.
- >
- > As for the term being fair, how would you describe a party that spent 6
- > years passing Obama Care repeals and then finally gained control of all
- > 3 branches of government and couldn't pass the bill again?

Disorganized?

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 16:39:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>

>> On Sun, 5 Jan 2020 06:05:00 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>

>> wrote:

>>

>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

>>>> On Sat, 4 Jan 2020 12:46:22 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>

>>>> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

>>>> >> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>>>> >>

>>>> >>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 09:07:18 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>

>>>> >>> wrote:

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>>> On Fri, 03 Jan 2020 22:20:28 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>

>>>> >>>>> wrote:

>>>> >>>>>

>>>> >>>>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>>>> >>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>> On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 09:57:40 -0800 (PST), googlegroups jmfbahciv

>>>> >>>>>>> <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:

>>>> >>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.

>>>> >>>>>>>> The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge

>>>> >>>>>>>> should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge

>>>> >>>>>>>> a national security risk at the highest level.

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> Actually the last major incandescent bulb factory shut down about 10

>>>> >>>>>>>> years ago. So what? Incandescent bulbs are a niche product.

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> Looks like EcoSmart makes LED bulbs in the USA:

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> (home depot)

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> <http://tinyurl.com/v8u4abg>

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> So does Cree. And Philips has a number of lighting manufacturing

>>>> >>>>>>>> facilities in the US.

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> I recently upgraded my kitchen lighting.

>>>> >>>>>>>> The ceiling lights can be set to 5 different color temperature settings.

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>> Newer fixtures don't always come with bulbs, the lights are built in.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> Lighting has improved dramatically.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>>> I would go so far as to say "amazingly". I really wish that the
>>>> >>>>> politicians hadn't tried to rush it though--CF was utter crap and I am
>>>> >>>>> very happy that it is dying the death.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>> Disagree on at least 2 counts.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>> 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
>>>> >>>> and used less power.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>> Which doesn't make them any less crap. As light sources they suck.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>> they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
>>>> >>>> The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
>>>> >>>> near with incandescents.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>> Lucky you.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>>> 2. "Politicians" had something to do with the rise of LEDs too.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>> What specifically? There was no law requiring LEDs, it was just a ban
>>>> >>> on incandescents.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >> Actually, that's wrong.
>>>> >> There was never any law banning incandescent bulbs:
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >> In December 2007, the federal government enacted the Energy
>>>> >> Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA), which set maximum power
>>>> >> consumption requirements for all general-service light bulbs producing
>>>> >> 310–2600 lumens of light.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >>> If the politicians had not banned incandescents we
>>>> >>> would not now be filling up landfills with mercury--when LEDs came
>>>> >>> along they would have started taking over the market as actually
>>>> >>> providing better illumination than incandescents.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >> Sorry, wrong.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >> The government did a pretty good job of pushing lighting manufacturers
>>>> >> to come up with more efficient lighting. The first thing to come up
>>>> >> were CFLs. They reduced pollution, including mercury pollution by
>>>> >> requiring less power to operate.
>>>> >>>>>
>>>> >> I don't know how many wound up in landfills vs. being correctly
>>>> >> recycled, but there is a very small amount of mercury in a CFL and

>>>> >> I'd rather have the mercury in a landfill than in the air where it ends
>>>> >> up when you burn coal to make power.
>>>> >
>>>> > What is the correct way to recycle them? I gave up trying to do the right
>>>> > thing and just binned them. Fortunately I have no CFLs in the new place.
>>>>
>>>> In the town it is my misfortune to inhabit hazardous waste may be
>>>> turned in at a location whose address is not disclosed on two
>>>> Saturdays a year from 8 AM to noon.
>>>>
>>> That's about it. One time I took some stuff to the landfill, trying to do
>>> the right thing, only to be told "we don't take that" for several things.
>>> They went into the dumpster after we left. Since we no longer can send our
>>> trash to China, the city of Phoenix has gotten very picky about how they
>>> handle recycling. Because of "contamination" our condo complex no longer
>>> accepts plastic or steel cans - only paper and aluminum cans - so as a
>>> result the amount of stuff we're tossing in the trash has increased
>>> greatly.
>>>
>>> People are willing to do some work for recycling, but they shouldn't have
>>> to jump thru hoops.
>>
>> Exactly.
>>
>> CT has now banned shopping bags because the recyclers won't take them.
>>
>> IMO, Congress should commission NIST to develop a standard recycling
>> load that includes plastic bags, pizza boxes, and other items that
>> recyclers today are too cheap or lazy or incompetent to find a way to
>> deal with and require Federal certification of all recyclers of
>> municipal trash, while also establishing a moratorium on mandatory
>> recycling until there are at least two companies in business that can
>> process the standard load with no surcharge for any item in it.
>
> Hmm, my Stop and Shop takes back plastic bags.

Why should I have to take plastic bags to Stop and Shop when there is
a government-mandated recycling bin at home?

> Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.

Well touch you.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 16:46:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> writes:

> Are you sure it's UV that's your problem? Could it be flicker? I don't
> know, but it's possible LEDs flicker more (they don't have the thermal
> buffering vs. incandescents) but there are probably (maybe more
> expensive) LEDs that flicker less.

LED bulb flickering can be traced in almost every instance to a non-compatible dimmer switch in the lighting circuit. ... LED bulbs don't have glowing filaments. When the dimmer switch goes off and on many times per second, the LED bulb becomes a flickering strobe light.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 16:52:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:46:23 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> writes:

>

>> Are you sure it's UV that's your problem? Could it be flicker? I don't
>> know, but it's possible LEDs flicker more (they don't have the thermal
>> buffering vs. incandescents) but there are probably (maybe more
>> expensive) LEDs that flicker less.

>

> LED bulb flickering can be traced in almost every instance to a
> non-compatible dimmer switch in the lighting circuit. ... LED bulbs
> don't have glowing filaments. When the dimmer switch goes off and on
> many times per second, the LED bulb becomes a flickering strobe light.

In that case it should be flickering at 60 cycles with no dimmer. If there is filtering adequate to take out the 60 cycle flicker, it should also take out any higher frequencies.

CFs need "compatible dimmers". Dimmable LEDs are allegedly designed to work on just about any dimmer that works with incandescents.

Subject: LEDs, was: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [danny burstein](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 17:03:17 GMT

In <us441flk2gq2gdqb7o7irfs4m5dm4v7641@4ax.com> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>> LED bulb flickering can be traced in almost every instance to a
>> non-compatible dimmer switch in the lighting circuit. ... LED bulbs
>> don't have glowing filaments. When the dimmer switch goes off and on
>> many times per second, the LED bulb becomes a flickering strobe light.

> In that case it should be flickering at 60 cycles with no dimmer. If
> there is filtering adequate to take out the 60 cycle flicker, it
> should also take out any higher frequencies.

Might be... 120 cycles as it would presumably light up on
both peaks ("up" and "down", so to speak) of the sine wave...

--

Knowledge may be power, but communications is the key
dannyb@panix.com
[to foil spammers, my address has been double rot-13 encoded]

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 18:33:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sun, 5 Jan 2020 06:05:05 -0700
Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> The poorest poor today live better than most royalty in the middle ages.

The poorest in America (or "the western world") perhaps, in some
ways (as long as you ignore the homeless) but the poorest in the world today
are starving and I doubt royalty ever did.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith		Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN		A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins.		licences available see
You lose and Bill collects.		http://www.sohara.org/

Subject: Re: Light 'Bulbs'
Posted by [Mike Spencer](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 20:08:17 GMT

Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

> On 2020-01-05, Kerr-Mudd,John <notsaying@invalid.org> wrote:

>

>> I can't see why an oven light would need to be incandescent.

>

> Because the electronics required to run an LED would survive about

> 3 minutes at oven temps.

The only LED I've scrutinized was behaving erratically so I sawed it open with an abrasive wheel. The bulb itself was plastic. I'd expect it to shrivel, sag, emit toxic fumes, burst into flame or all of those in an oven. BTW, the dismantled unit could still light up. The LED light not filtered by the milky plastic "bulb" is incredibly intense and garish.

I'm lighting my studio/shop/atelier with 300W incandescents. I'm gonna be really annoyed when I run out and have to figure out an alternative. Using incandescent-look-alike halogens in the house as I only have a couple of dozen 100W incandescents left.

--

Mike Spencer

Nova Scotia, Canada

Subject: Re: Light 'Bulbs'

Posted by [John Levine](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 20:42:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article <87blrh7jke.fsf@bogus.nodomain.nowhere>,

Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> wrote:

> I'm lighting my studio/shop/atelier with 300W incandescents. I'm

> gonna be really annoyed when I run out and have to figure out an

> alternative.

300W incandescents put out 3500 to 5500 lumens depending on the type of bulb. Poking around online it's not hard to find LED bulbs in the 4000-5000 lumen range. If you're used to incandescents you'd probably prefer the warmer looking 3000K rather than the usual 500K but they're not much harder to find. Most of them screw into the same socket as the incandescent they replace.

They cost a lot more than incandescents but since they last for decades and use 1/10 the power I expect they'll pay for themselves soon enough.

--

Regards,
John Levine, johnl@taugh.com, Primary Perpetrator of "The Internet for Dummies",
Please consider the environment before reading this e-mail. <https://jl.ly>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 21:16:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JimP <solosam90@gmail.com> wrote:
> On Sun, 5 Jan 2020 06:05:05 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 12:49:02 -0500
>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> The question is not "is there a disparity", it is "are the poorest
>>>> poor worse off than they were previously".
>>>
>>> Agreed that is the important question, and as far as I can make out
>>> the poorest of the poor have been getting steadily better off for a long
>>> time.
>>>
>> The poorest poor today live better than most royalty in the middle ages.
>
> Hmm. Well, I doubt it. No servants, but the poor do have problems
> making ends meet. The 'payday loan' places adore the poor and take
> advantage of them.
>

They usually have indoor plumbing, access to out-of-season fruits and vegetables, probably better medical care than the best of the middle ages where the "treatments" the doctors prescribed killed the patients as often as they cured, electricity, TV where medieval royalty only had an occasional singer...

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 21:16:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Sun, 5 Jan 2020 06:05:02 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
>> googlegroups jmfbahciv <jmfbah102162@gmail.com> wrote:
>>> On Friday, January 3, 2020 at 11:56:50 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>> On 1/3/2020 11:57 AM, googlegroups jmfbahciv wrote:
>>>>
>>>> I'm not going to address the other silliness, but...
>>>>
>>>> >
>>>> > Note that the US no longer knows how to manufacture light bulbs.
>>>> > The last factory shut down last month. Losing that knowledge
>>>> > should bother people. I consider losing manufacturing knowledge
>>>> > a national security risk at the highest level.
>>>> >
>>>> Of course the US knows how to manufacture light bulbs. Incandescent,
>>>> vapor discharge, fluorescent, and LED. Incandescent bulbs are mostly
>>>> obsolete these days (inefficient and short lifetime), though. The
>>>> issue is, we mostly don't make them, because it's cheaper to make them
>>>> somewhere else.
>>>
>>> If you check, there are no more incandescent manufacturers in the US.
>>> They shut down the plant and had a fire sale. My source was a news
>>> report on "market watch".
>>
>> I could still buy them if I wanted them - Home Depot stocks them. I buy
>> LEDs now for most things, but there are some specialized applications where
>> you need incandescents, for example oven lights or candelabra bulbs.
>
> Next time you go to Home Depot take a careful look at their candelabra
> bulbs--the store near me has 35 different LED candelabra bulb
> listings. Most of them are made to resemble bare-filament clear
> incandescent bulbs and work on most dimmers. Or if you are willing to
> sacrifice a bit of appearance to get an insane amount of control you
> can get Philips Hue Color at Best Buy that is equivalent to about a 55
> watt incandescent.
>

Thanks, I'll take a look. The state of the art here is changing faster than
I can keep up with it.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: whooshed, was: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 21:16:38 GMT

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:30:33 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>

> wrote:

>

>> danny burstein <dannyb@panix.com> writes:

>>

>>> In <qusv62\$1hl\$2@dont-email.me> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> writes:

>>>

>>>> Geez, can't any of you recognize RWNJ paranoia for what it is?

>>>

>>> umm, Right Wingnuts of New Jersey?

>>

>> So close.

>> Whoosh no more.

>> First hit on Google.

>>

>> As for the term being fair, how would you describe a party that spent 6

>> years passing Obama Care repeals and then finally gained control of all

>> 3 branches of government and couldn't pass the bill again?

>

> Disorganized?

>

Idiots, maybe. I had two complaints about Obamacare, aside from the way it was forced thru in the middle of the night New Year's Eve: 1) No one should be *forced* to buy insurance (or pay a penalty) 2) The government should not be able to dictate what insurance has to cover. For example, we're unlikely to need maternity coverage and shouldn't have to pay for it. People, should be able to buy the coverage they think they need.

The argument was made that the system had to include these things or it would collapse - boo hoo. If you can't design a system that still preserves individual freedom, it deserves to collapse. Hopefully upcoming court decisions will solve these problems.

Personally, If I were starting from where we were before I would have taken a more incremental approach, perhaps starting with only coverage for pre-existing conditions and letting young adults stay on their parents' policy until age 26. The last should be a net plus for the insurance companies, since those are the people who are the healthiest.

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [scott](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 21:38:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:

> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

>> On Sat, 04 Jan 2020 12:49:02 -0500

>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>> The question is not "is there a disparity", it is "are the poorest

>>> poor worse off than they were previously".

>>

>> Agreed that is the important question, and as far as I can make out

>> the poorest of the poor have been getting steadily better off for a long

>> time.

>>

>

> The poorest poor today live better than most royalty in the middle ages.

Tell that to the half million american homeless people, families and children sleeping on the street.

Subject: Re: Light 'Bulbs'

Posted by [scott](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 21:42:14 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> writes:

>

> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

>

>> On 2020-01-05, Kerr-Mudd,John <notsaying@invalid.org> wrote:

>>

>>> I can't see why an oven light would need to be incandescent.

>>

>> Because the electronics required to run an LED would survive about

>> 3 minutes at oven temps.

>

> The only LED I've scrutinized was behaving erratically so I sawed it

> open with an abrasive wheel. The bulb itself was plastic. I'd expect

> it to shrivel, sag, emit toxic fumes, burst into flame or all of those

> in an oven. BTW, the dismantled unit could still light up. The LED

> light not filtered by the milky plastic "bulb" is incredibly intense

> and garish.

>

> I'm lighting my studio/shop/atelier with 300W incandescents. I'm

> gonna be really annoyed when I run out and have to figure out an

> alternative. Using incandescent-look-alike halogens in the house as I

> only have a couple of dozen 100W incandescents left.

I illuminate my shop with F96T12 C50's. 8 of them. 5000k color temperature is best for color matching wood and finishes.

The new shop will likely have LED versions of the same (nine 8-foot duals on three circuits) color temperature.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 23:19:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-05, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

> On 5 Jan 2020 10:20:19 GMT
> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>
>> Depends if you like dim green light and mercury, I guess.
>
> The ones I used before LEDs had decent light with a selection of
> colour temperatures and the 30W ones kicked out a lot of light, mostly I
> used the 22W ones which were decent enough. I did have to hunt around for
> decent ones though, there was an awful lot of crud on the market and the
> suggested ones were ridiculously under-powered in order to push the energy
> savings which were real but not as good as advertised.

We tried a couple of CFLs when they first came out. We hate the light; it's a sickly colour which we find totally unfit for indoor use. We have a couple of CFLs left in outside fixtures where the colour doesn't matter much, and when they die we'll replace them with something else (probably LED).

> LEDs are a vast improvement, I look forward to the next iteration.

It seems to be an ongoing evolution. Every couple of years they seem to be able to handle dimmers better.

When we remodeled back around 2007, we put in pot lights everywhere. Originally they had 50-watt halogen PAR20s, which run so hot that sometimes the bases unsolder themselves. We have over 20 in the kitchen / dining room area, which meant that we were pulling over a kilowatt with them all on. But the light is wonderful.

Over the past few years we've been phasing in LEDs - the price is falling on drop-in replacements for the PAR20 halogens, and a 3000K model puts out light that's acceptably close in quality to halogens. We've been slower to replace the dimmed ones, though - even though the newest ones don't flicker when dimmed, most of them won't dim all the way down, and unlike halogens the colour

temperature remains the same when dimmed, which looks unnatural (and is quite a mismatch next to a halogen). Still, though, knocking that kilowatt down to 150 watts reflects nicely on our electric bill.

--

/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\ / <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 23:19:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-05, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:

> On 1/4/2020 1:46 PM, Peter Flass wrote:
>
>> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>> Just read an interesting statistic:
>>>
>>> As of 2010, 388 individuals possessed as much household wealth as the
>>> lower half of the world's population combined. Today, Oxfam estimates
>>> that number as 26.
>>
>> So 362 families got poorer
>
> No, 26 families got the wealth that the next wealthiest 362 families
> formerly had.

Plus, probably, some of the wealth that the lower half of the world's population formerly had.

--

/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\ / <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 23:32:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On 5 Jan 2020 23:19:04 GMT, Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:

> On 2020-01-05, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

>

>> On 5 Jan 2020 10:20:19 GMT

>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:

>>

>>> Depends if you like dim green light and mercury, I guess.

>>

>> The ones I used before LEDs had decent light with a selection of
>> colour temperatures and the 30W ones kicked out a lot of light, mostly I
>> used the 22W ones which were decent enough. I did have to hunt around for
>> decent ones though, there was an awful lot of crud on the market and the
>> suggested ones were ridiculously under-powered in order to push the energy
>> savings which were real but not as good as advertised.

>

> We tried a couple of CFLs when they first came out. We hate the light;
> it's a sickly colour which we find totally unfit for indoor use. We have
> a couple of CFLs left in outside fixtures where the colour doesn't matter
> much, and when they die we'll replace them with something else (probably LED).

>

>> LEDs are a vast improvement, I look forward to the next iteration.

>

> It seems to be an ongoing evolution. Every couple of years they seem
> to be able to handle dimmers better.

>

> When we remodeled back around 2007, we put in pot lights everywhere.
> Originally they had 50-watt halogen PAR20s, which run so hot that
> sometimes the bases unsolder themselves. We have over 20 in the
> kitchen / dining room area, which meant that we were pulling over
> a kilowatt with them all on. But the light is wonderful.

>

> Over the past few years we've been phasing in LEDs - the price
> is falling on drop-in replacements for the PAR20 halogens, and
> a 3000K model puts out light that's acceptably close in quality
> to halogens. We've been slower to replace the dimmed ones, though -
> even though the newest ones don't flicker when dimmed, most of
> them won't dim all the way down, and unlike halogens the colour
> temperature remains the same when dimmed, which looks unnatural
> (and is quite a mismatch next to a halogen). Still, though,
> knocking that kilowatt down to 150 watts reflects nicely on
> our electric bill.

FWIW, I have some Philips clear globe bulbs that change color temperature as they dim-they don't exactly match the incandescents in

the same fixture but they're close enough. They don't go all the way down though--at first I was annoyed but where they're located it's nice to have a night light.

Subject: Re: Light 'Bulbs'

Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 23:44:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

scott@slp53.sl.home (Scott Lurndal) writes:

> Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> writes:

>>

>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

>>

>>> On 2020-01-05, Kerr-Mudd,John <notsaying@invalid.org> wrote:

>>>

>>>> I can't see why an oven light would need to be incandescent.

>>>

>>> Because the electronics required to run an LED would survive about

>>> 3 minutes at oven temps.

>>

>> The only LED I've scrutinized was behaving erratically so I sawed it

>> open with an abrasive wheel. The bulb itself was plastic. I'd expect

>> it to shrivel, sag, emit toxic fumes, burst into flame or all of those

>> in an oven. BTW, the dismantled unit could still light up. The LED

>> light not filtered by the milky plastic "bulb" is incredibly intense

>> and garish.

>>

>> I'm lighting my studio/shop/atelier with 300W incandescents. I'm

>> gonna be really annoyed when I run out and have to figure out an

>> alternative. Using incandescent-look-alike halogens in the house as I

>> only have a couple of dozen 100W incandescents left.

>

> I illuminate my shop with F96T12 C50's. 8 of them. 5000k color

> temperature is best for color matching wood and finishes.

>

> The new shop will likely have LED versions of the same (nine 8-foot duals

> on three circuits) color temperature.

I have a plant light stand where I grow African Violets.

It uses 4 T40 tubes.

I changed it from florescent to LED and I love the color temp.

The plants aren't complaining either.

Florescents were a pain in the butt.

I was happy to remove the ballasts and chuck them.

This was many years ago.

The LEDs are still as bright as they were the first day.
If this was still florescent I'd have to have changed
the bulbs at least once by now.

I'm just thinking, these LED lights might outlive me...

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 05 Jan 2020 23:55:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:

> On 2020-01-05, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>
>> On 5 Jan 2020 10:20:19 GMT
>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>>
>>> Depends if you like dim green light and mercury, I guess.
>>
>> The ones I used before LEDs had decent light with a selection of
>> colour temperatures and the 30W ones kicked out a lot of light, mostly I
>> used the 22W ones which were decent enough. I did have to hunt around for
>> decent ones though, there was an awful lot of crud on the market and the
>> suggested ones were ridiculously under-powered in order to push the energy
>> savings which were real but not as good as advertised.
>
> We tried a couple of CFLs when they first came out. We hate the light;
> it's a sickly colour which we find totally unfit for indoor use. We have
> a couple of CFLs left in outside fixtures where the colour doesn't matter
> much, and when they die we'll replace them with something else (probably LED).
>
>> LEDs are a vast improvement, I look forward to the next iteration.
>
> It seems to be an ongoing evolution. Every couple of years they seem
> to be able to handle dimmers better.
>
> When we remodeled back around 2007, we put in pot lights everywhere.
> Originally they had 50-watt halogen PAR20s, which run so hot that
> sometimes the bases unsolder themselves. We have over 20 in the
> kitchen / dining room area, which meant that we were pulling over
> a kilowatt with them all on. But the light is wonderful.
>
> Over the past few years we've been phasing in LEDs - the price
> is falling on drop-in replacements for the PAR20 halogens, and

> a 3000K model puts out light that's acceptably close in quality
> to halogens. We've been slower to replace the dimmed ones, though -
> even though the newest ones don't flicker when dimmed, most of
> them won't dim all the way down, and unlike halogens the colour
> temperature remains the same when dimmed, which looks unnatural
> (and is quite a mismatch next to a halogen). Still, though,
> knocking that kilowatt down to 150 watts reflects nicely on
> our electric bill.

I just replaced kitchen ceiling can LED bulbs with LED cans.
The old LED bulbs dimmed all the way down with a non-LED dimmer.
The new cans didn't dim at all with the non-LED dimmer.
I replaced the dimmer with an LED dimmer and
the lights dim well again.

These same lights offered a color temperature choice.
I found the LED version of "incandescent" unappealing.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 02:08:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

> On 5 Jan 2020 23:19:04 GMT, Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid>
> wrote:
>
>> On 2020-01-05, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>>
>>> On 5 Jan 2020 10:20:19 GMT
>>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Depends if you like dim green light and mercury, I guess.
>>>
>>> The ones I used before LEDs had decent light with a selection of
>>> colour temperatures and the 30W ones kicked out a lot of light, mostly I
>>> used the 22W ones which were decent enough. I did have to hunt around for
>>> decent ones though, there was an awful lot of crud on the market and the
>>> suggested ones were ridiculously under-powered in order to push the energy
>>> savings which were real but not as good as advertised.
>>
>> We tried a couple of CFLs when they first came out. We hate the light;
>> it's a sickly colour which we find totally unfit for indoor use. We have
>> a couple of CFLs left in outside fixtures where the colour doesn't matter

>> much, and when they die we'll replace them with something else (probably LED).
>>
>>> LEDs are a vast improvement, I look forward to the next iteration.
>>
>> It seems to be an ongoing evolution. Every couple of years they seem
>> to be able to handle dimmers better.
>>
>> When we remodeled back around 2007, we put in pot lights everywhere.
>> Originally they had 50-watt halogen PAR20s, which run so hot that
>> sometimes the bases unsolder themselves. We have over 20 in the
>> kitchen / dining room area, which meant that we were pulling over
>> a kilowatt with them all on. But the light is wonderful.
>>
>> Over the past few years we've been phasing in LEDs - the price
>> is falling on drop-in replacements for the PAR20 halogens, and
>> a 3000K model puts out light that's acceptably close in quality
>> to halogens. We've been slower to replace the dimmed ones, though -
>> even though the newest ones don't flicker when dimmed, most of
>> them won't dim all the way down, and unlike halogens the colour
>> temperature remains the same when dimmed, which looks unnatural
>> (and is quite a mismatch next to a halogen). Still, though,
>> knocking that kilowatt down to 150 watts reflects nicely on
>> our electric bill.
>
> FWIW, I have some Philips clear globe bulbs that change color
> temperature as they dim-they don't exactly match the incandescents in
> the same fixture but they're close enough. They don't go all the way
> down though--at first I was annoyed but where they're located it's
> nice to have a night light.

For a while I had LED bulbs and incandescents on the same dimmer.
The LED bulbs would not dim all the way down but the incandescents
would. After replacing all the incandescents, the dimmer got the
lights down to night-light level.

If you have any dimmer issues, the first thing to do is get
a dimmer meant for LEDs if you don't already have one.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Joy Beeson](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 03:24:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
wrote:

> Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.

That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a real pest of yourself.

Well, not even then.

--

Joy Beeson

joy beeson at comcast dot net

<http://wlweather.net/PAGEJOY/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 04:45:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-06, Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> wrote:

> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>

> wrote:

>

>> Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.

>

> That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a

> real pest of yourself.

>

> Well, not even then.

You have to be fast. Before the cashier pulls out a plastic bag, drop your re-usable bag (or backpack, if you've been ultra-eco-friendly and ridden there on your bicycle) in front of her, and tell her to put everything right into your bag.

--

/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.

\ / <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.

X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.

/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Light 'Bulbs'

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 05:58:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: jmreno

On 1/5/2020 3:44 PM, Dan Espen wrote:

> scott@slp53.sl.home (Scott Lurndal) writes:

>

>> Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> writes:

>>>

>>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

>>>

>>>> On 2020-01-05, Kerr-Mudd,John <notsaying@invalid.org> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > I can't see why an oven light would need to be incandescent.

>>>>

>>>> Because the electronics required to run an LED would survive about

>>>> 3 minutes at oven temps.

>>>

>>> The only LED I've scrutinized was behaving erratically so I sawed it

>>> open with an abrasive wheel. The bulb itself was plastic. I'd expect

>>> it to shrivel, sag, emit toxic fumes, burst into flame or all of those

>>> in an oven. BTW, the dismantled unit could still light up. The LED

>>> light not filtered by the milky plastic "bulb" is incredibly intense

>>> and garish.

>>>

>>> I'm lighting my studio/shop/atelier with 300W incandescents. I'm

>>> gonna be really annoyed when I run out and have to figure out an

>>> alternative. Using incandescent-look-alike halogens in the house as I

>>> only have a couple of dozen 100W incandescents left.

>>

>> I illuminate my shop with F96T12 C50's. 8 of them. 5000k color

>> temperature is best for color matching wood and finishes.

>>

>> The new shop will likely have LED versions of the same (nine 8-foot duals

>> on three circuits) color temperature.

>

> I have a plant light stand where I grow African Violets.

> It uses 4 T40 tubes.

> I changed it from florescent to LED and I love the color temp.

> The plants aren't complaining either.

> Florescents were a pain in the butt.

> I was happy to remove the ballasts and chuck them.

>

> This was many years ago.

> The LEDs are still as bright as they were the first day.

> If this was still florescent I'd have to have changed

> the bulbs at least once by now.

>

> I'm just thinking, these LED lights might outlive me...

>

I never did like those newfangled incandescent lights.

I use only good old gas lights in my house.

But for those times I need a really bright light I have a few nice arc lights that I got for free from a movie theater that was converting from film to video.

And my "entertainment center" is an Atwater Kent Model 35.
Unfortunately, there isn't much to listen to anymore.

My favorite show is X Minus One but it hasn't been on lately.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Andy Burns](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 07:58:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Espen wrote:

> If you have any dimmer issues, the first thing to do is get
> a dimmer meant for LEDs if you don't already have one.

This.

The magic phrase (on this side of the pond at least) is "trailing edge dimmer", the better ones are programmable (by rapid toggling of the switch) to suit incandescent/LED lamps, I would recommend Varilight except they don't seem to cater for 110V.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Jorgen Grahn](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 08:33:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 2020-01-06, Charlie Gibbs wrote:

> On 2020-01-06, Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> wrote:
>
>> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.
>>
>> That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a
>> real pest of yourself.
>>
>> Well, not even then.

- >
> You have to be fast. Before the cashier pulls out a plastic bag, drop
> your re-usable bag (or backpack, if you've been ultra-eco-friendly
> and ridden there on your bicycle) in front of her, and tell her to
> put everything right into your bag.

Wow. Around here, if you're at the supermarket, you're responsible for picking a bag and paying for it, if you need one. In other stores they tend to ask you. In a few, you have to be fast, as you say.

There's no one packing the bags for you. Would be way too expensive to pay someone decent wages to do it, and Swedes see this as Their Own Damned Job.

We also had Plastic Bag Shaming during 2019, and some EU directive against them. Plastic grocery bags are low status markers now. They're used by immigrants, alcoholics and hicks.

Which is unfortunate because:

- I can use a single plastic grocery bag for years, if I'm careful.
- Most plastic you bring home from the store isn't in the grocery bags. E.g. you can't buy milk anymore without bringing home a big chunk of plastic.
- Anti-environmentalists got a great example for free.
- The problem with plastic in the oceans comes (as the right wing anti-environmentalists happily points out) mostly from East Asia.

/Jorgen

--

// Jorgen Grahm <grahn@Oo.o...>
\X/ snipabacken.se> O o .

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 09:22:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sun, 5 Jan 2020 13:08:44 -0600
Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:

- > Our big grocery chain does have bins for them. It's not really any
> more effort to take a bag o' bags if you're going there to shop
> anyhow.

'swot I've always done, originally they were aSnibsrui's big paper bags which were so much stronger than the plastic ones. These days there's a bag of cold bags and a bag of ordinary bags in the car.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 09:26:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 5 Jan 2020 23:19:04 GMT
Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:

> It seems to be an ongoing evolution. Every couple of years they seem
> to be able to handle dimmers better.

Mine handle a dimmer wonderfully - I use 12V PWM dimmers! It is far easier to drive LEDs properly than to try and make them pretend to be incandescents.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Andy Burns](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 10:44:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Huge wrote:

> So not only do we have to replace the fittings, but the dimmers as
> well. Am I the only one that smells a rat?

Presumably you don't have all your lights on dimmers, just a couple of rooms? Hardly a big expense. Alternatively have a main, and one or more extra lights in each room and switch them as appropriate ...

I did change to CFLs (and halogens for dimmable rooms) but they weren't

great so now I have LEDs everywhere except some fluorescent tubes in garage/shed and the old CFLs relegated to the loft.

Subject: Re: Light 'Bulbs'

Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 14:12:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 6 Jan 2020 10:19:53 GMT

Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:

> I recently rewired my barn/workshop/garage and used 35W (I think) LED
> batten fittings (noname Chinese from eBay). Ten of them. It's great in
> there now; I can actually see WTF I'm doing.

350W of LED lighting ? How big is your workshop ? I'm using 60W[1]
of LED strips (three 4m lengths at 5W/m) to light my 30 square metre
kitchen, visitors comment on how bright and clear[2] the light is in there.

[1] At 12V, add about 20% for power supply and cable losses to get the
mains draw.

[2] Using long strips of light results in very even light with little
shadow.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith	Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN	A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins.	licences available see
You lose and Bill collects.	http://www.sohara.org/

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 14:24:20 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

> On 5 Jan 2020 23:19:04 GMT, Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid>
> wrote:

>

>> On 2020-01-05, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

>>

>>> On 5 Jan 2020 10:20:19 GMT

>>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> Depends if you like dim green light and mercury, I guess.

>>>

>>> The ones I used before LEDs had decent light with a selection of

>>> colour temperatures and the 30W ones kicked out a lot of light, mostly I
>>> used the 22W ones which were decent enough. I did have to hunt around for
>>> decent ones though, there was an awful lot of crud on the market and the
>>> suggested ones were ridiculously under-powered in order to push the energy
>>> savings which were real but not as good as advertised.
>>
>> We tried a couple of CFLs when they first came out. We hate the light;
>> it's a sickly colour which we find totally unfit for indoor use. We have
>> a couple of CFLs left in outside fixtures where the colour doesn't matter
>> much, and when they die we'll replace them with something else (probably LED).
>>
>>> LEDs are a vast improvement, I look forward to the next iteration.
>>
>> It seems to be an ongoing evolution. Every couple of years they seem
>> to be able to handle dimmers better.
>>
>> When we remodeled back around 2007, we put in pot lights everywhere.
>> Originally they had 50-watt halogen PAR20s, which run so hot that
>> sometimes the bases unsolder themselves. We have over 20 in the
>> kitchen / dining room area, which meant that we were pulling over
>> a kilowatt with them all on. But the light is wonderful.
>>
>> Over the past few years we've been phasing in LEDs - the price
>> is falling on drop-in replacements for the PAR20 halogens, and
>> a 3000K model puts out light that's acceptably close in quality
>> to halogens. We've been slower to replace the dimmed ones, though -
>> even though the newest ones don't flicker when dimmed, most of
>> them won't dim all the way down, and unlike halogens the colour
>> temperature remains the same when dimmed, which looks unnatural
>> (and is quite a mismatch next to a halogen). Still, though,
>> knocking that kilowatt down to 150 watts reflects nicely on
>> our electric bill.
>
> FWIW, I have some Philips clear globe bulbs that change color
> temperature as they dim-they don't exactly match the incandescents in
> the same fixture but they're close enough. They don't go all the way
> down though--at first I was annoyed but where they're located it's
> nice to have a night light.
>

I was just reading about a computer restoration where there was some effort
to match the appearance of incandescent panel lights with LEDs, including
the color change when powering off.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 14:24:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> wrote:

> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
> wrote:
>
>> Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.
>
> That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a
> real pest of yourself.
>
> Well, not even then.
>

We use plastic grocery bags as wastebasket liners, which at least saves us
from buying bags specifically for the wastebaskets.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 14:39:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> writes:

> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
> wrote:
>
>> Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.
>
> That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a
> real pest of yourself.
>
> Well, not even then.

Okay, not clear to me how being a pest has any bearing
on the plastic bag outcome?

I just got one of my shopping bags in my junk mail.

They last pretty long, I've had a few of them for multiple years.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 14:41:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:

> On 2020-01-06, Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> wrote:
>
>> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.
>>
>> That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a
>> real pest of yourself.
>>
>> Well, not even then.
>
> You have to be fast. Before the cashier pulls out a plastic bag, drop
> your re-usable bag (or backpack, if you've been ultra-eco-friendly
> and ridden there on your bicycle) in front of her, and tell her to
> put everything right into your bag.

Still not getting the pest part.

I haven't used a cashier since they started self checkout.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: plastic bags, was: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [danny burstein](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 14:44:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In <2023267094.600013116.732632.peter_flass-yahoo.com@news.eternal-september.org> Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:

> Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> wrote:
>> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.
>>
>> That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a
>> real pest of yourself.
>>
>> Well, not even then.

>>

> We use plastic grocery bags as wastebasket liners, which at least saves us
> from buying bags specifically for the wastebaskets.

> --

> Pete

--

Knowledge may be power, but communications is the key
dannyb@panix.com
[to foil spammers, my address has been double rot-13 encoded]

Subject: plastic bags, was: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [danny burstein](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 14:49:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

(apologies for prior, empty, post. I hit the send keys too early)

In <2023267094.600013116.732632.peter_flass-yahoo.com@news.eternal-september.org> Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:

[snippeth]

> We use plastic grocery bags as wastebasket liners, which at least saves us
> from buying bags specifically for the wastebaskets.

They also come in handy for people with dogs who lived in civilized areas that wish to "scoop the poop".

--

Knowledge may be power, but communications is the key
dannyb@panix.com
[to foil spammers, my address has been double rot-13 encoded]

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 14:52:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:

> On 2020-01-06, Andy Burns <usenet@andyburns.uk> wrote:

>> Huge wrote:

>>

>>> So not only do we have to replace the fittings, but the dimmers as
>>> well. Am I the only one that smells a rat?
>>
>> Presumably you don't have all your lights on dimmers, just a couple of
>> rooms? Hardly a big expense. Alternatively have a main, and one or
>> more extra lights in each room and switch them as appropriate ...
>>
>> I did change to CFLs (and halogens for dimmable rooms)
>
> Halogens don't take well to being dimmed,

Are you sure? In my theatrical lighting days, all the lamps were halogen filled with tungsten filaments. 500w to 3000w per each. Don't touch the glass with bare fingers, or the bulbs will fail prematurely due to the oil from your fingers creating a hotspot on the outer envelope.

They dimmed quite well.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Andy Burns](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 16:00:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Scott Lurndal wrote:

> Huge writes:
>
>> Halogens don't take well to being dimmed,
>
> Are you sure?

I think the theory is that when dimmed the bulb may be cool enough that the halogens condense onto the glass and blacken it; in practice I've never had a problem from dimming them.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 16:34:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-06, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> writes:
>
>> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>> wrote:

>>
>>> Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.
>>
>> That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a
>> real pest of yourself.
>>
>> Well, not even then.
>
> Okay, not clear to me how being a pest has any bearing
> on the plastic bag outcome?

Sometimes that's what it takes to stop a cashier from loading one
before you can supply your own.

> I just got one of my shopping bags in my junk mail.

We just got given a couple by the city in commemoration of the
new rec centre. They look like they'll last a while.

> They last pretty long, I've had a few of them for multiple years.

We have a big one we picked up on a trip to Bonaire in 2009.
It carries a _lot_ of stuff, and shows very little sign of wear.

--
/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\/ <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 16:34:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-06, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:
>
>> On 2020-01-06, Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> wrote:
>>
>>> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.
>>>
>>> That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a
>>> real pest of yourself.

>>>
>>> Well, not even then.
>>
>> You have to be fast. Before the cashier pulls out a plastic bag, drop
>> your re-usable bag (or backpack, if you've been ultra-eco-friendly
>> and ridden there on your bicycle) in front of her, and tell her to
>> put everything right into your bag.
>
> Still not getting the pest part.
>
> I haven't used a cashier since they started self checkout.

Ugh. There's no way I'll ever put up with one of those machines
nattering at me. Besides, I'd rather give a job to a real person.

--
/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\/ <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 17:12:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:

> On 2020-01-06, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:
>>
>>> On 2020-01-06, Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> wrote:
>>>
>>>> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.
>>>>
>>>> That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a
>>>> real pest of yourself.
>>>>
>>>> Well, not even then.
>>>
>>> You have to be fast. Before the cashier pulls out a plastic bag, drop
>>> your re-usable bag (or backpack, if you've been ultra-eco-friendly
>>> and ridden there on your bicycle) in front of her, and tell her to
>>> put everything right into your bag.

>>
>> Still not getting the pest part.
>>
>> I haven't used a cashier since they started self checkout.
>
> Ugh. There's no way I'll ever put up with one of those machines
> nattering at me. Besides, I'd rather give a job to a real person.

Last few times I shopped, there was a waiting line to use the self checkout stations. I don't know if all the cashier lines were busy or not, I still waited.

Some people prefer that their nattering come from machines where you can just ignore it.

I guess I just didn't get the pest part.
Back when I used cashiers, I'd just put my bags as the first thing on the belt for the cashier.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 17:43:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On 6 Jan 2020 11:13:15 GMT, Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
> On 2020-01-06, Andy Burns <usenet@andyburns.uk> wrote:
>> Huge wrote:
>>
>>> So not only do we have to replace the fittings, but the dimmers as
>>> well. Am I the only one that smells a rat?
>>
>> Presumably you don't have all your lights on dimmers, just a couple of
>> rooms? Hardly a big expense. Alternatively have a main, and one or
>> more extra lights in each room and switch them as appropriate ...
>>
>> I did change to CFLs (and halogens for dimmable rooms)
>
> Halogens don't take well to being dimmed, and have been largely
> banned in the EU anyway.
>
> <https://www.which.co.uk/news/2018/08/eu-halogen-light-bulb-ban-everything-you-need-to-know/>
>

>> but they weren't
>> great so now I have LEDs everywhere except some fluorescent tubes in
>> garage/shed and the old CFLs relegated to the loft.

Which halogens ? They used to be used in stage theaters, probably still are, to light up the stage.

--
Jim

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 17:54:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:
> On 2020-01-06, Scott Lurndal <scott@slp53.sl.home> wrote:
>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> writes:
>>> On 2020-01-06, Andy Burns <usenet@andyburns.uk> wrote:
>>>> Huge wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > So not only do we have to replace the fittings, but the dimmers as
>>>> > well. Am I the only one that smells a rat?
>>>>
>>>> Presumably you don't have all your lights on dimmers, just a couple of
>>>> rooms? Hardly a big expense. Alternatively have a main, and one or
>>>> more extra lights in each room and switch them as appropriate ...
>>>>
>>>> I did change to CFLs (and halogens for dimmable rooms)
>>>
>>> Halogens don't take well to being dimmed,
>>
>> Are you sure? In my theatrical lighting days, all the lamps were
>> halogen filled with tungsten filaments. 500w to 3000w per each. Don't
>> touch the glass with bare fingers, or the bulbs will fail prematurely
>> due to the oil from your fingers creating a hotspot on the outer
>> envelope.
>>
>> They dimmed quite well.
>
> It's explained here;
>
> <https://www.topbulb.com/blog/dimming-alters-halogen-cycle/>

Well, if such an effect exists, it certainly didn't cause any issues theatrically; we generally only relamped when the lamp failed - when dimming dozens of lamps on a circuit, a small decrease in the available light didn't really matter.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Andy Burns](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 18:41:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> Which halogens ? They used to be used in stage theaters, probably
> still are, to light up the stage.

Just a couple of about 5" globe ones (think they were an opal globe with the quartz halogen capsule inside, as that style suited the shades which used to have similar large incandescent globes)

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 19:04:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jim Wrote:

>
>> Which halogens ? They used to be used in stage theaters, probably
>> still are, to light up the stage.
>

Modern theatrical lighting is mostly LED.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 20:27:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 06 Jan 2020 11:43:35 -0600
JimP <solosam90@gmail.com> wrote:

> Which halogens ? They used to be used in stage theaters, probably
> still are, to light up the stage.

They're getting replaced by LEDs for stage use - long life, fast switching (most stage lighting needs to be faded not switched, LEDs don't care), any colour you want from RGB mixers with no gels to change. It almost makes me wish I was still doing stage lighting instead of seeing it done. Halogens were just coming in last time I ran a lighting rig.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith		Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN		A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins.		licences available see
You lose and Bill collects.		http://www.sohara.org/

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 20:48:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 9:07:20 AM UTC-5, Dan Espen wrote:

- > 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescents they replaced
- > and used less power. While they had some minor drawbacks
- > they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
- > The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
- > near with incandescents.

In my opinion, CFLs were lousy. They were expensive and lasted no longer than incandescents. They broke easily and made a mess. The light quality was lousy and there was flicker. They were slow to get up to full brightness.

Lastly, the power saved wasn't all that great.

I support conservation, but the tree-huggers who pushed CFLs missed the boat on that one. It was an easy target, easy to convince kids to run around the house and replace the old bulbs and make them feel like they were doing something.

The problem is that there are far worse power hogs out there (as well as waste sources) but no one wants to touch them. For instance, almost everybody these days drives a big fat SUV or pickup truck that is exempt from the rules and is bigger than they really need. That wastes an enormous amount of fuel. We've allowed (or sabotaged) our passenger rail systems to decay, discouraging patronage and moving people over to wasteful automobiles. We have people flying short distances that should be on a fast train.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 20:58:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 2:20:03 PM UTC-5, Dan Espen wrote:

- > In the USA, lots of coal is burned to create electricity.
- > If the RWNJs had their way, a lot more coal would be burned.
- > Burning coal puts lots of bad things in the atmosphere,
- > including mercury.

We are air conditioning more places, for instance, schools. Admittedly, it was miserable sitting there in the heat

in May, June and September. But that takes power.

(And yes, I do like, even need, my a/c. Probably saves lives.)

When I entered the workforce, we used much less power. We had manual typewriters, adding machines, pencil sharpeners, copying switchboards, and mimeograph machines. A lot of record keeping was done on 3x5 cards and file cabinets. All that stuff is electric now, and that uses power, not only to run the machines, but provide a/c to take away the generated heat.

I remember when our office got a Xerox machine. Yeah, no more carbon paper! But they had to run a special 220V power line for it.

So, like it or not, our world today uses a lot more electricity. Natural sources like solar, wind, and hydro are simply inadequate to meet demand. Coal is available and cheap. If we ban coal altogether, we'll have power shortages or create problems with other sources.

Here's a question: why can't we use coke as a fuel? Coke is processed coal with the impurities burned off in a sealed oven (the chemicals are captured and used for other things). Yes, it would still cost more, but it would be a lot cleaner.

Another question: How about nuke as a fuel? With nuclear, we could electrify more railroads and transit. Maybe with modern technology it would be cheaper to build a nuke plant. (Whatever happened to "too cheap to meter"?)

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:02:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 2:20:03 PM UTC-5, Dan Espen wrote:

- > In the USA, lots of coal is burned to create electricity.
- > If the RWNJs had their way, a lot more coal would be burned.
- > Burning coal puts lots of bad things in the atmosphere,
- > including mercury.

P.S.

In my opinion, thanks to idiotic and selfish policies advanced by the tree-huggers and free-marketers the U.S. will soon face terrible power shortages. It already happened in California a

few years ago. I don't think they learned from that, and the zealots on both sides of the aisle are still working full steam for their agendas. Us ordinary schlubs are caught in the middle.

Ref. "Kochland : the secret history of Koch Industries and corporate power in America" by Christopher Leonard.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:07:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 2:46:24 PM UTC-5, Peter Flass wrote:

> This doesn't have to happen. Warren Buffett is giving away most of his
> money specifically to avoid this. People like Andrew Carnegie gave away
> lots of money and did a lot of good with it,.

Andrew Carnegie was a real bastard. Only at the end of his life did he realize how devastating his greed was and give his money away.

Ref: "Meet you in hell : Andrew Carnegie, Henry Clay Frick, and the bitter partnership that transformed America" by Les Standiford.

There has been recent attempts to repaint the oldtime robber barons as good people who created economic wealth in their mega corporations. But that isn't true. What those guys did was raid _existing_ companies that _other_ people built and force them, through dubious means, to sell out to them.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:10:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 2:50:27 PM UTC-5, Peter Flass wrote:

> I think more energy is wasted in transmission than is used productively.
> Until we achieve room-temperature superconductivity we need to put the
> source closer to the end-user. Small neighborhood nukes might be a good
> solution.

It's worse than that. The power grid is grossly overloaded and

at high risk for failure. Electricity needs to be provided upon demand, in full. No room for delay or error. With climate change and severe weather conditions (super cold or super warm) we need more energy than ever, as well as for modern computers and office needs.

In NYC, they wanted to build local supplemental power plants, but the tree huggers fought that.

California suffered disastrous power failures years ago thanks to foolish ideas.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:15:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 6:41:31 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:

- > FOr the most part, that's caused by people who don't RTFM. CFL's weren't suitable
- > for certain usages (unventilated enclosures, for example) or mounting
- > orientations (base up, in some cases); Improperly mounted or enclosed,
- > the ballast electronics would overheat and fail prematurely.

But what was an ordinary consumer supposed to do? Standard incandescents were unavailable. We had to stick the CFL in the sealed overhead fixture. (How unventilated could it have been since it had to have air for the hot oldstyle bulb?)

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:20:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sunday, January 5, 2020 at 2:18:09 AM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

- > I don't see why people are so down on CFLs (and presumably
- > conventional fluorescents). Of course they're not suitable for every
- > application, any idiot can see that. But the "on for hours"
- > applications (and in the orientation and with the ventilation they
- > were designed for) they work fine, and usually they were cost
- > effective otherwise, so long as you didn't need "instant on full
- > bright" service. Even the cheap Chinese ones. LEDs are better and
- > cheaper now but weren't available at the beginning, and nobody knew
- > how long it would be until they were economically effective. Disposal
- > is commensurate with conventional fluorescents (i.e. inconvenient).

I bought some traditional fluorescent 'stick lamps' (the kind you stick over your kitchen sink mounted on the cabinet). I discovered that while they lasted a long time and were efficient, they were not replaceable. Turned out the bulb was unique and not replaceable, so I had to throw out the whole fixture.

As to LEDs, the jury is still out in my uses for plain lamp lights.

But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact. (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life and the entire unit had to be discarded. I still use cheap 25 year old D cell flashlights that still work just fine.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:26:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sunday, January 5, 2020 at 2:36:41 AM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

> And vulture capitalists. Unions (i.e. workers) have lost a lot of
> power over the last 50 years.

Vulture capitalists have done tremendous damage to the U.S.
Unbelievable carnage and destruction.

Ref, "The Glass House the 1% economy and the shattering of
the all-American town by Brian Alexander.

As to unions, it's a mixed bag. Basic industrial unions
(steel, autos), got too powerful after 1960. They demanded
and received economically unsustainable wages and benefits
and suffocating work rules. This put strains on ordinary
consumers with expensive crappy cars and inflation and
made overseas goods desirable.

On the other hand, once unions lost power, corporations
exploited it and turned workers into serfs.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:27:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sunday, January 5, 2020 at 3:00:07 AM UTC-5, Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:

> Agreed that is the important question, and as far as I can make out
> the poorest of the poor have been getting steadily better off for a long
> time.

No.

Subject: Re: plastic bags, was: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:31:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

danny burstein <dannyb@panix.com> wrote:

> (apologies for prior, empty, post. I hit the send keys too early)
>
> In
> <2023267094.600013116.732632.peter_flass-yahoo.com@news.eternal-september.org> Peter
Flass
> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> [snippeth]
>
>> We use plastic grocery bags as wastebasket liners, which at least saves us
>> from buying bags specifically for the wastebaskets.
>
> They also come in handy for people with dogs who lived in civilized
> areas that wish to "scoop the poop".
>
>

Done that too, occasionally, though I usually buy bags for this.

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:32:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:

> On 2020-01-06, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>> Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> writes:
>>
>>> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>> wrote:

>>>
>>>> Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.
>>>
>>> That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a
>>> real pest of yourself.
>>>
>>> Well, not even then.
>>
>> Okay, not clear to me how being a pest has any bearing
>> on the plastic bag outcome?
>
> Sometimes that's what it takes to stop a cashier from loading one
> before you can supply your own.
>
>> I just got one of my shopping bags in my junk mail.
>
> We just got given a couple by the city in comemmmoration of the
> new rec centre. They look like they'll last a while.
>
>> They last pretty long, I've had a few of them for multiple years.
>
> We have a big one we picked up on a trip to Bonaire in 2009.
> It carries a _lot_ of stuff, and shows very little sign of wear.
>

I recently read an article that said reusable bags are no more "green" than disposables, due to manufacturing processes and disposal costs when they finally *do* wear out.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:32:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:
> On 2020-01-06, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:
>>
>>> On 2020-01-06, Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> wrote:
>>>
>>>> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.

>>>>
>>>> That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a
>>>> real pest of yourself.
>>>>
>>>> Well, not even then.
>>>
>>> You have to be fast. Before the cashier pulls out a plastic bag, drop
>>> your re-usable bag (or backpack, if you've been ultra-eco-friendly
>>> and ridden there on your bicycle) in front of her, and tell her to
>>> put everything right into your bag.
>>
>> Still not getting the pest part.
>>
>> I haven't used a cashier since they started self checkout.
>
> Ugh. There's no way I'll ever put up with one of those machines
> nattering at me. Besides, I'd rather give a job to a real person.
>

I usually get into a rather one-sided argument with the self-checkout.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:42:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

> On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 2:50:27 PM UTC-5, Peter Flass wrote:

>
> California suffered disastrous power failures years ago
> thanks to foolish ideas.

California has NEVER suffered disasterous power failures. Ever.

There were brownouts caused by market manipulations, not by any shortage of energy generation capability. Note that the 'brownouts' did not effect the entire bay area (only some 96k customers out of more than 2 million). They certainly cannot be categorized as "disasterous".

Please learn about it before writing about it.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/California_electricity_crisis

"California had an installed generating capacity of 45 GW. At the time of the blackouts, demand was 28 GW. A demand-supply gap was created by energy companies, mainly Enron, to create an artificial shortage."

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:43:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

> On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 6:41:31 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:
>
>> FOr the most part, that's caused by people who don't RTFM. CFL's weren't suitable
>> for certain usages (unventilated enclosures, for example) or mounting
>> orientations (base up, in some cases); Improperly mounted or enclosed,
>> the ballast electronics would overheat and fail prematurely.
>
> But what was an ordinary consumer supposed to do? Standard
> incandescents were unavailable. We had to stick the CFL in
> the sealed overhead fixture. (How unventilated could it have
> been since it had to have air for the hot oldstyle bulb?)

Incandescent bulbs can stand much higher temperatures without failing than the solid state electronics used in the CFL ballast, of course.

The ordinary consumer could have troubled themselves to read the packaging when selecting a CFL to ensure that it was suitable for the desired purpose.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:45:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

> As to LEDs, the jury is still out in my uses for plain
> lamp lights.
>
> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought
> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
> and the entire unit had to be discarded.

You know, you get what you pay for. Buy something that wasn't designed to last a week and you'll be much happier. I have LED flashlights that work extremely well; I didn't get them

at harbor freight, but rather paid for higher quality.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:48:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:
> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:
>> On 2020-01-06, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

>>
>> We have a big one we picked up on a trip to Bonaire in 2009.
>> It carries a _lot_ of stuff, and shows very little sign of wear.
>>
>
> I recently read an article that said reusable bags are no more "green" than
> disposables, due to manufacturing processes and disposal costs when they
> finally *do* wear out.

Use paper bags. I've been using the same four for a couple years now; a bit of care (don't overload them) and they'll last quite some time. And they only cost a dime (although most of the ones I have come from the weekly Noah's Bagel deliveries to work). And they can be composted at end-of-life. And they're made from renewable materials.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:53:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 12:58:40 -0800 (PST)
hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

> So, like it or not, our world today uses a lot more electricity.
> Natural sources like solar, wind, and hydro are simply inadequate
> to meet demand.

Backed by sufficient power storage they can easily more than adequate to meet demand (this is an easy calculation). Good enough power storage is still a problem, although the huge battery packs in Australia and California seem to be working well and making money for their owners.

Even without massive power storage natural sources accounted for 48.5% of the UK's electricity in 2019, fossil fuel burning produced 43%. This marks the first year that natural sources produced more than fossil fuel burning so you'll find it widely reported.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:54:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 13:15:33 -0800 (PST)
hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

> (How unventilated could it have
> been since it had to have air for the hot oldstyle bulb?)

Not really, nothing was going to go wrong with one of those until
the solder melted.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 23:05:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> writes:

> On 1/6/2020 2:48 PM, hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>> On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 9:07:20 AM UTC-5, Dan Espen wrote:
>>
>>> 1. CFLs lasted longer than the incandescent they replaced
>>> and used less power. While they had some minor drawbacks
>>> they were still a step up. I have CFLs in my driveway lamp.
>>> The bulbs must be at least 15 years old now. Something I got nowhere
>>> near with incandescent.
>>
>> In my opinion, CFLs were lousy. They were expensive and lasted
>> no longer than incandescent. They broke easily and made a mess.
>> The light quality was lousy and there was flicker. They were
>> slow to get up to full brightness.
>

> They were expensive at first, but got cheaper (less than a buck) and
> were often subsidized by power companies. Personally, I saw less
> flicker than with conventional fluorescents (I think the CFL arc is at
> much higher frequency). Mine lasted (still do) far better than
> incandescents (the name brand ones were generally better than the
> Brand X Chinese ones). You're right about breakage, and slow startup.

There is one place where I miss the slow startup of CFL's - the bathroom at night.

When I had the CFL globes in the bathroom, it was much easier on the eyes to turn the lights on when getting up in the middle of the night...

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 23:07:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 15:42:28 -0600
Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:

> As to
> light quality, neither fluorescent phosphors nor LEDs give you a nice
> clean spectrum like a photoflood does. But that's an incandescent that
> has a working life of only a few hours.

Have you tried the very high CRI LEDs made for photographic use ?
They're claimed to be a good match for a photoflood, it would be interesting to know if they are.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith	Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN	A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins.	licences available see
You lose and Bill collects.	http://www.sohara.org/

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 23:08:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 15:54:06 -0600
Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:

> On 1/6/2020 3:20 PM, hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>
>>
>> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought

>> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
>> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
>> and the entire unit had to be discarded. I still use cheap 25
>> year old D cell flashlights that still work just fine.
>>
> IME the flashlight failures are usually due to crappy switches, rather
> than the LEDs themselves.

That and overheating regulators.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 23:33:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> writes:
> On 1/6/2020 3:32 PM, Peter Flass wrote:
>> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:
>>> On 2020-01-06, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> writes:
>>>>>
>>>>> > On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>>> > wrote:
>>>>> >
>>>>> >> Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.
>>>>> >
>>>>> > That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a
>>>>> > real pest of yourself.
>>>>> >
>>>>> > Well, not even then.
>>>>>
>>>>> Okay, not clear to me how being a pest has any bearing
>>>>> on the plastic bag outcome?
>>>>
>>>> Sometimes that's what it takes to stop a cashier from loading one
>>>> before you can supply your own.
>>>>
>>>>> I just got one of my shopping bags in my junk mail.
>>>>>
>>>>> We just got given a couple by the city in comemmmoration of the
>>>>> new rec centre. They look like they'll last a while.

>>>
>>>> They last pretty long, I've had a few of them for multiple years.
>>>
>>> We have a big one we picked up on a trip to Bonaire in 2009.
>>> It carries a _lot_ of stuff, and shows very little sign of wear.
>>>
>>
>> I recently read an article that said reusable bags are no more "green" than
>> disposables, due to manufacturing processes and disposal costs when they
>> finally *do* wear out.
>>
> <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2016/09/to-to-te-or-note-to-tote/498557/>
>
> HDPE bag = 2kg carbon
> paper bag = 14kg carbon
> recycled HDPE tote = 52kg carbon
> cotton tote = 654kg carbon

I'd rather see the underlying study and its methodology rather than some reporter summarizing it. 30 pounds of carbon to make a paper bag seems a bit on the high side.

The UKEA study (link in above article) is much more nuanced than the figures above. Firstly, the carbon values listed above are actually "IPCC 2007 Global Warming Potential (kg CO₂ eq)", and the baseline (table 6.2) for paper (used 4 times) is 1.381kg rather than the 14kg you extracted from the article, and recycling the bag drops that to 1.09kg. This is the best from all the bag-types.

See also Figure 5.1 which shows total lifecycle impact GWP for paper as 4.5kg CO₂ eq.

The IPCC report (Table 5.4) shows the total global warming potential for paper as 5.523kg when discarded after one use, and 1.381kg when discarded after four uses.

Note sure where the numbers you reported come from, but they don't seem correct.

They also attempt to take into account the electricity mix used to produce the bags (considering the country/region where most of the bags are produced, e.g. China for most HDPE bags).

The report notes that paper bags aren't commonly used in the UK, so they have no evidence of re-use. re-use is common in California.

Mostly, the report is _very_ UK centric and makes assumptions about the manufacture of the various bag types consistent with UK experience (i.e. paper bags come from Europe, plastic from China) that may not apply to the US or other parts of the world.

It does confirm to me that paper bags are probably the best all-around; I shred mine into the compost pile after a dozen or more uses; the report assumes they're incinerated.

Note also the study was published in 2011 using data from 2006, I expect that the energy mix used to make the bags has changed (even in China) in the direction of using more renewable energy in the last 14 years, which would naturally reduce the IPCC GWP for each of the bag types.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 23:47:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-06, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:

> If we raised gas taxes to the point that they could pay for the entire
> upkeep and maintenance of roads that would help. But it would probably
> triple the taxes (right now, US gas tax and auto excise tax cover
> about half, but that doesn't include anything for city streets), no
> politician wants to go there.

Up here in Canada, gas taxes disappear down that black hole known as "general revenue" (government-speak for "money laundering"). Rumour has it that about 5% of gas taxes actually go towards roads.

--
/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\/ <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Mon, 06 Jan 2020 23:47:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-06, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:
>
>> On 2020-01-06, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>> I haven't used a cashier since they started self checkout.
>>
>> Ugh. There's no way I'll ever put up with one of those machines
>> nattering at me. Besides, I'd rather give a job to a real person.

>
> I usually get into a rather one-sided argument with the self-checkout.

I bet my blood pressure is lower than yours. :-)

--
/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\/ <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 01:21:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 13:27:59 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

> On Sunday, January 5, 2020 at 3:00:07 AM UTC-5, Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:
>> Agreed that is the important question, and as far as I can make out
>> the poorest of the poor have been getting steadily better off for a long
>> time.
>
> No.

Explain.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 01:25:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 13:20:20 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

> On Sunday, January 5, 2020 at 2:18:09 AM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>
>> I don't see why people are so down on CFLs (and presumably
>> conventional fluorescents). Of course they're not suitable for every
>> application, any idiot can see that. But the "on for hours"
>> applications (and in the orientation and with the ventilation they
>> were designed for) they work fine, and usually they were cost
>> effective otherwise, so long as you didn't need "instant on full
>> bright" service. Even the cheap Chinese ones. LEDs are better and

>> cheaper now but weren't available at the beginning, and nobody knew
>> how long it would be until they were economically effective. Disposal
>> is commensurate with conventional fluorescents (i.e. inconvenient).

>

> I bought some traditional fluorescent 'stick lamps' (the kind
> you stick over your kitchen sink mounted on the cabinet).
> I discovered that while they lasted a long time and were
> efficient, they were not replaceable. Turned out the bulb
> was unique and not replaceable, so I had to throw out the
> whole fixture.

>

> As to LEDs, the jury is still out in my uses for plain
> lamp lights.

>

> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought
> a bunch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
> and the entire unit had to be discarded. I still use cheap 25
> year old D cell flashlights that still work just fine.

"Terrible life"?!?!?!? Compared to an incandescent?!?!?!? What did
you DO to the poor thing?

And how can you stand those horribly dim battery eating incandescent
flashlights after using an LED that gives the same brightness as the
incandescent literally for _days_ or if you are willing to tolerate the
same battery life as the incandescent ten times the brightness? Of if
you really need to see turn it up all the way and have 100 times?

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 03:01:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:

> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:

>> On 2020-01-06, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>> Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> writes:

>>>

>>>> On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>

>>>> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.

>>>>

>>>> That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a

>>>> real pest of yourself.

>>>>
>>>> Well, not even then.
>>>
>>> Okay, not clear to me how being a pest has any bearing
>>> on the plastic bag outcome?
>>
>> Sometimes that's what it takes to stop a cashier from loading one
>> before you can supply your own.
>>
>>> I just got one of my shopping bags in my junk mail.
>>
>> We just got given a couple by the city in commemoration of the
>> new rec centre. They look like they'll last a while.
>>
>>> They last pretty long, I've had a few of them for multiple years.
>>
>> We have a big one we picked up on a trip to Bonaire in 2009.
>> It carries a _lot_ of stuff, and shows very little sign of wear.
>
> I recently read an article that said reusable bags are no more "green" than
> disposables, due to manufacturing processes and disposal costs when they
> finally *do* wear out.

They can't be recycled but they last for years.
For me, at least 3 or 4.
I doubt I put more than one bag a year into the landfills.

In that same one year I'd use hundreds of plastic bags.

I wouldn't mind paper bags.
I haven't seen any in ages.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: plastic bags, was: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Joy Beeson](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 05:22:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 14:49:05 +0000 (UTC), danny burstein
<dannyb@panix.com> wrote:

> (apologies for prior, empty, post. I hit the send keys too early)
>
> In <2023267094.600013116.732632.peter_flass-yahoo.com@news.eternal-september.org>
Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:
>

> [snippeth]
>
>> We use plastic grocery bags as wastebasket liners, which at least saves us
>> from buying bags specifically for the wastebaskets.
>
> They also come in handy for people with dogs who lived in civilized
> areas that wish to "scoop the poop".

I always carry a plastic bag of loosely-crumpled plastic bags on my bicycle. Very useful for packing material, and for attaching loaves of bread and other squishables to the rack or the top of the pannier. I put both handles of the bag through a hole in the pannier or rack, pull it snug, then tie the handles to each other around something. (I once used plastic bags as rope to keep some carpets samples I'd just bought rolled up.)

When I started carryng it, I thought that if I wanted the space the bag occupies, it would be because I'd just bought something, and there's always a trashbin or recycling barrel in or near a store, but it turns out that I always want a little padding on top of what I've just bought before I bungee it down.

Bags accumulate fast enough that I'm quite fussy when sorting out damaged or dirty bags to put into the bag to be taken to the recycling barrel.

--

Joy Beeson
joy beeson at comcast dot net
<http://wlweather.net/PAGEJOY/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Joy Beeson](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 05:46:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 6 Jan 2020 16:34:16 GMT, Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:

> We have a big one we picked up on a trip to Bonaire in 2009.
> It carries a _lot_ of stuff, and shows very little sign of wear.

I bought my bags when the SuperValu opened in 1995. They are beginning to show signs of wear.

And I usually wash them in hot water with bleach, like the dish towels.

--

Joy Beeson
joy beeson at comcast dot net
<http://wlweather.net/PAGEJOY/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Joy Beeson](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 05:46:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 06 Jan 2020 09:41:20 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
wrote:

> I haven't used a cashier since they started self checkout.

Everyone has a superpower. Mine is crashing self-checkout computers.

--

Joy Beeson
joy beeson at comcast dot net
<http://wlweather.net/PAGEJOY/>

Subject: Re: Light 'Bulbs'
Posted by [Mike Spencer](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 07:49:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

John Levine <johnl@taugh.com> writes:

> In article <87blrh7jke.fsf@bogus.nodomain.nowhere>,
> Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> wrote:
>
>> I'm lighting my studio/shop/atelier with 300W incandescents. I'm
>> gonna be really annoyed when I run out and have to figure out an
>> alternative.
>
> 300W incandescents put out 3500 to 5500 lumens depending on the type
> of bulb. Poking around online it's not hard to find LED bulbs in the
> 4000-5000 lumen range. If you're used to incandescents you'd probably
> prefer the warmer looking 3000K rather than the usual 500K but they're
> not much harder to find. Most of them screw into the same socket as
> the incandescent they replace.

Well, that would be good. Buying "online" not so good but doable.

Saved for future reference, tnx. The world may change again before I

have to give up on what I'm using.

- > They cost a lot more than incandescents but since they last for
- > decades and use 1/10 the power I expect they'll pay for themselves
- > soon enough.

The 300W bulbs I've been using last pretty well. Replaced maybe 6 in the 17 years since I built the shop.

--

Mike Spencer Nova Scotia, Canada

Subject: Re: Light 'Bulbs'

Posted by [Mike Spencer](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 07:57:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jmreno <none@znet.com> writes:

- > I never did like those newfangled incandescent lights.
- >
- > I use only good old gas lights in my house.

I lived for a decade without electricity, had two gas lights and a mantle-type oil lamp. Liked the newfangled incandescents well enough but not the cost or bother of getting the powerco to put in half a mile of poles.

ObAFC: No contact with computers whatsoever during those years. Did a lot of dead-tree reading though.

- > But for those times I need a really bright light I have a few nice arc
- > lights that I got for free from a movie theater that was converting from
- > film to video.

One-upped me there. Even now, my brightest light is a 1500W flood that I use for splitting wood when evenings are dark.

--

Mike Spencer Nova Scotia, Canada

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Mike Spencer](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 08:12:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:

> On 2020-01-06, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>> I haven't used a cashier since they started self checkout.
>
> Ugh. There's no way I'll ever put up with one of those machines
> nattering at me. Besides, I'd rather give a job to a real person.

Same here. We get acquainted with checkout clerks, are sorry when they get reassigned or move on. But the we shop in a small market town, not a huge 21st c. metropolis.

--

Mike Spencer Nova Scotia, Canada

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Mike Spencer](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 08:37:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

> Here's a question: why can't we use coke as a fuel? Coke
> is processed coal with the impurities burned off in a sealed
> oven (the chemicals are captured and used for other things).
> Yes, it would still cost more, but it would be a lot cleaner.

The "impurities" are a horrible mess of many variously sticky, ikky or toxic compounds, typically including a lot sulfur. Nova Scotia's chief environmental disaster site is the site of a coking plant run for decades with no controls other than settling "ponds". I actually saw it in operation in the early 70s -- gondolar car loads of red-hot coke hosed down with thousands of gallons of water.

The steel industry uses "metalurgical" coal, viz. low-sulfur bituminous coal, that they coke out before putting it into the blast furnace. North American blacksmith use metalurgical coal (when they can get it) and coke it out on the fly so the crap burns off and goes up the fue. British blacksmiths prefer "breeze", pea-sized coke that tends not to be an article of commerce in Leftpondia.

A curious story: Only a few years ago, a state of the art coking plant was completed in (IIRC) Germany. And they found they couldn't make a profit under the market circumstances of the moment. The Chinese, who were so desperate for coke for their steel industry that they were buying bulk shiploads of coke already in transit to other users, bought the coking plant. Sent a crew of Chinese workmen and and

engineers over, dismantled the whole shebang and shipped it back to China in containers.

One thing I *don't* understand is petroleum coke, a byproduct of refining. AFAIK, it's nearly 100% carbon but (again, AFAIK) there are huge mountains of it sitting around because nobody knows what to do (profitably) with it.

--

Mike Spencer Nova Scotia, Canada

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 09:40:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 06 Jan 2020 23:05:53 GMT
scott@slp53.sl.home (Scott Lurndal) wrote:

> There is one place where I miss the slow startup of CFL's - the bathroom
> at night.
>
> When I had the CFL globes in the bathroom, it was much easier on the
> eyes to turn the lights on when getting up in the middle of the night...

Sounds like a good use for a dimmer - or if you're feeling inventive a soft-start circuit (were you looking for a business opportunity ?).

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 09:58:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 06 Jan 2020 20:25:32 -0500
J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 13:20:20 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>
>> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought
>> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.

>> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
>> and the entire unit had to be discarded. I still use cheap 25
>> year old D cell flashlights that still work just fine.
>
> "Terrible life"?!?!?!? Compared to an incandescent?!?!?!? What did

The torches last forever - eating batteries and bulbs the whole time.

> you DO to the poor thing?

A lot of cheap LED torches are really badly built, cheap bright ones tend to overheat too.

> And how can you stand those horribly dim battery eating incandescent
> flashlights after using an LED that gives the same brightness as the

Yeah they do throw good light, but even reasonably good ones (I've not tried the really expensive ones) tend to pack up within a small number of years.

Currently that's not too much of a problem because they're improving significantly in that time - my current outgoing crop have three AAA batteries[1] and a point LED while the incoming ones have a USB charge port, a removable 18650 Li-Ion battery and both COB flood and point LEDs. The latest ones also seem to be better built, but time will tell as always.

[1] Conveniently my collection of low self-discharge NiMH batteries is running low as one by one they stop taking charge after many years of use.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith	Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN	A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins.	licences available see
You lose and Bill collects.	http://www.sohara.org/

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 11:38:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 7 Jan 2020 10:29:04 GMT
Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:

> On 2020-01-06, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>> On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 12:58:40 -0800 (PST)
>> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

>>
 >>> So, like it or not, our world today uses a lot more electricity.
 >>> Natural sources like solar, wind, and hydro are simply inadequate
 >>> to meet demand.
 >>
 >> Backed by sufficient power storage they can easily more than
 >> adequate to meet demand (this is an easy calculation). Good enough power
 >> storage is still a problem, although the huge battery packs in
 >> Australia and California seem to be working well and making money for
 >> their owners.
 >
 > Those "huge battery packs" aren't what you think they are. They're to
 > cover the gap while a thermal power station can be brought on-line, not

Yes I know, they're an alternative to expensive, fast-turn-on, gas turbines for filling in peaks. They also get used to hold cheap electricity for sale at peak times which is where they're making money hand over fist.

> to provide power for the week while an Atlantic high comes and sits over
 > your country (as regularly happens in the UK at this time of year) and
 > there's no wind or sunlight.

It's not that bad but yes power storage is nowhere near sufficient, and on the scale required is not even remotely economically feasible ... today. Those batteries indicate that it might be technically feasible if we wanted to pay for it.

From time to time I cost providing enough storage to take my home off grid or nearly so (around 120kWh of storage), it's certainly technically feasible to run my house on solar and wind with batteries at or above my current consumption level. As best I can make out such a system would pay for itself in ten to fifteen years (depending on how much contractors scalp^Wcharge and maintenance estimates - rather less if you assume horrendous price increases and energy shortages) while lasting twenty-five to thirty years.

It would perhaps be a good use for a small lottery win, but it's far more than I'd think about investing on that kind of return.

OTOH if trends continue it will eventually become the best option for powering rural properties, especially in areas where the grid is spotty and subject to weather induced outages.

Cities are another problem, in theory covering the roofs of a city with solar cells does the job but property rights, maintenance ... it's not going to happen until/unless it is so cheap it beats paying bills in a year or two.

In the meantime there's a lesser option of providing about 15kWh of storage, no generation and switching to day/night rates and only using night rate power. I haven't costed it in a while but it might be worthwhile sometime soon.

- > Until we can solve the intermittency issue
- > at an industrial scale, we will never be able to run purely on
- > renewables. The obvious solution is nuclear for baseline power, but the
- > greenies don't like that, either.

I have always liked that approach - but I'd prefer a lot more work to be done on fail-safe designs such as pebble-bed reactors rather than pressure cookers designed to make weapons grade plutonium with power as a side effect of cooling.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith	Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN	A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins.	licences available see
You lose and Bill collects.	http://www.sohara.org/

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 18:25:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On Mon, 06 Jan 2020 19:04:20 GMT, scott@slp53.sl.home (Scott Lurndal) wrote:

> Jim Wrote:

>>

>>> Which halogens ? They used to be used in stage theaters, probably

>>> still are, to light up the stage.

>>

>

> Modern theatrical lighting is mostly LED.

Wowsers. I have been outside the loop.

--

Jim

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 18:27:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 20:27:02 +0000, Ahem A Rivet's Shot

<steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

> On Mon, 06 Jan 2020 11:43:35 -0600

> JimP <solosam90@gmail.com> wrote:

>

>> Which halogens ? They used to be used in stage theaters, probably

>> still are, to light up the stage.

>

> They're getting replaced by LEDs for stage use - long life, fast

> switching (most stage lighting needs to be faded not switched, LEDs don't

> care), any colour you want from RGB mixers with no gels to change. It almost

> makes me wish I was still doing stage lighting instead of seeing it done.

> Halogens were just coming in last time I ran a lighting rig.

I distinctly remember a dress rehearsal for stage at the university where the lighting director and the play director arguing over color gels that didn't exist. According to the lighting director.

I don't miss gels for sure.

No, I didn't fall for the 'go wash these dirty gels' and have them disintegrate under the water.

--

Jim

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 18:39:32 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On Mon, 06 Jan 2020 21:45:53 GMT, scott@slp53.sl.home (Scott Lurndal) wrote:

> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

>

>> As to LEDs, the jury is still out in my uses for plain

>> lamp lights.

>>

>> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought

>> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.

>> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life

>> and the entire unit had to be discarded.

>

> You know, you get what you pay for. Buy something that wasn't

> designed to last a week and you'll be much happier. I have
> LED flashlights that work extremely well; I didn't get them
> at harbor freight, but rather paid for higher quality.

I've bought several styles and cost LED flashlights. The dollar ones don't last long, but might be good for a day of an emergency.

Since I go camping, I have bought around 3 headlamps. They go through batteries quickly.

What typically fails on the LED flashlights I have bought is the switch to turn them on and off. The 'rotate the barrel' to turn them on/off, can last years, and might not.

I do remember the glass bulb flashlights. The filament would break if you dropped flashlight and it was on for more than a few minutes. Which we kids did rather often when out camping.

--

Jim

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 18:48:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 4:42:04 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:

> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:
>> On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 2:50:27 PM UTC-5, Peter Flass wrote:
>
>>
>> California suffered disastrous power failures years ago
>> thanks to foolish ideas.
>
> California has NEVER suffered disasterous power failures. Ever.
>
> There were brownouts caused by market manipulations, not by any
> shortage of energy generation capability. Note that the 'brownouts'
> did not effect the entire bay area (only some 96k customers out of
> more than 2 million). They certainly cannot be categorized as
> "disasterous".
>
> Please learn about it before writing about it.
>
> https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/California_electricity_crisis
>
> "California had an installed generating capacity of 45 GW. At
> the time of the blackouts, demand was 28 GW. A demand-supply gap

> was created by energy companies, mainly Enron, to create an artificial shortage."

The book "Kochland : the secret history of Koch Industries and corporate power in America" presents a different view.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 18:50:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 4:44:00 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:

> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

>> On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 6:41:31 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:

>>

>>> FOr the most part, that's caused by people who don't RTFM. CFL's weren't suitable
>>> for certain usages (unventilated enclosures, for example) or mounting
>>> orientations (base up, in some cases); Improperly mounted or enclosed,
>>> the ballast electronics would overheat and fail prematurely.

>>

>> But what was an ordinary consumer supposed to do? Standard
>> incandescents were unavailable. We had to stick the CFL in
>> the sealed overhead fixture. (How unventilated could it have
>> been since it had to have air for the hot oldstyle bulb?)

>

> Incandescent bulbs can stand much higher temperatures
> without failing than the solid state electronics used in the CFL ballast, of course.

>

> The ordinary consumer could have troubled themselves to read
> the packaging when selecting a CFL to ensure that it was suitable
> for the desired purpose.

False to fact.

The packaging of CLFs did not contain that information.

Heck, it was hard enough to find the color temperature.

Further, consumers didn't have a choice of lamp beyond the wattage equivalent.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 18:53:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 4:45:55 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:

> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

>
>> As to LEDs, the jury is still out in my uses for plain
>> lamp lights.
>>
>> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought
>> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
>> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
>> and the entire unit had to be discarded.
>
> You know, you get what you pay for. Buy something that wasn't
> designed to last a week and you'll be much happier. I have
> LED flashlights that work extremely well; I didn't get them
> at harbor freight, but rather paid for higher quality.

False to fact.

My plain D cell flashlights were 75c each, lasted for
35 years in rough service and still work just fine.
The LED flashlights lasted about a year sitting around
the house and were expensive. The electronics in them
was crap.

I wasn't alone. They rebuilt a parking lot near by and
put in LED streetlights. Not long after installation
several heads failed and had to be replaced.

I noticed in traffic signals with LED several of the dots
are out.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 18:54:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 4:54:09 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

> On 1/6/2020 3:20 PM, hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>
>>
>> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought
>> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
>> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
>> and the entire unit had to be discarded. I still use cheap 25
>> year old D cell flashlights that still work just fine.
>>
> IME the flashlight failures are usually due to crappy switches, rather
> than the LEDs themselves.

No, it was the electronics.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 18:56:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 6:05:55 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:

- > There is one place where I miss the slow startup of CFL's - the bathroom at night.
- >
- > When I had the CFL globes in the bathroom, it was much easier on the
- > eyes to turn the lights on when getting up in the middle of the night...

I use a nitelight. They are little fixtures that plug into an outlet and support a 4 or 7 watt tiny bulb. Been around forever. Very good for the purpose. Just enough light to not stumble, but not a strain on sleepy eyes.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 19:02:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JimP <solosam90@gmail.com> writes:

- > On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 20:27:02 +0000, Ahem A Rivet's Shot
- > <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
- >> On Mon, 06 Jan 2020 11:43:35 -0600
- >> JimP <solosam90@gmail.com> wrote:
- >>
- >>> Which halogens ? They used to be used in stage theaters, probably
- >>> still are, to light up the stage.
- >>
- >> They're getting replaced by LEDs for stage use - long life, fast
- >> switching (most stage lighting needs to be faded not switched, LEDs don't
- >> care), any colour you want from RGB mixers with no gels to change. It almost
- >> makes me wish I was still doing stage lighting instead of seeing it done.
- >> Halogens were just coming in last time I ran a lighting rig.
- >
- > I distinctly remember a dress rehearsal for stage at the university
- > where the lighting director and the play director arguing over color
- > gels that didn't exist. According to the lighting director.

I've still got my Roscolux swatch book. I worked my way up from hanging lamps to lighting designer over a four-year period. Last show was South Pacific; tropical lighting...

- >
- > I don't miss gels for sure.

LED's have really simplified things; starting back with the Vari-lights

that Genesis (the prog-rock band) invested in back in the 80s. Today, the LED lamps are all bussed so they can be pointed in any axis and changed in color via simple computer commands.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vari-Lite>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 19:02:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 8:25:33 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
> On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 13:20:20 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>
>> On Sunday, January 5, 2020 at 2:18:09 AM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>
>>> I don't see why people are so down on CFLs (and presumably
>>> conventional fluorescents). Of course they're not suitable for every
>>> application, any idiot can see that. But the "on for hours"
>>> applications (and in the orientation and with the ventilation they
>>> were designed for) they work fine, and usually they were cost
>>> effective otherwise, so long as you didn't need "instant on full
>>> bright" service. Even the cheap Chinese ones. LEDs are better and
>>> cheaper now but weren't available at the beginning, and nobody knew
>>> how long it would be until they were economically effective. Disposal
>>> is commensurate with conventional fluorescents (i.e. inconvenient).
>>
>> I bought some traditional fluorescent 'stick lamps' (the kind
>> you stick over your kitchen sink mounted on the cabinet).
>> I discovered that while they lasted a long time and were
>> efficient, they were not replaceable. Turned out the bulb
>> was unique and not replaceable, so I had to throw out the
>> whole fixture.
>>
>> As to LEDs, the jury is still out in my uses for plain
>> lamp lights.
>>
>> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought
>> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
>> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
>> and the entire unit had to be discarded. I still use cheap 25
>> year old D cell flashlights that still work just fine.
>
> "Terrible life"?!?!?!? Compared to an incandescent?!?!?!? What did
> you DO to the poor thing?

The cheap D cell flashlights lasted a lot better through rough service than the LED units that basically sat on a

shelf with limited use.

The electronics in them was crap.

- > And how can you stand those horribly dim battery eating incandescent
- > flashlights after using an LED that gives the same brightness as the
- > incandescent literally for _days_ or if you are willing to tolerate the
- > same battery life as the incandescent ten times the brightness? Of if
- > you really need to see turn it up all the way and have 100 times?

LEDs consume power too, and get dimmer over time as the battery drains.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [scott](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 19:02:59 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

> On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 4:42:04 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:

>> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

>>> On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 2:50:27 PM UTC-5, Peter Flass wrote:

>>

>>>

>>> California suffered disastrous power failures years ago

>>> thanks to foolish ideas.

>>

>> California has _NEVER_ suffered disasterous power failures. Ever.

>>

>> There were brownouts caused by market manipulations, not by any

>> shortage of energy generation capability. Note that the 'brownouts'

>> did not effect the entire bay area (only some 96k customers out of

>> more than 2 million). They certainly cannot be categorized as

>> "disasterous".

>>

>> Please learn about it before writing about it.

>>

>> https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/California_electricity_crisis

>>

>> "California had an installed generating capacity of 45 GW. At

>> the time of the blackouts, demand was 28 GW. A demand-supply gap

>> was created by energy companies, mainly Enron, to create an artificial shortage."

>

> The book "Kochland : the secret history of Koch Industries and

> corporate power in America" presents a different view.

>

Please, enlighten us further...

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 19:05:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

> On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 4:45:55 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:

>> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

>>>

>>> As to LEDs, the jury is still out in my uses for plain
>>> lamp lights.

>>>

>>> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought
>>> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
>>> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
>>> and the entire unit had to be discarded.

>>

>> You know, you get what you pay for. Buy something that wasn't
>> designed to last a week and you'll be much happier. I have
>> LED flashlights that work extremely well; I didn't get them
>> at harbor freight, but rather paid for higher quality.

>

> False to fact.

>

> My plain D cell flashlights were 75c each, lasted for
> 35 years in rough service and still work just fine.
> The LED flashlights lasted about a year sitting around
> the house and were expensive. The electronics in them
> was crap.

>

> I wasn't alone. They rebuilt a parking lot near by and
> put in LED streetlights. Not long after installation
> several heads failed and had to be replaced.

Whereas my neighborhood switched to LEDs eight years ago, and there have been no failures in that time across thousands of fixtures. Clearly Philly either buys crap or doesn't know what their doing.

Far, Far superior to the old sodium vapor lamps in every respect.

>

> I noticed in traffic signals with LED several of the dots
> are out.

Better several of the dots than the entire bulb.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 19:07:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

> On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 6:05:55 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:

>
>> There is one place where I miss the slow startup of CFL's - the bathroom at night.
>>
>> When I had the CFL globes in the bathroom, it was much easier on the
>> eyes to turn the lights on when getting up in the middle of the night...
>
> I use a nitelight. They are little fixtures that plug into an
> outlet and support a 4 or 7 watt tiny bulb. Been around forever.
> Very good for the purpose. Just enough light to not stumble,
> but not a strain on sleepy eyes.
>

Do you really believe that you needed to define 'nitolight'?

I just tap on the scale, which provides enough light to find the target. The LED on the electric toothbrush is an effective nite lite as well. In any case, there are LED night-lights to replace your old 7watt incandescent.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 19:14:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-07, hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:

> I wasn't alone. They rebuilt a parking lot near by and
> put in LED streetlights. Not long after installation
> several heads failed and had to be replaced.
>
> I noticed in traffic signals with LED several of the dots
> are out.

High-power LEDs (or at least their electronics) are getting better, but I still see some teething problems. The most common failure mode is for the lights to start flickering; I've seen this in some warehouse complexes. A few years ago

in our hangar complex, we replaced 8 wall packs - 70-watt high-pressure sodium lamps - with 25-watt LED units. The light is much better - white rather than orange - and I calculated they'll pay for themselves in power savings in 10 years. But two or three of them failed; a couple quit entirely, while the other one started flashing once a second in a good imitation of an alarm strobe. I took them back to the supplier, who replaced them with no questions asked.

Our city has been phasing in LED street lights; I haven't seen any problems with them. They can only get better from here.

--

/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\/ <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 19:19:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tuesday, January 7, 2020 at 2:03:01 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:

> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

>> On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 4:42:04 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:

>>> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

>>>> On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 2:50:27 PM UTC-5, Peter Flass wrote:

>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> California suffered disastrous power failures years ago

>>>>> thanks to foolish ideas.

>>>>

>>>> California has NEVER suffered disasterous power failures. Ever.

>>>>

>>>> There were brownouts caused by market manipulations, not by any

>>>> shortage of energy generation capability. Note that the 'brownouts'

>>>> did not effect the entire bay area (only some 96k customers out of

>>>> more than 2 million). They certainly cannot be categorized as

>>>> "disasterous".

>>>>

>>>> Please learn about it before writing about it.

>>>>

>>>> https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/California_electricity_crisis

>>>>

>>>> "California had an installed generating capacity of 45 GW. At

>>>> the time of the blackouts, demand was 28 GW. A demand-supply gap

>>>> was created by energy companies, mainly Enron, to create an artificial shortage."

>>
>> The book "Kochland : the secret history of Koch Industries and
>> corporate power in America" presents a different view.
>>
>
> Please, enlighten us further...

It was a whole chapter. Lots of bad decisions, lots of greed.

the book says the situation was so bad they resorted to
rolling blackouts. It made national news and I recall it.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 20:23:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:
> On Tuesday, January 7, 2020 at 2:03:01 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:
>> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:
>>> On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 4:42:04 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:
>>>> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:
>>>> >On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 2:50:27 PM UTC-5, Peter Flass wrote:
>>>>
>>>> >
>>>> >California suffered disastrous power failures years ago
>>>> >thanks to foolish ideas.
>>>>
>>>> California has NEVER suffered disasterous power failures. Ever.
>>>>
>>>> There were brownouts caused by market manipulations, not by any
>>>> shortage of energy generation capability. Note that the 'brownouts'
>>>> did not effect the entire bay area (only some 96k customers out of
>>>> more than 2 million). They certainly cannot be categorized as
>>>> "disasterous".
>>>>
>>>> Please learn about it before writing about it.
>>>>
>>>> https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/California_electricity_crisis
>>>>
>>>> "California had an installed generating capacity of 45 GW. At
>>>> the time of the blackouts, demand was 28 GW. A demand-supply gap
>>>> was created by energy companies, mainly Enron, to create an artificial shortage."
>>>>
>>> The book "Kochland : the secret history of Koch Industries and
>>> corporate power in America" presents a different view.
>>>
>>

>> Please, enlighten us further...
>
> It was a whole chapter. Lots of bad decisions, lots of greed.
>
> the book says the situation was so bad they resorted to
> rolling blackouts. It made national news and I recall it.
>

Still have no idea what you mean by "Different View". Do they blame Enron or not?

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 21:21:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On Tue, 7 Jan 2020 10:54:04 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

> On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 4:54:09 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

>> On 1/6/2020 3:20 PM, hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

>>

>>>

>>> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought
>>> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
>>> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
>>> and the entire unit had to be discarded. I still use cheap 25
>>> year old D cell flashlights that still work just fine.

>>>

>> IME the flashlight failures are usually due to crappy switches, rather
>> than the LEDs themselves.

>

> No, it was the electronics.

In my current LED flashlight, I can hear the switch rattling around in the flashlight. When I press the button on the end of the flashlight to turn it on, it may not shine with any light. I shake it, it rattles, and the light may or may not come on.

My older LED flashlights don't do that and work fine.

--

Jim

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 21:40:09 GMT

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 13:20:20 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

>

>> On Sunday, January 5, 2020 at 2:18:09 AM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

>>

>>> I don't see why people are so down on CFLs (and presumably
>>> conventional fluorescents). Of course they're not suitable for every
>>> application, any idiot can see that. But the "on for hours"
>>> applications (and in the orientation and with the ventilation they
>>> were designed for) they work fine, and usually they were cost
>>> effective otherwise, so long as you didn't need "instant on full
>>> bright" service. Even the cheap Chinese ones. LEDs are better and
>>> cheaper now but weren't available at the beginning, and nobody knew
>>> how long it would be until they were economically effective. Disposal
>>> is commensurate with conventional fluorescents (i.e. inconvenient).

>>

>> I bought some traditional fluorescent 'stick lamps' (the kind
>> you stick over your kitchen sink mounted on the cabinet).
>> I discovered that while they lasted a long time and were
>> efficient, they were not replaceable. Turned out the bulb
>> was unique and not replaceable, so I had to throw out the
>> whole fixture.

>>

>> As to LEDs, the jury is still out in my uses for plain
>> lamp lights.

>>

>> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought
>> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
>> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
>> and the entire unit had to be discarded. I still use cheap 25
>> year old D cell flashlights that still work just fine.

>

> "Terrible life"?!?!?!? Compared to an incandescent?!?!?!? What did
> you DO to the poor thing?

>

> And how can you stand those horribly dim battery eating incandescent
> flashlights after using an LED that gives the same brightness as the
> incandescent literally for _days_ or if you are willing to tolerate the
> same battery life as the incandescent ten times the brightness? Of if
> you really need to see turn it up all the way and have 100 times?

>

LED flashlights throw a lot of light, but they're terrible for some
purposes. Try using one to check a sore throat to see how red it is.

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 21:40:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
> Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:
>>> On 2020-01-06, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> writes:
>>>>
>>>> > On Sun, 05 Jan 2020 11:36:42 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>>>> > wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> Personally, I buy re-usable shopping bags.
>>>> >
>>>> > That doesn't stop the accumulation of plastic bags unless you make a
>>>> > real pest of yourself.
>>>> >
>>>> > Well, not even then.
>>>>
>>>> Okay, not clear to me how being a pest has any bearing
>>>> on the plastic bag outcome?
>>>
>>> Sometimes that's what it takes to stop a cashier from loading one
>>> before you can supply your own.
>>>
>>>> I just got one of my shopping bags in my junk mail.
>>>
>>> We just got given a couple by the city in comemmmoration of the
>>> new rec centre. They look like they'll last a while.
>>>
>>>> They last pretty long, I've had a few of them for multiple years.
>>>
>>> We have a big one we picked up on a trip to Bonaire in 2009.
>>> It carries a _lot_ of stuff, and shows very little sign of wear.
>>
>> I recently read an article that said reusable bags are no more "green" than
>> disposables, due to manufacturing processes and disposal costs when they
>> finally *do* wear out.
>
> They can't be recycled but they last for years.
> For me, at least 3 or 4.
> I doubt I put more than one bag a year into the landfills.
>
> In that same one year I'd use hundreds of plastic bags.
>
> I wouldn't mind paper bags.

> I haven't seen any in ages.

>

We can get them here, but have to ask. Lately I've been using them to take shredded stuff to the recycle bin.

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 21:40:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:

> On 2020-01-07, hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:

>

>> I wasn't alone. They rebuilt a parking lot near by and

>> put in LED streetlights. Not long after installation

>> several heads failed and had to be replaced.

>>

>> I noticed in traffic signals with LED several of the dots

>> are out.

>

> High-power LEDs (or at least their electronics) are getting

> better, but I still see some teething problems. The most

> common failure mode is for the lights to start flickering;

> I've seen this in some warehouse complexes. A few years ago

> in our hangar complex, we replaced 8 wall packs - 70-watt

> high-pressure sodium lamps - with 25-watt LED units.

> The light is much better - white rather than orange - and

> I calculated they'll pay for themselves in power savings in

> 10 years. But two or three of them failed; a couple quit

> entirely, while the other one started flashing once a second

> in a good imitation of an alarm strobe. I took them back to

> the supplier, who replaced them with no questions asked.

>

> Our city has been phasing in LED street lights; I haven't seen

> any problems with them. They can only get better from here.

>

People here have complained when they replace incandescents. Apparently they're much brighter. I guess you can't please everybody.

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Tue, 07 Jan 2020 23:25:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> writes:

> On 1/7/2020 12:56 PM, hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

>> On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 6:05:55 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:

>>

>>> There is one place where I miss the slow startup of CFL's - the bathroom at night.

>>>

>>> When I had the CFL globes in the bathroom, it was much easier on the

>>> eyes to turn the lights on when getting up in the middle of the night...

>>

>> I use a nitelight. They are little fixtures that plug into an

>> outlet and support a 4 or 7 watt tiny bulb. Been around forever.

>> Very good for the purpose. Just enough light to not stumble,

>> but not a strain on sleepy eyes.

>>

> Hell, the dollar store has 1/4W LED nightlights that provide enough

> illumination if you were dark-adjusted already and are going back to bed.

>

> But I interpreted Scott to be getting up for the day, before the sun,

> and just wanting to avoid the shock of getting blasted by light.

O'dark 30 flights :-(.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Wed, 08 Jan 2020 00:01:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> writes:

> On 1/7/2020 12:50 PM, hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

>> Heck, it was hard enough to find the color temperature.

>

> None of mine has color temp info other than "warm white".

"Warm white" is 2000K - 3000K.

<http://www.westinghouselighting.com/color-temperature.aspx>

So, it is the color temperature expressed in units a consumer might understand.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 08 Jan 2020 00:20:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Tue, 7 Jan 2020 11:02:52 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

> On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 8:25:33 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>> On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 13:20:20 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

>>

>>> On Sunday, January 5, 2020 at 2:18:09 AM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

>>>

>>>> I don't see why people are so down on CFLs (and presumably
>>>> conventional fluorescents). Of course they're not suitable for every
>>>> application, any idiot can see that. But the "on for hours"
>>>> applications (and in the orientation and with the ventilation they
>>>> were designed for) they work fine, and usually they were cost
>>>> effective otherwise, so long as you didn't need "instant on full
>>>> bright" service. Even the cheap Chinese ones. LEDs are better and
>>>> cheaper now but weren't available at the beginning, and nobody knew
>>>> how long it would be until they were economically effective. Disposal
>>>> is commensurate with conventional fluorescents (i.e. inconvenient).

>>>

>>> I bought some traditional fluorescent 'stick lamps' (the kind
>>> you stick over your kitchen sink mounted on the cabinet).
>>> I discovered that while they lasted a long time and were
>>> efficient, they were not replaceable. Turned out the bulb
>>> was unique and not replaceable, so I had to throw out the
>>> whole fixture.

>>>

>>> As to LEDs, the jury is still out in my uses for plain
>>> lamp lights.

>>>

>>> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought
>>> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
>>> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
>>> and the entire unit had to be discarded. I still use cheap 25
>>> year old D cell flashlights that still work just fine.

>>

>> "Terrible life"?!?!?!? Compared to an incandescent?!?!?!? What did
>> you DO to the poor thing?

>

> The cheap D cell flashlights lasted a lot better through
> rough service than the LED units that basically sat on a
> shelf with limited use.

>

> The electronics in them was crap.

Did you do _any_ homework before you bought? The last time I experienced a failure with an LED flashlight it wasn't anything to do with the LEDs--a battery was so thoroughly corroded that I couldn't extract it.

>> And how can you stand those horribly dim battery eating incandescent
>> flashlights after using an LED that gives the same brightness as the
>> incandescent literally for _days_ or if you are willing to tolerate the
>> same battery life as the incandescent ten times the brightness? Of if
>> you really need to see turn it up all the way and have 100 times?
>
> LEDs consume power too, and get dimmer over time as the battery
> drains.

Reread the paragraph to which you are responding. Nobody has claimed that LEDs do not consume power, but for a given output they consume a HELL of a lot less than an incandescent flashlight bulb. As for getting dimmer over time, that depends on the design.

You really don't seem to know much about LEDs other than that you don't like them.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 08 Jan 2020 00:22:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Tue, 7 Jan 2020 14:40:09 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>> On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 13:20:20 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>>
>>> On Sunday, January 5, 2020 at 2:18:09 AM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>
>>>> I don't see why people are so down on CFLs (and presumably
>>>> conventional fluorescents). Of course they're not suitable for every
>>>> application, any idiot can see that. But the "on for hours"
>>>> applications (and in the orientation and with the ventilation they
>>>> were designed for) they work fine, and usually they were cost
>>>> effective otherwise, so long as you didn't need "instant on full
>>>> bright" service. Even the cheap Chinese ones. LEDs are better and
>>>> cheaper now but weren't available at the beginning, and nobody knew
>>>> how long it would be until they were economically effective. Disposal
>>>> is commensurate with conventional fluorescents (i.e. inconvenient).
>>>

>>> I bought some traditional fluorescent 'stick lamps' (the kind
>>> you stick over your kitchen sink mounted on the cabinet).
>>> I discovered that while they lasted a long time and were
>>> efficient, they were not replaceable. Turned out the bulb
>>> was unique and not replaceable, so I had to throw out the
>>> whole fixture.
>>>
>>> As to LEDs, the jury is still out in my uses for plain
>>> lamp lights.
>>>
>>> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought
>>> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
>>> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
>>> and the entire unit had to be discarded. I still use cheap 25
>>> year old D cell flashlights that still work just fine.
>>
>> "Terrible life"?!?!?!? Compared to an incandescent?!?!?!? What did
>> you DO to the poor thing?
>>
>> And how can you stand those horribly dim battery eating incandescent
>> flashlights after using an LED that gives the same brightness as the
>> incandescent literally for _days_ or if you are willing to tolerate the
>> same battery life as the incandescent ten times the brightness? Of if
>> you really need to see turn it up all the way and have 100 times?
>>
>
> LED flashlights throw a lot of light, but they're terrible for some
> purposes. Try using one to check a sore throat to see how red it is.

Why would that be an issue?

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Wed, 08 Jan 2020 06:33:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tue, 07 Jan 2020 19:22:35 -0500
J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Tue, 7 Jan 2020 14:40:09 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
>> LED flashlights throw a lot of light, but they're terrible for some
>> purposes. Try using one to check a sore throat to see how red it is.
>
> Why would that be an issue?

Cheap LEDs ==> lots of light at low CRI.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Andy Burns](#) on Wed, 08 Jan 2020 11:23:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Huge wrote:

> Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:
>
>> but I'd prefer a lot more work to be done on fail-safe designs such
>> as pebble-bed reactors rather than pressure cookers designed to
>> make weapons grade plutonium with power as a side effect of
>> cooling.
>
> *applause*

There was a bit of interest in various thorium based reactors a few years ago (and longer than back to the oak ridge MSRE) no high pressure vessels, doesn't produce highly enriched fuels, able to have passive fail-safe, can "eat" almost any nuclear fuel, yes a few issues such as preventing cracks in graphite components, etc

It seems "the west" isn't really interested enough in the technology, and the companies involved now seem to be concentrating on building "supertanker sized" floating power stations, that can turn up and dock in parts of the developing world and provide power for "n" years then get towed away to be replaced and refuelled back at base.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Wed, 08 Jan 2020 13:46:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:
> On 1/7/2020 12:50 PM, hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>> On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 4:44:00 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:
>>> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:
>>>> On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 6:41:31 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > FOr the most part, that's caused by people who don't RTFM. CFL's weren't suitable

>>>> > for certain usages (unventilated enclosures, for example) or mounting
>>>> > orientations (base up, in some cases); Improperly mounted or enclosed,
>>>> > the ballast electronics would overheat and fail prematurely.
>>>>
>>>> But what was an ordinary consumer supposed to do? Standard
>>>> incandescents were unavailable. We had to stick the CFL in
>>>> the sealed overhead fixture. (How unventilated could it have
>>>> been since it had to have air for the hot oldstyle bulb?)
>>>>
>>> Incandescent bulbs can stand much higher temperatures
>>> without failing than the solid state electronics used in the CFL ballast, of course.
>>>
>>> The ordinary consumer could have troubled themselves to read
>>> the packaging when selecting a CFL to ensure that it was suitable
>>> for the desired purpose.
>>
>> False to fact.
>>
>> The packaging of CLFs did not contain that information.
>
> I can't speak to all brands and ages, but of what I have on hand
> that's still in the original packaging:
> 1)Greenlite CFL 13W: CAUTION.. Do not use.. in totally enclosed fixtures.
> 2)GE soft white 100 (26W) and 60 (15W) (on base of bulb): caution Not
> for use in totally enclosed fixtures..
> 3) GE Energy Choice Biax 60: Use only with portable lamps that are
> provided with lampshades...Do not use.. with enclosed fixtures. This
> is one of the longer U-shaped tubes, probably older than the other
> curlies.
> 4) Buyer's Choice 13W: Not for use on.. totally enclosed recessed
> fixtures..
> and 1 out of package, printed on the base of the bulb:
> 5)Ikea 7W candelabra with plastic globe: Not for use in totally
> enclosed recessed fixtures.
>
> I suspect the issue is more, nobody RTFM, especially when the print
> isn't very large.

Probably true, since they were touted as direct replacements for incandescents, why would anyone RTFM?

>>
>> Heck, it was hard enough to find the color temperature.
>
> None of mine has color temp info other than "warm white".
>>
>> Further, consumers didn't have a choice of lamp beyond
>> the wattage equivalent.

>>
> It wasn't like they didn't know about this change years ahead of time,
> though. I've also got a stock of 100W, 60W, 40W incandescents that'll
> probably never get used, unless I need a small heat source or it's an
> "on for 5 minutes every few weeks" fixture.
>

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Wed, 08 Jan 2020 13:46:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
> On Tue, 7 Jan 2020 14:40:09 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>>> On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 13:20:20 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>>>>
>>>> On Sunday, January 5, 2020 at 2:18:09 AM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> > I don't see why people are so down on CFLs (and presumably
>>>>> > conventional fluorescents). Of course they're not suitable for every
>>>>> > application, any idiot can see that. But the "on for hours"
>>>>> > applications (and in the orientation and with the ventilation they
>>>>> > were designed for) they work fine, and usually they were cost
>>>>> > effective otherwise, so long as you didn't need "instant on full
>>>>> > bright" service. Even the cheap Chinese ones. LEDs are better and
>>>>> > cheaper now but weren't available at the beginning, and nobody knew
>>>>> > how long it would be until they were economically effective. Disposal
>>>>> > is commensurate with conventional fluorescents (i.e. inconvenient).
>>>>>
>>>>> I bought some traditional fluorescent 'stick lamps' (the kind
>>>>> you stick over your kitchen sink mounted on the cabinet).
>>>>> I discovered that while they lasted a long time and were
>>>>> efficient, they were not replaceable. Turned out the bulb
>>>>> was unique and not replaceable, so I had to throw out the
>>>>> whole fixture.
>>>>>
>>>>> As to LEDs, the jury is still out in my uses for plain
>>>>> lamp lights.
>>>>>
>>>>> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought

>>>> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
>>>> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
>>>> and the entire unit had to be discarded. I still use cheap 25
>>>> year old D cell flashlights that still work just fine.
>>>
>>> "Terrible life"?!?!?!? Compared to an incandescent?!?!?!? What did
>>> you DO to the poor thing?
>>>
>>> And how can you stand those horribly dim battery eating incandescent
>>> flashlights after using an LED that gives the same brightness as the
>>> incandescent literally for _days_ or if you are willing to tolerate the
>>> same battery life as the incandescent ten times the brightness? Of if
>>> you really need to see turn it up all the way and have 100 times?
>>>
>>
>> LED flashlights throw a lot of light, but they're terrible for some
>> purposes. Try using one to check a sore throat to see how red it is.
>
> Why would that be an issue?
>

Do I need to go to urgent care? Should I gargle? Etc.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Wed, 08 Jan 2020 20:02:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tuesday, January 7, 2020 at 3:23:39 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:
> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:
>> On Tuesday, January 7, 2020 at 2:03:01 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:
>>> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:
>>>> On Monday, January 6, 2020 at 4:42:04 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:
>>>> > hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:
>>>> > > On Saturday, January 4, 2020 at 2:50:27 PM UTC-5, Peter Flass wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> > >
>>>> > > California suffered disastrous power failures years ago
>>>> > > thanks to foolish ideas.
>>>> >
>>>> > California has _NEVER_ suffered disasterous power failures. Ever.
>>>> >
>>>> > There were brownouts caused by market manipulations, not by any
>>>> > shortage of energy generation capability. Note that the 'brownouts'
>>>> > did not effect the entire bay area (only some 96k customers out of

>>>> > more than 2 million). They certainly cannot be categorized as
>>>> > "disasterous".
>>>> >
>>>> > Please learn about it before writing about it.
>>>> >
>>>> > https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/California_electricity_crisis
>>>> >
>>>> > "California had an installed generating capacity of 45 GW. At
>>>> > the time of the blackouts, demand was 28 GW. A demand-supply gap
>>>> > was created by energy companies, mainly Enron, to create an artificial shortage."
>>>>
>>>> The book "Kochland : the secret history of Koch Industries and
>>>> corporate power in America" presents a different view.
>>>>
>>>
>>> Please, enlighten us further...
>>
>> It was a whole chapter. Lots of bad decisions, lots of greed.
>>
>> the book says the situation was so bad they resorted to
>> rolling blackouts. It made national news and I recall it.
>>
>
> Still have no idea what you mean by "Different View". Do they
> blame Enron or not?

They blame Enron, the Koch brothers, and a host of other players.

Certainly sounds like they should've left the original system and business model alone.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Thu, 09 Jan 2020 00:32:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Wed, 8 Jan 2020 06:46:47 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>> On Tue, 7 Jan 2020 14:40:09 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 13:20:20 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

>>>>
>>>> > On Sunday, January 5, 2020 at 2:18:09 AM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> I don't see why people are so down on CFLs (and presumably
>>>> >> conventional fluorescents). Of course they're not suitable for every
>>>> >> application, any idiot can see that. But the "on for hours"
>>>> >> applications (and in the orientation and with the ventilation they
>>>> >> were designed for) they work fine, and usually they were cost
>>>> >> effective otherwise, so long as you didn't need "instant on full
>>>> >> bright" service. Even the cheap Chinese ones. LEDs are better and
>>>> >> cheaper now but weren't available at the beginning, and nobody knew
>>>> >> how long it would be until they were economically effective. Disposal
>>>> >> is commensurate with conventional fluorescents (i.e. inconvenient).
>>>> >
>>>> > I bought some traditional fluorescent 'stick lamps' (the kind
>>>> > you stick over your kitchen sink mounted on the cabinet).
>>>> > I discovered that while they lasted a long time and were
>>>> > efficient, they were not replaceable. Turned out the bulb
>>>> > was unique and not replaceable, so I had to throw out the
>>>> > whole fixture.
>>>> >
>>>> > As to LEDs, the jury is still out in my uses for plain
>>>> > lamp lights.
>>>> >
>>>> > But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought
>>>> > a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
>>>> > (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
>>>> > and the entire unit had to be discarded. I still use cheap 25
>>>> > year old D cell flashlights that still work just fine.
>>>>
>>>> "Terrible life"?!?!?!? Compared to an incandescent?!?!?!? What did
>>>> you DO to the poor thing?
>>>>
>>>> And how can you stand those horribly dim battery eating incandescent
>>>> flashlights after using an LED that gives the same brightness as the
>>>> incandescent literally for _days_ or if you are willing to tolerate the
>>>> same battery life as the incandescent ten times the brightness? Of if
>>>> you really need to see turn it up all the way and have 100 times?
>>>>
>>>
>>> LED flashlights throw a lot of light, but they're terrible for some
>>> purposes. Try using one to check a sore throat to see how red it is.
>>
>> Why would that be an issue?
>>
>
> Do I need to go to urgent care? Should I gargle? Etc.

No, why would LED have an issue with checking a sore throat?

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Joy Beeson](#) on Thu, 09 Jan 2020 06:08:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 6 Jan 2020 04:45:38 GMT, Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:

- > You have to be fast. Before the casher pulls out a plastic bag, drop
- > your re-usable bag (or backpack, if you've been ultra-eco-friendly
- > and ridden there on your bicycle) in front of her, and tell her to
- > put everything right into your bag.

I often put the pile of bags on the conveyor ahead of the groceries, or throw it to the bagger. Which works in some stores and doesn't in others. At the store I most often visit, I've got some of the baggers trained, and once the cashier said to the bagger "she needs it loose in the cart." (I'd come on a road bike, and it's easier to fit things into my panniers if I don't have to unpack them first.)

When I bought my bicycle-shaped wheelchair, I bought a detachable basket thinking I could take it into stores with me, but it turns out that baggers haven't the foggiest clue as to how to pack for carrying on a bike. Which doesn't matter because a "comfort bike" is extremely uncomfortable to cross a major street on, and the mile and a half to the nearest grocery is a *long* way to ride on a pedestrian accellerator.

But such a "bicycle" (well, it *does* have two wheels) is very useful for exercising an injured leg without putting any strain on it.

--

Joy Beeson
joy beeson at comcast dot net
<http://wlweather.net/PAGEJOY/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Thu, 09 Jan 2020 07:55:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Wed, 08 Jan 2020 19:32:10 -0500
J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

- > No, why would LED have an issue with checking a sore throat?

White LEDs are really blue LEDs shining on a phosphor tuned to a reddish-yellow. The colour temperature is set by adjusting the phosphor.

Cheap (and highly efficient) ones tend to have a very spiky spectrum with big peaks in the blue and red/yellow which makes for bright light with poor colour rendition, sodium lights are an example of very poor colour rendition and high brightness.

There are expensive LEDs made with more balanced phosphors which have a high CRI (Colour Rendition Index) mainly sold for photographic lighting. The cheap way to get good CRI is an incandescent, it will beat even the best LEDs or fluorescent lights.

You want very good CRI for looking down the back of your throat to see what shade of red it is.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith	Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN	A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins.	licences available see
You lose and Bill collects.	http://www.sohara.org/

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Thu, 09 Jan 2020 12:18:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
> On Wed, 8 Jan 2020 06:46:47 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>>> On Tue, 7 Jan 2020 14:40:09 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> > On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 13:20:20 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> On Sunday, January 5, 2020 at 2:18:09 AM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> I don't see why people are so down on CFLs (and presumably
>>>> >>> conventional fluorescents). Of course they're not suitable for every
>>>> >>> application, any idiot can see that. But the "on for hours"
>>>> >>> applications (and in the orientation and with the ventilation they
>>>> >>> were designed for) they work fine, and usually they were cost
>>>> >>> effective otherwise, so long as you didn't need "instant on full
>>>> >>> bright" service. Even the cheap Chinese ones. LEDs are better and

>>>> >> cheaper now but weren't available at the beginning, and nobody knew
>>>> >> how long it would be until they were economically effective. Disposal
>>>> >> is commensurate with conventional fluorescents (i.e. inconvenient).
>>>> >>
>>>> >> I bought some traditional fluorescent 'stick lamps' (the kind
>>>> >> you stick over your kitchen sink mounted on the cabinet).
>>>> >> I discovered that while they lasted a long time and were
>>>> >> efficient, they were not replaceable. Turned out the bulb
>>>> >> was unique and not replaceable, so I had to throw out the
>>>> >> whole fixture.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> As to LEDs, the jury is still out in my uses for plain
>>>> >> lamp lights.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought
>>>> >> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
>>>> >> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
>>>> >> and the entire unit had to be discarded. I still use cheap 25
>>>> >> year old D cell flashlights that still work just fine.
>>>> >
>>>> > "Terrible life"?!?!?!? Compared to an incandescent?!?!?!? What did
>>>> > you DO to the poor thing?
>>>> >
>>>> > And how can you stand those horribly dim battery eating incandescent
>>>> > flashlights after using an LED that gives the same brightness as the
>>>> > incandescent literally for _days_ or if you are willing to tolerate the
>>>> > same battery life as the incandescent ten times the brightness? Of if
>>>> > you really need to see turn it up all the way and have 100 times?
>>>> >
>>>>
>>>> LED flashlights throw a lot of light, but they're terrible for some
>>>> purposes. Try using one to check a sore throat to see how red it is.
>>>
>>> Why would that be an issue?
>>>
>>
>> Do I need to go to urgent care? Should I gargle? Etc.
>
> No, why would LED have an issue with checking a sore throat?
>

Doesn't show color, all looks washed-out.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Thu, 09 Jan 2020 14:45:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Mike_Duffy

On Thu, 9 Jan 2020 07:55:07 +0000, Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:

- > Cheap (and highly efficient) ones tend to have a very spiky
- > spectrum with big peaks in the blue and red/yellow which makes
- > for bright light with poor colour rendition,

Here are a few graphics to help show your point.

1) Source (Incandescent Metal Halide) providing good human rendition. Power spikes are evenly strong & spaced well into human colour receptor range.

<http://www.ycctek.com/Portals/77/productdocs/%E7%87%88%E5%85%89%E5%9C%96/%E8%A4%87%E9%87%91%E5%B1%AC%E5%85%89%E8%AD%9C.jpg>

2) Source (High Pressure Sodium) providing poor human rendition. There is a huge (yellow) power spike outside of rod cell (red) optimum range and also outside of cone cell (blue & green) optimum range.

<http://www.ycctek.com/Portals/77/productdocs/%E7%87%88%E5%85%89%E5%9C%96/%E9%88%89%E5%85%89%E7%87%88%E5%85%89%E8%AD%9C.jpg>

- > sodium lights are an example of very poor colour rendition

True. The only worse example of colour rendition would be a monochromatic source, such as a laser (any colour). Essentially, all power is thus in one single spike.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Thu, 09 Jan 2020 16:26:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thu, 9 Jan 2020 09:45:13 -0500
Mike_Duffy <Look@Website.in.sig> wrote:

- > Here are a few graphics to help show your point.

Thank you. This one shows what LEDs are like.

<https://i.stack.imgur.com/lkyXG.png>

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Roger Blake](#) on Thu, 09 Jan 2020 16:39:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-09, Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> wrote:
> I often put the pile of bags on the conveyor ahead of the groceries,
> or throw it to the bagger.

I don't bother with any of that crap. I drive to the store in a vehicle
that gets 15mpg on a good day and use their throwaway plastic bags to
take away the goods. I just do not give a damn what the eco-weenies
think or want. Bicycles are for children, I drive.

--

Roger Blake (Posts from Google Groups killfiled due to excess spam.)

The US Census vs. privacy -- <http://censusfacts.info>
Don't talk to cops! -- <http://www.DontTalkToCops.com>
Badges don't grant extra rights -- <http://www.CopBlock.org>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Thu, 09 Jan 2020 16:40:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Kerr-Mudd,John

On Thu, 09 Jan 2020 16:39:28 GMT, Roger Blake <rogblake@iname.invalid>
wrote:

> On 2020-01-09, Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> wrote:
>> I often put the pile of bags on the conveyor ahead of the groceries,
>> or throw it to the bagger.
>
> I don't bother with any of that crap. I drive to the store in a vehicle
> that gets 15mpg on a good day and use their throwaway plastic bags to
> take away the goods. I just do not give a damn what the eco-weenies
> think or want. Bicycles are for children, I drive.

>
Are you a Climate change denier too?

--
Bah, and indeed, Humbug.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Thu, 09 Jan 2020 16:52:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Roger Blake <rogblake@iname.invalid> writes:
> On 2020-01-09, Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> wrote:
>> I often put the pile of bags on the conveyor ahead of the groceries,
>> or throw it to the bagger.
>
> I don't bother with any of that crap. I drive to the store in a vehicle
> that gets 15mpg on a good day and use their throwaway plastic bags to
> take away the goods. I just do not give a damn what the eco-weenies
> think or want. Bicycles are for children, I drive.

And nobody gives a shit. In a world of seven billion souls, you
are not even in the noise.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Thu, 09 Jan 2020 20:52:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
> On 2020-01-09, Scott Lurndal <scott@slp53.sl.home> wrote:
>> Roger Blake <rogblake@iname.invalid> writes:
>>> On 2020-01-09, Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> wrote:
>>>> I often put the pile of bags on the conveyor ahead of the groceries,
>>>> or throw it to the bagger.
>>>
>>> I don't bother with any of that crap. I drive to the store in a vehicle
>>> that gets 15mpg on a good day and use their throwaway plastic bags to
>>> take away the goods. I just do not give a damn what the eco-weenies
>>> think or want. Bicycles are for children, I drive.
>>
>> And nobody gives a shit. In a world of seven billion souls, you
>> are not even in the noise.
>
> And nobody is prepared to talk about the elephant in the room; people.
>

> There are too freaking many of us. Still, the Four Horsemen will be
> along in a while to sort that out.
>
>

Just so long as I'm not the one sorted. Actually, I'm old and don't much
care, but I worry about the grandkids.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Thu, 09 Jan 2020 21:11:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thursday, January 9, 2020 at 3:52:52 PM UTC-5, Peter Flass wrote:
> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>> On 2020-01-09, Scott Lurndal <scott@slp53.sl.home> wrote:
>>> Roger Blake <rogblake@iname.invalid> writes:
>>>> On 2020-01-09, Joy Beeson <jbeeson@invalid.net.invalid> wrote:
>>>> > I often put the pile of bags on the conveyor ahead of the groceries,
>>>> > or throw it to the bagger.
>>>>
>>>> I don't bother with any of that crap. I drive to the store in a vehicle
>>>> that gets 15mpg on a good day and use their throwaway plastic bags to
>>>> take away the goods. I just do not give a damn what the eco-weenies
>>>> think or want. Bicycles are for children, I drive.
>>>
>>> And nobody gives a shit. In a world of seven billion souls, you
>>> are not even in the noise.
>>
>> And nobody is prepared to talk about the elephant in the room; people.
>>
>> There are too freaking many of us. Still, the Four Horsemen will be
>> along in a while to sort that out.
>>
>>
>
> Just so long as I'm not the one sorted. Actually, I'm old and don't much
> care, but I worry about the grandkids.

I think the problem with people is not the raw quantity, but rather
there are too many of them in places that can't sustain them.
That is, there are plenty of places that could accommodate
more people.

There are some lifestyle adjustments that may be necessary,

but nothing too onerous.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Thu, 09 Jan 2020 22:54:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-09, hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com < Hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com > wrote:

> On Thursday, January 9, 2020 at 3:52:52 PM UTC-5, Peter Flass wrote:
>
>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>>
>>> And nobody is prepared to talk about the elephant in the room; people.
>>>
>>> There are too freaking many of us. Still, the Four Horsemen will be
>>> along in a while to sort that out.
>>
>> Just so long as I'm not the one sorted. Actually, I'm old and don't much
>> care, but I worry about the grandkids.
>
> I think the problem with people is not the raw quantity, but rather
> there are too many of them in places that can't sustain them.
> That is, there are plenty of places that could accommodate
> more people.

Space-wise, perhaps. But they'll need housing. And food.

> There are some lifestyle adjustments that may be necessary,
> but nothing too onerous.

At least not for the ones who are proposing these adjustments
(who somehow never seem to have to make them themselves).

The real problem is this belief that our population can and must
increase indefinitely. Efficiency only goes so far; the planet
doesn't care about per-capita consumption, only total consumption.

--

/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\ / <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Thu, 09 Jan 2020 23:10:57 GMT

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Thu, 9 Jan 2020 05:18:28 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

```
> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>> On Wed, 8 Jan 2020 06:46:47 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> On Tue, 7 Jan 2020 14:40:09 -0700, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> >> On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 13:20:20 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> On Sunday, January 5, 2020 at 2:18:09 AM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>>> I don't see why people are so down on CFLs (and presumably
>>>> >>>> conventional fluorescents). Of course they're not suitable for every
>>>> >>>> application, any idiot can see that. But the "on for hours"
>>>> >>>> applications (and in the orientation and with the ventilation they
>>>> >>>> were designed for) they work fine, and usually they were cost
>>>> >>>> effective otherwise, so long as you didn't need "instant on full
>>>> >>>> bright" service. Even the cheap Chinese ones. LEDs are better and
>>>> >>>> cheaper now but weren't available at the beginning, and nobody knew
>>>> >>>> how long it would be until they were economically effective. Disposal
>>>> >>>> is commensurate with conventional fluorescents (i.e. inconvenient).
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> I bought some traditional fluorescent 'stick lamps' (the kind
>>>> >>> you stick over your kitchen sink mounted on the cabinet).
>>>> >>> I discovered that while they lasted a long time and were
>>>> >>> efficient, they were not replaceable. Turned out the bulb
>>>> >>> was unique and not replaceable, so I had to throw out the
>>>> >>> whole fixture.
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> As to LEDs, the jury is still out in my uses for plain
>>>> >>> lamp lights.
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>> But in flashlights their service life is horrible. I bought
>>>> >>> a punch of what we used to call penlights. Small and compact.
>>>> >>> (Though used 3 AAA cells which was awkward). Terrible life
>>>> >>> and the entire unit had to be discarded. I still use cheap 25
>>>> >>> year old D cell flashlights that still work just fine.
>>>> >>>
>>>> >> "Terrible life"?!?!?!? Compared to an incandescent?!?!?!? What did
>>>> >> you DO to the poor thing?
```

>>>> >>
>>>> >> And how can you stand those horribly dim battery eating incandescent
>>>> >> flashlights after using an LED that gives the same brightness as the
>>>> >> incandescent literally for _days_ or if you are willing to tolerate the
>>>> >> same battery life as the incandescent ten times the brightness? Of if
>>>> >> you really need to see turn it up all the way and have 100 times?
>>>> >>
>>>> >
>>>> > LED flashlights throw a lot of light, but they're terrible for some
>>>> > purposes. Try using one to check a sore throat to see how red it is.
>>>>
>>>> Why would that be an issue?
>>>>
>>>
>>> Do I need to go to urgent care? Should I gargle? Etc.
>>
>> No, why would LED have an issue with checking a sore throat?
>>
>
> Doesn't show color, all looks washed-out.

If that's actually an issue for you, look for one with a high CRI.
Usually will have a Nichia 219 emitter, but check the CRI--all Nichia
219s are not high CRI.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Thu, 09 Jan 2020 23:52:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:
> On 2020-01-09, hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:
>
>> On Thursday, January 9, 2020 at 3:52:52 PM UTC-5, Peter Flass wrote:
>>
>>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>>>
>>>> And nobody is prepared to talk about the elephant in the room; people.
>>>>
>>>> There are too freaking many of us. Still, the Four Horsemen will be
>>>> along in a while to sort that out.
>>>
>>> Just so long as I'm not the one sorted. Actually, I'm old and don't much
>>> care, but I worry about the grandkids.
>>
>> I think the problem with people is not the raw quantity, but rather
>> there are too man of them in places that can't sustain them.
>> That is, there are plenty of places that could accommodate

>> more people.

>

> Space-wise, perhaps. But they'll need housing. And food.

And clean water.

And energy.

>

>> There are some lifestyle adjustments that may be necessary,

>> but nothing too onerous.

>

> At least not for the ones who are proposing these adjustments

> (who somehow never seem to have to make them themselves).

>

> The real problem is this belief that our population can and must

> increase indefinitely. Efficiency only goes so far; the planet

> doesn't care about per-capita consumption, only total consumption.

I suspect the planet has already exceeded its carrying capacity.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Fri, 10 Jan 2020 00:10:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Scott Lurndal <scott@slp53.sl.home> wrote:

> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:

>> On 2020-01-09, hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:

>>

>>> On Thursday, January 9, 2020 at 3:52:52 PM UTC-5, Peter Flass wrote:

>>>

>>>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > And nobody is prepared to talk about the elephant in the room; people.

>>>> >

>>>> > There are too freaking many of us. Still, the Four Horsemen will be

>>>> > along in a while to sort that out.

>>>>

>>>> Just so long as I'm not the one sorted. Actually, I'm old and don't much

>>>> care, but I worry about the grandkids.

>>>

>>> I think the problem with people is not the raw quantity, but rather

>>> there are too many of them in places that can't sustain them.

>>> That is, there are plenty of places that could accommodate

>>> more people.

>>

>> Space-wise, perhaps. But they'll need housing. And food.

>
> And clean water.
>
> And energy.
>
>>
>>> There are some lifestyle adjustments that may be necessary,
>>> but nothing too onerous.
>>
>> At least not for the ones who are proposing these adjustments
>> (who somehow never seem to have to make them themselves).
>>
>> The real problem is this belief that our population can and must
>> increase indefinitely. Efficiency only goes so far; the planet
>> doesn't care about per-capita consumption, only total consumption.
>
> I suspect the planet has already exceeded its carrying capacity.
>

Probably, but not with food. I think I read that if food was properly distributed, and lots was not wasted, that there'd be plenty for everyone now alive.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Fri, 10 Jan 2020 12:17:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 10 Jan 2020 11:52:43 GMT
Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:

> Eventually, we're going to stop having babies; why not start now?

Slow down not stop preferably.

That being said, we are slowing down a *lot*! See the UN crude birthrate chart at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birth_rate, the birth rate today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.

--
Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Andy Burns](#) on Fri, 10 Jan 2020 13:08:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:

- > the birth rate
- > today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.

Yebbut, if the birth rate per 1000 is under half what it was, when the population itself is more than twice what it was ...

< <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.DYN.CBRT.IN?start=1963> >

<<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?start=1963>>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Fri, 10 Jan 2020 14:21:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Fri, 10 Jan 2020 13:08:39 +0000
Andy Burns <usenet@andyburns.uk> wrote:

- > Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:
- >
- >> the birth rate
- >> today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.
- >
- > Yebbut, if the birth rate per 1000 is under half what it was, when the
- > population itself is more than twice what it was ...

Sure but if the trend continues (it looks pretty solid) eventually (about 2100 I think) the birth rate falls below the death rate.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith		Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN		A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins.		licences available see
You lose and Bill collects.		http://www.sohara.org/

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Fri, 10 Jan 2020 16:53:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 10 Jan 2020 16:08:08 GMT
Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:

> On 2020-01-10, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>> On Fri, 10 Jan 2020 13:08:39 +0000
>> Andy Burns <usenet@andyburns.uk> wrote:
>>
>>> Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:
>>>
>>>> the birth rate
>>>> today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.
>>>
>>> Yebbut, if the birth rate per 1000 is under half what it was, when the
>>> population itself is more than twice what it was ...
>>
>> Sure but if the trend continues (it looks pretty solid)
>> eventually (about 2100 I think) the birth rate falls below the death
>> rate.
>
> By which time we're chin deep in shit.

Perhaps, but "Make Room! Make Room!" was set twenty years ago and based on a pretty accurate global population estimate. We're **still** living a **lot** better than that, we're even living better (on average) than we were when it was written.

--
Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Fri, 10 Jan 2020 18:21:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thursday, January 9, 2020 at 5:55:58 PM UTC-5, Charlie Gibbs wrote:

>> There are some lifestyle adjustments that may be necessary,
>> but nothing too onerous.
>
> At least not for the ones who are proposing these adjustments
> (who somehow never seem to have to make them themselves).

Certainly, the tree-huggers propose very impractical solutions that are counter-productive.

But also, conservatives block any discussion whatsoever of ecology and conserving natural resources. They vehemently

deny any problem exists. (It bugs me that they _deliberately_ ignore recycling and discard cans and glass in their trash; those items are easily recycled.

Anyway, there are common sense approaches that would save money and not be inconvenient or onerous. It just takes people willing to have some common sense, be reasonable, and look at the overall picture.

- > The real problem is this belief that our population can and must
- > increase indefinitely. Efficiency only goes so far; the planet
- > doesn't care about per-capita consumption, only total consumption.

Ironically, the population is growing the fastest in places that are least able to support it.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Fri, 10 Jan 2020 18:22:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thursday, January 9, 2020 at 11:39:30 AM UTC-5, Roger Blake wrote:

- > I don't bother with any of that crap. I drive to the store in a vehicle
- > that gets 15mpg on a good day and use their throwaway plastic bags to
- > take away the goods. I just do not give a damn what the eco-weenies
- > think or want. Bicycles are for children, I drive.

Do you pay the full costs of building and maintaining the roads you drive on? No, you do not.

Anyway, why would anyone brag about wasting their money in a gas guzzler?

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Fri, 10 Jan 2020 18:51:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-10, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

- > On 10 Jan 2020 11:52:43 GMT
- > Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:

>
>> Eventually, we're going to stop having babies; why not start now?
>
> Slow down not stop preferably.
>
> That being said, we are slowing down a *lot*! See the UN crude
> birthrate chart at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birth_rate, the birth
> rate today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.

Yes, and governments are having hysterics. Now they're trying to get population increase back to what it was in the Good Old Days, by encouraging immigration, baby bonuses, etc.

--
/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\/ <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Fri, 10 Jan 2020 19:15:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:
> On 2020-01-10, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>
>> On 10 Jan 2020 11:52:43 GMT
>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>>
>>> Eventually, we're going to stop having babies; why not start now?
>>
>> Slow down not stop preferably.
>>
>> That being said, we are slowing down a *lot*! See the UN crude
>> birthrate chart at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birth_rate, the birth
>> rate today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.
>
> Yes, and governments are having hysterics. Now they're trying to
> get population increase back to what it was in the Good Old Days,
> by encouraging immigration, baby bonuses, etc.

The fundamental tenent of Capitalism as we currently practice it is growth.

Growth in revenue, growth in income, growth in the stock price.

Growth requires one of two things (or, generally, both):
- an increase in per-worker productivity

- an increase in the number of workers.

Given that productivity increases slowly; growth generally needs new workers.

New workers come about either indiginously or via immigration. For years, USA growth has been facilitated by immigration (skilled in the silly valley, unskilled in agriculture) due to an indiginous birth-rate close to the replacement rate of two.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Fri, 10 Jan 2020 19:16:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 1:52:33 PM UTC-5, Charlie Gibbs wrote:

- > Yes, and governments are having hysterics. Now they're trying to
- > get population increase back to what it was in the Good Old Days,
- > by encouraging immigration, baby bonuses, etc.

Back in the 1950s, when the US was having its baby boom, advertisers often used children as a theme even for ads that were for other businesses and industry, not families. For instance, an advertiser for computer paper stock always had a smiling baby sitting on top of a roll of tape in various poses.

<https://books.google.com/books?id=MDw7AAAAMAAJ&dq=railroad%20computer&pg=PA82#v=onepage&q&f=false>

<https://books.google.com/books?id=MDw7AAAAMAAJ&dq=railroad%20computer&pg=PA130#v=onepage&q&f=false>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Fri, 10 Jan 2020 19:53:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 2:15:03 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:

- > Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:
- >> On 2020-01-10, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
- >>
- >>> On 10 Jan 2020 11:52:43 GMT
- >>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
- >>>
- >>>> Eventually, we're going to stop having babies; why not start now?
- >>>

>>> Slow down not stop preferably.
>>>
>>> That being said, we are slowing down a *lot*! See the UN crude
>>> birthrate chart at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birth_rate, the birth
>>> rate today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.
>>
>> Yes, and governments are having hysterics. Now they're trying to
>> get population increase back to what it was in the Good Old Days,
>> by encouraging immigration, baby bonuses, etc.
>
> The fundamental tenent of Capitalism as we currently practice it is growth.
>
> Growth in revenue, growth in income, growth in the stock price.
>
> Growth requires one of two things (or, generally, both):
> - an increase in per-worker productivity
> - an increase in the number of workers.
>
> Given that productivity increases slowly; growth generally needs new workers.
>
> New workers come about either indiginously or via immigration. For
> years, USA growth has been facilitated by immigration (skilled in the
> silly valley, unskilled in agriculture) due to an indiginous birth-rate close to
> the replacement rate of two.

In my opinion, our current immigration policy is a disaster. It is based on ugly racial prejudice--we don't like brown people--and not honest economic analysis*. (Certainly no humanitarian issues are considered). Given the US declining birthrate, we need new young people.

In my opinion, a particularly ugly and foolish policy was cancelling out DACA which gave certain young illegals an entryway. For one thing, it's bad policy when government reneges on a commitment. Secondly, those people were students and contributors and we need them.

* The mushroom industry requires lots of manual workers to do literally backbreaking shit jobs. So they've used illegals, no one else will do it. With the crackdown, there aren't enough workers.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [scott](#) on Fri, 10 Jan 2020 21:01:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 2:15:03 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:

> * The mushroom industry requires lots of manual workers to
> do _literally_ backbreaking shit jobs. So they've used
> illegals, no one else will do it. With the crackdown,
> there aren't enough workers.

I drive by Monterey Mushrooms fairly regularly. There is always
a help wanted sign displayed along Hale Ave.

<https://www.google.com/maps/place/Monterey+Mushrooms/@37.166551,-121.7137301,16z/data=!4m5!3m4!1s0x808e268477152a91:0x27e2398c4a7a3faf!8m2!3d37.1640839!4d-121.7059167>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Fri, 10 Jan 2020 21:08:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:
> On 2020-01-10, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>
>> On 10 Jan 2020 11:52:43 GMT
>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>>
>>> Eventually, we're going to stop having babies; why not start now?
>>
>> Slow down not stop preferably.
>>
>> That being said, we are slowing down a *lot*! See the UN crude
>> birthrate chart at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birth_rate, the birth
>> rate today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.
>
> Yes, and governments are having hysterics. Now they're trying to
> get population increase back to what it was in the Good Old Days,
> by encouraging immigration, baby bonuses, etc.
>

Not encouraging immigration much lately. Norwegians always welcome.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Fri, 10 Jan 2020 21:08:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:

- > On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 2:15:03 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:
- >> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:
- >>> On 2020-01-10, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
- >>>>
- >>>> On 10 Jan 2020 11:52:43 GMT
- >>>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
- >>>>
- >>>> > Eventually, we're going to stop having babies; why not start now?
- >>>>
- >>>> Slow down not stop preferably.
- >>>>
- >>>> That being said, we are slowing down a *lot*! See the UN crude
- >>>> birthrate chart at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birth_rate, the birth
- >>>> rate today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.
- >>>>
- >>> Yes, and governments are having hysterics. Now they're trying to
- >>> get population increase back to what it was in the Good Old Days,
- >>> by encouraging immigration, baby bonuses, etc.
- >>
- >> The fundamental tenent of Capitalism as we currently practice it is growth.
- >>
- >> Growth in revenue, growth in income, growth in the stock price.
- >>
- >> Growth requires one of two things (or, generally, both):
- >> - an increase in per-worker productivity
- >> - an increase in the number of workers.
- >>
- >> Given that productivity increases slowly; growth generally needs new workers.
- >>
- >> New workers come about either indiginously or via immigration. For
- >> years, USA growth has been facilitated by immigration (skilled in the
- >> silly valley, unskilled in agriculture) due to an indiginous birth-rate close to
- >> the replacement rate of two.
- >
- > In my opinion, our current immigration policy is a disaster. It
- > is based on ugly racial prejudice--we don't like brown people--
- > and not honest economic analysis*. (Certainly no humanitarian
- > issues are considered). Given the US declining birthrate, we
- > need new young people.

No we don't, not really, except for the foolish growth thing. We have plenty of people here now. Who wants New York to look like New Delhi?

- >
- > In my opinion, a particularly ugly and foolish policy was
- > cancelling out DACA which gave certain young illegals an
- > entryway. For one thing, it's bad policy when government reneges

> on a commitment. Secondly, those people were students and
> contributors and we need them.

DACA shows the problems of trying to do things by presidential fiat instead of thru legislation. What one president does, the next can undo. That's going to bite Trump, too, once he's out of office.

>
> * The mushroom industry requires lots of manual workers to
> do _literally_ backbreaking shit jobs. So they've used
> illegals, no one else will do it. With the crackdown,
> there aren't enough workers.

>

>

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 00:48:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Fri, 10 Jan 2020 10:22:49 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

> On Thursday, January 9, 2020 at 11:39:30 AM UTC-5, Roger Blake wrote:

>

>> I don't bother with any of that crap. I drive to the store in a vehicle
>> that gets 15mpg on a good day and use their throwaway plastic bags to
>> take away the goods. I just do not give a damn what the eco-weenies
>> think or want. Bicycles are for children, I drive.

>

> Do you pay the full costs of building and maintaining the
> roads you drive on? No, you do not.

We each pay our share of those costs. The roads weren't built for free.

> Anyway, why would anyone brag about wasting their money in
> a gas guzzler?

Beats wasting a lot more money on a gas-sipper that won't carry what one needs.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 06:39:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-11, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:

> It's true that if the per-mile taxes paid for the whole thing, goods
> would be more expensive. But assigning actual costs to price tags
> seems like a reasonable thing to do, rather than having the hidden
> subsidies.

Unless you're a politician. Then it's suicide.

> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
> or pickups with duals on the rear.)

One of the reasons I enjoyed our visits to Scotland and Ireland
was that I didn't see a single Hummer or monster pickup truck.

--
/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\/ <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 06:39:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-10, hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:

> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 1:52:33 PM UTC-5, Charlie Gibbs wrote:
>

>> Yes, and governments are having hysterics. Now they're trying to
>> get population increase back to what it was in the Good Old Days,
>> by encouraging immigration, baby bonuses, etc.

>
> Back in the 1950s, when the US was having its baby boom,
> advertisers often used children as a theme even for ads
> that were for other businesses and industry, not families.
> For instance, an advertiser for computer paper stock always
> had a smiling baby sitting on top of a roll of tape in various
> poses.

>
> <https://books.google.com/books?id=MDw7AAAAMAAJ&dq=railroad%20computer&pg=PA82#v=onepage&q&f=false>
>

> <https://books.google.com/books?id=MDw7AAAAMAAJ&dq=railroad%20computer&pg=PA130#v=onepage&q&f=false>

"Mommy, there's no more Zee!"

(Oops, different roll of paper...)

--

/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\/ <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 06:39:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-10, Scott Lurndal <scott@slp53.sl.home> wrote:

> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:
>
>> On 2020-01-10, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>>
>>> On 10 Jan 2020 11:52:43 GMT
>>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Eventually, we're going to stop having babies; why not start now?
>>>
>>> Slow down not stop preferably.
>>>
>>> That being said, we are slowing down a *lot*! See the UN crude
>>> birthrate chart at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birth_rate, the birth
>>> rate today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.
>>
>> Yes, and governments are having hysterics. Now they're trying to
>> get population increase back to what it was in the Good Old Days,
>> by encouraging immigration, baby bonuses, etc.
>
> The fundamental tenent of Capitalism as we currently practice it is growth.
>
> Growth in revenue, growth in income, growth in the stock price.
>
> Growth requires one of two things (or, generally, both):
> - an increase in per-worker productivity
> - an increase in the number of workers.
>
> Given that productivity increases slowly; growth generally needs new workers.

>
> New workers come about either indiginously or via immigration. For
> years, USA growth has been facilitated by immigration (skilled in the
> silly valley, unskilled in agriculture) due to an indiginous birth-rate
> close to the replacement rate of two.

Growth for the same of growth is the ideology of the cancer cell.
-- Edward Abbey

--
/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\/ <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 06:39:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-10, hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com < Hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com > wrote:

> * The mushroom industry requires lots of manual workers to
> do _literally_ backbreaking shit jobs. So they've used
> illegals, no one else will do it. With the crackdown,
> there aren't enough workers.

They're too busy working in Trump's hotels.

--
/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\/ <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 13:07:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On 11 Jan 2020 06:39:45 GMT, Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid>
wrote:

> On 2020-01-11, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:
>

>> It's true that if the per-mile taxes paid for the whole thing, goods
>> would be more expensive. But assigning actual costs to price tags
>> seems like a reasonable thing to do, rather than having the hidden
>> subsidies.
>
> Unless you're a politician. Then it's suicide.
>
>> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>> or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>
> One of the reasons I enjoyed our visits to Scotland and Ireland
> was that I didn't see a single Hummer or monster pickup truck.

Hummer went out of business 10 years ago. Monster trucks are not work trucks, they are similar in nature to "hot rods"--modification of a vehicle for the sake of modification, as a form of personal expression.

In the city a vanishing tiny number of people in the US have personal transportation of any kind. It's the people who don't live in cities who need that sort of thing.

By the way, SUVs fill the long dead "station wagon" niche, killed by CAFE. They're essentially "cheater" vehicles built to game the tax code. Pickups are evolving into the same niche.

As for Scotland, if you like Scotland better, by all means move there.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 18:22:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On Fri, 10 Jan 2020 11:53:17 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 2:15:03 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:
>> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:
>>> On 2020-01-10, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> On 10 Jan 2020 11:52:43 GMT
>>>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> > Eventually, we're going to stop having babies; why not start now?
>>>>>
>>>>> Slow down not stop preferably.
>>>>>
>>>>> That being said, we are slowing down a *lot*! See the UN crude

>>>> birthrate chart at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birth_rate, the birth
>>>> rate today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.
>>>
>>> Yes, and governments are having hysterics. Now they're trying to
>>> get population increase back to what it was in the Good Old Days,
>>> by encouraging immigration, baby bonuses, etc.
>>
>> The fundamental tenent of Capitalism as we currently practice it is growth.
>>
>> Growth in revenue, growth in income, growth in the stock price.
>>
>> Growth requires one of two things (or, generally, both):
>> - an increase in per-worker productivity
>> - an increase in the number of workers.
>>
>> Given that productivity increases slowly; growth generally needs new workers.
>>
>> New workers come about either indiginously or via immigration. For
>> years, USA growth has been facilitated by immigration (skilled in the
>> silly valley, unskilled in agriculture) due to an indiginous birth-rate close to
>> the replacement rate of two.
>
> In my opinion, our current immigration policy is a disaster. It
> is based on ugly racial prejudice--we don't like brown people--
> and not honest economic analysis*. (Certainly no humanitarian
> issues are considered). Given the US declining birthrate, we
> need new young people.

I have heard white people declare in no uncertain terms that they
didn't immigrate, and neither did their ancestors.

Obviously they are delusional.

I have asked some of them if they were Native American ? All said no.
I then point out their ancestors came from Europe, and they are the
descendants of immigrants. They don't like those facts, but I am
careful to say it to people I don't think will attack me.

--
Jim

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [hancock4](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 19:54:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

- > Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
- > (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
- > or pickups with duals on the rear.)

Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big pickup or SUV.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Roger Blake](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 20:12:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-11, JimP <solosam90@gmail.com> wrote:
> I have heard white people declare in no uncertain terms that they
> didn't immigrate, and neither did their ancestors.

They may well mean that their ancestors were already here when the American Revolution took place.

Is there anyplace on earth at this point that is still in the hands of its original inhabitants?

--

Roger Blake (Posts from Google Groups killfiled due to excess spam.)

The US Census vs. privacy -- <http://censusfacts.info>
Don't talk to cops! -- <http://www.DontTalkToCops.com>
Badges don't grant extra rights -- <http://www.CopBlock.org>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 20:25:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 08:07:44 -0500
J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

- > By the way, SUVs fill the long dead "station wagon" niche,

They're only dead in the US, here in Europe they're alive and well.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 20:46:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 20:12:38 -0000 (UTC)
Roger Blake <rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:

> Is there anyplace on earth at this point that is still in the hands of
> its original inhabitants?

Nope, they're all long dead. Africa is still in the hands of the
descendants of those who evolved there. Everywhere else was invaded by
other descendants of them, several times over. In one sense the only
difference between the 'native' inhabitants and the 'invaders' is the route
their ancestors took and when they settled.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Alfred Falk](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 20:51:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote in
news:20200106215447.00937b940975c00ff893cd93@eircom.net:

> On Mon, 6 Jan 2020 13:15:33 -0800 (PST)
> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>
>> (How unventilated could it have been since it had to have air for the
>> hot oldstyle bulb?)
>
> Not really, nothing was going to go wrong with one of those until
> the solder melted.

.... or something in or near the fixture caught fire.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 20:56:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 11:54:25 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

>

>> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.

>> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,

>> or pickups with duals on the rear.)

>

> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big

> pickup or SUV.

So move to some place where the government decides what people need
and get yourself appointed commissar of vehicles.

The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
for having one.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [hancock4](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 21:00:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Saturday, January 11, 2020 at 3:56:43 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:

> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 11:54:25 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

>

>> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

>>

>>> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.

>>> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,

>>> or pickups with duals on the rear.)

>>

>> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big

>> pickup or SUV.

>

> So move to some place where the government decides what people need

> and get yourself appointed commissar of vehicles.

>

> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason

> for having one.

How about just making the people who want big fat cars pay
all the costs of operating them?

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Roger Blake](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 21:03:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-11, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
> Nope, they're all long dead.

Bazinga! Of course I meant their descendants! :)

--

Roger Blake (Posts from Google Groups killfiled due to excess spam.)

The US Census vs. privacy -- <http://censusfacts.info>
Don't talk to cops! -- <http://www.DontTalkToCops.com>
Badges don't grant extra rights -- <http://www.CopBlock.org>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Roger Blake](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 21:07:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-11, J Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
> for having one.

Indeed. I love the reactions I get when mentioning I drive a 14-15 mpg vehicle. My money, my choice, no one else has anything to say about it as far as I am concerned. Screw liberals, enviro-nazis, social justice warriors, and whole lot leftist twits who want to dictate how people live their lives. (Likewise I would not consider purchasing an electric car in large part due to the people pushing them.)

--

Roger Blake (Posts from Google Groups killfiled due to excess spam.)

The US Census vs. privacy -- <http://censusfacts.info>
Don't talk to cops! -- <http://www.DontTalkToCops.com>
Badges don't grant extra rights -- <http://www.CopBlock.org>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 21:32:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 13:00:27 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

> On Saturday, January 11, 2020 at 3:56:43 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:

>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 11:54:25 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

>>

>>> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

>>>

>>>> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.

>>>> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,

>>>> or pickups with duals on the rear.)

>>>

>>> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big

>>> pickup or SUV.

>>

>> So move to some place where the government decides what people need

>> and get yourself appointed commissar of vehicles.

>>

>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason

>> for having one.

>

> How about just making the people who want big fat cars pay

> _all_ the costs of operating them?

How about making people who eat food transported to them pay _all_ the costs of transporting it?

For that matter, how about we make you pay _all_ the costs of your computer, including _all_ the costs of the electricity to run it? And if you say "solar panels" how about we make you pay _all_ the cost of those solar panels including _all_ the costs of transporting them from wherever they were made?

For that matter, how about we make you pay _all_ the costs of spouting a bunch of bullshit on the Internet?

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 11 Jan 2020 21:41:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 21:07:34 -0000 (UTC), Roger Blake

<rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:

> On 2020-01-11, J Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
>> for having one.

>

> Indeed. I love the reactions I get when mentioning I drive a 14-15 mpg
> vehicle. My money, my choice, no one else has anything to say about it
> as far as I am concerned. Screw liberals, enviro-nazis, social justice
> warriors, and whole lot leftist twits who want to dictate how people
> live their lives. (Likewise I would not consider purchasing an electric
> car in large part due to the people pushing them.)

My commuter car is a plug-in hybrid, but it can't carry very much and absolutely sucks in snow even with expensive European snow tires. When not running on battery it still gets better gas mileage than my motorcycle.

So I have an SUV as well. Right now it's a Jeep Grand Cherokee which gets 14 miles to the gallon on a good day. That one is old enough to drink at this point and starting to give me expensive problems, so I think it's time to swap it for something more recent. One option is a pickup truck--I'm getting old enough that lifting stuff up to the top of the SUV and tying it down is getting to be a nuisance, while the other is a Trackhawk, just because a 180 mph Jeep is such an outrageous concept.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 00:20:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> writes:

> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 20:12:38 -0000 (UTC)
> Roger Blake <rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:
>
>> Is there anyplace on earth at this point that is still in the hands of
>> its original inhabitants?
>
> Nope, they're all long dead. Africa is still in the hands of the
> descendants of those who evolved there. Everywhere else was invaded by
> other descendants of them, several times over. In one sense the only
> difference between the 'native' inhabitants and the 'invaders' is the route
> their ancestors took and when they settled.

Humans evolved between 6 and 2 million years ago.

All this time those humans have been moving away from the neighbors they can't stand.

Parts of my family were here in the US in the 1600s.
I can't see where I should get any special privileges from that.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 00:26:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> writes:

> On 1/11/2020 7:07 AM, J. Clarke wrote:
>
>>
>> In the city a vanishing tiny number of people in the US have personal
>> transportation of any kind. It's the people who don't live in cities
>> who need that sort of thing.
>
> I'm not sure what city you're referring to. It's probably true of
> Manhattan, and perhaps those with top-notch 24hr public transit. (In
> my city, they don't run the trains in the wee hours, because homeless
> people were using them as a safe place to catch a few hours sleep.)
> Certainly here, not having personal transportation mostly falls to the
> groups that are too poor and/or elderly, or committed
> bicyclists. (It's currently 14F with icy streets, so you can guess how
> big that last group is, though it's certainly bigger than it was 30
> years ago.) The neighbors on one side have 3 cars (one a work-related
> SUV), the retired fella on the other side has a car and a van, the
> families across the street have 3 and 2 cars/vans respectively (the
> third house is a single guy who only has 1, as do I).
>
> It is true that wheels are an absolute necessity for those who don't
> live in cities.

I recently drove Riverside Drive (Upper West Side).
Residential and a large park.
A stunningly beautiful place with wide streets and cars parked everywhere.

I've known people that lived in NYC. Invariably they needed a car
because they wanted to go places trains don't go.
The best thing is to rent garage space.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 00:37:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

> On Saturday, January 11, 2020 at 3:56:43 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 11:54:25 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>>
>>> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>
>>>> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>>>> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>>> or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>>
>>> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>>> pickup or SUV.
>>
>> So move to some place where the government decides what people need
>> and get yourself appointed commissar of vehicles.
>>
>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
>> for having one.
>
> How about just making the people who want big fat cars pay
> _all_ the costs of operating them?

They cost more, use more gas so pay more gas tax,
registration costs more (at least in NJ).

Maybe they already pay _all_ the costs.

We don't tax pollution, but the gas tax is proportional to the pollution
produced.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 00:48:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 21:07:34 -0000 (UTC), Roger Blake
> <rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:
>

>> On 2020-01-11, J Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
>>> for having one.
>>
>> Indeed. I love the reactions I get when mentioning I drive a 14-15 mpg
>> vehicle. My money, my choice, no one else has anything to say about it
>> as far as I am concerned. Screw liberals, enviro-nazis, social justice
>> warriors, and whole lot leftist twits who want to dictate how people
>> live their lives. (Likewise I would not consider purchasing an electric
>> car in large part due to the people pushing them.)
>
> My commuter car is a plug-in hybrid, but it can't carry very much and
> absolutely sucks in snow even with expensive European snow tires. When
> not running on battery it still gets better gas mileage than my
> motorcycle.
>
> So I have an SUV as well. Right now it's a Jeep Grand Cherokee which
> gets 14 miles to the gallon on a good day. That one is old enough to
> drink at this point and starting to give me expensive problems, so I
> think it's time to swap it for something more recent. One option is a
> pickup truck--I'm getting old enough that lifting stuff up to the top
> of the SUV and tying it down is getting to be a nuisance, while the
> other is a Trackhawk, just because a 180 mph Jeep is such an
> outrageous concept.

Years ago I test drove a Jeep.
It reminded me of driving a truck.

Just looked at that Trackhawk:

Powered by a 6.4L V8 engine, Grand Cherokee SRT® rewards you with track-ready capability, exhilarating acceleration and impressive handling

Not sure what kind of track I'd want to drive a Luxury SUV around.

Seems to me, 14mpg is a reasonable price to pay for something like that it sounds like a lot of fun.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 05:28:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-11, Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:

> Growth for the same of growth is the ideology of the cancer cell.
 ^
 sake
> -- Edward Abbey

Don't you hate it when that happens?
-- Beetlejuice

--
/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\/ <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Andy Burns](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 08:15:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:

> J. Clarke wrote:
>
>> SUVs fill the long dead "station wagon" niche
>
> They're only dead in the US, here in Europe they're alive and well.

Thankfully without the wood-effect fablon (d-c-fix?) ...

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Bernd Felsche](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:51:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:
> On 2020-01-10, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:

>>> Eventually, we're going to stop having babies; why not start now?
>>
>> Slow down not stop preferably.
>>
>> That being said, we are slowing down a *lot*! See the UN crude
>> birthrate chart at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birth_rate, the birth
>> rate today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.

> Yes, and governments are having hysterics. Now they're trying to
> get population increase back to what it was in the Good Old Days,
> by encouraging immigration, baby bonuses, etc.

Governments will do anything to fight the laws of nature that contradict their ideology.

Sometimes it's as simple as governments needing enough stupid people to keep voting them into power. If the IQ distribution keeps narrowing as a consequence of environmental conditions and reduced reproduction via consanguinity in "developed" societies, then there are feared to be too few to do menial jobs.

And then there are the countries which have for decades tried to build a welfare state now facing imminent retirement of a large block population; having squandered the money that the people have been contributing all their working lives to provide for life after work.

It's supreme folly to expect a flood of oft-functionally-illiterate immigrants to be contributing sufficiently to stop the sh!t from hitting that fan. Especially as support of those immigrants will be dipping into the coffers for a decade or more in an effort to make them economically productive units.

--

/\" Bernd Felsche - Somewhere in Western Australia
\\ ASCII ribbon campaign | For every complex problem there is an
X against HTML mail | answer that is clear, simple, and wrong.
/\ and postings | --HL Mencken

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 11:02:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Kerr-Mudd,John

On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 21:32:53 GMT, J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 13:00:27 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>
>> On Saturday, January 11, 2020 at 3:56:43 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 11:54:25 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland
>>>> wrote:

>>>>
>>>> > Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the
>>>> > need. (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_
>>>> > Hummers, Jeeps, or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>>>
>>>> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>>>> pickup or SUV.
>>>
>>> So move to some place where the government decides what people need
>>> and get yourself appointed commissar of vehicles.
>>>
>>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
>>> for having one.
>>
>> How about just making the people who want big fat cars pay
>> _all_ the costs of operating them?
>
> How about making people who eat food transported to them pay _all_ the
> costs of transporting it?
>
> For that matter, how about we make you pay _all_ the costs of your
> computer, including _all_ the costs of the electricity to run it? And
> if you say "solar panels" how about we make you pay _all_ the cost of
> those solar panels including _all_ the costs of transporting them from
> wherever they were made?
>
> For that matter, how about we make you pay _all_ the costs of spouting
> a bunch of bullshit on the Internet?
>

How about if people looked at it calmly and rationally and decided they
did want a better future for their offspring?

--

Bah, and indeed, Humbug.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 12:35:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 11:02:08 -0000 (UTC)
"Kerr-Mudd,John" <notsaying@invalid.org> wrote:

> How about if people looked at it calmly and rationally and decided they
> *did* want a better future for their offspring?

There would still be those who say "I have no kids and I don't care I just want what I want and I want it NOW, nothing that happens after I die matters to me".

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 15:56:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 21:07:34 -0000 (UTC)
Roger Blake <rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:

> On 2020-01-11, J Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys you is quite sufficient reason
>> for having one.
>
> Indeed. I love the reactions I get when mentioning I drive a 14-15 mpg
> vehicle. My money, my choice, no one else has anything to say about it
> as far as I am concerned. Screw liberals, enviro-nazis, social justice
> warriors, and whole lot leftist twits who want to dictate how people
> live their lives. (Likewise I would not consider purchasing an electric
> car in large part due to the people pushing them.)

It seems a shame to risk letting politics get in the way of
rational self interest. It would probably be wiser to consider purchasing
one as soon as it is in your interest to do so no matter what you think of
the people who push them.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 16:11:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 18:51:26 +0800, Bernd Felsche

<berfel@innovative.iinet.net.au> wrote:

> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:

>> On 2020-01-10, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

>>> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:

>

>>>> Eventually, we're going to stop having babies; why not start now?

>>>>

>>> Slow down not stop preferably.

>>>>

>>> That being said, we are slowing down a *lot*! See the UN crude

>>> birthrate chart at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birth_rate, the birth

>>> rate today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.

>

>> Yes, and governments are having hysterics. Now they're trying to

>> get population increase back to what it was in the Good Old Days,

>> by encouraging immigration, baby bonuses, etc.

>

> Governments will do anything to fight the laws of nature that

> contradict their ideology.

>

> Sometimes it's as simple a governments needing enough stupid people

> to keep voting them into power. If the IQ distribution keeps

> narrowing as a consequence of environmental conditions and reduced

> reproduction via consanguinity in "developed" societies , then there

> are _feared_ to be too few to do menial jobs.

>

> And then there are the countries which have for decades tried to

> build a welfare state now facing imminent retirement of a large

> block population; having squandered the money that the people have

> been contributing all their working lives to provide for life after

> work.

>

> It's supreme folly to expect a flood of oft-functionally-illiterate

> immigrants to be contributing sufficiently to stop the sh!t from

> hitting that fan. Especially as support of those immigrants will be

> dipping into the coffers for a decade or more in an effort to make

> them economically productive units.

Some immigrants, even ones who have white skin, have usable university degrees from accredited universities in their home nation.

Not all immigrants are ignorant. Many want to get educations, but in their former country they cannot as they aren't in the upper crust.

--

Jim

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 16:12:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 15:56:06 +0000, Ahem A Rivet's Shot
<steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 21:07:34 -0000 (UTC)
> Roger Blake <rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:
>
>> On 2020-01-11, J Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
>>> for having one.
>>
>> Indeed. I love the reactions I get when mentioning I drive a 14-15 mpg
>> vehicle. My money, my choice, no one else has anything to say about it
>> as far as I am concerned. Screw liberals, enviro-nazis, social justice
>> warriors, and whole lot leftist twits who want to dictate how people
>> live their lives. (Likewise I would not consider purchasing an electric
>> car in large part due to the people pushing them.)
>
> It seems a shame to risk letting politics get in the way of
> rational self interest. It would probably be wiser to consider purchasing
> one as soon as it is in your interest to do so no matter what you think of
> the people who push them.

He apparently would prefer shafting himself, and blame others for his problems.

--
Jim

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 16:26:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Kerr-Mudd,John

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 12:35:54 GMT, Ahem A Rivet's Shot
<steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 11:02:08 -0000 (UTC)
> "Kerr-Mudd,John" <notsaying@invalid.org> wrote:
>
>> How about if people looked at it calmly and rationally and decided
>> they *did* want a better future for their offspring?

>
> There would still be those who say "I have no kids and I don't
> care I just want what I want and I want it NOW, nothing that happens
> after I die matters to me".

"And I'll shout loudly about my right to do it."

Ah yes. that'll be the flaw.

--

Bah, and indeed, Humbug.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JimP <solosam90@gmail.com> wrote:
> On Fri, 10 Jan 2020 11:53:17 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 2:15:03 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:
>>> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:
>>>> On 2020-01-10, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > On 10 Jan 2020 11:52:43 GMT
>>>> > Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> Eventually, we're going to stop having babies; why not start now?
>>>> >
>>>> > Slow down not stop preferably.
>>>> >
>>>> > That being said, we are slowing down a *lot*! See the UN crude
>>>> > birthrate chart at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birth_rate, the birth
>>>> > rate today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.
>>>>
>>>> Yes, and governments are having hysterics. Now they're trying to
>>>> get population increase back to what it was in the Good Old Days,
>>>> by encouraging immigration, baby bonuses, etc.
>>>
>>> The fundamental tenent of Capitalism as we currently practice it is growth.
>>>
>>> Growth in revenue, growth in income, growth in the stock price.
>>>
>>> Growth requires one of two things (or, generally, both):
>>> - an increase in per-worker productivity
>>> - an increase in the number of workers.
>>>
>>> Given that productivity increases slowly; growth generally needs new workers.

>>>

>>> New workers come about either indiginously or via immigration. For
>>> years, USA growth has been facilitated by immigration (skilled in the
>>> silly valley, unskilled in agriculture) due to an indiginous birth-rate close to
>>> the replacement rate of two.

>>

>> In my opinion, our current immigration policy is a disaster. It
>> is based on ugly racial prejudice--we don't like brown people--
>> and not honest economic analysis*. (Certainly no humanitarian
>> issues are considered). Given the US declining birthrate, we
>> need new young people.

>

> I have heard white people declare in no uncertain terms that they
> didn't immigrate, and neither did their ancestors.

>

> Obviously they are delusional.

>

> I have asked some of them if they were Native American ? All said no.
> I then point out their ancestors came from Europe, and they are the
> descendants of immigrants. They don't like those facts, but I am
> careful to say it to people I don't think will attack me.

>

Wow, what's WITH people where you live?

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:00:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:

> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

>

>> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>> or pickups with duals on the rear.)

>

> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
> pickup or SUV.

>

I've gotten more sympathetic to SUVs since I've observed mothers toting a
carful of kids and their sports gear. Try that with a Prius. As someone
pointed out, our silly tax structure makes pickups relatively cheap, but
there again lots of people need them. Even in built-up suburbs a lot of

people are plumbers, electricians, carpenters, etc.

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:00:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 21:07:34 -0000 (UTC), Roger Blake

> <rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:

>

>> On 2020-01-11, J Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

>>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason

>>> for having one.

>>

>> Indeed. I love the reactions I get when mentioning I drive a 14-15 mpg
>> vehicle. My money, my choice, no one else has anything to say about it
>> as far as I am concerned. Screw liberals, enviro-nazis, social justice
>> warriors, and whole lot leftist twits who want to dictate how people
>> live their lives. (Likewise I would not consider purchasing an electric
>> car in large part due to the people pushing them.)

>

> My commuter car is a plug-in hybrid, but it can't carry very much and
> absolutely sucks in snow even with expensive European snow tires. When
> not running on battery it still gets better gas mileage than my
> motorcycle.

Makes sense, isn't the gas engine used only to recharge the battery? This
is like a diesel-electric locomotive.

>

> So I have an SUV as well. Right now it's a Jeep Grand Cherokee which
> gets 14 miles to the gallon on a good day. That one is old enough to
> drink at this point and starting to give me expensive problems, so I
> think it's time to swap it for something more recent. One option is a
> pickup truck--I'm getting old enough that lifting stuff up to the top
> of the SUV and tying it down is getting to be a nuisance, while the
> other is a Trackhawk, just because a 180 mph Jeep is such an
> outrageous concept.

>

--

Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:00:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> writes:
>
>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 20:12:38 -0000 (UTC)
>> Roger Blake <rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:
>>
>>> Is there anyplace on earth at this point that is still in the hands of
>>> its original inhabitants?
>>
>> Nope, they're all long dead. Africa is still in the hands of the
>> descendants of those who evolved there. Everywhere else was invaded by
>> other descendants of them, several times over. In one sense the only
>> difference between the 'native' inhabitants and the 'invaders' is the route
>> their ancestors took and when they settled.
>
> Humans evolved between 6 and 2 million years ago.
>
> All this time those humans have been moving away from the neighbors they
> can't stand.
>
> Parts of my family were here in the US in the 1600s.
> I can't see where I should get any special privileges from that.
>

No, it's fun to research ancestors but shouldn't matter. What should matter is how willing immigrants are to adopt our culture and hop into the melting pot. Keep your old-country customs for various "ethnic festivals" that pop up all over.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:00:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:
>
>> On Saturday, January 11, 2020 at 3:56:43 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 11:54:25 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>>>
>>>> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

>>>>
>>>> > Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>>>> > (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>>> > or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>>>
>>>> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>>>> pickup or SUV.
>>>
>>> So move to some place where the government decides what people need
>>> and get yourself appointed commissar of vehicles.
>>>
>>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
>>> for having one.
>>
>> How about just making the people who want big fat cars pay
>> _all_ the costs of operating them?
>
> They cost more, use more gas so pay more gas tax,
> registration costs more (at least in NJ.
>
> Maybe they already pay _all_ the costs.
>
> We don't tax pollution, but the gas tax is proportional to the pollution
> produced.
>

Who DOESN'T pay are the 18-wheelers.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:00:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>
>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 21:07:34 -0000 (UTC), Roger Blake
>> <rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:
>>
>>> On 2020-01-11, J Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
>>>> for having one.
>>>
>>> Indeed. I love the reactions I get when mentioning I drive a 14-15 mpg
>>> vehicle. My money, my choice, no one else has anything to say about it

>>> as far as I am concerned. Screw liberals, enviro-nazis, social justice
>>> warriors, and whole lot leftist twits who want to dictate how people
>>> live their lives. (Likewise I would not consider purchasing an electric
>>> car in large part due to the people pushing them.)
>>
>> My commuter car is a plug-in hybrid, but it can't carry very much and
>> absolutely sucks in snow even with expensive European snow tires. When
>> not running on battery it still gets better gas mileage than my
>> motorcycle.
>>
>> So I have an SUV as well. Right now it's a Jeep Grand Cherokee which
>> gets 14 miles to the gallon on a good day. That one is old enough to
>> drink at this point and starting to give me expensive problems, so I
>> think it's time to swap it for something more recent. One option is a
>> pickup truck--I'm getting old enough that lifting stuff up to the top
>> of the SUV and tying it down is getting to be a nuisance, while the
>> other is a Trackhawk, just because a 180 mph Jeep is such an
>> outrageous concept.
>
> Years ago I test drove a Jeep.
> It reminded me of driving a truck.
>
> Just looked at that Trackhawk:
>
> Powered by a 6.4L V8 engine, Grand Cherokee SRT® rewards you with
> track-ready capability, exhilarating acceleration and impressive
> handling
>
> Not sure what kind of track I'd want to drive a Luxury SUV around.
>
> Seems to me, 14mpg is a reasonable price to pay for something like that
> it sounds like a lot of fun.
>

They all look like fun in the card ads, too, but where the heck do you find
roads where you're the only car?

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:24:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:05 -0700, Peter Flass

<peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

>> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

>>

>>> On Saturday, January 11, 2020 at 3:56:43 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:

>>>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 11:54:25 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.

>>>> >> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,

>>>> >> or pickups with duals on the rear.)

>>>> >

>>>> > Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big

>>>> > pickup or SUV.

>>>>

>>>> So move to some place where the government decides what people need

>>>> and get yourself appointed commissar of vehicles.

>>>>

>>>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason

>>>> for having one.

>>>

>>> How about just making the people who want big fat cars pay

>>> _all_ the costs of operating them?

>>

>> They cost more, use more gas so pay more gas tax,

>> registration costs more (at least in NJ.

>>

>> Maybe they already pay _all_ the costs.

>>

>> We don't tax pollution, but the gas tax is proportional to the pollution

>> produced.

>>

>

> Who DOESN'T pay are the 18-wheelers.

They don't? They pay tolls, per axle, the tax on diesel is higher than on gas, so in what way do they not pay?

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:31:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:06 -0700, Peter Flass

<peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>>

>>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 21:07:34 -0000 (UTC), Roger Blake

>>> <rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> On 2020-01-11, J Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

>>>> > The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason

>>>> > for having one.

>>>>

>>>> Indeed. I love the reactions I get when mentioning I drive a 14-15 mpg
>>>> vehicle. My money, my choice, no one else has anything to say about it
>>>> as far as I am concerned. Screw liberals, enviro-nazis, social justice
>>>> warriors, and whole lot leftist twits who want to dictate how people
>>>> live their lives. (Likewise I would not consider purchasing an electric
>>>> car in large part due to the people pushing them.)

>>>

>>> My commuter car is a plug-in hybrid, but it can't carry very much and
>>> absolutely sucks in snow even with expensive European snow tires. When
>>> not running on battery it still gets better gas mileage than my
>>> motorcycle.

>>>

>>> So I have an SUV as well. Right now it's a Jeep Grand Cherokee which
>>> gets 14 miles to the gallon on a good day. That one is old enough to
>>> drink at this point and starting to give me expensive problems, so I
>>> think it's time to swap it for something more recent. One option is a
>>> pickup truck--I'm getting old enough that lifting stuff up to the top
>>> of the SUV and tying it down is getting to be a nuisance, while the
>>> other is a Trackhawk, just because a 180 mph Jeep is such an
>>> outrageous concept.

>>

>> Years ago I test drove a Jeep.

>> It reminded me of driving a truck.

>>

>> Just looked at that Trackhawk:

>>

>> Powered by a 6.4L V8 engine, Grand Cherokee SRT® rewards you with
>> track-ready capability, exhilarating acceleration and impressive
>> handling

>>

>> Not sure what kind of track I'd want to drive a Luxury SUV around.

>>

>> Seems to me, 14mpg is a reasonable price to pay for something like that
>> it sounds like a lot of fun.

>>

>

> They all look like fun in the card ads, too, but where the heck do you find
> roads where you're the only car?

Lime Rock Park for one example.

But it's not really about going fast. It's about things like getting
on the Interstate with an immense grin on your face, or starting to
pass some moron who decides that he wants to race.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:32:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:03 -0700, Peter Flass
<peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 21:07:34 -0000 (UTC), Roger Blake
>> <rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:
>>
>>> On 2020-01-11, J Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
>>>> for having one.
>>>
>>> Indeed. I love the reactions I get when mentioning I drive a 14-15 mpg
>>> vehicle. My money, my choice, no one else has anything to say about it
>>> as far as I am concerned. Screw liberals, enviro-nazis, social justice
>>> warriors, and whole lot leftist twits who want to dictate how people
>>> live their lives. (Likewise I would not consider purchasing an electric
>>> car in large part due to the people pushing them.)
>>
>> My commuter car is a plug-in hybrid, but it can't carry very much and
>> absolutely sucks in snow even with expensive European snow tires. When
>> not running on battery it still gets better gas mileage than my
>> motorcycle.
>
> Makes sense, isn't the gas engine used only to recharge the battery? This
> is like a diesel-electric locomotive.

No, it runs on the electric motor until the battery is down to a
certain point, then runs on the gas engine. There are hybrids that
work the way you say. Mine isn't one of them.

>> So I have an SUV as well. Right now it's a Jeep Grand Cherokee which
>> gets 14 miles to the gallon on a good day. That one is old enough to

>> drink at this point and starting to give me expensive problems, so I
>> think it's time to swap it for something more recent. One option is a
>> pickup truck--I'm getting old enough that lifting stuff up to the top
>> of the SUV and tying it down is getting to be a nuisance, while the
>> other is a Trackhawk, just because a 180 mph Jeep is such an
>> outrageous concept.
>>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:33:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:02 -0700, Peter Flass
<peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:
>> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>
>>> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>>> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>> or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>
>> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>> pickup or SUV.
>>
>
> I've gotten more sympathetic to SUVs since I've observed mothers toting a
> carful of kids and their sports gear.

Yep. A minivan does the same thing but it isn't any more economical
or any safer and it is much less happy on snow days.

> Try that with a Prius. As someone
> pointed out, our silly tax structure makes pickups relatively cheap, but
> there again lots of people need them. Even in built-up suburbs a lot of
> people are plumbers, electricians, carpenters, etc.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:37:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Kerr-Mudd,John

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:24:47 GMT, J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:05 -0700, Peter Flass

> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

>

>> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:

>>> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:

>>>

>>>> On Saturday, January 11, 2020 at 3:56:43 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:

>>>> > On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 11:54:25 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com

>>>> > wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland

>>>> >> wrote:

>>>> >>

>>>> >>> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the

>>>> >>> need. (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_

>>>> >>> Hummers, Jeeps, or pickups with duals on the rear.)

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big

>>>> >> pickup or SUV.

>>>> >

>>>> > So move to some place where the government decides what people

>>>> > need and get yourself appointed commissar of vehicles.

>>>> >

>>>> > The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient

>>>> > reason for having one.

>>>>

>>>> How about just making the people who want big fat cars pay

>>>> _all_ the costs of operating them?

>>>

>>> They cost more, use more gas so pay more gas tax,

>>> registration costs more (at least in NJ.

>>>

>>> Maybe they already pay _all_ the costs.

>>>

>>> We don't tax pollution, but the gas tax is proportional to the

>>> pollution produced.

>>>

>>

>> Who DOESN'T pay are the 18-wheelers.

>

> They don't? They pay tolls, per axle, the tax on diesel is higher

> than on gas, so in what way do they not pay?

>

Here ya go:

<https://www.denenapoints.com/relationship-vehicle-weight-roa d-damage/>

<quote>

A study by the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) determined that the road damage caused by a single 18-wheeler was equivalent to the damage caused by 9,600 cars.

Or are you just looking for an argument?

--

Bah, and indeed, Humbug.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:41:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:02 -0700
Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Even in built-up suburbs a lot of people are plumbers, electricians,
> carpenters, etc.

Here most of them use vans, often the small ones built on a car chassis.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:42:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:02 -0700, Peter Flass
> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>> <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:
>>> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>
>>>> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.

>>>> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>>> or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>>
>>> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>>> pickup or SUV.
>>>
>>
>> I've gotten more sympathetic to SUVs since I've observed mothers toting a
>> carful of kids and their sports gear.
>
> Yep. A minivan does the same thing but it isn't any more economical
> or any safer and it is much less happy on snow days.

Actually, I have a mini-van (2006 Scion Xb) that gets 32MPG.

I got it because I love the ugly look, it's economical, I can
carry most types of cargo, and the sound system is first rate.
(I just brought home a recliner.) It's front wheel drive so has
no problem in the snow.

Most mini-vans are overbuilt in my opinion.
Perhaps the Scion Xb doesn't fit the mini-van category exactly.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:50:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:

> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:
>>
>>> On Saturday, January 11, 2020 at 3:56:43 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>>>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 11:54:25 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>>>> >> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>>> >> or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>>> >
>>>> > Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>>>> > pickup or SUV.
>>>>

>>>> So move to some place where the government decides what people need
>>>> and get yourself appointed commissar of vehicles.
>>>>
>>>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
>>>> for having one.
>>>>
>>> How about just making the people who want big fat cars pay
>>> _all_ the costs of operating them?
>>>
>> They cost more, use more gas so pay more gas tax,
>> registration costs more (at least in NJ.
>>
>> Maybe they already pay _all_ the costs.
>>
>> We don't tax pollution, but the gas tax is proportional to the pollution
>> produced.
>
> Who DOESN'T pay are the 18-wheelers.

I believe diesel is gas taxed, yep:

The United States federal excise tax on gasoline is 18.4 cents per gallon and 24.4 cents per gallon for diesel fuel.

State taxes seem to be a mixed bag:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fuel_taxes_in_the_United_States

Some states actually have lower taxes on diesel but it looks like most states put higher taxes on diesel.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 17:59:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:

> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> writes:
>>
>>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 20:12:38 -0000 (UTC)
>>> Roger Blake <rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Is there anyplace on earth at this point that is still in the hands of

>>>> its original inhabitants?
>>>
>>> Nope, they're all long dead. Africa is still in the hands of the
>>> descendants of those who evolved there. Everywhere else was invaded by
>>> other descendants of them, several times over. In one sense the only
>>> difference between the 'native' inhabitants and the 'invaders' is the route
>>> their ancestors took and when they settled.
>>
>> Humans evolved between 6 and 2 million years ago.
>>
>> All this time those humans have been moving away from the neighbors they
>> can't stand.
>>
>> Parts of my family were here in the US in the 1600s.
>> I can't see where I should get any special privileges from that.
>
> No, it's fun to research ancestors but shouldn't matter. What should matter
> is how willing immigrants are to adopt our culture and hop into the melting
> pot. Keep your old-country customs for various "ethnic festivals" that pop
> up all over.

And that is what seems to happen.

Actually, a few generations in the USA and you are unlikely to be able
to even identify your ethnic background. I sure can't even with a DNA test.

Except for the notable exception of people with darker skin.
They can adopt our culture but can't "blend in" like the Irish,
Germans, Latins, etc.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 18:07:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 12:42:50 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>
>> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:02 -0700, Peter Flass
>> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>>> <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:

>>>> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>>>> > (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>>> > or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>>>
>>>> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>>>> pickup or SUV.
>>>>
>>>
>>> I've gotten more sympathetic to SUVs since I've observed mothers toting a
>>> carful of kids and their sports gear.
>>
>> Yep. A minivan does the same thing but it isn't any more economical
>> or any safer and it is much less happy on snow days.
>
> Actually, I have a mini-van (2006 Scion Xb) that gets 32MPG.

And a RAV 4 gets 35.

> I got it because I love the ugly look, it's economical, I can
> carry most types of cargo, and the sound system is first rate.
> (I just brought home a recliner.) It's front wheel drive so has
> no problem in the snow.

My hybrid is front wheel drive. I love people who say "front wheel
drive has no problem in the snow". They're always so grateful when I
hook the Jeep up and pull them out of wherever they're stuck.

> Most mini-vans are overbuilt in my opinion.
> Perhaps the Scion Xb doesn't fit the mini-van category exactly.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 18:27:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-12, Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:

> On 1/12/2020 6:35 AM, Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:
>
>> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 11:02:08 -0000 (UTC)
>> "Kerr-Mudd,John" <notsaying@invalid.org> wrote:
>>
>>> How about if people looked at it calmly and rationally and decided they
>>> *did* want a better future for their offspring?
>>
>> There would still be those who say "I have no kids and I don't

>> care I just want what I want and I want it NOW, nothing that happens after
>> I die matters to me".
>
> And yet, somehow, in their twilight years they'll want younger people
> to be keeping the wheels of civilization turning, not to speak of
> helping to maintain their own decrepit carcass.

Which would be a lot less decrepit if they took care of it.
(The same goes for our decrepit planet.)

> Where these younger people will come from is a mystery.

Oh, there's no shortage of young people - if we stop training them to be parasites.

(Note: I don't have children either. But I still believe that we should all be looking after the ones who are already here.)

> The Japanese (resisting immigration) are trying to do some of it
> with robots.
>
> When the last human dies, they can turn out the lights. Well-built
> robots won't need that energy waste.

Someone once pointed out that we're not "destroying the ecology". However, we might succeed in shifting it enough that there won't be a place for us anymore.

--

/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\ / <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 18:27:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-12, J Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

> But it's not really about going fast. It's about things like getting
> on the Interstate with an immense grin on your face, or starting to
> pass some moron who decides that he wants to race.

Ah, that brings back memories of the old Suburban with its 350-cubic-inch V8 and Holley Quadrajet carb. Much fun when coming down the on-ramp and some twerp in a 240Z decides

he's not going to let me in. I'm big, I'm ugly, and I have a couple of dings to show I don't give a damn.
"Go ahead, make my day."

Mind you, 15 miles per gallon didn't hurt much with gas prices being what they were 40 years ago. Our 2007 Honda Civic is good enough for me now.

--
/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\/ <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 18:33:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-12, J Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

> My hybrid is front wheel drive. I love people who say "front wheel
> drive has no problem in the snow". They're always so grateful when I
> hook the Jeep up and pull them out of wherever they're stuck.

Let me guess, they're the ones who believe that the correct action to take when their wheels start slipping is to floor it.

--
/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\/ <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 18:42:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On 12 Jan 2020 18:33:16 GMT, Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:

> On 2020-01-12, J Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>> My hybrid is front wheel drive. I love people who say "front wheel

>> drive has no problem in the snow". They're always so grateful when I
>> hook the Jeep up and pull them out of wherever they're stuck.
>
> Let me guess, they're the ones who believe that the correct action
> to take when their wheels start slipping is to floor it.

I have no idea what they think. I'm driving along and there's some
front-wheel drive in a ditch and I pull him out.

I note that even with traction control and gingerly handling and the
latest generation of Blizzak my front-wheel drive has trouble getting
moving and when it does it tends to wander a lot.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 19:03:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
> Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>>> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> writes:
>>>>
>>>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 20:12:38 -0000 (UTC)
>>>> Roger Blake <rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > Is there anyplace on earth at this point that is still in the hands of
>>>> > its original inhabitants?
>>>>
>>>> Nope, they're all long dead. Africa is still in the hands of the
>>>> descendants of those who evolved there. Everywhere else was invaded by
>>>> other descendants of them, several times over. In one sense the only
>>>> difference between the 'native' inhabitants and the 'invaders' is the route
>>>> their ancestors took and when they settled.
>>>
>>> Humans evolved between 6 and 2 million years ago.
>>>
>>> All this time those humans have been moving away from the neighbors they
>>> can't stand.
>>>
>>> Parts of my family were here in the US in the 1600s.
>>> I can't see where I should get any special privileges from that.
>>
>> No, it's fun to research ancestors but shouldn't matter. What should matter
>> is how willing immigrants are to adopt our culture and hop into the melting
>> pot. Keep your old-country customs for various "ethnic festivals" that pop
>> up all over.

>
> And that is what seems to happen.
> Actually, a few generations in the USA and you are unlikely to be able
> to even identify your ethnic background. I sure can't even with a DNA test.
>
> Except for the notable exception of people with darker skin.
> They can adopt our culture but can't "blend in" like the Irish,
> Germans, Latins, etc.
>

They're blending, but more slowly. In a few hundred years everyone will be some shade of tan.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 19:03:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:05 -0700, Peter Flass
> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>>> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:
>>>
>>>> On Saturday, January 11, 2020 at 3:56:43 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>>>> > On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 11:54:25 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>>>> >>> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>>> >>> or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>>> >>
>>>> >> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>>>> >> pickup or SUV.
>>>> >
>>>> > So move to some place where the government decides what people need
>>>> > and get yourself appointed commissar of vehicles.
>>>> >
>>>> > The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
>>>> > for having one.
>>>>
>>>> How about just making the people who want big fat cars pay
>>>> _all_ the costs of operating them?

>>>
>>> They cost more, use more gas so pay more gas tax,
>>> registration costs more (at least in NJ.
>>>
>>> Maybe they already pay _all_ the costs.
>>>
>>> We don't tax pollution, but the gas tax is proportional to the pollution
>>> produced.
>>>
>>
>> Who DOESN'T pay are the 18-wheelers.
>
> They don't? They pay tolls, per axle, the tax on diesel is higher
> than on gas, so in what way do they not pay?
>
>

They're a lot tougher on infrastructure than cars.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 19:03:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 12:42:50 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
> wrote:
>
>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>
>>> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:02 -0700, Peter Flass
>>> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:
>>>> > On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>>>> >> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>>> >> or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>>> >
>>>> > Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>>>> > pickup or SUV.
>>>> >
>>>>
>>>> I've gotten more sympathetic to SUVs since I've observed mothers toting a

>>>> careful of kids and their sports gear.
>>>
>>> Yep. A minivan does the same thing but it isn't any more economical
>>> or any safer and it is much less happy on snow days.
>>
>> Actually, I have a mini-van (2006 Scion Xb) that gets 32MPG.
>
> And a RAV 4 gets 35.
>
>> I got it because I love the ugly look, it's economical, I can
>> carry most types of cargo, and the sound system is first rate.
>> (I just brought home a recliner.) It's front wheel drive so has
>> no problem in the snow.
>
> My hybrid is front wheel drive. I love people who say "front wheel
> drive has no problem in the snow". They're always so grateful when I
> hook the Jeep up and pull them out of wherever they're stuck.
>
>> Most mini-vans are overbuilt in my opinion.
>> Perhaps the Scion Xb doesn't fit the mini-van category exactly.
>

It's like the idiots who think four- or all-wheel drive vehicles don't have problems. Technology is no substitute for careful driving. Front-wheel drive cars are much better in snow than rear-wheel drive.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Roger Blake](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 19:24:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-12, Kerr-Mudd,John <notsaying@invalid.org> wrote:
> How about if people looked at it calmly and rationally and decided they
> *did* want a better future for their offspring?

You are assuming the crap being spewed by environmentalists is going to do so. After 50 years of lies and failed hysterical doomsday predictions I see no reason to believe that. It is highly unlikely that anything you do will create a better future for your offspring other than doing your best to take of them properly. Your responsibility, not mine or anyone else's.

I will make no changes here - no electric or hybrid car, no LED light bulbs, no crappy high-efficiency appliances.

--

Roger Blake (Posts from Google Groups killfiled due to excess spam.)

The US Census vs. privacy -- <http://censusfacts.info>
Don't talk to cops! -- <http://www.DontTalkToCops.com>
Badges don't grant extra rights -- <http://www.CopBlock.org>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anne & Lynn Wheel](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 20:35:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
> They don't? They pay tolls, per axle, the tax on diesel is higher
> than on gas, so in what way do they not pay?

highway design, wear&tear, maint, costs are based on projected 18wheeler
axle-ton (cars and light trucks have no affect).

This has moved a couple times (and/or unavailable) since originally
posted ... so from wayback machine
<https://web.archive.org/web/20090421013132/http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/hdm/hdmtoc.htm>
pavement engineering
<https://web.archive.org/web/20090411065841/http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/hdm/pdf/chp0600.pdf>

603.1 Introduction

The primary goal of the design of the pavement structural section is to provide a structurally stable and durable pavement and base system which, with a minimum of maintenance, will carry the projected traffic loading for the designated design period. This topic discusses the factors to be considered and procedures to be followed in developing a projection of truck traffic for design of the "pavement structure" or the structural section for specific projects.

Pavement structural sections are designed to carry the projected truck traffic considering the expanded truck traffic volume, mix, and the axle loads converted to 80 kN equivalent single axle loads (ESAL's) expected to occur during the design period. **The effects on pavement life of passenger cars, pickups, and two-axle trucks are considered to be negligible**.

Traffic information that is required for structural section design includes axle loads, axle configurations, and number of applications. The results of the AASHO Road Test (performed in the early

1960's in Illinois) have shown that the damaging effect of the passage of an axle load can be represented by a number of 80 kN ESAL's. For example, one application of a 53 kN single axle load was found to cause damage equal to an application of approximately 0.23 of an 80 kN single axle load, and four applications of a 53 kN single axle were found to cause the same damage (or reduction in serviceability) as one application of an 80 kN single axle.

.... snip ...

past posts/refs

<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2002j.html#41> Transportation
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2002j.html#42> Transportation
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2004e.html#7> OT Global warming
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2006g.html#56> The Pankian Metaphor
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2006g.html#57> The Pankian Metaphor
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2006g.html#59> The Pankian Metaphor
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2006g.html#60> The Pankian Metaphor
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2006g.html#61> The Pankian Metaphor
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2006g.html#62> The Pankian Metaphor
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2006h.html#0> The Pankian Metaphor
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2006h.html#6> The Pankian Metaphor
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2006h.html#8> The Pankian Metaphor
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2006h.html#11> The Pankian Metaphor
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2006h.html#23> The Pankian Metaphor
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2008e.html#48> fraying infrastructure
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2008k.html#68> Historian predicts the end of 'science superpowers'
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2008l.html#36> dollar coins
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2010m.html#61> Idiotic cars driving themselves
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2010n.html#39> Central vs. expanded storage
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2010p.html#52> TCM's Moguls documentary series
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2011h.html#5> Home prices may drop another 25%, Shiller predicts
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2011n.html#80> A Close Look at the Perry Tax Plan
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2011n.html#83> A Close Look at the Perry Tax Plan
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2013h.html#28> "Highway Patrol" back on TV
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2013h.html#29> "Highway Patrol" back on TV
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2015b.html#47> Future of support for telephone rotary dial ?
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2015h.html#76> IMPI (System/38 / AS/400 historical)
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2016.html#12> 1970--protesters seize computer center
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2016h.html#109> Minimum Wage
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2017f.html#70> [CM] What was your first home computer?
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2017h.html#31> Disregard post (another screwup; absolutely nothing to do with computers whatsoever!)
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2018.html#42> Predicting the future in five years as seen from 1983
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2018.html#44> Predicting the future in five years as seen from 1983
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2018b.html#26> Bitcoin confusion?
<http://www.garlic.com/~lynn/2018f.html#103> Is LINUX the inheritor of the Earth?

--

virtualization experience starting Jan1968, online at home since Mar1970

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 21:25:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2020-01-12, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> It's like the idiots who think four- or all-wheel drive vehicles don't have
> problems. Technology is no substitute for careful driving. Front-wheel
> drive cars are much better in snow than rear-wheel drive.

An experienced off-roader once told me that for such people,
the presence of a winch on their truck just means that they'll
get farther into the woods before getting stuck.

--

/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Microsoft is a dictatorship.
\ / <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | Apple is a cult.
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | Linux is anarchy.
/\ if you read it the right way. | Pick your poison.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 22:04:07 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 19:24:25 -0000 (UTC), Roger Blake
<rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:

> On 2020-01-12, Kerr-Mudd,John <notsaying@invalid.org> wrote:
>> How about if people looked at it calmly and rationally and decided they
>> *did* want a better future for their offspring?
>
> You are assuming the crap being spewed by environmentalists is going to
> do so. After 50 years of lies and failed hysterical doomsday predictions
> I see no reason to believe that. It is highly unlikely that anything you
> do will create a better future for your offspring other than doing your
> best to take of them properly. Your responsibility, not mine or anyone
> else's.
>
> I will make no changes here - no electric or hybrid car, no LED light bulbs,
> no crappy high-efficiency appliances.

You might want to try out some of the better electric cars. I never thought I'd buy one but my Jeep was starting to do expensive things (expensive if I have to get it fixed in order to go to work--recreation if I can fix it at my leisure) and my employer has reserved parking and free charging for electrics and plug-ins so I decided to give one a try. It's really not bad. It's good enough in fact that I'm thinking that when it's ready to be traded the replacement might be a Tesla.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 22:07:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 12:03:15 -0700, Peter Flass
<peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:
>> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 12:42:50 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>
>>>> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:02 -0700, Peter Flass
>>>> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:
>>>> >> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>>>> >>> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>>> >>> or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>>> >>
>>>> >> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>>>> >> pickup or SUV.
>>>> >>
>>>> >
>>>> > I've gotten more sympathetic to SUVs since I've observed mothers toting a
>>>> > carful of kids and their sports gear.
>>>>
>>>> Yep. A minivan does the same thing but it isn't any more economical
>>>> or any safer and it is much less happy on snow days.
>>>>
>>> Actually, I have a mini-van (2006 Scion Xb) that gets 32MPG.
>>

>> And a RAV 4 gets 35.
>>
>>> I got it because I love the ugly look, it's economical, I can
>>> carry most types of cargo, and the sound system is first rate.
>>> (I just brought home a recliner.) It's front wheel drive so has
>>> no problem in the snow.
>>
>> My hybrid is front wheel drive. I love people who say "front wheel
>> drive has no problem in the snow". They're always so grateful when I
>> hook the Jeep up and pull them out of wherever they're stuck.
>>
>>> Most mini-vans are overbuilt in my opinion.
>>> Perhaps the Scion Xb doesn't fit the mini-van category exactly.
>>
>
> It's like the idiots who think four- or all-wheel drive vehicles don't have
> problems. Technology is no substitute for careful driving. Front-wheel
> drive cars are much better in snow than rear-wheel drive.

The best rallye drivers in the world, with the best front-wheel drive cars in the world, couldn't beat the first generation of all-wheel-drive Audis.

Front wheel drive may be "better" but it's a poor second to the real thing.

Have you ever owned a four-wheel-drive vehicle?

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Bernd Felsche](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 23:47:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:

> On 2020-01-12, Peter Flass <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

>> It's like the idiots who think four- or all-wheel drive vehicles don't have
>> problems. Technology is no substitute for careful driving. Front-wheel
>> drive cars are much better in snow than rear-wheel drive.

> An experienced off-roader once told me that for such people,
> the presence of a winch on their truck just means that they'll
> get farther into the woods before getting stuck.

That's a bonus. For Darwin.

--

/\" Bernd Felsche - Somewhere in Western Australia

\ / ASCII ribbon campaign | For every complex problem there is an
X against HTML mail | answer that is clear, simple, and wrong.
/\ and postings | --HL Mencken

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Sun, 12 Jan 2020 23:57:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> wrote:
> On 1/12/2020 11:00 AM, Peter Flass wrote:
>> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>>> Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> writes:
>>>
>>>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 20:12:38 -0000 (UTC)
>>>> Roger Blake <rogblake@iname.invalid> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > Is there anyplace on earth at this point that is still in the hands of
>>>> > its original inhabitants?
>>>>
>>>> Nope, they're all long dead. Africa is still in the hands of the
>>>> descendants of those who evolved there. Everywhere else was invaded by
>>>> other descendants of them, several times over. In one sense the only
>>>> difference between the 'native' inhabitants and the 'invaders' is the route
>>>> their ancestors took and when they settled.
>>>
>>> Humans evolved between 6 and 2 million years ago.
>>>
>>> All this time those humans have been moving away from the neighbors they
>>> can't stand.
>>>
>>> Parts of my family were here in the US in the 1600s.
>>> I can't see where I should get any special privileges from that.
>>>
>>
>> No, it's fun to research ancestors but shouldn't matter. What should matter
>> is how willing immigrants are to adopt our culture and hop into the melting
>> pot. Keep your old-country customs for various "ethnic festivals" that pop
>> up all over.
>>
>
> Well, most of our (US) ancestors didn't adapt to Native American
> cultures worth a damn.

Some did. Many kids adopted into native families didn't want to go back to white society. Can't say I blame them.

> But in any case, since then immigrants always

> have melted in. Not the first generation (thus we got "Chinatowns",
> "Little Italys", "Germantowns", etc.). The first generations always
> have made Americans uncomfortable. We couldn't understand what they
> were saying, they had weird customs, their food smelled funny, they
> were clannish. But the next generation blended in better, and their
> kids are indistinguishable.
>
>

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Mon, 13 Jan 2020 00:37:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 12:42:50 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
> wrote:
>
>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>
>>> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:02 -0700, Peter Flass
>>> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> <hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:
>>>> > On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>>>> >> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>>> >> or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>>> >
>>>> > Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>>>> > pickup or SUV.
>>>> >
>>>>
>>>> I've gotten more sympathetic to SUVs since I've observed mothers toting a
>>>> carful of kids and their sports gear.
>>>
>>> Yep. A minivan does the same thing but it isn't any more economical
>>> or any safer and it is much less happy on snow days.
>>
>> Actually, I have a mini-van (2006 Scion Xb) that gets 32MPG.
>

> And a RAV 4 gets 35.

That's really good.

I think the RAV 4 has less interior room.

I looked at one before I bought the Scion...

I can't remember why I didn't like it.

>> I got it because I love the ugly look, it's economical, I can

>> carry most types of cargo, and the sound system is first rate.

>> (I just brought home a recliner.) It's front wheel drive so has

>> no problem in the snow.

>

> My hybrid is front wheel drive. I love people who say "front wheel

> drive has no problem in the snow". They're always so grateful when I

> hook the Jeep up and pull them out of wherever they're stuck.

Well, I think the Jeep wins in the ground clearance department.

So far I haven't encountered snow that got me stuck.

Back in my youth everything was rear wheel drive.

Big heavy, powerful engine up front.

Really bad in the snow. Even with bags of salt in the trunk.

--

Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 13 Jan 2020 01:17:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 19:37:21 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
wrote:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>

>> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 12:42:50 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>

>> wrote:

>>

>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:

>>>

>>>> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:02 -0700, Peter Flass

>>>> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> ><hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:

>>>> >> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>>>> >>> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>>> >>> or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>>> >>
>>>> >> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>>>> >> pickup or SUV.
>>>> >>
>>>> >
>>>> >I've gotten more sympathetic to SUVs since I've observed mothers toting a
>>>> >carful of kids and their sports gear.
>>>>
>>>> Yep. A minivan does the same thing but it isn't any more economical
>>>> or any safer and it is much less happy on snow days.
>>>>
>>> Actually, I have a mini-van (2006 Scion Xb) that gets 32MPG.
>>
>> And a RAV 4 gets 35.
>
> That's really good.
> I think the RAV 4 has less interior room.
> I looked at one before I bought the Scion...
> I can't remember why I didn't like it.
>
>>> I got it because I love the ugly look, it's economical, I can
>>> carry most types of cargo, and the sound system is first rate.
>>> (I just brought home a recliner.) It's front wheel drive so has
>>> no problem in the snow.
>>>
>> My hybrid is front wheel drive. I love people who say "front wheel
>> drive has no problem in the snow". They're always so grateful when I
>> hook the Jeep up and pull them out of wherever they're stuck.
>
> Well, I think the Jeep wins in the ground clearance department.
>
> So far I haven't encountered snow that got me stuck.

My front drive gets squirrely--it tries to move laterally on acceleration. I've never had the Jeep do that.

> Back in my youth everything was rear wheel drive.
> Big heavy, powerful engine up front.
> Really bad in the snow. Even with bags of salt in the trunk.

Given the choice between my 1984 Corvette and the front wheel drive I have now, I'd take the Corvette as a snow car. If I didn't push it too hard the air dam plowed me a path and it had limited slip.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 13 Jan 2020 03:41:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:00 -0700, Peter Flass
<peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
> JimP <solosam90@gmail.com> wrote:
>> On Fri, 10 Jan 2020 11:53:17 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>>> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 2:15:03 PM UTC-5, Scott Lurndal wrote:
>>>> Charlie Gibbs <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> writes:
>>>> > On 2020-01-10, Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> On 10 Jan 2020 11:52:43 GMT
>>>> >> Huge <Huge@nowhere.much.invalid> wrote:
>>>> >>
>>>> >>> Eventually, we're going to stop having babies; why not start now?
>>>> >>
>>>> >> Slow down not stop preferably.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> That being said, we are slowing down a *lot*! See the UN crude
>>>> >> birthrate chart at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birth_rate, the birth
>>>> >> rate today is slightly less than half what it was in 1950.
>>>> >
>>>> > Yes, and governments are having hysterics. Now they're trying to
>>>> > get population increase back to what it was in the Good Old Days,
>>>> > by encouraging immigration, baby bonuses, etc.
>>>>
>>>> The fundamental tenent of Capitalism as we currently practice it is growth.
>>>>
>>>> Growth in revenue, growth in income, growth in the stock price.
>>>>
>>>> Growth requires one of two things (or, generally, both):
>>>> - an increase in per-worker productivity
>>>> - an increase in the number of workers.
>>>>
>>>> Given that productivity increases slowly; growth generally needs new workers.
>>>>
>>>> New workers come about either indiginously or via immigration. For
>>>> years, USA growth has been facilitated by immigration (skilled in the
>>>> silly valley, unskilled in agriculture) due to an indiginous birth-rate close to
>>>> the replacement rate of two.
>>>>
>>> In my opinion, our current immigration policy is a disaster. It
>>> is based on ugly racial prejudice--we don't like brown people--
>>> and not honest economic analysis*. (Certainly no humanitarian
>>> issues are considered). Given the US declining birthrate, we
>>> need new young people.

>>
>> I have heard white people declare in no uncertain terms that they
>> didn't immigrate, and neither did their ancestors.
>>
>> Obviously they are delusional.
>>
>> I have asked some of them if they were Native American ? All said no.
>> I then point out their ancestors came from Europe, and they are the
>> descendants of immigrants. They don't like those facts, but I am
>> careful to say it to people I don't think will attack me.
>>
>

Lots of Preppers and its Duh South.

--
Jim

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 13 Jan 2020 16:32:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: nobody

On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:05 -0700, Peter Flass
<peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>> We don't tax pollution, but the gas tax is proportional to the pollution
>> produced.
>>
>
> Who DOESN'T pay are the 18-wheelers.

Do you know how much it costs in taxes to put a commercial semitruck
on the road? A lot. Is it proportional to the public resources they
use? Not necessarily. But before drawing your conclusion, consider the
benefits that trucks provide. Look at the objects around you and see
if you can spot all the ones that got to you without being carried on
a truck. I'm not saying there isn't room for improvement, but it isn't
a simple problem.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Mike Spencer](#) on Mon, 13 Jan 2020 17:25:30 GMT

Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> writes:

- > Well, most of our (US) ancestors didn't adapt to Native American
- > cultures worth a damn.

In 1883 a small group of Eastern humanitarians began to meet annually at Lake Mohonk, where with an agreeable background of natural beauty, congenial companionship, and crusading motive, they discussed the Indian problem. At their third meeting Senator Henry L. Dawes of Massachusetts, a distinguished Indian theorist, gave a glowing description of a visit of inspection he had recently made to the Indian Territory. The most partisan Indian would hardly have painted such an idealized picture of his people's happiness and prosperity and culture, but, illogically, the senator advocated a change in this perfect society because it held the wrong principles of property ownership. Speaking apparently of the Cherokees, he said: "The head chief told us that there was not a family in that whole nation that had not a home of its own. There was not a pauper in that nation, and the nation did not owe a dollar. It built its own capitol, in which we had this examination, and it built its schools and its hospitals. Yet the defect of the system was apparent. They have got as far as they can go, because they own their land in common. It is Henry George's system, and under that there is no enterprise to make your home any better than that of your neighbors. There is no selfishness, which is at the bottom of civilization. Till this people will consent to give up their lands, and divide them among their citizens so that each can own the land he cultivates, they will not make much more progress.

-- Lake Mohonk Conference, Report, 1904, pp 5-6;
Department of the Interior, Annual Report, 1900,
pp. 655-735.

- > But in any case, since then immigrants always
- > have melted in. Not the first generation (thus we got "Chinatowns",
- > "Little Italys", "Germantowns", etc.). The first generations always
- > have made Americans uncomfortable. We couldn't understand what they
- > were saying, they had weird customs, their food smelled funny, they
- > were clannish. But the next generation blended in better, and their
- > kids are indistinguishable.
- >

--

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 13 Jan 2020 18:52:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: lee.winson10

On Monday, January 13, 2020 at 11:32:13 AM UTC-5, Scott wrote:

> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:05 -0700, Peter Flass
> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>>> We don't tax pollution, but the gas tax is proportional to the pollution
>>> produced.
>>>
>>
>> Who DOESN'T pay are the 18-wheelers.
>
> Do you know how much it costs in taxes to put a commercial semitruck
> on the road? A lot. Is it proportional to the public resources they
> use? Not necessarily. But before drawing your conclusion, consider the
> benefits that trucks provide. Look at the objects around you and see
> if you can spot all the ones that got to you without being carried on
> a truck. I'm not saying there isn't room for improvement, but it isn't
> a simple problem.

Trucks simply do not pay their own way. They are subsidized by our tax dollars.

If one believes in true free market economics, then trucks and trains should stand on their own and whatever is most efficient win out. Trucks have certain advantages over trains, especially in short haul and light duty service. But trains tend to work better for long haul and heavy service.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 13 Jan 2020 18:55:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: lee.winson10

On Saturday, January 11, 2020 at 3:56:43 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:

> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 11:54:25 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:

>
>> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>
>>> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>>> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>> or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>
>> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>> pickup or SUV.
>
> So move to some place where the government decides what people need
> and get yourself appointed commissar of vehicles.
>
> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
> for having one.

Undoubtedly, your SUV does not create any noxious exhaust
that the rest of us breath in.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 13 Jan 2020 18:59:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: lee.winson10

On Sunday, January 12, 2020 at 1:07:50 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:

> My hybrid is front wheel drive. I love people who say "front wheel
> drive has no problem in the snow". They're always so grateful when I
> hook the Jeep up and pull them out of wherever they're stuck.

Jeep article and ad

[https://books.google.com/books?id=6k0EAAAAMBAJ&lpg=PA21&
amp;dq=life%20jeep%20july%202020&pg=PA65#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?id=6k0EAAAAMBAJ&lpg=PA21&dq=life%20jeep%20july%202020&pg=PA65#v=onepage&q&f=false)

[https://books.google.com/books?id=3IYEAAAAMBAJ&lpg=PA54&
amp;dq=life%20willys%20jeep&pg=PA54#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?id=3IYEAAAAMBAJ&lpg=PA54&dq=life%20willys%20jeep&pg=PA54#v=onepage&q&f=false)

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Mon, 13 Jan 2020 19:09:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 13 Jan 2020 16:32:19 GMT
nobody@example.org (Scott) wrote:

> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:05 -0700, Peter Flass
> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
>>> We don't tax pollution, but the gas tax is proportional to the
>>> pollution produced.
>>>
>>
>> Who DOESN'T pay are the 18-wheelers.
>
> Do you know how much it costs in taxes to put a commercial semitruck
> on the road? A lot. Is it proportional to the public resources they
> use? Not necessarily. But before drawing your conclusion, consider the
> benefits that trucks provide. Look at the objects around you and see
> if you can spot all the ones that got to you without being carried on
> a truck. I'm not saying there isn't room for improvement, but it isn't
> a simple problem.

Indeed, if for no other reason than the 18 wheelers are paid for
by the people who buy the goods they carry (increase their taxes and
the operator will increase their charges and their customers will increase
their prices and the end customer pays) whereas private cars are paid for by
their owners.

--
Steve O'Hara-Smith | Directable Mirror Arrays
C:\>WIN | A better way to focus the sun
The computer obeys and wins. | licences available see
You lose and Bill collects. | <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 13 Jan 2020 19:17:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: lee.winson10

On Saturday, January 11, 2020 at 7:37:31 PM UTC-5, Dan Espen wrote:
> hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com writes:
>
>> On Saturday, January 11, 2020 at 3:56:43 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 11:54:25 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>>>
>>>> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>>>> > (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>>> > or pickups with duals on the rear.)

>>>>
>>>> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>>>> pickup or SUV.
>>>
>>> So move to some place where the government decides what people need
>>> and get yourself appointed commissar of vehicles.
>>>
>>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
>>> for having one.
>>
>> How about just making the people who want big fat cars pay
>> _all_ the costs of operating them?
>
> They cost more, use more gas so pay more gas tax,
> registration costs more (at least in NJ.
>
> Maybe they already pay _all_ the costs.
>
> We don't tax pollution, but the gas tax is proportional to the pollution
> produced.

Despite a recent increase in the gasoline tax, NJ motor vehicle fees and taxes do not cover all costs. In addition to physically maintaining the roads, there are extensive public safety costs.

Some fire and rescue units bill motorists after a crash and insurance covers it. But that is not guaranteed, and I don't think police do that. Public safety costs after an accident or special circumstances are extensive. Cops spend a heck of a lot of time on motor vehicle issues (and no, traffic fines do not cover costs).

In NJ particularly, there are 500/600 county roads. Their expenses are paid for by property taxes. In other states, equivalent grade roads are covered by state government. My estimate is that average homeowner pays an extra \$500/year in NJ for such roads.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 14 Jan 2020 00:19:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Mon, 13 Jan 2020 10:55:56 -0800 (PST), lee.winson10@gmail.com wrote:

> On Saturday, January 11, 2020 at 3:56:43 PM UTC-5, J. Clarke wrote:
>> On Sat, 11 Jan 2020 11:54:25 -0800 (PST), hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com wrote:
>>
>>> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:
>>>
>>>> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>>>> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>>> or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>>
>>> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>>> pickup or SUV.
>>
>> So move to some place where the government decides what people need
>> and get yourself appointed commissar of vehicles.
>>
>> The fact that driving an SUV annoys _you_ is quite sufficient reason
>> for having one.
>
> Undoubtedly, your SUV does not create any noxious exhaust
> that the rest of us breath in.

If you want to poke your heat up my Jeep's tailpipe, that's _your_ problem.

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 14 Jan 2020 03:08:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Mike Small

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> writes:

> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>
>> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 12:42:50 -0500, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> writes:
>>>
>>>> On Sun, 12 Jan 2020 10:00:02 -0700, Peter Flass
>>>> <peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> ><hancock4@bbs.cpcn.com> wrote:
>>>> >> On Friday, January 10, 2020 at 10:20:07 PM UTC-5, Dave Garland wrote:

>>>> >>
>>>> >>> Sure, if one actually needs it and isn't just BS'ing about the need.
>>>> >>> (In the city, a vanishing tiny number of people _need_ Hummers, Jeeps,
>>>> >>> or pickups with duals on the rear.)
>>>> >>
>>>> >> Most people in cities or built-up suburbs do not need a big
>>>> >> pickup or SUV.
>>>> >>
>>>> >
>>>> >I've gotten more sympathetic to SUVs since I've observed mothers toting a
>>>> >carful of kids and their sports gear.
>>>>
>>>> Yep. A minivan does the same thing but it isn't any more economical
>>>> or any safer and it is much less happy on snow days.
>>>
>>> Actually, I have a mini-van (2006 Scion Xb) that gets 32MPG.
>>
>> And a RAV 4 gets 35.
>
> That's really good.
> I think the RAV 4 has less interior room.
> I looked at one before I bought the Scion...
> I can't remember why I didn't like it.
>
>>> I got it because I love the ugly look, it's economical, I can
>>> carry most types of cargo, and the sound system is first rate.
>>> (I just brought home a recliner.) It's front wheel drive so has
>>> no problem in the snow.
>>
>> My hybrid is front wheel drive. I love people who say "front wheel
>> drive has no problem in the snow". They're always so grateful when I
>> hook the Jeep up and pull them out of wherever they're stuck.
>
> Well, I think the Jeep wins in the ground clearance department.
>
> So far I haven't encountered snow that got me stuck.
>
> Back in my youth everything was rear wheel drive.
> Big heavy, powerful engine up front.
> Really bad in the snow. Even with bags of salt in the trunk.

A long time ago I drove a Chevette with sandbags in the back across Canada and half way back in January. It's alternator conked out, so I left it on the Trans-Canada somewhere between Swift Current and Moose Jaw. People out there are really nice, or maybe the fellow who picked me up, first one to come along, was wise enough to instantly understand the seriousness of my predicament. It was about -55 C including wind chill that day and cars seemed a good 5 to 10 minutes apart (rush hour for

that stretch?).

But the Chevette was great fun in the snow. It didn't have enough power to get you into trouble and even I, as not a particularly skilled driver, was able to do controlled donuts or 90 degree turns into parking spaces with a good snow cover down.

- Mike

Subject: Re: Office jobs eroding
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 14 Jan 2020 15:03:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: JimP

On 13 Jan 2020 13:25:30 -0400, Mike Spencer
<mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> wrote:

>

> Dave Garland <dave.garland@wizinfo.com> writes:

>

>> Well, most of our (US) ancestors didn't adapt to Native American
>> cultures worth a damn.

>

>

> In 1883 a small group of Eastern humanitarians began to meet
> annually at Lake Mohonk, where with an agreeable background of
> natural beauty, congenial companionship, and crusading motive,
> they discussed the Indian problem. At their third meeting
> Senator Henry L. Dawes of Massachusetts, a distinguished Indian
> theorist, gave a glowing description of a visit of inspection
> he had recently made to the Indian Territory. The most
> partisan Indian would hardly have painted such an idealized
> picture of his people's happiness and prosperity and culture,
> but, illogically, the senator advocated a change in this
> perfect society because it held the wrong principles of
> property ownership. Speaking apparently of the Cherokees, he
> said: "The head chief told us that there was not a family in
> that whole nation that had not a home of its own. There was
> not a pauper in that nation, and the nation did not owe a
> dollar. It built its own capitol, in which we had this
> examination, and it built its schools and its hospitals. Yet
> the defect of the system was apparent. They have got as far as
> they can go, because they own their land in common. It is
> Henry George's system, and under that there is no enterprise to
> make your home any better than that of your neighbors. There
> is no selfishness, which is at the bottom of civilization.
> Till this people will consent to give up their lands, and

> divide them among their citizens so that each can own the land
> he cultivates, they will not make much more progress.
>
> -- Lake Mohonk Conference, Report, 1904, pp 5-6;
> Department of the Interior, Annual Report, 1900,
> pp. 655-735.

That sounds like similar things I heard after WW2. Any lie so they can claim superiority.

Also sounds like they want the little land those people still had.

--
Jim
