

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 1 03:54:53 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id DAA16597; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 03:54:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail (root@ns3.minx.net.uk [212.1.130.144]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id DAA16557; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 03:54:50 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host root@ns3.minx.net.uk [212.1.130.144] claimed to be mail
Received: from [212.1.136.54] (helo=e116i5)
by mail with smtp (Exim 2.12 #1)
id 11iFBt-0004hH-00
for weavetech@List-Server.net; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 10:59:58 +0000
Message-ID: <002f01bf2458\$3d8aece0\$e79901d4@e116i5>
From: "Rachel Dufton" <rach.dufton@millenium-uk.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Chenille
Date: Mon, 1 Nov 1999 10:59:22 -0000
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

To introduce myself - I am a new member of the list, live in the NW of England, and work on a 16 shaft doobby (manual).
I was interested in Ruth's question as I was thinking of doing something similar. I had intended to use chenille for the weft with a silk or cotton warp, thinking it would be less abraded. Do any of you experienced chenille weavers have any pros or cons for using chenille as warp or weft? If this subject has already been exhaustively discussed on the list and you don't want to do it again, I would be grateful for any private answers.
Rachel Dufton

To reply privately send message to rach.dufton@millenium-uk.net

To reply privately, send message to "Rachel Dufton" <rach.dufton@millenium-uk.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 1 04:40:25 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA23958; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 04:40:25 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail1.ync.net (mail1.ync.net [206.185.20.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA23949; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 04:40:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: from SuButler (tcv90-ARC-004.158.ync.net [206.185.20.158])
by mail1.ync.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id FAA08671
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 05:56:11 -0600 (CST)
Message-ID: <003b01bf245e\$49921760\$0400a8c0@SuButler>
From: "Su Butler" <aabutler@ync.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Re: Chenille
Date: Mon, 1 Nov 1999 05:43:16 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3

WeaveTech Archive 9911

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>I was interested in Ruth's question as I was thinking of doing something
>similar. I had intended to use chenille for the weft with a silk or cotton
>warp, thinking it would be less abraded.

HI Rachel and Ruth.....I have done tons of chenille, both in clothing and scarves etc.....while I feel the question you are posing is quite valid, there is one point even more pressing IMHO.....no matter what you do to the seams, nor which warp thread you choose to use, you must consider chenille yarns have a very low tensile strength...so any stress points on the garment are subject to early demise...particularly armceye and center back seams. To treat the seams you might consider a fusible interfacing to help strengthen the area....I usually use an extremely light weight interfacing on all pieces of a chenille garment to help control the extremes of stretching and shrinking in the wearing and laundering process. And someone, (I am sorry I forgot who!) suggested sewing the seam allowance back on itself...a very good suggestion as it will curl and be apparent after the first cleaning. Chenille can make a lovely garment, just one which must be constructed with care....
Su :-) apbutler@ync.net

To reply privately, send message to "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 1 08:50:09 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA07138; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 08:50:09 -0700 (MST)
Received: from pop.nwlink.com (pop.nwlink.com [209.20.130.39]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA07115; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 08:50:05 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [207.202.173.119] (ip28.r5.d.bel.nwlink.com [207.202.173.28]) by pop.nwlink.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id HAA16075 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 07:50:08 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: alcorn@mail.nwlink.com
Message-Id: <l03130303b4436458a3a1@[207.202.173.119]>
In-Reply-To: <002f01bf2458\$3d8aece0\$e79901d4@e116i5>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Mon, 1 Nov 1999 07:52:34 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: alcorn <alcorn@nwlink.com>
Subject: Re: Chenille
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi Rachel,

In any of the chenille garments I have woven, I used the chenille as both warp and weft. I normally warp front to back. Even with that there has been no problem with abrasion. If you want the hand of the chenille with silk or cotton, it MIGHT be a bit easier to use the silk or cotton as the warp. Weave a couple of samples with the chenille as warp: one sample with the chenille as weft, the other sample with the silk or cotton as weft. Which do you like better?

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Another matter about construction. Try to design the piece of fabric to use the selvages in the seams. Su Butler's suggestions about light weight interfacing are excellent. Try to find the fusible knits. (G Street Fabrics in Rockville, MD has any interfacing imaginable. They cheerfully do mail order.) You might want to bind curved seams with something light weight. An important matter is that you don't want to leave any cut chenille unbound.

Perhaps another thing to consider in designing a chenille garment is to line it if at all appropriate. Use a light weight knit lining. Trims can be very elegant.

Cheers,

Francie Alcorn

To reply privately, send message to alcorn <alcorn@nmlink.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 1 10:24:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA29233; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 10:24:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA29222; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 10:24:12 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-30.idsonline.com [209.8.42.30])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id MAA21075
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 12:23:12 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991101121953.006c6c3c@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Mon, 01 Nov 1999 12:19:53 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Re: Chenille
In-Reply-To: <l03130303b4436458a3a1@[207.202.173.119]>
References: <002f01bf2458\$3d8aece0\$e79901d4@e1l6i5>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Francie wrote:

>Perhaps another thing to consider in designing a chenille garment is to line
>it if at all appropriate. Use a light weight knit lining. Trims can be
>very elegant.

Is this absolutely essential? The jacket pattern I have in mind is unlined & would not lend itself to being lined. However, all seams are enclosed (French seams), so raveling is not a problem.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 1 12:58:49 1999

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA07403; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 12:58:49 -0700 (MST)

Received: from spdmgaaa.compuserve.com (ds-img-1.compuserve.com [149.174.206.134]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA07391; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 12:58:45 -0700 (MST)

X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host ds-img-1.compuserve.com [149.174.206.134] claimed to be spdmgaaa.compuserve.com

Received: (from mailgate@localhost)

by spdmgaaa.compuserve.com (8.9.3/8.9.3/SUN-1.7) id OAA03726

for weavetech@List-Server.net; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 14:58:20 -0500 (EST)

Date: Mon, 1 Nov 1999 14:57:54 -0500

From: S&R Hutton <Huttons@compuserve.com>

Subject: sewing handwoven chenille

To: "INTERNET:weavetech@List-Server.net" <weavetech@List-Server.net>

Message-ID: <199911011458_MC2-8B48-281E@compuserve.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset=ISO-8859-1

Content-Disposition: inline

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net

Precedence: bulk

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi Ruth,

You should purchase a velvet board (G Street should have them) and use it=

to press velvet, chenille--even some wools to eliminate shine while
pressing. =

If you do press your chenille and then wash it, it might relax some, but =
it

will stay pressed looking to some extent.

Sandy Hutton

To reply privately, send message to S&R Hutton <Huttons@compuserve.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 1 17:21:16 1999

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA08652; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 17:21:16 -0700 (MST)

Received: from smtp3.erols.com (smtp3.erols.com [207.172.3.236]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA08641; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 17:21:14 -0700 (MST)

Received: from LOCALNAME (208-58-193-18.s272.tnt9.lnhva.md.dialup.rcn.com [208.58.193.18])

by smtp3.erols.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id TAA14149;

Mon, 1 Nov 1999 19:21:13 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <381E628A.35BE@erols.com>

Date: Mon, 01 Nov 1999 20:03:22 -0800

From: Anne Wells <arwells@erols.com>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-DH397 (Win16; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: weaving@quilt.net, weavetech@list-server.net

Subject: W-Long Eyed Heddles, again

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net

Precedence: bulk

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

When I sent a message to the Lists asking if anyone could help me
find long-eyed heddles, I got several replies. One came from a weaver

WeaveTech Archive 9911

who already has long-eyes, and she wanted to use them on a "regular" loom to do some weaving. Well. I have lost her name and address, but found the article I remembered which described this possibility!

The article is in WEAVERS, Issue 6, Summer 89, page 33. It's a well written article about how to use some of the shafts on a "regular" loom (but a multi-shaft: more than 4) to do some unique style pattern weaving.

Apologies to the person who's id I have lost ...
Anne in Annandale
arwells@erols.com

To reply privately, send message to Anne Wells <arwells@erols.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 1 20:28:26 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA19453; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 20:28:26 -0700 (MST)
Received: from pop.nwlink.com (pop.nwlink.com [209.20.130.39]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA19436; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 20:28:24 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [207.202.174.176] (ip176.r11.d.bel.nwlink.com [207.202.174.176]) by pop.nwlink.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id TAA10804 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 19:28:34 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: alcorn@mail.nwlink.com
Message-Id: <l03130301b44405848690@[207.202.172.136]>
In-Reply-To: <3.0.3.32.19991101121953.006c6c3c@cpcug.org>
References: <l03130303b4436458a3a1@[207.202.173.119]>
<002f01bf2458\$3d8aece0\$e79901d4@e116i5>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Mon, 1 Nov 1999 19:31:01 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: alcorn <alcorn@nwlink.com>
Subject: Re: Chenille
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Regarding lining a chenille jacket: No, it isn't essential.

However, all seams are enclosed
>(French seams), so raveling is not a problem.

You might consider binding the seams with a light weight knit. French seams in chenille would require a very large seam allowance and would be rather bulky. French seams are really successful only in pretty light weight and thin fabrics. With the ravelly nature of chenille, you might go bald tearing your hair out, and the air would probably turn blue, in trying to make French seams.

Francie

To reply privately, send message to alcorn <alcorn@nwlink.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 04:27:39 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA28590; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 04:27:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA28564; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 04:27:37 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-31.idsonline.com [209.8.42.31]) by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id GAA24173 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 06:26:34 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991102062323.006cd964@cpcug.org>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Tue, 02 Nov 1999 06:23:23 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Re: Chenille
In-Reply-To: <l03130301b44405848690@[207.202.172.136]>
References: <3.0.3.32.19991101121953.006c6c3c@cpcug.org>
<l03130303b4436458a3a1@[207.202.173.119]>
<002f01bf2458\$3d8aece0\$e79901d4@e116i5>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> With the ravelly nature of chenille, you might go
> bald tearing your hair out, and the air would probably turn blue, in trying
> to make French seams.

Might you be confusing French seams w/ flat-fell seams? Flat-fell seams would be a royal pain to do w/ chenille, but I don't see that French seams would be a problem. W/ a French seam, you put *wrong* sides together & sew the seam 3/8" from the edge. Then you trim that seam & fold the garment over w/ right sides together to enclose what you just sewed. Then sew this seam 1/4" from the edge. What this seam *doesn't* do very well is lie flat. You can press it to one side or the other, but you cannot press it open.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 04:58:18 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA03167; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 04:58:18 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail.netaxs.com (mail@mail.netaxs.com [207.8.186.26]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA03159; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 04:58:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [207.8.207.116] (ppp116.blackbox1-mfs.netaxs.com [207.8.207.116]) by mail.netaxs.com (8.8.7/8.8.5) with ESMTP id GAA16517 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 06:58:14 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: jane@pop3.netaxs.com
Message-Id: <l03130301b44481a7826f@[207.8.207.116]>
In-Reply-To: <l03130301b44405848690@[207.202.172.136]>
References: <3.0.3.32.19991101121953.006c6c3c@cpcug.org>
<l03130303b4436458a3a1@[207.202.173.119]>
<002f01bf2458\$3d8aece0\$e79901d4@e116i5>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1999 06:58:18 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Jane Eisenstein <jane@softweave.com>
Subject: Re: Chenille
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>You might consider binding the seams with a light weight knit.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

I haven't worked with chenille, but I have used a a light weight (knit? bias-cut tricot?) seambinding on handwovens with good results. I got the idea from the video "Power Sewing's Handwoven and Quilted Garments."

Jane

Jane Eisenstein janee@softweave.com <http://www.softweave.com/>

To reply privately, send message to Jane Eisenstein <janee@softweave.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 05:22:30 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA06311; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 05:22:30 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail1.ync.net (mail1.ync.net [206.185.20.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA06306; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 05:22:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: from SuButler (tcv90-ARC-004.185.ync.net [206.185.20.185])
by mail1.ync.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id GAA14527
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 06:38:45 -0600 (CST)
Message-ID: <004e01bf252d\$6477ebc0\$0400a8c0@SuButler>
From: "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Re: Chenille
Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1999 06:25:47 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Ruth wrote....

>*wrong* sides together & sew the seam 3/8" from the edge. Then you trim that >seam & fold the garment over w/ right sides together to enclose what you just >sewed. Then sew this seam 1/4" from the edge

Oh dear, I think you are headed for trouble....with chenille in a jacket, I have found I must always use a larger seam allowance than usual...the reason is the chenille simply will not hold over time with a seam allowance which is too narrow...a 3/8" allowance, even when protected by the overstitching would be weak IMHO....and to sew a mere 1/4 inch to encase the seam would be to invite disaster.....If using French seams, I usually apply interfacing to the garment prior to cutting out the pieces so the interfacing goes all the way to the edge of each piece...then I can use the smaller allowance...otherwise, I use a full 1/2-3/4" seam allowance....the other concern, I think, is the idea of trimming a seam in chenille.....I try whenever possible to use the selvedge edge in a seam, in which case you might be able to get away with the smaller allowance. But wherever you have cut the chenille, you really need to bind the edge securely...and even a bound edge *will* pull out at a stress point if the seam is to shallow.....while it is a LOT of extra work, I usually sew a 3/4 inch seam, then by hand, fold under the edge of each side of the seam and stitch

WeaveTech Archive 9911

down by hand for a finished interior seam. Seems to stay more secure and so far has not been a problem with stress points.....but remember I also fully interface my chenille. Hope this helps Ruth!
Su :-) apbutler@ync.net

To reply privately, send message to "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 06:50:31 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA22724; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 06:50:31 -0700 (MST)
Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1999 06:50:31 -0700 (MST)
Message-Id: <199911021350.GAA22724@salmon.esosoft.net>
To: weavetech@list-server.net
From: Srude@aol.com
Subject: silk and static electricity
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

To all you silk weavers out there:

I'm having a problem weaving with some very fine (maybe 120/2?) silk weft on a 36/2 painted silk warp. The structure is satin/sateen stripes, which pleat really nicely with these yarns. The trouble is, our rainy season hasn't started yet, and the humidity levels are *really* low. When the weft yarn leaves the flyshuttle, it accumulates so much static that it sticks to anything it comes near, in huge loops that don't get drawn fully through the shed.

I've tried tightening the tension on the flyshuttle to its maximum, but that makes the selvages draw in too much - the loops are generally forming near the end of each pass, not the beginning.

I've tried wetting down the whole pirn, hoping the moisture will kill the static. Instead, the moisture makes the yarn swell, which upsets the tension on the flyshuttle.

I've tried spritzing the warp right at the fell. This helps a bit, but there's still too much static on the weft yarn. And I'm concerned about having this much moisture near the reed.

Any ideas? Would it help to run a humidifier under/near the loom, or will that put too much moisture near the metal parts of the loom (an AVL)?

I'd love to know if anybody else has had this problem, and how you resolved it!

Thanks --
Sandra
srude@aol.com
<http://threespringshandworks.webjump.com>

To reply privately, send message to Srude@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 07:14:40 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA27439; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 07:14:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail-01.cdsnet.net (mail-01.cdsnet.net [206.107.16.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA27431; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 07:14:38 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 18144 invoked from network); 2 Nov 1999 14:14:38 -0000
Received: from d01a81a6.dip.cdsnet.net (HELO cdsnet.net) (208.26.129.166)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

by mail.cdsnet.net with SMTP; 2 Nov 1999 14:14:38 -0000
Message-ID: <381EF256.7C259A7A@cdsnet.net>
Date: Tue, 02 Nov 1999 06:16:54 -0800
From: Margaret Copeland <busys@cdsnet.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.03 [en] (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: Chenille
References: <199911021058.DAA22084@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Anytime you have a problematic fabric, it is a good idea to create a "sample" book of possible seam finishes. This you can keep for later reference and will be as valuable to you as a draw down and weave sample. By trying out different seam finishes and interfaces, bindings etc. you can get a good idea about using them for the particular clothing pattern you have in mind. Many times it means using a different seam finish than you originally thought of but.... many times I've totally changed patterns !

I've made large double weave blanket/throws with the idea of having a fringe. I was able to sample various hems etc. and ending up not using fringe but serging cross grain and turning the end under twice and stitching it down. No fringe to tangle in the washing machine and it looks good - really good. I've also been able to do things I thought were impossible with handwoven, like bound buttonholes. I did this on a jacket I made by reinforcing the area with a light fusible knit interfacing. I made a few practice button holes before I cut into the "real" cloth. Lastly by sampling your seam finishes you may come to the conclusion that your cloth will never make it as clothing because it is set wrong or has too much diagonal movement. Try again.

- Margaret Copeland

To reply privately, send message to Margaret Copeland <busys@cdsnet.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 07:50:51 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA06251; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 07:50:51 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA06244; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 07:50:50 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42])
by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id JAA21621
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:50:53 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:50:53 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911021450.JAA21621@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: silk and static electricity
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 06:50 AM 11/2/99 -0700, you wrote:

> When the weft yarn
>leaves the flyshuttle, it accumulates so much static that it sticks to

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>anything it comes near, in huge loops that don't get drawn fully through the
>shed.

The static is actually being generated by the warp. We experienced this quite often in just about every operation in which yarns were subjected to friction on some machine component which was not grounded. This is why all our yarn guides, eyelets, etc., were electrically conductive and connected to a source of ground. Because of the potentially dangerous amount of static generated on our warping equipment, we had a static eliminator. Short of installing a static eliminator below the warp, which would be a costly ideal, you need to ground off the static. If you can find something conductive which contacts the entire warp sheet, you can connect it to a source of ground such as a ground rod in the earth, a conductive water pipe. Anything which is connected to earth will generally ground off the static. Use of moisture and other such things are only temporary and make more of a mess than they help.

If you still have a problem getting this to work, talk to me off list.

AAF

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300

mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 08:04:52 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA09825; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 08:04:52 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail1.ync.net (mail1.ync.net [206.185.20.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA09780; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 08:04:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from SuButler (tcv90-ARC-004.186.ync.net [206.185.20.186])
by mail1.ync.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id JAA29160
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:20:55 -0600 (CST)
Message-ID: <001501bf2544\$0c2ad240\$0400a8c0@SuButler>
From: "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Re: silk and static electricity
Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:07:56 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>Any ideas? Would it help to run a humidifier under/near the loom, or will
>that put too much moisture near the metal parts of the loom (an AVL)?

WeaveTech Archive 9911

HI Sandra....well this is a pretty simplistic solution, but it has worked for me in the past.....get a pan of water and run a fan over it....it will add moisture to the room as well as circulate it without adding so much it damages the loom.

Su :-) apbutler@ync.net

To reply privately, send message to "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 08:07:28 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA10646; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 08:07:28 -0700 (MST)
Received: from firefly.prairienet.org (firefly.prairienet.org [192.17.3.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA10624; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 08:07:25 -0700 (MST)
Received: from lizard (pnet-ppp-14.dacc.cc.il.us [198.88.201.234])
by firefly.prairienet.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id JAA12893
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:07:28 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <3.0.5.16.19991102090010.37ff36ae@prairienet.org>
X-Sender: bjstultz@prairienet.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (16)
Date: Tue, 02 Nov 1999 09:00:10
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Brenda Stultz <bjstultz@prairienet.org>
Subject: Re: silk and static electricity
In-Reply-To: <199911021350.GAA22724@salmon.esosoft.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

When I was weaving a lot with fine silk I kept a can of static guard to spray on the warp. It helped a lot and was washed out in the finishing process.

Brenda
in IL

To reply privately, send message to Brenda Stultz <bjstultz@prairienet.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 09:16:21 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA00778; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:16:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: from pop.nwlink.com (pop.nwlink.com [209.20.130.39]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA00767; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:16:20 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [207.202.175.153] (ip153.r14.d.bel.nwlink.com [207.202.175.153])
by pop.nwlink.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id IAA09672
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 08:16:23 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: alcorn@mail.nwlink.com
Message-Id: <103130300b444b12c29c9@[207.202.174.176]>
In-Reply-To: <3.0.3.32.19991102062323.006cd964@cpcug.org>
References: <103130301b44405848690@[207.202.172.136]>
<3.0.3.32.19991101121953.006c6c3c@cpcug.org>
<103130303b4436458a3a1@[207.202.173.119]>
<002f01bf2458\$3d8aece0\$e79901d4@e116i5>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1999 08:19:20 -0800

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: alcorn <alcorn@nwlinc.com>
Subject: Re: Chenille
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

No, I wasn't confusing French seams with flat fell seams. Chenille just doesn't fold that well...especially if it has been cut.

For the jacket, I would bind each seam allowance separately, press (or not) the seam open and sew the allowances to the fabric. Getting back to pressing for a moment, another sewing trick is to "finger press" just in front of the needle.

Francie

To reply privately, send message to alcorn <alcorn@nwlinc.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 09:16:57 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA00986; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:16:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtpout.telus.net (smtpout.telus.net [207.194.28.79]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA00974; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:16:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [209.53.60.169] (a3b05603.sympatico.bconnected.net [209.53.60.169]) by smtpout.telus.net (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id IAA04456 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 08:16:58 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: ryeburn@popserver.sfu.ca
Message-Id: <103130303b444bdf72ebb@[209.53.60.169]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1999 08:16:54 -0800
To: WeaveTech <weavetech@list-server.net>
From: Jo Anne Ryeburn <ryeburn@sfu.ca>
Subject: chenille
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I have found a problem with weaving with rayon chenille is that the threads do not felt in, but can be slipped in and out of place with ease after the fabric is washed and ironed. So when adding a length of thread as a mending thread, I have taken to fastening it at the ends with stitches taken with sewing thread. Better yet is to make no mistakes!

Would either cotton or silk chenille behave better in this respect? I want to weave another length of fabric in the same pattern that I used with rayon chenille but would like to see the threads felt in a bit after the fabric is washed and ironed.

Jo Anne

Jo Anne Ryeburn ryeburn@sfu.ca

To reply privately, send message to Jo Anne Ryeburn <ryeburn@sfu.ca>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 09:23:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA02839; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:23:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from kali.vtech.enteract.com (kali.vtech.enteract.com [216.80.32.9]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA02828; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:23:13 -0700 (MST)
From: bruciec@vtechworld.com
Message-Id: <199911021623.JAA02828@salmon.esosoft.net>
Received: (qmail 86440 invoked from network); 2 Nov 1999 16:23:03 -0000
Received: from protocol-1.vtech.enteract.com (HELO vtechworld.com) (216.80.32.6) by kali.vtech.enteract.com with SMTP; 2 Nov 1999 16:23:03 -0000
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: Text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
To: Srude@aol.com, weavetech@list-server.net
Date: 2 Nov 1999 08:46
Subject: Re:silk and static electricity
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I recently completed a scarf similar to that but I was using handspun singles for warp and 40/2 silk for weft in which I had increased to twist to create a very active yarn. As I had failed to put enough twist into the singles I had "fuzzies" escaping and tangling the weft (and the other warp threads. All complicated by the *always* dry climate of Wyoming.

I found that if I crossed whichever hand was not holding and throwing the shuttle over the weaving to grasp the yarn as it came out of the fly shuttle I was able to put just enough tension to straighten out the weft. With the 10" weaving width I did not really "throw" the shuttle.

Brucie <bruciec@vtechworld.com>

FROM : Srude@aol.com
DATE : Tue
SUBJECT: silk and static electricity
To all you silk weavers out there:

I'm having a problem weaving with some very fine (maybe 120/2?) silk weft on a 36/2 painted silk warp. The structure is satin/sateen stripes, which pleat really nicely with these yarns. The trouble is, our rainy season hasn't started yet, and the humidity levels are *really* low. When the weft yarn leaves the flyshuttle, it accumulates so much static that it sticks to anything it comes near, in huge loops that don't get drawn fully through the shed.

I've tried tightening the tension on the flyshuttle to its maximum, but that makes the selvages draw in too much - the loops are generally forming near the end of each pass, not the beginning.

I've tried wetting down the whole pirn, hoping the moisture will kill the static. Instead, the moisture makes the yarn swell, which upsets the tension on the flyshuttle.

I've tried spritzing the warp right at the fell. This helps a bit, but there's still too much static on the weft yarn. And I'm concerned about having this much moisture near the reed.

Any ideas? Would it help to run a humidifier under/near the loom, or will that put too much moisture near the metal parts of the loom (an AVL)?

I'd love to know if anybody else has had this problem, and how you resolved it!

Thanks --
Sandra

WeaveTech Archive 9911

srude@aol.com
<http://threespringshandworks.webjump.com>

To reply privately, send message to Srude@aol.com

To reply privately, send message to bruciec@vtechworld.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 09:51:16 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA10952; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:51:16 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA10932; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:51:13 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42]) by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id LAA28121 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 11:51:17 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1999 11:51:17 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911021651.LAA28121@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re:silk and static electricity
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 08:46 AM 11/2/99, you wrote:

> I found that if I crossed whichever hand was not holding and throwing the shuttle over the weaving to grasp the yarn as it came out of the fly shuttle I was able to put just enough tension to straighten out the weft. With the 10" weaving width I did not really "throw" the shuttle.
>Brucie <bruciec@vtechworld.com>

This is a shuttle handling habit which I have observed in many handloom weavers. True, it works but is excruciatingly slow and wasteful of movements. If static elimination, filling tension control and selvage control are the issues, there are certainly easier solutions which do not so drastically complicate the shuttle handling motions.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562
-5300
<mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 10:10:01 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA26695; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:01:28 -0700 (MST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA26676; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 09:01:26 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 18883 invoked by alias); 2 Nov 1999 16:01:22 -0000
Received: (qmail 18847 invoked from network); 2 Nov 1999 16:01:19 -0000
Received: from ip141.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.141) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 2 Nov 1999 16:01:19 -0000
Message-ID: <381F0B09.892E17F4@netbistro.com>
Date: Tue, 02 Nov 1999 08:02:17 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: static
References: <199911021507.IAA10662@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Have also had this problem, not just with silk. I found that if the relative humidity drops below 40%, static electricity will build up. I started by inadvertently grounding the loom when my knees made contact with the roller! (ouch) When I got the compu-dobby, the static would sometimes knock the program out of the remote station cartridge (Dobby I). The solution for me was to run a humidifier near the loom, although I'm tempted to try Allen's suggestion of grounding the entire warp sheet. I'm wondering about getting one of those static guards that are sold for computers - or jury-rigging one. In the meantime, I've now got an old computer that I use during the winter to drive the loom, eliminating losing the program, and keep the small humidifier filled up. You can buy a small temp/humidity gizmo to monitor relative humidity - I got mine at Canada Tire.

Laura Fry

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 10:24:53 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA19888; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 10:24:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA19840; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 10:24:48 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42]) by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id MAA18564 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 12:24:51 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1999 12:24:51 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911021724.MAA18564@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: static
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 08:02 AM 11/2/99 -0800, you wrote:

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>although I'm tempted to try Allen's suggestion of grounding the entire
>warp sheet. I'm wondering about getting one of those static guards
>that are sold for computers - or jury-rigging one.
> Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

In order to ground off static generated by the warp, the warp sheet must be in intimate contact with something conductive which is itself connected to ground. This is a problem with having so much of a handloom made of wood, lack of electrical conductivity and continuity.

AAF

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300

mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 14:02:00 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA22100; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 14:02:00 -0700 (MST)
Received: from europe.std.com (europe.std.com [199.172.62.20]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA22030; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 14:01:43 -0700 (MST)
Received: from world.std.com (root@world-f.std.com [199.172.62.5])
by europe.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id QAA08806
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 16:01:48 -0500 (EST)
Received: from world.std.com (ppp0c121.std.com [208.192.102.121])
by world.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id PAA28050
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 15:59:06 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <381F509B.2A465A8F@world.std.com>
Date: Tue, 02 Nov 1999 15:59:07 -0500
From: Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #627 - Static electricity
References: <199911021507.IAA10662@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

May I suggest a sheet of aluminum foil taped to the back beam that the warp runs over and a wire attached to both the foil and ground. However, an even more effective static eliminator can be made (you picked the right season) from the aluminum Christmas decoration that looks like chenille gone wild. They are for hanging in swages around the tree or windows. The advantage of these is that draped across the warp, the little fringes of aluminum are more likely to touch every thread. (Of course, it too needs to be grounded.) In the good old, bad old, days remnants of used Christmas swages like these could be found on the back of every computer printer to keep the static from causing the paper to fly all over the place.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Message-Id: <199911022142.QAA23615@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re:silk and static electricity
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 04:23 PM 11/2/99 -0500, you wrote:
>In the mill fly shuttles AAF gave me many moons ago (thanks Allen!) there
>are strips of fake fur,

Actually that is the real thing, usually possum, or sheared beaver. It's purpose is more for balloon control than filling tension, which latter is taken care of by other means in the shuttle. The fur lining has nothing to do with static control since the biggest source of static on a loom is the friction of ungrounded loom parts on the warp yarns during shedding and beat-up. Trying to eliminate the filling problem which is caused by warp generated static won't solve the root problem, to wit, the need to ground the warp sheet.

AAF

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562
-5300
mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 14:58:32 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA07153; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 14:58:32 -0700 (MST)
Received: from emerald.lightlink.com (root@emerald.lightlink.com [205.232.34.14]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA07141; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 14:58:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: from adore.lightlink.com (incaed@adore.lightlink.com [205.232.34.20]) by emerald.lightlink.com (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTMP id QAA29665 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 16:58:35 -0500
Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1999 16:58:35 -0500 (EST)
From: Ed Franquemont <incaed@lightlink.com>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re:silk and static electricity
In-Reply-To: <199911022142.QAA23615@mailbox.syr.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSU.4.10.9911021645070.21313-100000@adore.lightlink.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

WeaveTech Archive 9911

An interesting and informative discussion. I trust that everyone who is using a motor or other electronic device has them properly plugged into grounded outlets, that is, no three pronged plugs into adaptors to go into two-prong outlets, or any other attempt to escape the need to ground your device.

As for grounding the warp, I find myself thinking of a rigid polished metal extension to the back beam such that the warp must pass over it on its way to the heddles. These could be easily made in any local machine shop or even trade high school. Drill a hole in one end for a wire, probably #20 or so would do but it may be easiest to find #14 from local electricians. Lead the wire to ground. Probably the best ground is in the wall socket. Take the cover off and attach the ground wire to the screw at the top of the outlet where there should be an uninsulated wire (the continuous ground of the house) already attached. If you live in an old house that has not been rewired recently, the screw that holds the outlet cover on should do. IN a new house, I wouldn't trust it. Incidentally (this has nothing to do with your loom), if you open the outlet cover and there is no continuous ground, call an electrician to ground that plug and check others in the house. Older wiring systems with metal covered wires usually have adequate ground without other provisions.

Where electrical outlets are scarce (probably not the case for anyone on this list), a great ground is as Allen says, the water system. In South America I always grounded my computers to the metal water pipes of the house because I did not trust the wiring.

Unless your floor is tile on concrete, probably auto strips wouldn't work since wood is a pretty good insulator.

Ed Franquemont

To reply privately, send message to Ed Franquemont <incaed@lightlink.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 15:23:14 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA14082; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 15:23:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail1.javanet.com (mail1.javanet.com [205.219.162.10]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA14049; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 15:23:09 -0700 (MST)
Received: from eunismit (armory-us109.javanet.com [209.94.151.14]) by mail1.javanet.com (8.9.3/8.9.2) with SMTP id RAA20727 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 17:23:10 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <007f01bf2580\$cf8d8d980\$0e975ed1@eunismit>
From: "Eunice Smith" <eunismit@javanet.com>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
References:
<l03130303b4436458a3a1@[207.202.173.119]><002f01bf2458\$3d8aece0\$e79901d4@e116i5>
<l03130301b44405848690@[207.202.172.136]>
Subject: Re: Chenille
Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1999 17:12:43 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

There is something you can buy in Notions Departments called "Seams Great". It is a knitted seam binding that curves around the seam as you sew it on. It is very light weight and does not add to the bulkiness of handwoven fabrics.

----- Original Message -----

From: alcorn <alcorn@nwlink.com>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Sent: Monday, November 01, 1999 10:31 PM
Subject: Re: Chenille

> Regarding lining a chenile jacket: No, it isn't essential.
>
> However, all seams are enclosed
> >(French seams), so raveling is not a problem.
>
> You might consider binding the seams with a light weight knit. French
> seams in chenille would require a very large seam allowance and would be
> rather bulky. French seams are really successful only in pretty light
> weight and thin fabrics. With the ravelly nature of chenille, you might go
> bald tearing your hair out, and the air would probably turn blue, in
> trying
> to make French seams.
>
> Francie
>
>
>
> To reply privately, send message to alcorn <alcorn@nwlink.com>
>

To reply privately, send message to "Eunice Smith" <eunismit@javanet.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 18:19:51 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA28593; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 18:19:51 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA28567; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 18:19:48 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 23497 invoked by alias); 3 Nov 1999 01:19:57 -0000
Received: (qmail 23481 invoked from network); 3 Nov 1999 01:19:56 -0000
Received: from ip141.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.141) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 3 Nov 1999 01:19:56 -0000
Message-ID: <381F63E7.A1156DF1@netbistro.com>
Date: Tue, 02 Nov 1999 14:21:27 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: warp sheet ground
References: <199911022131.0AA00319@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

As the entire warp sheet is in contact with the metal back roller on my loom, I was thinking I could ground that, but I like the Christmas swag idea - rather festive! :D

Laura Fry
who is supposed to be weaving in the midst of a close to frantic current schedule.....

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 2 18:57:08 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA06264; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 18:57:08 -0700 (MST)
Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1999 18:57:08 -0700 (MST)
Message-Id: <199911030157.SAA06264@salmon.esosoft.net>
To: weavetech@list-server.net
From: DAFitzp@aol.com
Subject: Re: Chenille
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi Ruth,

I recently made a full length rayon chenille coat using a Vogue pattern by Geoffrey Beene. I just fell in love with the pattern. The construction precludes lining and also interfacing. The pattern called for flat felled seams. I knew that wouldn't work so I simply pressed the seams to one side and topstitched. This reinforced the seams quite a bit but not enough. The fabric is quite unstable and will probably be worn for New Years Eve only. I just hope it makes it through the evening. I set the 1450 ypp chenille at 18 epi and wove it in plain weave with 10/2 mercerized cotton packed as tightly as I could manage.

If I were to do this again I would definitely find a pattern that could be lined and would fuse a lightweight interfacing to the entire garment. It's really disappointing to spend all that effort for something less than you would want.

Darlene Fitzpatrick
Palm Desert

To reply privately, send message to DAFitzp@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 3 01:32:40 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id BAA12262; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 01:32:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from wsintt15.win.tue.nl (elisabeth@wsintt15.win.tue.nl [131.155.70.106]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id BAA12241; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 01:32:36 -0700 (MST)
Received: from elisabeth@localhost by wsintt15.win.tue.nl (8.8.7)
for weavetech@list-server.net
id JAA21268. Wed, 3 Nov 1999 09:32:32 +0100 (MET)
Message-ID: <19991103093231.A20784@win.tue.nl>
Date: Wed, 3 Nov 1999 09:32:31 +0100
From: Elisabeth Melby <elisabeth@win.tue.nl>
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: static

WeaveTech Archive 9911

References: <199911022131.0AA00319@salmon.esosoft.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
X-Mailer: Mutt 0.93i
In-Reply-To: <199911022131.0AA00319@salmon.esosoft.net>; from weavetech-digest on Tue, Nov 02, 1999 at 02:31:51PM -0700
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Most of the static is probably made by the reed. To ground the reed, should solve the problem. How easy/difficult that is, depends on how your reed is made. If it is conductive and the metal does connect somewhere (probably hidden from sight), it is easy. It is easy to measure with a resistance meter (or whatever it is called) As for getting past moving points, one of those things used by computer hardware installers, should work.

To increase the humidity, green plants work very well. The airco at work is so bad, I had to find a solution. A room contains a lot of air, so to increase the humidity, you need a lot of water.

Elisabeth

A Norwegian in the Netherlands

To reply privately, send message to Elisabeth Melby <elisabeth@win.tue.nl>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 3 02:05:47 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id CAA15803; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 02:05:47 -0700 (MST)
Received: from wsintt15.win.tue.nl (elisabeth@wsintt15.win.tue.nl [131.155.70.106]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id CAA15793; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 02:05:38 -0700 (MST)
Received: from elisabeth@localhost by wsintt15.win.tue.nl (8.8.7)
for weavetech@list-server.net
id KAA21995. Wed, 3 Nov 1999 10:05:35 +0100 (MET)
Message-ID: <19991103100535.A21805@win.tue.nl>
Date: Wed, 3 Nov 1999 10:05:35 +0100
From: Elisabeth Melby <elisabeth@win.tue.nl>
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Textile Ergonomics class - review
References: <199910290957.DAA13324@salmon.esosoft.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
X-Mailer: Mutt 0.93i
In-Reply-To: <199910290957.DAA13324@salmon.esosoft.net>; from weavetech-digest on Fri, Oct 29, 1999 at 03:57:16AM -0600
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

The Textile Ergonomics Class at the Syracuse University is about how to do anything weaving related without wearing out the weaver's body, with as bonus that the tasks gets done quicker and better (fewer mistakes, more even tention,..). As an extra bonus other areas might benifit as well - like my sewingroom.

The clue is to fit the tools to the weaver and not the other way around. Well written text, video to demonstrate what is hard to get from a written text, lots of communication options in the software at the University, leaving a weaver with no excuse for not improving tools and motions.

Anyone how wants a list of superlatives/more information, can e-mail me off list : elisabeth@win.tue.nl.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 3 15:32:02 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA12679; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 15:32:02 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo-d10.mx (imo-d10.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.42]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA12666; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 15:32:00 -0700 (MST)
From: Keist@aol.com
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host imo-d10.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.42] claimed to be imo-d10.mx
Received: from Keist@aol.com
by imo-d10.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id tFKL4Xx9f_ (4327)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 17:31:32 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.16c4a4e2.255211c3@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 3 Nov 1999 17:31:31 EST
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #625
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 16-bit for Windows sub 86
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

In a message dated 99-11-01 05:59:08 EST, you write:

<< Here's my question for those of you who have made garments with your handwoven chenille: how do you handle the pressing of seams, etc, if you want to maintain the loft of the chenille? I do not want the jacket to have the look of "pressed" chenille--which is a perfectly valid but different look, and not the one I want. Can one just press as one usually does when sewing and then wet finish the garment a second time to restore the loft? Is the loft restored to ironed chenille when you re-wash it?
>>

Ruth

You've probably already had answers to your question and I'm a couple of days late, but here it is: I press seams flat as I sew and then toss the finished, dry jacket in the dryer with a bath towel on no heat (or low). This fluffs the chenille nicely.

Joyce Keister

To reply privately, send message to Keist@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 4 05:23:37 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA15169; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 05:23:37 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.jjj.net (root@smtp.jjj.net [209.235.31.137]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA15153; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 05:23:31 -0700 (MST)
Received: from HENRY (usr1-37.connex.net [209.116.252.195])
by smtp.jjj.net (8.9.1/8.9.0) with SMTP id HAA08359;
Thu, 4 Nov 1999 07:19:18 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.16.19991104072315.2fcf6ca8@smtp.jjj.com>
X-Sender: wheat@smtp.jjj.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (16)
Date: Thu, 04 Nov 1999 07:23:15 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net, weaving@quilt.net
From: Wheat Carr <wheat@craftwolf.com>
Subject: Re: Wearable Art/Fiber Art Show

WeaveTech Archive 9911

In-Reply-To: <3.0.3.32.19991103124201.006c3c58@cpug.org>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 12:42 PM 11/3/99 -0500, you wrote:

>If you live in the US mid-Atlantic area, you might want to drop in on the
>Potomac Craftsmen Gallery's "Wearable Art/Fiber Art Show & Sale" at the
>Garrett Park Town Hall in Garrett Park, Maryland, on Saturday, Nov. 6 from
>9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
>

Ruth,

Just wanted to let you know the interactive map to Garret Park Town Hall
with an option to enter a starting point and get driving directions is done.

It can be found at:

<http://www.craftwolf.com/potomac/garrett.htm>

For those who might want to use public transportation, do you know how
close the nearest MARC or METRO Stop is?

Wheat

To reply privately, send message to Wheat Carr <wheat@craftwolf.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 4 11:49:10 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA20894; Thu, 4 Nov 1999
10:23:28 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo17.mx.aol.com (imo17.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.7]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id KAA20875; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 10:23:25 -0700 (MST)
From: Magstrands@aol.com
Received: from Magstrands@aol.com
by imo17.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id tI0Ta17102 (4113)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 12:22:52 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.5987b7c7.25531aeb@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1999 12:22:51 EST
Subject: cashmere
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL for Macintosh sub 54
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi all, I'm starting a new project with cashmere, and having never used this
fiber, I was wondering if there was anyone out there that would have any
suggestions on sett and finishing techniques. I'm using a very fine wt. the
cone says 28000yd to the lb. I would appreciate any advice that any of you
might have.. thanks so much..Sue

To reply privately, send message to Magstrands@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 4 13:03:14 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA04504; Thu, 4 Nov 1999
13:03:14 -0700 (MST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: from ccrtc.com (mail.ccrtc.com [205.243.45.34]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA04490; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 13:03:12 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host mail.ccrtc.com [205.243.45.34] claimed to be ccrtc.com
Received: from stevensj_home.indy.tce.com [206.230.133.65] by ccrtc.com (SMTPD32-5.05) id A079372601F6; Thu, 04 Nov 1999 15:02:17 -0500
Message-ID: <001901bf26fd\$e7d153e0\$4185e6ce@stevensj_home.indy.tce.com>
From: "Kathleen Stevens" <hndwvnds@ccrtc.com>
To: <Weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: portfolio
Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1999 14:50:53 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi All,

I am seeking advice on how to set up or design my weaving portfolio to present to a couple of nice galleries. Is there anyone on list who has had experience in this matter? I have never done this before. Thanks and appreciation in advance. Cheers, Kathleen hndwvnds@ccrtc.com

To reply privately, send message to "Kathleen Stevens" <hndwvnds@ccrtc.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 5 06:34:39 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA18445; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 06:34:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: from c004.sfo.cp.net (c004-h009.c004.sfo.cp.net [209.228.14.66]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA18437; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 06:34:37 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host c004-h009.c004.sfo.cp.net [209.228.14.66] claimed to be c004.sfo.cp.net
Received: (cpmta 9750 invoked from network); 5 Nov 1999 05:41:46 -0800
Received: from 216-59-34-117.usa.flashcom.net (HELO post.harvard.edu) (216.59.34.117) by smtp.flashcom.net with SMTP; 5 Nov 1999 05:41:46 -0800
X-Sent: 5 Nov 1999 13:41:46 GMT
Message-ID: <3822DCE3.C5F10175@post.harvard.edu>
Date: Fri, 05 Nov 1999 08:34:27 -0500
From: Jessica Polito <jpolito@post.harvard.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (X11; I; Linux 2.2.5-22 i686)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech list <weavetech@List-Server.net>, weaving@quilt.net
Subject: New Handwoven Scarves book!
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I just got Interweave Press's new Handwoven scarves book, and it is *fantastic*! They got submissions of scarves from a lot of top designers, and picked the 54 that made them say "wow". It's *not* a how-to book -- most of the scarves have some info, but not enough to duplicate them. They range from plain weave, to 16 harness twills, to draw looms, and are absolutely fantastic. I'd love to see Interweave

WeaveTech Archive 9911

come out with more book like this -- insparational & motivational, but with enough information to get some good ideas too.

Wow!

--jessica

To reply privately, send message to Jessica Polito <jpolito@post.harvard.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 5 09:29:03 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA00759; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 09:29:03 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA00744; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 09:29:01 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 22273 invoked by alias); 5 Nov 1999 16:29:05 -0000
Received: (qmail 22265 invoked from network); 5 Nov 1999 16:29:04 -0000
Received: from ip132.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.132) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 5 Nov 1999 16:29:04 -0000
Message-ID: <3822FA1F.595D1879@netbistro.com>
Date: Fri, 05 Nov 1999 07:39:11 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: Cashmere
References: <199911051057.DAA21472@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

So far I've only used the cashmere I bought at Atlanta as weft on a silk warp for scarves. (See the new Handwoven Scarf Book for one example.)

Wet finishing was for worsted. Because scarves are small, I hand finished in a basin, used liquid soap, very little agitation, hung til nearly damp, hard pressed. Worked the silk by tossing into the dryer on tumble only, no heat.

Laura Fry

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 6 03:58:40 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id DAA17895; Sat, 6 Nov 1999 03:58:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from ccgw.cc.hollandc.pe.ca (ccgw.cc.hollandc.pe.ca [142.87.1.253]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id DAA17884; Sat, 6 Nov 1999 03:58:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Charlottetown-Message_Server by ccgw.cc.hollandc.pe.ca with Novell_GroupWise; Sat, 06 Nov 1999 07:02:53 -0400
Message-Id: <s823d29d.063@ccgw.cc.hollandc.pe.ca>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Sat, 06 Nov 1999 07:02:38 -0400
From: Barbara Henry <BHenry@ccgw.cc.hollandc.pe.ca>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #632 (Your e-mail message)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Content-Disposition: inline
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I am on holidays Monday, November 15 - November 19 inclusive.
If you require information from the Health/Community/Media Communications Office during that time, contact Paula MacInnis at 566-9564 from 8:30 - 12:00 daily.

Otherwise, I will answer your message when I return to the College on Monday, November 22.

Cheers Barbara

To reply privately, send message to Barbara Henry <BHenry@ccgw.cc.hollandc.pe.ca>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 6 04:58:25 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA24258; Sat, 6 Nov 1999 04:58:25 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA24253; Sat, 6 Nov 1999 04:58:23 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-4.idsonline.com [209.8.42.4])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id GAA24048
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 6 Nov 1999 06:57:07 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991106065351.006cbdf4@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Sat, 06 Nov 1999 06:53:51 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: ADMIN
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Dear WeaveTech Friends--

Our list has recently received an automated reply from a list member who is out of town. While automated responses may be useful in a business context, they are a nuisance to a list. Please remember: if you are going to be out of town or otherwise away from your computer for more than a couple of days, either uns*u*b (sorry for having to write it that way, but Majordomo is sensitive the the s-word and the un-s-word) or set your subscription to nomail. This is especially true if you receive the list at your place of work and if you set up an automated response on that computer while you are gone. Thanks for your cooperation.

Ruth
co-list-admin

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 6 08:51:53 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA22910; Sat, 6 Nov 1999 08:51:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail1.svr.pol.co.uk (mail1.svr.pol.co.uk [195.92.193.18]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA22901; Sat, 6 Nov 1999 08:51:51 -0700 (MST)
Received: from modem-68.arsenic.dialup.pol.co.uk ([62.136.16.68] helo=headquarters2)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

by mail1.svr.pol.co.uk with smtp (Exim 3.03 #0)
id 11k88A-0004em-00
for weavetech@list-server.net; Sat, 06 Nov 1999 15:51:54 +0000
Message-ID: <000201bf286e\$d00ba180\$a590fea9@headquarters2>
From: "Ian Bowers" <ian@fibrecrafts.freemove.co.uk>
To: <weavetech@list-server.net>
References: <002001bf2312\$8f170fe0\$c3c3efd1@fvjn5>
Subject: Re: cutting reeds
Date: Sun, 31 Oct 1999 16:00:03 -0000
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

It depends on how old the reed is. Modern reeds are often bound in Epoxy resin, older reeds in tar soaked string.

Whichever type it will not fall apart if you saw off the excess length.

Pull off the end cap with a pair of pliers (carefully - you will reuse it later) Cut off the length and leave around quarter to half an inch of excess. Then peel back the tape wrapping and remove 3 or 4 of the metal pieced making up the reed. With the string you should unwrap as you go. With the epoxy pull them out individually with the pliers. When you have removed enough, tap the end cap back into place (I always use the heel of my shoe, it is just the right weight and soft enough no to do any damage).
Finished.

Hope this helps

Best regards

Ian Bowers
Fibrecrafts - UK

----- Original Message -----
From: Betty Lou Whaley <enbwhaley@jps.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Sent: Saturday, October 30, 1999 8:08 PM
Subject: Re: cutting reeds

> Could someone please tell me how to shorten the length of a reed? If I cut
> off a section, will the reed fall apart? Is there some way to re-attach
the
> strong bar at the end?
>
> ~Betty Lou
>
>
>
> To reply privately, send message to "Betty Lou Whaley" <enbwhaley@jps.net>
>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To reply privately, send message to "Ian Bowers" <ian@fibrecrafts.freeseerve.co.uk>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 7 00:20:42 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id AAA08094; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 00:20:42 -0700 (MST)
Received: from ecpport2.midcoast.com.au (ecpport2.ecopost.com.au [203.28.64.15]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id AAA08088; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 00:20:39 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host ecpport2.ecopost.com.au [203.28.64.15] claimed to be ecpport2.midcoast.com.au
Received: from tnewman (mcport28-119.midcoast.com.au [203.12.28.119]) by ecpport2.midcoast.com.au (8.9.1/8.8.5) with SMTP id SAA03740 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 18:20:32 +1100
Message-ID: <001001bf28f0\$a95befe0\$771c0ccb@tnewman>
From: "Trudy Newman" <tnewman@midcoast.com.au>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #631
Date: Sun, 7 Nov 1999 18:20:42 +1100
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>Subject: cashmere

For What It's Worth.

I've been weaving with cashmere, as a production weaver, here in Australia for about five years, on commission for cashmere growers. The products are scarves and square shawls. A machine washable wool warp is used, 2/20 or 2/22 and sett at about 24 epi. Cashmere, the same and is only used in the weft.

The product is gently washed as wool, using wool wash detergent, in the washing machine, for about 8 carefully supervised minutes (to make sure the fabric does not get tangled around the centre post). Spin out, and rinse with fabric softener. Air dry. Steam press.

Trudy Newman
27 Allunga Ave PORT MACQUARIE NSW 2444
AUSTRALIA. Ph/fax:(02) 6582 2722
tnewman@midcoast.com.au

To reply privately, send message to "Trudy Newman" <tnewman@midcoast.com.au>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 7 05:12:59 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA05030; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 05:12:59 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail.netaxs.com (mail@mail.netaxs.com [207.8.186.26]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA05021; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 05:12:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [207.8.207.41] (ppp41.blackbox1-mfs.netaxs.com [207.8.207.41]) by mail.netaxs.com (8.8.7/8.8.5) with ESMTP id HAA26838 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 07:12:57 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: jane@pop3.netaxs.com
Message-Id: <l03130300b44b1c482975@[207.8.207.85]>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

In-Reply-To: <001001bf28f0\$a95befe0\$771c0ccb@tnewman>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Sun, 7 Nov 1999 07:13:04 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Jane Eisenstein <janee@softweave.com>
Subject: Re: fulling wool
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

from Trudy Newman:

>The product is gently washed as wool, using wool wash detergent, in the
>washing machine, for about 8 carefully supervised minutes (to make sure the
>fabric does not get tangled around the centre post).

Trudy's instructions reminded me to ask whether anyone has tried fulling in
a front-loading (tumbling) washing machine. If you have, what differences
are there in timing, etc. from using a top-loading (agitator) machine?

Thanks,
Jane

Jane Eisenstein janee@softweave.com http://www.softweave.com/

To reply privately, send message to Jane Eisenstein <janee@softweave.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 7 05:25:19 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA06065; Sun, 7 Nov 1999
05:25:19 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.jjj.net (root@smtp.jjj.net [209.235.31.137]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id FAA06060; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 05:25:17 -0700 (MST)
Received: from HENRY (usr1-17.connex.net [209.116.252.175])
by smtp.jjj.net (8.9.1/8.9.0) with SMTP id HAA12743
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 07:20:43 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.16.19991107072505.2fd76a04@smtp.jjj.com>
X-Sender: wheat@smtp.jjj.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (16)
Date: Sun, 07 Nov 1999 07:25:05 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Wheat Carr <wheat@craftwolf.com>
Subject: Re: fulling wool
In-Reply-To: <103130300b44b1c482975@[207.8.207.85]>
References: <001001bf28f0\$a95befe0\$771c0ccb@tnewman>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>
>Trudy's instructions reminded me to ask whether anyone has tried fulling in
>a front-loading (tumbling) washing machine. If you have, what differences
>are there in timing, etc. from using a top-loading (agitator) machine?
>

The problem with FULLING in a front loading machine (at last for me) was
that you cannot STOP and remove items prior to the end of a cycle, cause if
you open the door, water falls out.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

This may not be that important for FELTING, but unless the machine allows you to interrupt and advance the cycles - you lose control of the process.

To reply privately, send message to Wheat Carr <wheat@craftwolf.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 7 13:42:31 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA09155; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 13:42:31 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mtiwmhc04.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc04.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.39]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA09151; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 13:42:30 -0700 (MST)
Received: from worldnet.att.net ([12.67.147.143])
by mtiwmhc04.worldnet.att.net (InterMail v03.02.07.07 118-134)
with ESMTP id <19991107204206.HMDN21848@worldnet.att.net>
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 20:42:06 +0000
Message-ID: <3825E4F8.22D79565@worldnet.att.net>
Date: Sun, 07 Nov 1999 15:45:44 -0500
From: Grand Larseney <fiberweaver@worldnet.att.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en]C-WorldNet (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: Lot of Rug Yarn for Sale
References: <001201bf0646\$e69ba2a0\$4585e6ce@stevensj_home.indy.tce.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi Kathleen,

I am sorry for not responding sooner, but I kept debating about giving you the address of the guy that was selling his rug yarn at a workshop for \$2 a lb.. Last remarks from him towards me were very nasty. He had come here to teach, had left a piece of equipment, and was upset that I wouldn't drive close to 6 hours to deliver it to him. I realize it is not your problem but I don't know if I trust him. I had given him several options, like meet him at the next 2 upcoming shows, meet him halfway, etc. And he was literally yelling at me.

I don't feel comfortable about putting you in any kind of situation with him.

Hope you understand, but if you still want me to give it to you, I will.

Carol

To reply privately, send message to Grand Larseney <fiberweaver@worldnet.att.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 7 14:12:46 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA14608; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 14:12:46 -0700 (MST)
Received: from fog.powercom.net (fog.powercom.net [216.114.0.132]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA14603; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 14:12:45 -0700 (MST)
Received: from sarav ([207.7.41.78])
by fog.powercom.net (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id PAA34854
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 15:15:46 -0600 (CST)
(envelope-from sarav@powercom.net)
Message-ID: <001e01bf2964\$e8302140\$4e2907cf@sarav>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

From: "Sara von Tresckow" <sarav@powercom.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
References: <001001bf28f0\$a95befe0\$771c0ccb@tnewman>
<3.0.3.16.19991107072505.2fd76a04@smtp.jjj.com>
Subject: Re: fulling wool
Date: Sun, 7 Nov 1999 15:13:14 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Fulling and/or felting in the front loader is substantially better for the cloth as there is NO centerpost to tangle it or pull it out of shape. Modern front loaders have settings that allow to let the water out to below the door level (mine is a Swedish model that doesn't even get that full) to check on the progress. Also, the precision of the Asko that I own is such that after testing a small sample, I have felted 4 identical pieces in 4 loads with no perceptible difference in the pieces. If the weaver is willing to try one or two small samples, the actual end process would be the same on the large piece of cloth. Sara von Tresckow
sarav@powercom.net
Fond du Lac, WI

To reply privately, send message to "Sara von Tresckow" <sarav@powercom.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 7 14:37:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA18568; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 14:37:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mtiwmhc06.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc06.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.41]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA18517; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 14:36:43 -0700 (MST)
Received: from worldnet.att.net ([12.67.147.143])
 by mtiwmhc06.worldnet.att.net (InterMail v03.02.07.07 118-134)
 with ESMTP id <19991107213429.HZTE24056@worldnet.att.net>
 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 21:34:29 +0000
Message-ID: <3825F13F.9DD910E2@worldnet.att.net>
Date: Sun, 07 Nov 1999 16:38:07 -0500
From: Grand Larseney <fiberweaver@worldnet.att.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en]C-WorldNet (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: Lot of Rug Yarn for Sale
References: <001201bf0646\$e69ba2a0\$4585e6ce@stevensj_home.indy.tce.com>
<3825E4F8.22D79565@worldnet.att.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Oh Man, Now I am really embarrassed. This was definitely and very obviously a PRIVATE message. Please, everyone forgive this message. Fortunately I didn't list the person

WeaveTech Archive 9911

I was major complaining about. Ouch, ouch, ouch, beat me with a wet skein already.
Carol

To reply privately, send message to Grand Larseney <fiberweaver@worldnet.att.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 8 05:48:44 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA03132; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 05:48:44 -0700 (MST)
Received: from rgate.ricochet.net (rgate1.ricochet.net [204.179.143.6]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA03128; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 05:48:43 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host rgate1.ricochet.net [204.179.143.6] claimed to be rgate.ricochet.net
Received: from ricochet.net (mg-206253202-12.ricochet.net [206.253.202.12]) by rgate.ricochet.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id GAA00595 for <WeaveTech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 06:48:42 -0600 (CST)
Message-ID: <3826C6A8.229823EF@ricochet.net>
Date: Mon, 08 Nov 1999 04:48:40 -0800
From: Lynn/Ken <kamco@ricochet.net>
Organization: Kamco
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (WinNT; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: WeaveTech <WeaveTech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Interesting article
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

This came from the Online Textile News.

Lynn--
< kamco@ricochet.net >

Feel free to forward this newsletter to your interested associates. They can quickly subscribe at:
<http://www.onlinetextilenews.com/subscribe/newcustomer.htm>

Designers With CAD Skills See
12% Salary Increase

11/04/1999

CHELMSFORD, MA -- CAD salaries are up 13% over last year, according to the results of our 1999 CAD Salary and Job Satisfaction survey. Nearly 100 designers, stylists, managers, and IT professionals completed surveys by mail or via the internet. This year's increase is the largest since the salary survey was first done in 1994.

As more companies add computers to their design studios, the need for talented computer savvy designers

WeaveTech Archive 9911

has increased, said Alison Grudier, owner of FabriCAD and publisher of the survey.

The good people who have both art and tech skills are able to command higher salaries than in the past. Salaries for those who are using computers to design apparel, textiles, home furnishings, and more rose from an average of \$44,385 last year to \$50,290 this year.

Salaries for designers rose 12% from \$39,030 in 1998 to \$43,575 in 1999. Designers represent the largest segment of the survey population (42%), with Manager/Supervisor and Sr. Designer the next largest groups at around 20% each. Salaries for managers rose 10% to an average of \$56,019 while Sr. Designers/Stylists only saw increases of 3% to \$60,428. Sr. Designer/Stylists saw their big jump last year from an average salary of \$46,000 in 1997 to \$58,811 in 1998.

This is the second year job satisfaction has been included in the survey, and overall CAD users are pretty satisfied with their jobs. 52% reported being moderately satisfied with their jobs, down only slightly from the 58% that felt that way last year. The number of those who were not very satisfied grew the most.

Challenge of the work topped the list again this year as the factor most contributing to the satisfaction of being employed. The importance of flexibility or being able to work from home was the second most cited factor. As hardware and software gets smaller and more portable, designers are able to be creative outside of a corporate office.

A complete copy of the salary survey results for 1999 can be ordered from the FabriCAD website.

FabriCAD is the leading provider of information regarding CAD in the fashion, home, and textile industries. The Salary Survey has been conducted since 1993 and published in November in the FabriCAD Update newsletter. Complete copies of the survey are available for \$30 to FabriCAD Update subscribers, \$80 for non subscribers and can be ordered by calling (800) 617-2410 or online at www.fabricad.com.

FabriCAD
Contact: Alison Grudier
Phone: 978-256-2033
Email: cadgirl@fabricad.com

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Visit Us At: www.fabricad.com

To reply privately, send message to Lynn/Ken <kamco@ricochet.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 8 06:21:24 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA08523; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 06:21:24 -0700 (MST)
Received: from postoffice.mail.cornell.edu (POSTOFFICE.MAIL.CORNELL.EDU [132.236.56.7]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA08518; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 06:21:23 -0700 (MST)
Received: from chem161 (EILEEN.CHEM.CORNELL.EDU [128.253.229.195])
by postoffice.mail.cornell.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id IAA03245
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 08:21:25 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <4.1.19991108081703.00a73720@postoffice.mail.cornell.edu>
X-Sender: efd2@postoffice.mail.cornell.edu (Unverified)
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1
Date: Mon, 08 Nov 1999 08:18:48 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Eileen Driscoll <efd2@cornell.edu>
Subject: Lunasea
In-Reply-To: <199911061057.DAA17623@salmon.esosoft.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Is anyone planning to attend Lunasea in Florida in February? I'd like to attend and am looking for a roommate. I'm non-smoking, quiet and flexible.

Thanks.

Eileen Driscoll
Chemistry Computer Services
257 Baker Laboratory
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
(607) 255-6278 voice
(607) 255-4137 fax
mailto:efd2@cornell.edu
<http://www.people.cornell.edu/pages/efd2/>
Please send help questions to CRCF@CORNELL.EDU

To reply privately, send message to Eileen Driscoll <efd2@cornell.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 8 08:03:46 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA01036; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 08:03:46 -0700 (MST)
Received: from pop.nwlink.com (pop.nwlink.com [209.20.130.39]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA01028; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 08:03:45 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [207.202.173.215] (ip69.r10.d.bel.nwlink.com [207.202.174.69])
by pop.nwlink.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTMP id HAA00191
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 07:03:47 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: alcorn@mail.nwlink.com
Message-Id: <l03130302b44c9686dee3@[207.202.173.215]>
In-Reply-To: <4.1.19991108081703.00a73720@postoffice.mail.cornell.edu>
References: <199911061057.DAA17623@salmon.esosoft.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 07:06:25 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: alcorn <alcorn@nwlink.com>
Subject: Re: Lunasea
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>Is anyone planning to attend Lunasea in Florida in February? I'd like to
>attend and am looking for a roommate. I'm non-smoking, quiet and flexible.
>
>Thanks.
>Eileen Driscoll

I will definitely attest to that! Eileen is a great roommate. If I
were'nt so far away,

Francie Alcorn

To reply privately, send message to alcorn <alcorn@nmlink.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 8 08:30:10 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA07725; Mon, 8 Nov 1999
08:30:10 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo15.mx.aol.com (imo15.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id IAA07714; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 08:30:09 -0700 (MST)
From: TBeau1930@aol.com
Received: from TBeau1930@aol.com
by imo15.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id tZEGa04601 (2619)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 10:29:37 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.2b87d172.25584660@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 10:29:36 EST
Subject: Re: Home Fulling(Felting) of Wool Fabric. Front Loaders.
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 41
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi Wheat and all:

<< The problem with FULLING in a front loading machine (at last for me) was
that you cannot STOP and remove items prior to the end of a cycle, cause if
you open the door, water falls out. This may not be that important for
FELTING, but unless the machine allows you to interrupt and advance the
cycles - you lose control of the process. >>

Most all processes in the manufacture of Textiles are a combination of
Science and Art. We have enough experience with most of the basics(some 9000+
years by Dr. Barbers writings<G>) to establish the objective portion(Rules of
Science), but in most cases it still requires the subjective approval of an
individual(the Art) for final approval of the piece.

In Industry, that final approval usually fell to the Dept Head or
someone they designated before the piece(or pieces) went on to the next dept
for processing. The Quality Assurance Manager(or Plant Manager or Supt.)
usually passed judgement on material going out the Door.

The Greige Mill was usually more influenced by Science(objective) and the
Finishing Mill leaned more heavily on the Artistic expertise(subjective)
approval, of the Heads in charge.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

In the Finishing Mill, the Fulling(Felting) of the Wool Fabric was probably the most dependant phase of manufacture that depended on subjective approval for final passage. The Boss of the Fulling Mills(the machines that Felted the cloth) would usually decide if the pieces needed another 10 minutes or 20 minutes(or whatever) beyond the prescribed procedure set for that particular fabric.

Successfull Fulling is dependant on controlling the process. The procedure followed in each Mill was different and that was based on the type of equipment the Mill had available for the Fulling process.

And so it goes when we Full Fabric at home. We control the process based on the equipment we have available.

One important aspect of Fulling we must keep in mind is that the Fabric need not be immersed in a Bath(Tub or Wahing Machine) to be Felted. The material only needs to be saturated with the Felting solution and then subjected to heat and agitation to commence the felting process.

With that, if you have a Front loading Washing Machine as your Fulling Mill, you only need sufficient solution in the Tub during the Felting cycle to saturate the Fabric and keep it working. You should be able to open the Door at any time you wish to check the Fabric without spilling any solution since there should be very little if any excess. Once the desired finish is approached, the rest can be accomplished in a gentle rinse.

Of the two types of Washing Machines most home finishers have at their disposal, the tumbling action of the Front loading more closely resembles the action of the Industrial Mills. But in either case, since each household location is unique within itself, considering all the variables, the controls required for satisfactory home Fulling must be set up by the individual involved. And this can only be accomplished thru trial and error. The final decision is primarily subjective, and you are the Artist.

Laura Fry has established excellent handweaver guidlines for successfull Felting of Wool Fabric, Re: controls for friction(agitation), temp., Lubricant. Look to her findings for direction in this area.

As in the Mill, it falls to the individual home operator to decide what controls need be established to best utilize the equipment they have available to accomplish the desired finished product.

Keep those Beaters moving. And when your done, put the fabric in a Tub<G>. It ain't finished till it's Wet Finished.

Have a good day, and have fun

Tom Beaudet

To reply privately, send message to TBeau1930@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 9 06:37:02 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA15674; Tue, 9 Nov 1999 06:37:02 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Namesrv.Mountain.Net (root@Namesrv.Mountain.Net [198.77.1.1]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA15667; Tue, 9 Nov 1999 06:37:00 -0700 (MST)
Received: from access.mountain.net (slip7-5.Spencer-WV.Mountain.Net [198.77.53.104]) by Namesrv.Mountain.Net (8.9.3/8.9.0) with ESMTP id IAA18462
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 9 Nov 1999 08:37:00 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <382812D4.B474EA73@access.mountain.net>
Date: Tue, 09 Nov 1999 07:25:56 -0500
From: susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>
X-Sender: "susan ernst" <vegalyra@access.mountain.net> (Unverified)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en]C-gatewaynet (Win98; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: ergonomics course
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> The Textile Ergonomics Class at the Syracuse University is about how to do
> anything weaving related without wearing out the weaver's body,

i'll second this! i took this course as well and am a changed weaver.
the added bonus i got out of the course is that i am making more money.
i am weaving in much less time (i will post %s as soon as i consider
myself proficient).

the most important factor in being successful in the course is realizing
that you are going to experience some slow and frustrating times as you
learn new handloom weaving techniques. i was reminded of when i first
learned to weave(remember... when we had only thumbs on our hands).

i would also love to see more online courses....keep it up allen!

susan
who is completely revamping her studio

To reply privately, send message to susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 9 11:05:48 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA24835; Tue, 9 Nov 1999
11:05:48 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo-d02.mx.aol.com (imo-d02.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.34]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA24828; Tue, 9 Nov 1999 11:05:47 -0700 (MST)
From: Magstrands@aol.com
Received: from Magstrands@aol.com
by imo-d02.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id tBQU0aGvX8 (4406)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Tue, 9 Nov 1999 13:05:06 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.8e4db0b9.2559bc51@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 9 Nov 1999 13:05:05 EST
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #633
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL for Macintosh sub 54
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Thanks Trudie for your info on cashmere.. washing it in the washer seems
scary to me .. I'm using cashmere for warp and weft on this first project and
the warp breaks often... This is Italian cashmere, but I have some samples of
Scottish cashmere that seems stronger for warp.. this is sure an expensive
little adventure... It is such a great fiber and I really want to work out
what dilemmas it puts forth, so I'm very grateful for all the info I could
get.. Does anyone know what pashmina is.. I've heard that it comes from the
beard of the goat but I've also heard that it comes from the belly... anyone
know for sure..and thanks again Trudie, I appreciate it ..
Sue

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To reply privately, send message to Magstrands@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 9 14:07:12 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA12893; Tue, 9 Nov 1999 14:07:12 -0700 (MST)
Received: from c004.sfo.cp.net (c004-h005.c004.sfo.cp.net [209.228.14.76]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA12881; Tue, 9 Nov 1999 14:07:10 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host c004-h005.c004.sfo.cp.net [209.228.14.76] claimed to be c004.sfo.cp.net
Received: (cpmta 29369 invoked from network); 9 Nov 1999 13:07:16 -0800
Received: from 216-59-34-117.usa.flashcom.net (HELO post.harvard.edu) (216.59.34.117) by smtp.flashcom.net with SMTP; 9 Nov 1999 13:07:16 -0800
X-Sent: 9 Nov 1999 21:07:16 GMT
Message-ID: <38288CFD.8BB4D97D@post.harvard.edu>
Date: Tue, 09 Nov 1999 16:07:09 -0500
From: Jessica Polito <jpolito@post.harvard.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (X11; I; Linux 2.2.5-22 i686)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech list <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: AVL solenoids on CompuDobby 1
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Thanks all for your advice on how to deal with mis-fires on the CoppuDobby. My husband & I ended up retrofitting thi thing ourselves to use mag switches instead of the light sensors. It now works *fantastically*, and I just took off my first warp! Yea!

Let me know if you're interested in what we did -- it was pretty easy (well, he did all the work, but it looked pretty easy.) Weneded up leaving it so the light sensors work as well, just in case something strange happens...

--Jessica
jpolito@post.harvard.edu

To reply privately, send message to Jessica Polito <jpolito@post.harvard.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 10 07:11:13 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA05977; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 07:11:13 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo25.mx.aol.com (imo25.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.69]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA05968; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 07:11:11 -0700 (MST)
From: TBeau1930@aol.com
Received: from TBeau1930@aol.com
by imo25.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id tHS0a17867 (4586)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:10:32 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.a33b2c2b.255ad6d8@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:10:32 EST
Subject: Re:Looms for Sale
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 41
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Listers all:

I have 4 Looms for sale. Two 36" Leclerc "Artisat" 4 Shaft Floor Looms , a 32" "Tools of the Trade" Table Loom, and a 22" Leclerc "Meco" Table Loom. All have been fully reconditioned.

If interested go to:

<http://members.aol.com/tbeau1930/genealogy/index.htm>

and then to My Place2 for details

Keep those Beaters Moving<G>

Tom Beaudet

To reply privately, send message to TBeau1930@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 10 07:36:22 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA12468; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 07:36:22 -0700 (MST)
Received: from www.arquired.es (WWW.arquired.es [194.179.41.2]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA12462; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 07:36:19 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [194.179.41.223] by www.arquired.es (NTMail 3.03.0017/1.abcl) with ESMTTP id xa296397 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 15:35:37 +0100
Message-ID: <001401bf2b88\$a65fb520\$df29b3c2@juan-carlos>
From: "juan carlos rubio/neki rivera" <rr@arquired.es>
To: "weavetech" <weavetech@list-server.net>
Subject: =?iso-8859-1?B?ZGFtYXNz6A==?=
Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:35:15 +0100
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

hi

i'm looking for info on damassÉ structure.the only reference i have is in alice schlein's network drafting book so any leads would be greatly appreciated.

neki in barcelona
rr@arquired.es

To reply privately, send message to "juan carlos rubio/neki rivera" <rr@arquired.es>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 10 09:45:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA13622; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:45:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from new.burgoyne.com (new.burgoyne.com [209.197.0.17]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA13613; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:45:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: from loom (pmh6.burgoyne.com [209.197.2.161])
 by new.burgoyne.com (8.9.3/8.9.1) with SMTP id JAA06240

WeaveTech Archive 9911

for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:45:16 -0700
From: "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: RE: Midwest 2001 Conference -
Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:43:34 -0700
Message-ID: <NDBBIFBOMLMBGFHHPCKLAECCDAA.jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200
Importance: Normal
In-Reply-To: <87364857.24f29e46@aol.com>
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi Amy,

As the Advertising Chair for the Complex Weavers Journal, we are starting a new classifieds page.

We are looking for ads for the page for the January 2000 issue. It has been our policy to carry information for regional conferences that involve a CW activity for free and for other conferences on a space available basis.

Would you be interested in an ad for the upcoming issue? 50 words maximum. Dates and a web address might be ideal. A call for teachers or show entries could also be appropriate.

Since I am brand new in this position and the deadline is now, I would need this information this week. Or you could send me information for future issues. Next deadline is 1 March.

Thanks,

Judie Eatough
judie@eatough.net

To reply privately, send message to "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 10 10:02:59 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA17509; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 10:02:59 -0700 (MST)
Received: from new.burgoyne.com (new.burgoyne.com [209.197.0.17]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA17502; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 10:02:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from loom (pmh6.burgoyne.com [209.197.2.161])
by new.burgoyne.com (8.9.3/8.9.1) with SMTP id KAA09199
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 10:03:01 -0700
From: "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: RE: Midwest 2001 Conference -
Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 10:01:18 -0700
Message-ID: <NDBBIFBOMLMBGFHHPCKLMECCDAA.jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200
Importance: Normal
In-Reply-To: <NDBBIFBOMLMBGFHHPCKLAECCDAA.jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I got caught with the wrong address -- but I did want to extend the invitation to several conferences -- <gg>

Sorry, but hopeful

Judie

To reply privately, send message to "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 10 13:17:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA03794; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 13:17:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail1.ync.net (mail1.ync.net [206.185.20.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA03766; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 13:17:10 -0700 (MST)
Received: from SuButler (tcv90-ARC-004.153.ync.net [206.185.20.153])
by mail1.ync.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id OAA22217;
Wed, 10 Nov 1999 14:33:55 -0600 (CST)
Message-ID: <00a101bf2bb9\$0e1a1e00\$0400a8c0@SuButler>
From: "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>
To: "Weavetech" <weavetech@list-server.net>, "Weave List" <weaving@quilt.net>
Subject: Gilmore 8S Loom available
Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 14:20:34 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

HI lists....An email-less friend has a practically new Gilmore 32" 8S floor loom, (not the Little Gem) with bench for sale. It is in pristine condition. Also included are warping board, shuttle, bobbins, a book etc.....please email me if you are interested and want price info. She just decided she didn't really want to weave, and put only two warps on this little beauty.
Su :-> apbutler@ync.net

To reply privately, send message to "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 10 15:01:21 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA00897; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 15:01:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA00887; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 15:01:17 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.15(src addr [206.63.102.15]) (743 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com> id <m11lfnb-0002ZlC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 14:01:03 -0800 (PST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

(Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <3829B46B.47C3@nas.com>
Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 11:07:40 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Forbidden subject
References: <0.a33b2c2b.255ad6d8@aol.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I realize it is probably forbidden to discuss power looms (automated) on this hand weaver's list...but I would really like to talk with someone who works with these looms. Do any of you work with power looms?
Thanks,
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 10 15:50:10 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA11955; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 15:50:10 -0700 (MST)
Received: from ecpport2.midcoast.com.au (ecpport2.ecopost.com.au [203.28.64.15]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA11940; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 15:50:05 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host ecpport2.ecopost.com.au [203.28.64.15] claimed to be ecpport2.midcoast.com.au
Received: from tnewman (mcport28-205.midcoast.com.au [203.12.28.205]) by ecpport2.midcoast.com.au (8.9.1/8.8.5) with SMTP id JAA09539 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 09:49:30 +1100
Message-ID: <000601bf2bcd\$eac91540\$cd1c0ccb@tnewman>
From: "Trudy Newman" <tnewman@midcoast.com.au>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #636
Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1999 09:49:33 +1100
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #633
>
>Thanks Trudie for your info on cashmere.. washing it in the washer seems
>scary to me .. I'm using cashmere for warp and weft on this first project
>and
>the warp breaks often... This is Italian cashmere, but I have some samples
>of
>Scottish cashmere that seems stronger for warp

Sue,
I have used cashmere in the warp and you are right, it is a very soft yarn.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

It needed perserverance! Now however wool is the preferred warp, partly because it is stronger and partly because it cuts the cost of the product down quite a lot. (\$40/kg compared to \$350/kg).

If I was making just 1 scarf I too would wash by hand. The warps are usually about 25 yds. long with multiple scarves, so the machine is the way to go. The dried articles are then also sent out to be commercially steam pressed, purely and simply for the time factor, and because it only costs about \$1 per scarf.

> Does anyone know what pashmina is.. I've heard that it comes from the >beard of the goat but I've also heard that it comes from the belly >

This was found on the web.

" Pashmina is unmistakable for its softness. Pashmina yarn is spun from the hair of the ibex found at 14,000 ft above sea level. Pure Pashmina is expensive, but the cost is sometimes brought down by blending it with rabbit fur or wool. Pashmina shawls that Kashmir's most exquisite embroidery is worked, sometimes covering the entire surface, earning it the name of 'jamawar'. Less frequently seen weave, done only on Pashmina, covers the surface with tiny lozenge shaped squares, earning it the delightful name of 'Chashme bulbul', or eye of the bulbul. As this weave is a masterpiece of the weaver's art, it is normally not embroidered upon.
<http://www.thenettstore.com/jktourism/index.htm> "

So now we all know. I was wondering too - pashmina shawls seem to be pretty trendy with the beautiful people at present. I bet there is a fair bit of rabbit or wool in the trendy stock, the same as a lot of cashmere things are made with 2nd quality hair, but the high prices are charged just the same.

The Australian cashmere is top quality, grown in Australia and spun in New Zealand. It is a small business run by 1 family, who gather the fibre and get the processing done. The yarn is made up into knitted garments, and woven shawls and scarves. The the family takes it out to quality markets and fairs to sell. It is very time consuming, but they feel the effort is worth it.

To reply privately, send message to "Trudy Newman" <tnewman@midcoast.com.au>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 10 16:05:20 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA16058; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 16:05:20 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA16052; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 16:05:19 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-28.idsonline.com [209.8.42.28])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id SAA05200
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 18:03:52 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991110180035.006d899c@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 18:00:35 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Re: Power looms
In-Reply-To: <3829B46B.47C3@nas.com>
References: <0.a33b2c2b.255ad6d8@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>I realize it is probably forbidden to discuss power looms (automated) on
>this hand weaver's list...

On the contrary--look at the list's name: WeaveTech. And go back & read
your "Welcome to WeaveTech" letter. Discussions of such looms are
absolutely on topic for this list.

But could you define a little more what you mean by power looms, Myra?
Lots of us use CAD/CAM in the sense of working on an AVL, a Macomber, a
Jcomp, a Leclerc or other computerized loom. But do you mean "power looms"
in the sense of what you'd find in a textile mill?

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 11 06:19:00 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA18841; Thu, 11 Nov 1999
06:19:00 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA18827; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 06:18:48 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42])
by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id IAA07672
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 08:18:10 -0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1999 08:18:10 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911111318.IAA07672@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: Forbidden subject
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 11:07 AM 11/10/99 -0700, you wrote:

>I realize it is probably forbidden to discuss power looms (automated) on
>this hand weaver's list...but I would really like to talk with someone
>who works with these looms. Do any of you work with power looms?

> Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

There is no reason such a topic should be forbidden on this list because
there is too much that handloom weavers need to learn from powerloom
technology. I owned a mill full of powerlooms and have managed others
similarly from earlier shuttle looms to modern airjets and rapier. What
would you like to know that could be considered in this somewhat otherwise
limited format?

AAF

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department

WeaveTech Archive 9911

224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300
mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 11 07:10:25 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA29678; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 07:10:25 -0700 (MST)
Received: from uhura.concentric.net (uhura.concentric.net [206.173.118.93]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA29649; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 07:10:22 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cliff.concentric.net (cliff.concentric.net [206.173.118.90]) by uhura.concentric.net (8.9.1a/(98/12/15 5.12)) id JAA07003; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 09:10:25 -0500 (EST) [1-800-745-2747 The Concentric Network]
Received: from [206.83.73.100] (ts002d40.gre-sc.concentric.net [206.83.73.100]) by cliff.concentric.net (8.9.1a) id JAA09596; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 09:10:23 -0500 (EST)

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
X-Sender: aschlein@pop3.concentric.net
Message-Id: <v04011700b4507a82b08a@[206.83.73.53]>
Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1999 09:10:54 -0500
To: WeaveTech <WeaveTech@List-Server.net>
From: Alice Schlein <aschlein@concentric.net>
Subject: Damasse
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>i'm looking for info on damass=CB structure.the only reference i have is in >alice schlein's network drafting book so any leads would be greatly >appreciated.

The most complete discussion of damass=E9 (there is an acute accent over the final "e", which doesn't come through in all email programs) I have found is in Irene Emery's "The Primary Structures of Fabrics." On pages 133 - 136 Emery summarizes various definitions of damask and damasse, and suggests some differences between the two. I refer you to this excellent work.

I first became interested in damasse after seeing a damasse fabric on display at the Cooper-Hewitt Museum in New York. You're right, references are not plentiful. My understanding of the term is this:

Damasse is a cloth in which patterning is accomplished through the use of two distinct weave structures, such as satin & plain weave, whereas in damask the patterning is based on the two distinct faces of a single weave, such as the 4/1 and 1/4 faces of a 5-end satin.

Handweavers who explore damasse may weave it in blocks, or with the help of network drafting may go the curved route.

Alice Schlein

To reply privately, send message to Alice Schlein <aschlein@concentric.net>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 11 10:16:17 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA19681; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 10:16:17 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA19671; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 10:16:16 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.17(src addr [206.63.102.17]) (685 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:inet_hosts/T:smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m111xpV-0002adC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 09:16:13 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)
Message-ID: <382AF9AE.5E64@nas.com>
Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1999 10:15:26 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: Power looms
References: <0.a33b2c2b.255ad6d8@aol.com> <3.0.3.32.19991110180035.006d899c@cpug.org>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Ruth Blau wrote:

But do you mean "power looms"
> in the sense of what you'd find in a textile mill?

Yes.

Thanks,
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 11 12:56:55 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA01759; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 12:56:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp1.erols.com (smtp1.erols.com [207.172.3.234]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA01746; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 12:56:52 -0700 (MST)
Received: from erols.com (207-172-38-250.s250.tnt8.ann.va.dialup.rcn.com [207.172.38.250]) by smtp1.erols.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id OAA28630 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 14:56:55 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <382B1F53.9941A90D@erols.com>
Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1999 14:56:03 -0500
From: Catherine Chung <cacjhc@erols.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en]C-RR082798 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Cone winders or electronic ball winders
References: <v04011700b4507a82b08a@[206.83.73.53]>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I'm thinking about getting a cone winder or an electronic ball winder.
Machine knitting suppliers list a Brother jumbo ball winder (#1) and an

WeaveTech Archive 9911

electronic cone winder (\$240). I've also seen a listing for "L-type cone winder". Does anyone have any first hand knowledge of these?

Thanks,
Cathie

To reply privately, send message to Catherine Chung <cacjhc@erols.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 11 13:46:29 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA14886; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 13:46:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail1.ync.net (mail1.ync.net [206.185.20.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA14848; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 13:46:23 -0700 (MST)
Received: from SuButler (tcv90-ARC-004.177.ync.net [206.185.20.177])
by mail1.ync.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id PAA13646;
Thu, 11 Nov 1999 15:03:10 -0600 (CST)
Message-ID: <000a01bf2c86\$4d7ada80\$0400a8c0@SuButler>
From: "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>
To: "Weavetech" <weavetech@list-server.net>, "Weave List" <weaving@quilt.net>,
<rugtalk@rugweavers.com>
Subject: Questions please.....
Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1999 14:49:46 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

HI LLists...sorry if you get a duplicate of this message.....

Just wanted to announce that HANDWOVEN magazine will be running a question and answer column beginning in the near future. The column will feature questions by readers, and answers by yours truly. So I am soliciting questions, which may be emailed directly to me at apbutler@ync.net, or to the staff at HANDWOVEN at handwoven@interweave.com If you write to this address, please put Questions for Su in the Subject line of the message. Thanks!

Please include your full name and city, state, country of residence. Please include your permission to publish your questions and name and location. I will also peruse the list and pick up questions from listers.

Since some upcoming themes for the magazine are color and block weaves, how about starting out with questions about using color, blocks or any combination of the above? All questions on all weaving subjects are welcome!! Looking forward to hearing from you with questions, suggestions or any other comments you care to make.....thanks for your support!!

Su :-) apbutler@ync.net

To reply privately, send message to "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 11 14:36:40 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA29214; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 14:36:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo21.mx.aol.com (imo21.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.65]) by salmon.esosoft.net

WeaveTech Archive 9911

(8.8.5) id OAA29193; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 14:36:38 -0700 (MST)
From: Srude@aol.com
Received: from Srude@aol.com
by imo21.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id tVFMa18445 (4000)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 16:36:08 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.99e27170.255c90c8@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1999 16:36:08 EST
Subject: Silk and static
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL for Macintosh sub 54
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Thanks to all of you for many good suggestions on solving the static problem. I chose the simplest solution (thanks, Brenda!), and invested in a spray can of Static Guard. Works like a charm. Weave about 6 inches, spritz lightly. Weave some more... no more loops and tangles. The stuff washes out during wet finishing, and appears to have no effect on color or hand.

Happy weaving -- Sandra
srude@aol.com
<http://threespringshandworks.webjump.com>

To reply privately, send message to Srude@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 11 18:20:23 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA21315; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 18:20:23 -0700 (MST)
Received: from home.humboldt1.com (home.humboldt1.com [206.13.45.1]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA21309; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 18:20:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [206.13.45.229] (ppp129-pm4.humboldt1.com [206.13.45.229]) by home.humboldt1.com (Pro-8.9.2/Pro-8.9.2) with ESMTP id RAA20955 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 17:21:27 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: arachne@humboldt1.com (Unverified)
Message-Id: <l03110700b4511b9ea4db@[206.13.45.228]>
In-Reply-To: <0.99e27170.255c90c8@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1999 18:25:06 -0700
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>
Subject: loom for sale
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I am posting this for a friend who is not on the list. Please email her directly for more information.

Loom For Sale--12-Shaft LeClerc, 14 treadles, 60" wide 2 back beams, single box fly shuttle. Includes: loom bench, 4 reeds, 2 shuttles, lots of bobbins. Asking \$1750 for entire package.
Nancy Kennedy
2538 S St
Eureka, CA 95501
707 445-8204
email: highfiberdesigns@hotmail.com

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To reply privately, send message to Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 12 06:05:44 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA16447; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 06:05:44 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail1.ync.net ([206.185.20.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA16422; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 06:05:33 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host [206.185.20.11] claimed to be mail1.ync.net
Received: from SuButler (tcv90-ARC-004.173.ync.net [206.185.20.173]) by mail1.ync.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id HAA27224; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 07:21:44 -0600 (CST)
Message-ID: <00a101bf2d0e\$fd99900\$0400a8c0@SuButler>
From: "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>
To: "Weavetech" <weavetech@list-server.net>, "Weave List" <weaving@quilt.net>
Subject: Terrific show
Date: Fri, 12 Nov 1999 07:08:18 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

HI all...sorry if you receive this twice.....

For anyone in the Milwaukee, WI area, there is a terrific show called Colored Threads IX, 1999 Art to Wear Collection at the Katie Gingrass Gallery, 241 N Broadway in Milwaukee's Third Ward district....it is Great!! The gallery hours are Mon-Sat 10-5 and Sunday 11-3....worth the trip!! They have a web site as well....
<http://www.execpc.com/~katieg>

While in Milwaukee, check out the WI Fed of Handweavers annual show at the Charles Allis Museum.....

No affiliation, just very impressed with the show!!
Su :-) apbutler@ync.net

To reply privately, send message to "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 12 09:59:29 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA09102; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 09:59:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo18.mx.aol.com (imo18.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.8]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA09096; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 09:59:27 -0700 (MST)
From: Magstrands@aol.com
Received: from Magstrands@aol.com by imo18.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.16dd61b7 (3960) for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 11:58:46 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.16dd61b7.255da145@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 12 Nov 1999 11:58:45 EST
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #638
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL for Macintosh sub 54
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi all, I'd love to get into a discussion about powerlooms.. Allan you have so much knowledge on this subject, it would be wonderful to be able to tap your brain on this subject.. I have 4 of AVL's "powerlooms".. and I could use some advice, (for lack of a better word) on how the industry works out there.. I've heard so much about mills, etc., and can't afford to go check it out... but from what I've learned from basically running my equipment for the past 3 years, that I have I've come to realize how great it would be to talk to someone that has done this type of weaving on a bigger scale.. I was a traditional weaver for many years, and it took me a while to go up to an AVL with a flyshuttle, but due to orders I needed to be able to weave quicker.. Well after taking that large step and change in weaving habits and techniques I was able to watch as AVL turned on their first IDL ... my first reaction was "oh God" we're all out of business... The industrial revolution has come full circle ... within a couple months, with an order for 1200 solid black scarves I saw a use for this loom and that department now has 4 of them .. It's been an interesting adventure to say the least, but Allan please tell us what got you involved in the mills.. You say you owned and ran a mill? How many looms and what kind did you have? How many folks and what did you weave? How did you like it, and what happened to all of it? Is it still up and running? Did your looms make selvages like handlooms or were they a different type of loom all together? I hear that powerlooms in mills shoot the shuttles or weft with air with no selvages.. or something like that .. please tell us about the process ... as you can see, I'm very interested in what you have to say .. thanks for bringing this up Myra.. hope we hear from you Allan...on the list or in private, which ever or both for that matter..Sue

To reply privately, send message to Magstrands@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 12 10:23:18 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA14930; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 10:23:18 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA14902; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 10:23:10 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syr2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42])
by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id MAA04788
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 12:23:12 -0500 (EST)
Date: Fri, 12 Nov 1999 12:23:12 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911121723.MAA04788@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #638
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 11:58 AM 11/12/99 EST, you wrote:

>Hi all, I'd love to get into a discussion about powerlooms.. Allan you have
>so much knowledge on this subject, it would be wonderful to be able to tap
>your brain on this subject..

WeaveTech Archive 9911

.Sue Magstrands@aol.com

Your message would involve many, many lines of reply since the subject is so broad. If you all will bear with me, I'll formulate a response over the weekend and try to post something on Monday.

AAF

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300

mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 12 12:32:02 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA19213; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 12:32:02 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.vci.net (smtp.vci.net [207.162.160.12]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA19199; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 12:32:00 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Bonnie (ppp-166-67.vci.net [207.162.166.67] (may be forged)) by smtp.vci.net (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id NAA28247 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 13:32:03 -0600
Message-Id: <3.0.32.19991112133212.007ab8b0@mail.vci.net>
X-Sender: brdatta@mail.vci.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Fri, 12 Nov 1999 13:33:09 -0600
To: weavetech@list-server.net
From: Bonnie Datta <brdatta@vci.net>
Subject: CALL FOR PAPERS - TEXTILE SOCIETY OF AMERICA
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I'm forwarding this announcement from the tablet weaving list. I presented at this symposium in 1998 and was thoroughly impressed by the content and networking opportunities it offered.

>>

>>CALL FOR PAPERS

>>TEXTILE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

>>Seventh Biennial Symposium

>>La Fonda Hotel, Santa Fe, New Mexico

>>September 21-23, 2000

>>

>>APPROACHING TEXTILES, VARYING VIEWPOINTS

>>Deadline for proposals: December 1, 1999

>>

>>The theme of the Seventh Biennial Symposium of the Textile Society of

>>America, Approaching Textiles, Varying Viewpoints, is intended to bring out

>>presentations and discussions about the many ways in which textiles can be

>>explored and understood.

>>

>>Approaching Textiles reflects TSA's interest in textiles as fascinating

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>>objects that draw our attention and reflect their cultural, geographic, and
>>temporal settings. Varying Viewpoints emphasizes the ways in which scholars
>>and others investigate textiles through a wide range of methods and
>>theories. Viewpoints also invites exploration of differing cultural
>>perspectives. In the American Southwest, the location for the 2000
>>Symposium, American Indian, Mesoamerican, and European textile traditions
>>have influenced each other over hundreds of years even as they have
>>continued to develop distinct identities. TSA encourages presentations
>>from all parts of the globe and from textile-related disciplines including,
>>but not limited to, anthropology, archaeology, art, art history,
conservation,
>>cultural geography, design, economics, history, linguistics, theater, and
>>the physical and social sciences. Direct involvement in the program by
>>indigenous scholars and textile producers/users is especially welcomed.

>>

>>The symposium is organized to include structured sessions with
>>slide-illustrated presentations by individuals, panel discussions with
>>discussants, video presentations and demonstrations, and informal
>>gatherings of participants. The Santa Fe setting offers unique
>>opportunities to utilize local resources, including native demonstrations,
>>museum exhibitions, behind-the-scenes museum tours, and studio and gallery
>>visits.

>>

>>This Call for Papers solicits proposals for sessions, papers, panels, and
>>all other presentations. The deadline for receipt of submissions is
>>December 1, 1999.

>>

>>I. CATEGORIES OF PRESENTATION

>>Individual papers are generally slide-illustrated, with a strict time limit
>>of 20 minutes.

>>

>>Organized sessions should include 3 or 4 paper presenters, a chair and,
>>when feasible, a discussant. Times for speakers are flexible. In general,
>>total time of one and a half-hours is recommended for sessions.

>>

>>Panel discussions might involve 2 to 4 individuals and a moderator who
>>poses questions to which panelists respond (generally without prepared
>>papers).

>>

>>Times for speakers are flexible. In general, total time of one hour is
>>recommended for panels.

>>

>>Video presentations. Screening time for videos and films will be structured
>>around the proposals that are submitted and accepted.

>>

>>II. SYMPOSIUM GUIDELINES

>>All submissions should be clearly related to the symposium theme and, in
>>general, papers should be based on original scholarship, reflecting
material

>>not previously published. The Selection Committee may group individual
>>submissions in any category of presentation into sessions. A moderator
>>may be added to a group of individual papers by the Selection Committee
>>to facilitate discussion.

>>

>>Sessions usually focus on a subject related by theoretical interests,
>>geographic area, time period or other common element, but, in keeping with
>>the symposium theme, may also provide contrast among differing points of
>>view (e.g. a session devoted to a single class of textiles, but approached
>>from the perspectives of a conservator, historian, cultural geographer, and
>>designer).

>>

>>To encourage discussion and stimulate audience participation, ALL speakers
>>must send a copy of their working paper to both the chair and the

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>>discussant of the session in which they are participating by August 15,
>>2000.

>>

>>III. ABSTRACTS

>>Prospective speakers in ALL CATEGORIES must submit a 250-word abstract and
>>a short, one paragraph biography.

>>

>>Individual proposals must contain (1) a title page that includes the title
>>of the proposed paper, the speaker name, address, telephone and fax
>>numbers, and e-mail address, and a one paragraph biography, and (2) the
>>abstract itself, containing only the title of the paper and a 250-word
>>abstract.

>>The name of the speaker should NOT appear on the abstract page.

>>

>>Organized Session proposals, submitted by the prospective chair, should
>>include the session title, an abstract that addresses the relationships
>>between papers, the title and an abstract of each paper, plus the name,
>>address, and one paragraph biography of the chair, discussant, and each
>>presenter. Speakers in organized sessions must submit their abstracts to
>>the session chair who will submit them to the Selection Committee as a part
>>of the session package.

>>

>>Panel proposals, submitted by the prospective moderator, should include the
>>panel title, an abstract of the topic to be discussed, plus the name,
>>address, and one paragraph biography of the moderator and each panelist.
>>Panelists must submit their materials to the panel moderator who will
>>submit them to the Selection Committee as a part of the panel package.

>>

>>Video presentations, submitted by the videographer or member of the
>>production team, should include the video title, an abstract of the
>>contents, the time length, format, and a one paragraph biography of
>>relevant production team members and the presenter.

>>

>>IV. PROGRAM SELECTION

>>TSA follows a policy of peer review and merit consideration for acceptance
>>and inclusion on the symposium program. Initial review of the abstracts by
>>the Selection Committee members and outside readers will be done without
>>author identification. Final selections will be juried. The final program
>>will be organized to ensure the inclusion of a variety of geographic
>>regions, subject matter, and scholarly approaches, and to encourage new
>>speakers.

>>

>>V. REQUIREMENTS FOR PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

>>All program speakers must be paid TSA members for 2000 and must register
>>for the Symposium. Non-members will be invoiced upon acceptance of their
>>proposals. (TSA dues are (US dollars) 45.00 for U.S.A. and Canada,
>>(US dollars) 55.00 for all others, except students who pay (US dollars)
>>25.00 in North America and 35.00 elsewhere). If extenuating circumstances
>>exist, an explanatory letter should be sent to one of Symposium
>>Coordinators.

>>

>>VI. PUBLICATION OF CONFERENCE PAPERS

>>The deadline for submitting manuscripts for inclusion in the Conference
>>Proceedings is October 31, 2000. If a full-length manuscript is not
>>submitted by this date, the 250-word abstract may be printed instead.
>>Format guidelines for manuscripts will be available by Spring 2000.

>>

>>VII. DEADLINE AND MAILING INSTRUCTIONS

>>All submissions must be received by December 1, 1999. Faxes and e-mail
>>will not be accepted. Send five (5) copies of each page, UNFOLDED, WITHOUT
>>STAPLES, in a large mailing envelope to:

>>

>>Ann Lane Hedlund and Margot Blum Schevill

WeaveTech Archive 9911

> limited format?

>

Anything and everything you are willing to post? It is a subject that is no doubt of great interest to many of us as we become successful production weavers and need to expand production in relation to time available to meet orders.

Start with a comparison between the automated and what we more generally call the hand loom. Engineering description, capabilities of output, etc., etc. What complement of equipment is needed to support an automated loom, building and its systems to house it, special zoning permit if it is considered a light industrial activity, etc.

Thanks,
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 12 13:21:38 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA00688; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 13:21:38 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA00679; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 13:21:37 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42]) by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id PAA06008 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 12 Nov 1999 15:21:41 -0500 (EST)
Date: Fri, 12 Nov 1999 15:21:41 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911122021.PAA06008@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: CALL FOR PAPERS - TEXTILE SOCIETY OF AMERICA
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

BONNIE:

At 01:33 PM 11/12/99 -0600, you wrote:

>I'm forwarding this announcement from the tablet weaving list. I presented
>at this symposium in 1998 and was thoroughly impressed by the content and
>networking opportunities it offered.

I recall that you went up to NYC to present your work in tablet weaving. Unfortunately, my time is going to be severely limited because of some heavy writing and equipment development work I have to do in the next year. On the other hand, these kinds of opportunities are costly for the presenter and at my stage, I don't need the credential. Thanks anyway for the information.

We need to communicate again soon on your tablet fabric project.

ALLEN

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 13 11:16:44 1999

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA11380; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 11:16:44 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mtiwmhc01.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc01.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.36]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA11371; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 11:16:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from settle ([12.79.189.145]) by mtiwmhc01.worldnet.att.net (InterMail v03.02.07.07 118-134) with SMTP id <19991113181616.UUTB26289@settle> for <WeaveTech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 18:16:16 +0000
From: "Clare & Dominic J. Settle" <CD.Settle@worldnet.att.net>
To: "'WeaveTech'" <WeaveTech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Double beam tension on AVL
Date: Sat, 13 Nov 1999 13:15:28 -0500
Message-ID: <000201bf2e03\$1322f1a0\$91bd4f0c@settle>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I'm using a 16 shaft 40" small frame AVL. It has two conventional beams on it (at the moment). I have two very different warps on the two beams - one is Jagerspun Zephyr (50/50 silk/wool) and the other is 140/2 reeled silk. The weave structure is S&W - the fine silk is the tiedown warp (on 1 & 2).

As I advance the warp, the Zephyr advances readily and the silk reels off more slowly, so the silk ends up tight as a drum. Strong as it is, even this stuff will snap at this high a tension. I have to get up and release the excess tension on the silk by hand.

I have tried adjusting the tension on the two beams and even completely dropped the tension off of the beam with the silk (that was too loose, needless to say), none of which has resolved the problem.

I am using the cloth storage system, and have tried both the original sandpaper beam and the new "non-skid" wrap that AVL now offers (which works brilliantly with chenille).

Any ideas on how to solve the problem?

Thanks,
Clare

To reply privately, send message to "Clare & Dominic J. Settle" <CD.Settle@worldnet.att.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 13 16:03:05 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA20687; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 16:03:05 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mtiwmhc05.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc05.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.40]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA20675; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 16:03:01 -0700 (MST)
Received: from worldnet.att.net ([12.67.131.226]) by mtiwmhc05.worldnet.att.net (InterMail v03.02.07.07 118-134) with ESMTMP id <19991113230238.TFXQ11272@worldnet.att.net>; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 23:02:38 +0000
Message-ID: <382DEEE4.EA6744E0@worldnet.att.net>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Date: Sat, 13 Nov 1999 18:06:12 -0500
From: Grand Larseney <fiberweaver@worldnet.att.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en]C-WorldNet (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weaving@quilt.net, weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Ann Sutton Book
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I have a brand new copy (with a slight dent on the top of the back cover that you have to search to find) of Ann Sutton "The Structure of Weaving." Since I already have a copy of it, the highest bidder gets it. There will be \$3.20 in shipping in the U.S. contiguous states.
Carol in the Flatlands of MI

To reply privately, send message to Grand Larseney <fiberweaver@worldnet.att.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 13 16:05:22 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA21210; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 16:05:22 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA21206; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 16:05:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-46.idsonline.com [209.8.42.46])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id SAA21154
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 18:03:42 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991113180024.006d1c28@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Sat, 13 Nov 1999 18:00:24 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Re: Double beam tension on AVL
In-Reply-To: <000201bf2e03\$1322f1a0\$91bd4f0c@settle>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Clare wrote (about tension problems with 2 beams on an AVL):

>I am using the cloth storage system, and have tried both the original
>sandpaper beam and the new "non-skid" wrap that AVL now offers...

I can't help on the tension problem, Clare, but I think it's true that the cloth storage has nothing to do w/ the tension. The tension exists solely between the front beam (sandpaper or non-skid) and the two back beams, and tension is controlled solely by the weights (and little draw cords, if you have the same system I do).

On the larger issue of working w/ two warps on an AVL, I'm just as curious as Clare. I have two beams (plain & sectional), and I have enough trouble tensioning one of them. I've wondered how I might tension them both at the same time. So I'll be looking at the replies, too. For all of us who are still groping in the dark with our AVLS, plz keep this on the list.

Ruth

WeaveTech Archive 9911

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 13 16:25:57 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA24150; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 16:25:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from phnxpop3.phnx.uswest.net (phnxpop3.phnx.uswest.net [206.80.192.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA24143; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 16:25:56 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 9066 invoked by alias); 13 Nov 1999 23:25:32 -0000
Delivered-To: fixup-weavetech@list-server.net@fixme
Received: (qmail 8974 invoked by uid 0); 13 Nov 1999 23:25:29 -0000
Received: from dialupq129.phnx.uswest.net (HELO uswest.net) (209.181.111.129) by phnxpop3.phnx.uswest.net with SMTP; 13 Nov 1999 23:25:29 -0000
Message-ID: <382DF25E.4E698937@uswest.net>
Date: Sat, 13 Nov 1999 16:21:02 -0700
From: kip broughton <cynthb@uswest.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: Double beam tension on AVL
References: <3.0.3.32.19991113180024.006d1c28@cpcug.org>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Several years ago I was successful in weaving a pique with the 2 sectional beams on my loom, but then the second warp needed to be very tight and I was using cotton. You might check to see if the beam is binding. Another option might be to use the half weight.
Good luck.
Cynthia Broughton

> Clare wrote (about tension problems with 2 beams on an AVL):
>
> >I am using the cloth storage system, and have tried both the original
> >sandpaper beam and the new "non-skid" wrap that AVL now offers...
>
>

To reply privately, send message to kip broughton <cynthb@uswest.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 13 17:09:55 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA00500; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 17:09:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA00492; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 17:09:54 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 159 invoked by alias); 14 Nov 1999 00:10:02 -0000
Received: (qmail 147 invoked from network); 14 Nov 1999 00:10:01 -0000
Received: from ip107.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO darmul) (204.239.167.107) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 14 Nov 1999 00:10:01 -0000
Message-ID: <003901bf2e33\$9473f3a0\$6ba7efcc@darmul>
From: "Darlene Mulholland" <darmul@netbistro.com>
To: "weavetech list" <weavetech@list-server.net>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Subject: using two beams
Date: Sat, 13 Nov 1999 16:02:08 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I've got two sectional beams on my AVL and use both for many of my warps. My top beam is a yard around and the lower one is half yard. I find that no matter what I'm using on the lower beam I need very little weight on the bar to get enough tension. This might be due to the way my loom is adjusted but I generally use a knitting machine weight [usually the larger one] and it works perfectly. I'm sure even the half weight would be too much for much of my weaving. I make a loop with 1/2" sewing elastic on the black rod and hook the weight onto that. Not very high tech but it works for me.

Darlene Mulholland
darmul@netbistro.com
www.pgmoneysaver.bc.ca/weaving/

To reply privately, send message to "Darlene Mulholland" <darmul@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 13 17:55:28 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA07390; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 17:55:28 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA07384; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 17:55:26 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-46.idsonline.com [209.8.42.46])
 by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id TAA25653
 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 19:53:49 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991113195024.006be4d8@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Sat, 13 Nov 1999 19:50:24 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Re: using two beams
In-Reply-To: <003901bf2e33\$9473f3a0\$6ba7efcc@darmul>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Darlene wrote:

>My top beam is a yard around and the lower one is half yard. I find that
>no matter what I'm using on the lower beam I need very little weight on the
>bar to get enough tension.

This is fascinating to me. I find that no matter what I do, I can't get *enough* tension on either of my beams. The weaving goes OK, but I would prefer more tension. Even if I put the weight all the way out to the end (this is w/ either the plain beam or the sectional), the warp still feels soggy to me. These are both the full weights--I don't have the half weights.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 13 21:53:47 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA15902; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 21:53:47 -0700 (MST)
Received: from new.burgoyne.com (new.burgoyne.com [209.197.0.17]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA15893; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 21:53:45 -0700 (MST)
Received: from loom (pmh6.burgoyne.com [209.197.2.161])
by new.burgoyne.com (8.9.3/8.9.1) with SMTP id VAA07150
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 13 Nov 1999 21:53:56 -0700
From: "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: RE: using two beams
Date: Sat, 13 Nov 1999 21:52:09 -0700
Message-ID: <NDBBIFBOMLMBGFHHPCKLIEFBCDAA.jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
In-Reply-To: <3.0.3.32.19991113195024.006be4d8@cpcug.org>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Does the small frame AVL have the weighted tension or a rope and spring brake? I find that it is much harder to adjust the tension on the rope brake than on the weighted brake.

One hint given me by Jim Ahrens was to use whatever you wanted for a weight. You can just hang a bag on the black arm and put whatever you need to in the bag. So if you need a very small weight you can use something small like a wrench or two. This has worked great for me when weaving very narrow bookmarks. Also he felt that you could get a very tight tension if that is what you liked. I have been able to get a very high tension when I have wanted to. Ruth, you might try hanging a bag on the end of the arm with your weight and then adding more weight. If the tension does not increase, something else is the reason. Does the weight arm stay up -- parallel to the floor?

The spring brake is a different story because you can not add weight to it. I find that it is a much softer tension.

Judie

To reply privately, send message to "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 14 06:19:10 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA15976; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 06:19:10 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA15971; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 06:19:09 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-35.idsonline.com [209.8.42.35])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id IAA14343

WeaveTech Archive 9911

for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 08:17:23 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991114081401.006d21c0@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Sun, 14 Nov 1999 08:14:01 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: RE: Setting tension on an AVL
In-Reply-To: <NDBBIFBOMLMBGFHHPCKLIEFBCDAA.jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>
References: <3.0.3.32.19991113195024.006be4d8@cpcug.org>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>I have been able to get a very high tension when I have
>wanted to. Ruth, you might try hanging a bag on the end of the arm with
>your weight and then adding more weight. If the tension does not increase,
>something else is the reason. Does the weight arm stay up -- parallel to
>the floor?

My notes from when I took the class at AVL say that the weight should be about parallel to the floor, but I seem to have trouble getting it there. Even with the weight all the way out at the end of the black arm, the arm dips towards the floor. The way we were taught to set the tension was to make an initial, gross adjustment w/ the weight, then fine tune it w/ the spring & cord. It just doesn't seem to work for me.

As I said in my last whine, the weaving goes just fine, but the tension feels soggy to me. Maybe I should just ignore the fact that the tension feels soft, since the result is OK. But I'd love to hear from others with this setup (black arm w/ weight/spring & cord) about how they set the tension. This is becoming something of a problem for me: I've gotten to the point where I dread getting to the part of dressing the loom where I have to set the tension.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 14 07:20:17 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA23860; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 07:20:17 -0700 (MST)
Received: from netexpress.net (root@shamu.netexpress.net [206.65.64.2]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA23856; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 07:20:16 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host root@shamu.netexpress.net [206.65.64.2] claimed to be netexpress.net
Received: from [206.65.65.194] (flexgen-194.netexpress.net [206.65.65.194]) by netexpress.net (8.9.3/8.9.1) with ESMTP id IAA15432
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 08:20:56 -0600
Message-Id: <v03007800b4546f209adc@[206.65.65.185]>
In-Reply-To: <199911141057.DAA02613@salmon.esosoft.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Sun, 14 Nov 1999 08:16:51 -0600
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Dick Lindell <dlindell@netexpress.net>
Subject: Re: tension

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

If you set the tension to some degree and it's too much and you release the tension completely and it's too little, then you have to find the 'happy medium' in between.

I doubt that your cloth storage system has anything to do with the situation.

If the silk warp is not being gripped positively by the front beam because it is so much smaller (and slicker) than the Zephyr, this can cause your situation.

Be sure to check that the tension cord is not crossed as it goes around the drum. This can give you, virtually, a 'lock-up'.

Some unorthodox ways to reduce tension:

1. Wrap your tension cord around the drum only twice.
2. Reduce the size of the big spring.

>Date: Sat, 13 Nov 1999 13:15:28 -0500
>From: "Clare & Dominic J. Settle" <CD.Settle@worldnet.att.net>
>Subject: Double beam tension on AVL

>
>I'm using a 16 shaft 40" small frame AVL. It has two conventional beams on
>it (at the moment). I have two very different warps on the two beams - one
>is Jagger spun Zephyr (50/50 silk/wool) and the other is 140/2 reeled silk.
>The weave structure is S&W - the fine silk is the tiedown warp (on 1 & 2).

>
>As I advance the warp, the Zephyr advances readily and the silk reels off
>more slowly, so the silk ends up tight as a drum. Strong as it is, even
>this stuff will snap at this high a tension. I have to get up and release
>the excess tension on the silk by hand.

>
>I have tried adjusting the tension on the two beams and even completely
>dropped the tension off of the beam with the silk (that was too loose,
>needless to say), none of which has resolved the problem.

>
>I am using the cloth storage system, and have tried both the original
>sandpaper beam and the new "non-skid" wrap that AVL now offers (which works
>brilliantly with chenille).

>
>Any ideas on how to solve the problem?

>
>Thanks,
>Clare

Dick Lindell
mailto:dlindell@netexpressnet
Check out my new size die cut cards at <http://www.angelfire.com/il/dickshome>

- - -
The first step to wisdom is in calling things by their right name.
--- Lao Tzu

To reply privately, send message to Dick Lindell <dlindell@netexpress.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 14 07:27:40 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA25473; Sun, 14 Nov 1999
07:27:40 -0700 (MST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA25454; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 07:27:35 -0700 (MST)

Received: from authoriu (dc-hiper180.idsonline.com [205.177.251.180])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id JAA16766
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 09:25:49 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991114092624.003f003f0@cpcug.org>

X-Sender: jstoll@cpcug.org

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)

Date: Sun, 14 Nov 1999 09:26:24 -0500

To: weavetech@List-Server.net

From: Janet Stollnitz <jstoll@cpcug.org>

Subject: Small frame AVL brake

In-Reply-To: <NDBBIFBOMLMBGFHHPCKLIEFBCDAA.jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>

References: <3.0.3.32.19991113195024.006be4d8@cpcug.org>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net

Precedence: bulk

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 09:52 PM 11/13/99 -0700, you wrote:

>Does the small frame AVL have the weighted tension or a rope and spring
>brake?

The small frame AVL doobby has the rope and spring brake. It can be
finicky to adjust--it takes some perseverance and patience.

Janet

Janet Stollnitz
Silver Spring, MD

jstoll@cpcug.org

To reply privately, send message to Janet Stollnitz <jstoll@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 14 08:45:39 1999

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA07154; Sun, 14 Nov 1999
08:45:39 -0700 (MST)

Date: Sun, 14 Nov 1999 08:45:39 -0700 (MST)

Message-Id: <199911141545.IAA07154@salmon.esosoft.net>

To: weavetech@List-Server.net

From: Margaret Copeland <busys@cdsnet.net>

Subject: Re: Double beam tension on AVL

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net

Precedence: bulk

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> Date: Sat, 13 Nov 1999 13:15:28 -0500

> From: "Clare & Dominic J. Settle" <CD.Settle@worldnet.att.net>

> Subject: Double beam tension on AVL

>

> I'm using a 16 shaft 40" small frame AVL. It has two conventional beams on
> it (at the moment). I have two very different warps on the two beams - one
> is Jagerspun Zephyr (50/50 silk/wool) and the other is 140/2 reeled silk.
> The weave structure is S&W - the fine silk is the tiedown warp (on 1 & 2).

In addition to experimenting with different weights between the beams,
consider if you can
(probably can't) sacrificing four shafts to put on a basketweave selvage. In
addition to any
take up problems you have between the two warps, you may end up creating
little boa constrictors
on the selvages the more you weave. Ideally one would have independently

WeaveTech Archive 9911

tensioned selvage
bobbins as well.

You didn't say how you beamed this material - I'm assuming you have two plain beams and I hope the silk is on a beam with heads. The apron on the back beam arrangement with a steel rod to tie to - or even wood - can cause a counterweight effect as the beam turns. This can cause havoc with the tension especially since there seems to be such a disparity between the elasticity and grist of the materials on each beam. The circumference of the plain beams on my AVL is pretty small (9.5") and this causes the warp tension to be distributed over a smaller area on the beam. It is less even and requires more attention in the beaming process - no soft beams ! If you had a choice, I'd put the silk on a sectional beam, which can be used as a plain beam, to take advantage of the additional circumference.

As far as tension goes - less is better - just enough to get the shed and no more. The secret here is in having an evenly warped beam. This is difficult - you have to practice it - but the AVL works so much better than when you have to crank up the tension to accommodate your sloppy beaming. You can weave faster, the shafts don't levitate etc.

- Margaret Copeland
<http://home.cdsnet.net/~busys>

To reply privately, send message to Margaret Copeland <busys@cdsnet.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 14 10:15:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA22295; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 10:15:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from new.burgoyne.com (new.burgoyne.com [209.197.0.17]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA22291; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 10:15:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: from loom (pmb35.burgoyne.com [209.197.2.88])
by new.burgoyne.com (8.9.3/8.9.1) with SMTP id KAA09794
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 10:15:17 -0700
From: "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: RE: Setting tension on an AVL
Date: Sun, 14 Nov 1999 10:13:30 -0700
Message-ID: <NDBBIFBOMLMBGFHHPCKLKEFCCDAA.jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
In-Reply-To: <3.0.3.32.19991114081401.006d21c0@cpcug.org>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I think you need to get the arm up so it is parallel to the floor. If the arm dips towards the floor, the cord is too long for where the weight is. Putting the weight at the end of the arm adds the most weight. I found that having the weight up to the horizontal makes a big difference in the way my loom functions when I beat. If the tension is too high when the arm is parallel, I just move the weight back on the arm until the tension is right. My last warp was about 20 inches wide and cotton and the weight is about half way down the arm, and I had good tension. So now, I adjust the

WeaveTech Archive 9911

position of the weight and haven't changed the cord length in a while.

Judie

To reply privately, send message to "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 14 13:12:26 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA20379; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 13:12:26 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mtiwmhc02.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc02.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.37]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA20372; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 13:12:25 -0700 (MST)
Received: from settle ([12.79.189.166]) by mtiwmhc02.worldnet.att.net (InterMail v03.02.07.07 118-134) with SMTP id <19991114201201.LBWS11011@settle> for <WeaveTech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 20:12:01 +0000
From: "Clare & Dominic J. Settle" <CD.Settle@worldnet.att.net>
To: "'WeaveTech'" <WeaveTech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Re: Double beam tension on AVL
Date: Sun, 14 Nov 1999 15:11:12 -0500
Message-ID: <000401bf2edc\$68468c80\$a6bd4f0c@settle>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Thanks for all of your ideas so far. Judie Eatough asked which kind of brake system the small frame uses.

The small frame uses a spring tension, not weights. I've found that I can get *extreme* tension, but it's hard to get it adjusted to much of anything else.

I wonder if a weight system could be retrofitted to it? Or if anyone else has found an easy way to adjust the spring system?

Clare

To reply privately, send message to "Clare & Dominic J. Settle" <CD.Settle@worldnet.att.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 14 13:52:53 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA26144; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 13:52:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mc-qout4.whowhere.com (mc-qout4.whowhere.com [209.185.123.18]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA26140; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 13:52:52 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Unknown/Local ([?.?.?.?]) by angelfire.com; Sun Nov 14 12:52:17 1999
To: WeaveTech@list-server.net
Date: Sun, 14 Nov 1999 14:52:17 -0600
From: "Sara Nordling" <snordling@angelfire.com>
Message-ID: <FCJJDALOAFBLBAAA@angelfire.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
X-Sent-Mail: off

WeaveTech Archive 9911

X-Mailer: MailCity Service
Subject: re: not enough tension on AVL
X-Sender-IP: 129.62.170.128
Organization: Angelfire (<http://email.angelfire.com:80>)
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Ruth,

I had this problem for a while myself. One thing that helps is to wash the cables to get rid of dust and greases. Another is to use a fine grade sandpaper and run it on the path the cable runs on. Another is to purchase a new spring, but since your loom is relatively new, I wouldn't think you'd need to do that. These were tips AVL told me when I was having the same problem.

Sara
snorlding@angelfire.com

Angelfire for your free web-based e-mail. <http://www.angelfire.com>

To reply privately, send message to "Sara Nordling" <snorlding@angelfire.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 14 14:50:09 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA05259; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 14:50:09 -0700 (MST)
Date: Sun, 14 Nov 1999 14:50:09 -0700 (MST)
Message-Id: <199911142150.OAA05259@salmon.esosoft.net>
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net
From: tnewman@midcoast.com.au (Trudy Newman)
Subj: loom query
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I've heard of a lady that wants to weave 5 colour tartans as a commercial enterprise/cottage industry. She has an 8-shaft loom which she hopes to have converted to a "power loom" (her words). She would also like a 5-colour fly shuttle - does anyone know if there is any such animal in the hand weaving area? She can probably get her loom converted OK here, but the 5 colour sequence is causing a few problems. Can anyone help with information?

Trudy

Trudy Newman
27 Allunga Ave PORT MACQUARIE NSW 2444
AUSTRALIA. Ph/fax:(02) 6582 2722
tnewman@midcoast.com.au

To reply privately, send message to tnewman@midcoast.com.au (Trudy Newman)

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 14 15:47:11 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA16938; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 15:47:11 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo20.mx.aol.com (imo20.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.10]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA16934; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 15:47:10 -0700 (MST)
From: LDMADDEN@aol.com
Received: from LDMADDEN@aol.com
by imo20.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.f91cefda (3933)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 17:46:37 -0500 (EST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Message-ID: <0.f91cefda.256095cc@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 14 Nov 1999 17:46:36 EST
Subject: Re: not enough tension AVL
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 38
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I have had good luck doing pique on my 40" AVL with the cord and spring type tensioners by getting a second braking apparatus which has a metal cable, a break release and another spring gizmo. This break must be released using a foot pedal and there is no gradual slipping forward that you have with the original break system.

I also have used those Velcro attaching ankle weights around my 18" beams to add some drag (one set on each side of the warp, wrapped around the beam). if you weave enough, you get to know a physical therapist who will introduce you to ankle weights. I later had to admit that one of my springs had sprung and replaced it.

Linda Madden

To reply privately, send message to LDMADDEN@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 14 18:18:38 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA15872; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 18:18:38 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA15859; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 18:18:36 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-11.idsonline.com [209.8.42.11])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id UAA20784
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 20:16:55 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991114201335.006c96b4@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Sun, 14 Nov 1999 20:13:35 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: re: not enough tension on AVL
In-Reply-To: <FCJJDAL0AFBLBAAA@angelfire.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>Another is to use a fine grade sandpaper and run it on the path the cable runs on.

Thanks, Sara. I had forgotten about this one. When I went to AVL school, fine grade sandpaper was recommended to cure a lot of ills. When I finish the current warp, I'll try roughing up the cable path.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 14 19:35:26 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA01852; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 19:35:26 -0700 (MST)
Received: from spamgaad.compuserve.com (as-img-4.compuserve.com [149.174.217.147]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA01832; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 19:35:19 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host as-img-4.compuserve.com [149.174.217.147] claimed to be spamgaad.compuserve.com
Received: (from mailgate@localhost) by spamgaad.compuserve.com (8.9.3/8.9.3/SUN-1.7) id VAA18780 for weavetech@List-Server.net; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 21:34:59 -0500 (EST)
Date: Sun, 14 Nov 1999 21:34:36 -0500
From: Georgean Curran <Georgean@compuserve.com>
Subject: AVL tension
To: weavetech <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Message-ID: <199911142135_MC2-8D1A-C1DF@compuserve.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Disposition: inline
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I had a funny thing happen to me on my last warp. I wove the whole warp off, with beautiful selvages and correct ppi and when I went to cut it off I hang the weight arm on a loop of string so it won't crash when I cut it off and found I had woven the whole thing with the weight arm held in the string. Oh well, it came out perfect. I don't know why, but I'm not going to argue with it.
Georgean Curran
In western WA where the fall colors are still doing their thing better than they usually do.

To reply privately, send message to Georgean Curran <Georgean@compuserve.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 14 20:34:27 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA13354; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 20:34:27 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA13335; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 20:34:25 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 8488 invoked by alias); 15 Nov 1999 03:34:35 -0000
Received: (qmail 8477 invoked from network); 15 Nov 1999 03:34:34 -0000
Received: from ip149.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO darmul) (204.239.167.149) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 15 Nov 1999 03:34:34 -0000
From: "Darlene Mulholland" <darmul@netbistro.com>
To: "Weavetech List" <weavetech@list-server.net>
Subject: AVL tension
Date: Sun, 14 Nov 1999 19:27:23 -0800
Message-ID: <LPBBJODDNFILGACK000NCEBGCAAA.darmul@netbistro.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

WeaveTech Archive 9911

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi Georgan and everyone,

I often leave the weight supported by a string when weaving a narrow width on my AVL. Works just fine for scarves etc. I don't think I've left it for full width warps. Maybe it is the vintage of my loom but I find the warp tensioning one of the great features.

Darlene Mulholland

To reply privately, send message to "Darlene Mulholland" <darmul@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 14 22:30:29 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id WAA05317; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 22:30:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo-d05.mx.aol.com (imo-d05.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.37]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id WAA05308; Sun, 14 Nov 1999 22:30:27 -0700 (MST)
From: Grimi@aol.com
Received: from Grimi@aol.com
by imo-d05.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.73e3eca2 (4320)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 15 Nov 1999 00:27:33 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.73e3eca2.2560f3c4@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1999 00:27:32 EST
Subject: Re: Setting tension on an AVL
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0.1 for Mac sub 82
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

On the AVL full frame looms with tension arm and weight you should adjust the height of the tension arm first by adjusting the length of the small cord. Once you have the arm about parallel to the floor you can then move the weight in or out for less or more tension. The arm should be riding about horizontal or maybe slightly down. Shouldn't be above horizontal. If you need more tension add more weight to the arm. You can also purchase a second tension arm and weight for the other end of the beam if you really want it tight, but do consider that the AVL's weave under a lighter tension than most other looms.
Tom Greminger
grimi@aol.com

To reply privately, send message to Grimi@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 15 10:08:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA12150; Mon, 15 Nov 1999 10:08:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo-d09.mx.aol.com (imo-d09.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.41]) by

WeaveTech Archive 9911

salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA12111; Mon, 15 Nov 1999 10:08:09 -0700 (MST)
From: JMadelady@aol.com
Received: from JMadelady@aol.com
by imo-d09.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.65390a08 (4386)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 15 Nov 1999 12:07:35 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.65390a08.256197d7@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1999 12:07:35 EST
Subject: Re: Questions for Sue
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 38
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

In a message dated 11/12/99 3:00:01 AM Pacific Standard Time,
owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net writes:

<>

To reply privately, send message to JMadelady@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 15 10:08:43 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA12335; Mon, 15 Nov 1999
10:08:43 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA24283; Mon, 15 Nov 1999 09:07:00 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42])
by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id LAA11054
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 15 Nov 1999 11:07:02 -0500 (EST)
Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1999 11:07:02 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911151607.LAA11054@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@list-server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: POWERLOOMS (long)
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

TO ALL:

At 11:58 AM 11/12/99 EST, you wrote:

>Hi all, I'd love to get into a discussion about powerlooms.. Allan you have
>so much knowledge on this subject, it would be wonderful to be able to tap
>your brain on this subject.

>Sue <Magstrands@aol.com>

At 12:24 PM 11/12/99 -0700, you wrote:

>Start with a comparison between the automated and what we more generally
>call the hand loom. Engineering description, capabilities of output,
>etc., etc. What complement of equipment is needed to support an
>automated loom, building and its systems to house it, special zoning
>permit if it is considered a light industrial activity, etc.

>>To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

I spent part of the weekend pondering over the above two messages and trying, as I said I would, to formulate some kind of response that could work in this limited format.

The pondering ended with the conclusion that the questions, though simple at the surface, would require massive amounts of writing to answer the only way they deserve to be answered, completely. Fortunately this information has long existed in the textile literature and my first thought is to strongly recommend, as I have done in the past, that anyone with more than a passing interest in the subject search out the textile literature and do some reading. Most of the literature in the form of books is out of print but easily accessible through interlibrary loan. HWT contains an extensive bibliography which could be a place to start. Once those interested in this subject have acquainted themselves with the basics, then a more manageable discussion could be pursued. This list format does not, in my mind lend itself to a properly thorough discussion of all that people appear to want to know without everyone participating having some basic knowledge at the outset. Less than a thorough discussion would result in what often happens, the propagation and perpetuation of misinformation.

Midway into my pondering I digressed, as often happens, into the basis for this interest in powerloom operation. This is not the first time that I have been involved in the issue and will certainly not be the last. Technical matters aside, which should be dealt with as I suggested above, there are some philosophical and ideological ones for which I think this list format would be highly appropriate and which in fact should really be addressed before getting too far into the nuts and bolts of the stuff.

In order for handloom weavers to fully understand the whole world of the powerloom, a radical change in mindset must first occur. That is, we must learn to think in a truly open-minded, machine vernacular without prejudice or value judgment. There are certain fundamental realisations which need to be part of that mind-set. A powerloom is a machine, period. Seems obvious in a literal sense, but follow along a bit further. A powerloom is not something magic with a life of its own. It's a big, noisy, potentially dangerous, expensive, finicky, ugly, fast and stupid machine. On its own, it can do nothing. It only functions when under the control of some operator. That being said, learning this machine is not something that can be done in the way that many handloom weavers try to learn, by "...figuring it out..." on one's own any more than one can learn any profession or trade by "...figuring it out..." on one's own. There is the dangerously simplistic tendency to think that the transition to this level of technology can be done without the help of someone or ones with experience. A well meaning, but otherwise unknowledgeable and inexperienced male does not qualify.

The concentration on the powerloom itself can also mislead one into failing to realise that what we are actually talking about is an entire SYSTEM of making cloth that includes far more than just the loom. A powerloom without the means of making proper warps, perhaps winding filling etc., is useless. Once we encounter this system, then the really tough question of "why" becomes even more critical.

Then there is the ego factor, perhaps the most dangerous of all. In my experience it has always been the case that when a handloom weaver get a powerloom, as a few have done, they are immediately put on a pedestal by the their handloom colleagues who typically have no more intimate knowledge of the machine than the one whom they pedestalise. This can then lead to a degree of hubris which prevents the powerloomer from realising how much they really don't know because of the humility factor.

The ideology which is so often heard in handloom circles that "...there is no one right way..." to do this, that or the other, to which I do not

WeaveTech Archive 9911

subscribe, is even less true when it comes to machinery of this ilk. My experience clearly demonstrates that every place a given powerloom is operating with a certain kind of fabric, it better be timed exactly one way or it won't make the fabric, period.

So, finally, it may be more useful before getting into the technology, which is undoubtedly of great fascination, to examine some of these questions.

AAF

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300

<mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 15 15:07:59 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA05471; Mon, 15 Nov 1999 15:07:59 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA05460; Mon, 15 Nov 1999 15:07:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 29104 invoked by alias); 15 Nov 1999 22:07:59 -0000
Received: (qmail 29093 invoked from network); 15 Nov 1999 22:07:58 -0000
Received: from ip132.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.132) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 15 Nov 1999 22:07:58 -0000
Message-ID: <3830753D.1721FF93@netbistro.com>
Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1999 13:03:57 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: setting tension on the AVL
References: <199911142053.NAA26170@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Like Darlene, I find that my small second beam requires very little in the way of weight.

Generally I use the weight arm with the weight as far to the "front" of the loom as it goes. The tension may feel "soggy" if you are used to the ratchet and tooth system and using a very high tension on your warps. Remember that you only need as much tension as is

WeaveTech Archive 9911

required to get a weavable shed! :) If your results are good to okay, then it is probably just that you need to get used to the new system.....

As for the two beams not releasing at the same rate, you might need to find an alternate weight - like Darlene's machine knitting weights. I think I hung a handy tool off my small beam the last time! Whatever works!

Laura Fry
finally home from Portland after a much too "interesting" trip.....

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 15 19:22:32 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA06617; Mon, 15 Nov 1999 19:22:32 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA06606; Mon, 15 Nov 1999 19:22:30 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 198.182.208.201(src addr [198.182.208.190]) (1954 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11nYGU-0002baC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 15 Nov 1999 18:22:38 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <38309588.2671@nas.com>
Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1999 16:21:45 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: POWERLOOMS (long)
References: <199911151607.LAA11054@mailbox.syr.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Allen Fannin wrote:

> there are some philosophical and ideological ones for which I think this
> list format would be highly appropriate and which in fact should really be
> addressed before getting too far into the nuts and bolts of the stuff.
>
> In order for handloom weavers to fully understand the whole world of the
> powerloom, a radical change in mindset must first occur. That is, we must
> learn to think in a truly open-minded, machine vernacular without prejudice
> or value judgment.

Is this thought based on the assumption that all on the list are handloom weavers...or that we are not open minded and/or free of prejudice?

Allen, if these are your assumption, then try setting it aside ... so that your way is clear to get to the grist of the matter. I think you will be surprised at the progressive philosophy of your audience, its participation in the subject... and the enjoyment of the discussion that will result.

What we all have in common is the cloth that wraps us... rather than a specific type of tool. IMHO it is time for this technically oriented list to explore this type (power-industrial loom) of tool and its

WeaveTech Archive 9911

complement of equipment and space needs, especially after rather constant discussion of the handloom.

Perhaps there are weavers employed by the textile industry, in the mills and elsewhere, who can contribute to the discussion as well?

Best of the Season,
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 15 21:17:27 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA05450; Mon, 15 Nov 1999 21:17:27 -0700 (MST)
Received: from snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.62]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA05433; Mon, 15 Nov 1999 21:17:26 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 63.14.66.157 (1Cust157.tnt1.asheville2.nc.da.uu.net [63.14.66.157]) by snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id UAA05004 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 15 Nov 1999 20:17:35 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <3830DB0B.192E@earthlink.net>
Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1999 23:18:19 -0500
From: Betty Carlson <bettycarlson@earthlink.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; I; 68K)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #643
References: <199911151057.DAA19265@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

A friend is liquidating her weaving studio and wishes to sell an AVL.

The price is \$3,500. It is a 16 harness Compu-Dobby with a 40" width. According to the seller, it is in perfect condition with many extras including loom beam and separation roller, yardage counter, 1/2 yard sectional warping system, and dobbie peg system. The loom folds. The seller's husband drives up to western North Carolina at least once a month so there is a delivery option using his truck. Otherwise buyer pays the shipping

The seller's name is Judy Warrington in Beaufort, SC. Her e-mail address is <mrssockmonkey@islc.net>. The name on the e-mail account is Joel Newman.

Thank you..Betty Carlson
†

To reply privately, send message to Betty Carlson <bettycarlson@earthlink.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 06:01:00 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA27313; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 06:01:00 -0700 (MST)
Received: from europe.std.com (europe.std.com [199.172.62.20]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA27304; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 06:00:58 -0700 (MST)
Received: from world.std.com (root@world-f.std.com [199.172.62.5]) by europe.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id IAA14586 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 08:01:00 -0500 (EST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

From: susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>
X-Sender: "susan ernst" <vegalyra@access.mountain.net> (Unverified)
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en]C-gatewaynet (Win98; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: POWERLOOMS
References: <199911160417.VAA05470@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>
> Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1999 11:07:02 -0500 (EST)
> From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
> Subject: POWERLOOMS (long)
>

> In order for handloom weavers to fully understand the whole world of >the powerloom, a radical change in mindset must first occur.

the first error in mindset that i made when it came to handloom weaving was that i refereed to it as an art. in my opinion this mistake cost me a lot. i should have, and do now, think of handloom weaving as a craft. it is something to be studied in the same format as other crafts. i use the word craft defined as "an occupation or trade requiring manual dexterity" -the carpenter, a carpenter must have a thorough working knowledge of her/his tools. the writing of plays-. a play write must understand sentence construction etc. i think the artistic skill in the craft of handloom weaving comes into play during the design phase and the mistake i made was approaching this phase of handloom weaving in conjunction with the "basics of operation". it was too much for me to learn at one time.

i have started my handloom weaving career over. my attention is place on learning the mechanics of the loom, the structure of fabric, the movements of the weaver, the most efficient studio set-up. for the next while i am not designing my own work, i am systematically weaving projects written by other handloom weavers that will teach me the craft. for me, this has been the right decision. i am weaving a better quality product and i feel much more confident at the loom.

still learning,
susan

To reply privately, send message to susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 09:28:18 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA18014; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 09:28:18 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA18004; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 09:28:16 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 20436 invoked by alias); 16 Nov 1999 16:28:20 -0000
Received: (qmail 20429 invoked from network); 16 Nov 1999 16:28:20 -0000
Received: from ip168.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.168) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 16 Nov 1999 16:28:20 -0000
Message-ID: <3831827B.730A44A9@netbistro.com>
Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 08:12:43 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: mindset changes
References: <199911160417.VAA05470@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I started weaving with the assumption that "hand" weaving was in some way "superior" to "power" weaving. The wedge in changing that attitude was reading the book Run of the Mill by (author not remembered - Donald Something? Tom Beaudet will remember I think!)

It is a history of the textile industry in New England, leading up to and through the Industrial Revolution to the mills eventual dying out in the first part of this century.

The satori moment was reading the caption under a photo of a loom tender who said words to the effect that his aim was to produce "perfect" cloth. Those words rang in my mind with a bell-like resonance! How different was that from what *I* was trying to do??? None whatsoever. We were just using different tools.

I completely agree with Allen that when using the incredibly specialized equipment that has been developed for industry that there very likely is only one way to use it. The difference in attitude comes when I look at the less specialized equipment that most "hand" weavers use. This equipment has larger tolerances for the application of the technology. If we can all remember our own personal application of textile technology, and allow latitude for that perspective, I think a discussion of the differences AND similarities would prove enlightening. When beaming at 400 yards per minute, obviously tolerance to tension changes etc. is going to be much finer than when beaming at 40 yards per minute.

Then there is the further complication that application of "power" technology may not be possible, or may be extremely difficult for an individual to obtain due to space or budget constraints. I would be very interested in "power" equipment, in fact already own some, thanks to Allen, but find that my studio is too small, my income ditto, to acquire more. Weaving, like Life, is a constant series of compromises..... :(

On the other hand, this attitude may very well stem from my inherent ignorance about industrial equipment that Allen refers to!

As someone highly concerned with efficiency, I would love to be further enlightened as to how industry handles the construction of textiles.

Laura Fry

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 10:26:01 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA05413; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 10:26:01 -0700 (MST)
Received: from ntmsg5.standard.com (exchange3.standard.com [198.107.111.39]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA05405; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 10:25:54 -0700 (MST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host exchange3.standard.com
[198.107.111.39] claimed to be nmsg5.standard.com
Received: by nmsg5 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
id <VK3WV4FL>; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 09:25:23 -0800
Message-ID: <6F916C7B1D3BD21194FE00805FA7E47A07109EB3@exchange1bg3>
From: Carrie Brezine <cbrezine@standard.com>
To: "Weavetech (E-mail)" <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: cloth systems
Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 09:25:19 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Allen wrote:

>The concentration on the powerloom itself can also mislead one into failing to realise that what we are actually talking about is an entire SYSTEM of making cloth that includes far more than just the loom.

I would be interested in a discussion about any systems of making cloth, not only those which include power looms. As handweavers on floor looms, in countries with relatively advanced technology, what sort of system do we partake in? What sort of cloth-making systems do other peoples of the world have, in places where floor looms as we know them are not common? Are these systems different? If so, do different systems produce any fundamental differences in the cloth? Or does the cloth have a different place in culture, depending on what system produced it?

Carrie

To reply privately, send message to Carrie Brezine <cbrezine@standard.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 10:26:31 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA05579; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 10:26:31 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA05565; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 10:26:26 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42])
by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id MAA26371
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 12:26:31 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 12:26:31 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911161726.MAA26371@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: Power Looms - weavetech-digest V1 #644
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

WeaveTech Archive 9911

At 07:59 AM 11/16/99 -0500, you wrote:

> However,
>that does not mean that there is only one correct way of doing anything

>Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>

>The difference in
>attitude comes when I look at the less specialized equipment that
>most "hand" weavers use. This equipment has larger tolerances for
>the application of the technology.

Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

I would have to disagree with Tom. There is one way, within very limited parameters to set the lug strap on an old C&K S-6 loom and if one goes outside those narrow limits, the loom will not pick properly. Likewise setting the grippers on a Dornier rapier to give and take filling yarn must be done with equal attention to close tolerances, ones personal preferences notwithstanding.

Attitude that there is no one right way to do something seems to be endemic to handloom weaving for reasons which I suspect are more psycho-political than technical. In the rest of the textile trade this attitude does not exist and would be ridiculed with great laughter if it were expounded. I have associated with mill personnel at all levels in all kinds of places and there is far more general agreement about how most things should be done than disagreement. I have talked with loom fixers, for example who may, for very clear technical reasons push the boundaries of loom adjustment, but their reasons are always based on sound technical considerations and not on the kind of personal need to do ones own things which seems to permeate handloom weaving.

Until we can accept that when dealing with "real" machinery as opposed to what is commonly used in handloom weaving, there is not the slack which Laura so astutely points out and when a service manual says that an adjustment needs to be a certain dimension, only a fool would do otherwise as many a loom fixer has told me. Try putting a warp on a powerloom in the sloppy way that most handlooms can tolerate and disaster is guaranteed.

None of the above is presented as opinion, but rather experience, not only of one person, this writer, but of the collective experience of the many mill people with whom I have associated over the years.

If this discussion is to have any real meaning, everyone will need to experience his/her own "...satori..." moment as Laura has done to clear ones mind of things which prevent open understanding.

AAF

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300

<mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 10:43:43 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA10517; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 10:43:43 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA10501; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 10:43:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42]) by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id MAA06567 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 12:43:45 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 12:43:45 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911161743.MAA06567@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: POWERLOOMS (long)
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 04:21 PM 11/15/99 -0700, you wrote:

>Is this thought based on the assumption that all on the list are
>handloom weavers....or that we are not open minded and/or free of
>prejudice?

Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

Not at all. I don't base anything on assumptions nor do I believe that all on the list are handloom weavers but most are and of those, most have a certain mind-set, towards which I make no value judgement nor hold any prejudice, which will act as a barrier to understanding the level of technology on which powerlooms are based. Laura said it best,

>I started weaving with the assumption that "hand" weaving was in some
>way "superior" to "power" weaving.

Likewise there is the idea that there is no one right way which will get in the way of understanding.

AAF

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300

mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 13:08:18 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA20570; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 13:08:18 -0700 (MST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: from europe.std.com (europe.std.com [199.172.62.20]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA20549; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 13:08:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from world.std.com (root@world-f.std.com [199.172.62.5])
by europe.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id PAA00803
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 15:08:21 -0500 (EST)
Received: from world.std.com (ppp0c123.std.com [208.192.102.123])
by world.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id PAA17937
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 15:05:26 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3831B917.65966D9@world.std.com>
Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 15:05:43 -0500
From: Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #645 High tech tolerances
References: <199911161726.KAA05594@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Allen,

I am sorry to say you missed my point. I have spent most of my life successfully designing and using high tech laboratory equipment. You are quite correct that specific adjustments must be made within tightly controlled tolerances if the machine is to work properly. This is true even for most hand looms. That does not mean, however, that there is not significant latitude in how the problem of loom (or instrument) adjustment is addressed, just as in how the optical alignment of a spectrometer is addressed. The end result must be a properly adjusted machine, often to very tight tolerances. But, by examining the end result of proper adjustment it is usually impossible to tell what steps the adjuster went through to achieve that result. Achieving the correct result does not require that all the adjusters approach the problem with the same mindset or proceed through identically the same sequence of steps. In fact, loud and extensive disagreements exist on how to teach someone to adjust a spectrometer, just as in weaving.

In my view, it is important to teach what needs to be adjusted to what tolerances for what reasons, tell the student what one method for achieving that tolerance is, and then let the student find their own comfort level of achieving the desired result. That is how I have always taught my students and I continue to be amazed at the clever new ideas they have come up with, some of which I have incorporated into my own thinking. I have found that it is rare indeed for there to be only one path to a desired end; in fact, in my experience, the more complicated what is needed is, the more different ways there are to achieve that end.

Cheers,

T.

--

Tom Vogl
29 Scotchman's Lane
West Tisbury, MA 02575
"Intuition is the result of 20 years experience" K. C. Long

Voice: 508-693.6065
Fax: 508-696.0625
tpv@world.std.com

To reply privately, send message to Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 15:53:32 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA07948; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 15:53:32 -0700 (MST)
Received: from edtnps05.telusplanet.net (edtnps05.telusplanet.net [198.161.157.105]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA07940; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 15:53:31 -0700 (MST)
Received: from edtnnt3-port-126.agt.net ([161.184.198.126]:1045 "HELO pmarriot") by smtp2.telusplanet.net with SMTP id <S40457AbPKPW4X>; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 15:56:23 -0700
Message-ID: <003301bf3085\$996cef20\$7ec6b8a1@pmarriot>
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>
To: "weave tech" <weavetech@list-server.net>
Subject: speaking of warping
Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 15:54:54 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2014.211
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2014.211
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I have been tying on to a dummy warp, successive three scarf rayon chenille warps. Should have 5 sets done (warped and woven) by Friday. Warping is an chore I am always open to ways to improve, speed up, simplify. Yes money and available equipment does put some constraints on my technique, but that technique is always changing as well, never the same as I do not feel I am quite there yet. I was tying on the front apron the other day and wondered why we do it (the tying on the front apron I mean) the way we do. It does seem to be one of the weak links in the Handweavers warping process. I spend a lot of time trying to make sure my warp is wound on the reel at an even tension, ditto for winding on to the back beam, which ever method is used, but then here I am tying on to the front apron, closing my eyes and running my hand over the tied bundles to try and make them the same tension. This can not be the best and most efficient way. I have tried lashing and had tension problems, took off the lashing and tied again and wa la no more tension problems.

So how do you all tie on the front. Non AVL owners that is who I understand in my limited knowledge of this loom depend on sandpaper to grab and hold the threads?????
Pamela

Pamela Marriott
Dancing Sheep Studio
Weaving & Graphics
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

To reply privately, send message to "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 16:09:42 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA11751; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 16:09:42 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA11729; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 16:09:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-18.idsonline.com [209.8.42.18]) by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id SAA23558

WeaveTech Archive 9911

for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 18:09:37 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991116180424.006dfbf8@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 18:04:24 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Re: speaking of warping
In-Reply-To: <003301bf3085\$996cef20\$7ec6b8a1@pmarriot>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> So how do you all tie on the front. Non AVL owners that is who I
>understand in my limited knowledge of this loom depend on sandpaper to grab
>and hold the threads?????

I very much tie onto the apron on my AVL. The tension on the AVL exists between the warp beam & the sandpaper beam, but you still have to tie onto the apron if you use the cloth storage system, as you need something to pull the cloth to the back & onto the cloth storage beam. I think some people may just lay the ends over the sandpaper, test & adjust for tension, weave a bit, then tie on to the apron after they've got a bit woven, but I haven't tried that (I'm a very new AVL'er).

I use the Nyquist tie-on. Janet Stollnitz showed me this several years ago, and it was love at first try. I find it quick & easy to use, and especially easy to adjust. Lashing did not work for me either, and took much more time than the Nyquist tie on, though in both methods, bouts of ends are tensioned and tied off w/ an overhand knot. In the case of the Nyquist tieon, I can then just slip this knot over the cords, which live on the apron bar. In the case of lashing, you have to start over w/ each warp.

I never liked the method where you bring a bout over the apron, split it, bring it under & back up over & tie it w/ a square knot. I found it hard to tension and very wasteful of warp.

A guild in upstate NY (Janet Nyquist's home guild, I believe) was selling a little pamphlet describing this method a couple of years ago. Perhaps someone can post that info.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 16:39:08 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA18639; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 16:39:08 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@[198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA18628; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 16:39:04 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host root@[198.182.207.3] claimed to be cleese.nas.com
Received: from 206.63.102.20(src addr [206.63.102.20]) (1255 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11nsBG-0002bpC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 15:38:34 -0800 (PST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

(Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <3831CEE1.7171@nas.com>
Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 14:38:43 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: POWERLOOMS (long)
References: <199911161743.MAA06567@mailbox.syr.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Allen Fannin wrote:

>
> At 04:21 PM 11/15/99 -0700, you wrote:
>
> >Is this thought based on the assumption that all on the list are
> >handloom weavers....or that we are not open minded and/or free of
> >prejudice?
>
> Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
which will act as a barrier to understanding the level of
> technology on which powerlooms are based.

I know you have lots of experience with your students' attitudes, so I do not pretend to deny your perception of this list...but lets give it a try, Allen. I happen to believe "change is constant" and that we evolve...sometimes by means of revolution. Consider the list, at this moment in time, on the edge of revolutionary change of attitude. Give it a try.

Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 16:40:28 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA18748; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 16:40:28 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA18711; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 16:39:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.20(src addr [206.63.102.20]) (1300 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11nsBZ-0002bSC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 15:38:53 -0800 (PST)
(Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <3831DAEE.7563@nas.com>
Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 15:30:09 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #645 High tech tolerances
References: <199911161726.KAA05594@salmon.esosoft.net> <3831B917.65966D9@world.std.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Tom Vogl wrote:

>

> You

> are quite correct that specific adjustments must be made within tightly
> controlled tolerances if the machine is to work properly. This is true
> even for most hand looms.

This beginning of a comparison is great. Could we have more from each
and all of you, Please? Disagreements can be wonderful springboards to
understanding, eh?

As regards who does the adjustments:

If I find I must use an automated loom in order to be a weaver...because
I have a disability and I need the loom to "do it for me"...should I
also budget into the picture the services of a technician to keep it in
working order, as a taxi driver would utilize the services of a
mechanic, etc.?

Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 17:41:39 1999

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA01196; Tue, 16 Nov 1999
17:41:39 -0700 (MST)

Received: from ps.zeuter.com (ps.zeuter.com [207.164.7.9]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5)
id RAA01164; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 17:41:34 -0700 (MST)

Received: from default (ppp23.zeuter.com [207.164.7.32])

by ps.zeuter.com (8.9.1b+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTP id TAA12754

for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 19:37:11 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <199911170037.TAA12754@ps.zeuter.com>

From: "Sue Brunton" <brunton@zeuter.com>

To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>

Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #645 High tech tolerances

Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 19:42:35 -0500

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Priority: 3

X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1162

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net

Precedence: bulk

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

:

If I find I must use an automated loom in order to be a weaver...because
I have a disability and I need the loom to "do it for me"...should I
also budget into the picture the services of a technician to keep it in
working order, as a taxi driver would utilize the services of a
mechanic, etc.?

Hello all

I can speak to this issue from experience. I am disabled, a car accident 7
years ago took away my ability to walk without the aid of braces and
crutches I also need a walker or wheel chair depending on the area to
navigate..

DO NOT FALL INTO THE IDEA THAT AUTOMATED WILL DO THE JOB FOR YOU!!!!

WeaveTech Archive 9911

I had to get rid of my "advanced" loom with all the addons that would do this and that. Maintaining them and adjusting them well trying to balance on 2 crutches tools in hand not to mention bending moving around the loom. Every time you add something that you think will assist the handicapped weaver, for example, automatic warp advance or cloth storage system, you realize in a hurry these things require able bodied attention. It was a physical nightmare to work with this machine. I have simplified and now that I can master all the tasks on a more basic loom, I can weave.

Also, I would like to point out that a loom is a machine. One can make cloth of amazingly technical difficulty on a frame that holds the warp under enough tension to weave. I had months in the hospital, in various forms of traction etc to challenge my mind. A small frame, a little thread and a needle, I wove twills, block designs anything I could remember as I did not have my books with me. A machine does not make a weaver. The loom is a machine to be operated, repaired adjusted etc to do the job.

Sue

To reply privately, send message to "Sue Brunton" <brunton@zeuter.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 20:02:28 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA07880; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 20:02:28 -0700 (MST)
Received: from edtnps05.telusplanet.net (edtnps05.telusplanet.net [198.161.157.105]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA07818; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 20:01:03 -0700 (MST)
Received: from edtnnt2-port-230.agt.net ([161.184.195.230]:1323 "HELO pmarriot") by smtp2.telusplanet.net with SMTP id <S40535AbPKQDEH>; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 20:04:07 -0700
Message-ID: <000701bf30a8\$35589520\$e6c3b8a1@pmarriot>
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>
To: "Weaver's digest" <weaving@quilt.net>
Cc: "weave tech" <weavetech@list-server.net>
Subject: Okay its Martha Stewart
Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 20:02:38 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2014.211
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2014.211
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

On tomorrows program there will be a feature on a rug weaver. Her name is ELIZABETH EAKINS
Ya Ya I know Martha Stewart, but she is featuring a handweaver so tune in...
I will
Pamela
(who although watches Martha when having her morning latte dose not in any way hope or wish to be like her. I get tired just watching. But she does go on cool field trips.)
Pamela

Pamela Marriott
Dancing Sheep Studio
Weaving & Graphics
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada

WeaveTech Archive 9911

pmarriot@telusplanet.net

To reply privately, send message to "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 21:03:25 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA22041; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 21:03:25 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail.aeroinc.net (aeroinc.net [208.247.248.6]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA22030; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 21:03:22 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host aeroinc.net [208.247.248.6] claimed to be mail.aeroinc.net
Received: from Keating (208.247.251.119)
by mail.aeroinc.net with MERCUR-SMTP/POP3/IMAP4-Server (v3.10.07 AS-0098309)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 21:40:06 -0600
Message-Id: <1.5.4.16.19991116214223.2a1797ec@aeroinc.net>
X-Sender: wevrscroft@aeroinc.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (16)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@list-server.net
From: "keating/weaver's croft" <wevrscroft@aeroinc.net>
Subject: a barrier,ideology,isms, and being contrary!?
Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 21:40:06 -0600
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> nor do I believe that all
>on the list are handloom weavers but most are and of those, most have a
>certain mind-set, towards which I make no value judgement nor hold any
>prejudice, which will act as a barrier (snip from aff)
a barrier.
my first contact with weaving and looms took place in 1988 when i was being taught to use a handloom. during this beginner class the instructor went thru the use of his computer for designing and showed the class his antique norwegian loom, his automated loom, his jacquard loom and how he used them all. thinking i could form a deep affection for an old loom and a respectful working relationship with an automated loom while have lots of fun with the design program i expressed my desire to embrace all of the above to a handweaver.
the response was a barrier.
"you don't want an automated loom, especially if you have the antique loom! and why bring the computer into your weaving?"
my response was contrary. all were means to an end for me;
weaving.
i was surprised by this weaver's reaction and reasoning. i "filed it" for later consideration. i was a newbie so maybe this weaver knew something i didn't...

ideology of art.
>the first error in mindset that i made when it came to handloom weaving
>was that i refereed to it as an art. (snip from another weaver)
my perception was contrary to this;
i was the least "artistic" in a family of folks who could draw,etc. with great ease. i could not and so considered myself not artistic. thus i came to weaving as a way to express myself creatively while not being constrained by my inability to sketch,draw, paint etc.

an ism.
and i have heard it said that most weavers are women.
my first experiences were contrary.
my instructor was a man, the only local weaver i knew at that time was a man

WeaveTech Archive 9911

(blind at that), i bought my loom from a man, later bought my old linen loom from a man who's father, gfather and ggfather had been the weavers in the family. i seemed to be a lone woman amongst men and their looms.

i was exposed from the first moments of my weaving life to ideologies and isms to which my approach and/or attitude seemed contrary. these factors did not deter me from my goal. weaving. back then i had a yearning to see all weaving; locals doing rag rugs on 2shaft handlooms to industrial weaving. that desire hasn't changed for to me; it's all weaving. am i being contrary!
nope?
susank

PS

>A guild in upstate NY (Janet Nyquist's home guild, I believe) was selling a >little pamphlet describing this method a couple of years ago. Perhaps >someone can post that info.
this nyquist lashing on info i would like, please.
tia

To reply privately, send message to "keating/weaver's croft" <wevrscroft@aeroinc.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 23:04:24 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id XAA13410; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 23:04:24 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (smtp10.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.200.246]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id XAA13401; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 23:04:23 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mindspring.com (user-2iveaho.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.42.56]) by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id BAA06217 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 01:04:34 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3832459E.319651F4@mindspring.com>
Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1999 01:05:18 -0500
From: Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>
Organization: bnathans
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: looms and physical infirmities
References: <199911170041.RAA01232@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Sue Brunton writes:

" had to get rid of my "advanced" loom with all the addons that would do this and that. Maintaining them and adjusting them well trying to balance on 2 crutches tools in hand not to mention bending moving around the loom. Every time you add something that you think will assist the handicapped weaver, for example, automatic warp advance or cloth storage system, you realize in a hurry these things require able bodied attention. It was a physical nightmare to work with this machine. I have simplified and now that I can master all the tasks on a more basic loom, I can weave."

At the risk of boring those who've heard me say this before, a knitting

WeaveTech Archive 9911

machine is a wonderful "high tech" way of producing very complex fabric without the need to ever reach or crawl underneath and around it.

I will be very unhappy when the time comes that I can't get under (really it's into) my AVL to adjust the cables or fix the clothe takeup beam or hook/unhook the shaft springs, etc. I know I can't sit on a low stool to thread anymore--it kills my knees.....

I'm don't need to give up on my loom yet, but any further deterioration of joints could force the issue..... then I'd have to focus on my Knitting machine.

Barbara Nathans Bellport, Long Island, New York

To reply privately, send message to Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 16 23:56:04 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id XAA22308; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 23:56:04 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id XAA22300; Tue, 16 Nov 1999 23:56:02 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 5244 invoked by alias); 17 Nov 1999 06:56:14 -0000
Received: (qmail 5233 invoked from network); 17 Nov 1999 06:56:13 -0000
Received: from ip118.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.118) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 17 Nov 1999 06:56:13 -0000
Message-ID: <38324D22.11C385EF@netbistro.com>
Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 22:37:22 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: doing it for you
References: <199911170041.RAA01232@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

As someone who has a loom that is perceived to "do it all for me", I'd like to say that without DH as my loom mechanic, I would not be able to weave.

The day before I left for Portland, the loom "broke" (AGAIN - but that's another story already told too often) - this time the coupling from the piston to the air hose cracked. While repairing this, Doug noticed that the brackets holding the piston for the air fly shuttles are so badly worn that one of them has about 1/16" of metal left in the bracket to hold the pin and the pin was half worn through, too. This after exactly 18 months of production weaving. :(

He is going to try a "fix" that will be simpler to repair in the future...a new bracket but he will replace the metal pin with a nylon one. Doug wishes he would have caught this earlier, but he's been busy with a new job and didn't have time for regular maintenance checks.

It scares me to think that I can no longer "fix" my loom on my own, as we are dependant on my weaving income for the household. Such complex equipment brings rewards in terms of efficiency, and challenges in terms of keeping them running properly.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

I am very fortunate in that my DH finds mechanic-ing interesting, and willingly keeps the loom operational. He is also very knowledgeable about things mechanical, and inventive about repairs.

The loom has features that make it very efficient and that I would no longer willingly do without - auto cloth advance and CAM being just two. The air assist is good in theory, but has proved problematical - to *me* - in terms of speed (lack of) and rapidity of wearing out. I'm hoping that AVL is listening to me and will address some of my experiences with wear points.

So, yes, I would say that if you up-grade to a loom with more mechanical enhancements than you know how to fix yourself, then do make provision for regular maintenance checks, and repairs.

Laura Fry
with Doug reading over her shoulder

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 17 07:32:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA27479; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 07:32:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from emerald.lightlink.com (root@emerald.lightlink.com [205.232.34.14]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA27434; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 07:32:09 -0700 (MST)
Received: from adore.lightlink.com (incaed@adore.lightlink.com [205.232.34.20]) by emerald.lightlink.com (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTMP id JAA26074 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 09:32:06 -0500
Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1999 09:32:06 -0500 (EST)
From: Ed Franquemont <incaed@lightlink.com>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Differently abled weavers
In-Reply-To: <199911170037.TAA12754@ps.zeuter.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSU.4.10.9911170926200.4288-100000@adore.lightlink.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I know several weavers in the Andes with seriously compromised capacity in their legs. Because they generally are somewhat more able than most of us with the capacity still available to them, they make excellent and complex cloth on backstrap looms. In fact, most became weavers precisely because they were handicapped and could not pursue most other avenues of achieving social and economic value.

BUT still I should think could relatively trouble free devices should be available to overcome physical barriers to making textiels on most looms.

Ed Franquemont

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To reply privately, send message to Ed Franquemont <incaed@lightlink.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 17 07:56:16 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA05324; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 07:56:16 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo15.mx.aol.com (imo15.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA05315; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 07:56:14 -0700 (MST)
From: TBeau1930@aol.com
Received: from TBeau1930@aol.com
by imo15.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.4b155ba8 (3950)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 09:55:32 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.4b155ba8.25641be4@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1999 09:55:32 EST
Subject: Handweaving, Power Looms and mindset
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 45
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi Laura and listers all

<< Subject: Re: mindset changes. I started weaving with the assumption that "hand" weaving was in some way "superior" to "power" weaving. The wedge in changing that attitude was reading the book Run of the Mill by (author not remembered - Donald Something? Tom Beaudet will remember I think!)>>

"Run of the Mill" by Steve Dunwell, c.1978. David R. Godine- Publisher

A pictorial, narrative depiction of the Textile industry in New England. This book tells it exactly the way it was. It is the story of Mill life, and the social and economic impact of growing up in a Mill Town. Having worked in some of the Mills portrayed, I knew them and the people that worked there personally. It is the story of my life.

<<It is a history of the textile industry in New England, leading up to and through the Industrial Revolution to the mills eventual dying out in the first part of this century. The satori moment was reading the caption under a photo of a loom

tender who said words to the effect that his aim was to produce "perfect" cloth. Those words rang in my mind with a bell-like resonance! How different was that from what *I* was trying to do??? None whatsoever. We were just using different tools.>>

"We were just using different Tools"

Different, but not divorced from the same basic necessities required for good weavability in Handweaving. In fact, more demanding of a solid knowledge of the basics.

The higher speed, more automated equipment introduces a whole new area of study brought on by the demands of tighter controls and precision settings to operate the machinery as designed. When selecting operators for staffing this equipment in the Mills, they were usually selected from groups within the Mill that had already proven an understanding and mastery of the basics at each level of operation leading up to the point of being ready build on what

WeaveTech Archive 9911

they already knew. In some cases this took years.

If a discussion of high speed direct Dressing or Quilling(winding Bobbins) or Weaving were undertaken(amongst a multitude of other subjects that would be touched on) then one of the first to be discussed would be the control of Yarn under high speed conditions.

One of the first phenomenon experienced with the moving of Yarn from one package to another at high speed is the ballooning affect speed has on Yarn, the collapse of the balloon, the control of that collapse, and how it varies with the Yarn types and count(size) of the Yarn being handled.

In order to describe the problems encountered and motivate a free flow discussion of the remedy of those problems, an understanding of Yarn terminology used would have to be expected. Unless the weaver understands the difference between a 3R(Run) Wool spun Yarn, a 40/2 Worsted spun Yarn or a 8/3 Cotton spun Yarn, I expect the dialogue would center on covering the differences(the basics)of Yarn manufacturing rather than what affect high speed would have on Yarn. And thats probably as it should be.

As far as the structural integrity of the buildings to house this equipment, the power source and the local zoning requirements, these are items best answered by a certified engineered plan prepared and targeted for a specific proposal and geographic location.

There is much the Handweaver can gain by taking advantage of the knowledge already developed in the Mill. A good example of that is the current thread involved with take-up Roll coverings on Looms. Every Mill I ever worked in faced the same problem and investigated and evaluated the same coverings whether they be Sandpaper, perforated Tin, Rubber, etc. and in each case the problem was solved differently by understanding the demands of the equipment being used and the Fabric being woven.

For those that want to enrich their weaving expertise by taking advantage of what the Mills have to offer, why not, that is to your advantage. But it will not come without a sound foundation of weaving principles to build on.

Take the best and leave the rest. Keep those Beaters moving<G>

Tom Beaudet
TBeau1930@aol.com

To reply privately, send message to TBeau1930@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 17 09:07:57 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA23833; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 09:07:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from uhura.concentric.net (uhura.concentric.net [206.173.118.93]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA20965; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 09:00:54 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cliff.concentric.net (cliff.concentric.net [206.173.118.90]) by uhura.concentric.net (8.9.1a/(98/12/15 5.12)) id LAA03309; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 11:00:58 -0500 (EST) [1-800-745-2747 The Concentric Network]
Received: from oemcomputer (ts005d03.tuc-az.concentric.net [206.173.160.207]) by cliff.concentric.net (8.9.1a) id LAA05784; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 11:00:56 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <003601bf3114\$46544ce0\$cfa0adce@oemcomputer>
From: "Marge Coe" <MargeCoe@concentric.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
References: <1.5.4.16.19991116214223.2a1797ec@aeroinc.net>
Subject: Re: a barrier, ideology, isms, and being contrary!?
Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1999 08:56:11 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> my first contact with weaving and looms took place in 1988 when i was
being
> taught to use a handloom. <snip>
> thru the use of his computer for designing and showed the class his
antique
> norwegian loom, his automated loom, his jacquard loom and how he used them
all.
> thinking i could form a deep affection for an old loom and a respectful
> working relationship with an automated loom while have lots of fun with
the
> design program i expressed my desire to embrace all of the above to a
> handweaver. the response was a barrier.
> "you don't want an automated loom, especially if you have the antique
loom!
> and why bring the computer into your weaving?"

It is unfortunate that in 1988 you were not surrounded by weavers, other than your instructor, who embraced CAD, but frankly there wasn't much affordable CAD to embrace in those days. In the Weavers' defense, at that time the IBM PC had been generally available for a little more than 5 years; they weren't all that cheap; the 286 was cutting edge; DOS, not Windows, was the OS of choice; fewer folks had PCs in their homes, even fewer weavers; and the earlier weaving programs were nowhere near as sophisticated as the ones available to us now. (In fact we'd barely graduated from 6 IBM supplied colors to 16!)

I doubt this one weaver's response mirrored the majority of weavers' thinking at that time (my experience is that as a group we've been pretty quick to embrace technology) and consequently I don't think your approach contrary at all, nor do I think our craft/art is full of isms, barriers, or mind-sets.

Margaret

To reply privately, send message to "Marge Coe" <MargeCoe@concentric.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 17 14:54:04 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA27150; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 14:54:04 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mc-qout4.whowhere.com (mc-qout4.whowhere.com [209.185.123.18]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA27144; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 14:54:03 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Unknown/Local ([?.?.?.?]) by angelfire.com; Wed Nov 17 13:53:33 1999
To: WeaveTech@List-Server.net
Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1999 15:53:33 -0600
From: "Sara Nordling" <snordling@angelfire.com>
Message-ID: <KNMDLHNDGGAKCAAA@angelfire.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
X-Sent-Mail: off
X-Mailer: MailCity Service
Subject: edges on lace curtains
X-Sender-IP: 129.62.170.144

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Organization: Angelfire (<http://email.angelfire.com:80>)
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi,

I am making plans to weave some curtains for my kitchen in Bronson lace. The design will be similar to an undulating twill but the line will be in lace. The fabric will be 50/50 lace and plain weave. I want to put an edge on the fabric. So far the design has used 10 of my 16 shafts. Now, is it wiser to use plain weave or basket weave. If I do plain weave, should I beam those onto my second beam (I haven't used it yet but talk on the list lately has made me bold enough to try). I plan to use 20/2 mercerized cotton for warp and weft.

TIA,
Sara
snordling@angelfire.com

Angelfire for your free web-based e-mail. <http://www.angelfire.com>

To reply privately, send message to "Sara Nordling" <snordling@angelfire.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 17 16:18:04 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA16580; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 16:18:04 -0700 (MST)
Received: from europe.std.com (europe.std.com [199.172.62.20]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA16534; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 16:17:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: from world.std.com (root@world-f.std.com [199.172.62.5])
by europe.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id SAA06352
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 18:18:00 -0500 (EST)
Received: from world.std.com (ppp0c125.std.com [208.192.102.125])
by world.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id SAA16972;
Wed, 17 Nov 1999 18:13:30 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <383336AC.18AAE5C@world.std.com>
Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1999 18:13:48 -0500
From: Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Ashenhurst's Formula
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi,

I recently found this on Nancy McKenna's website and thought it might be of interest to some folk on the group. It is also possible that I was supposed to know all about this years ago, in which case I appologize for taking up the bandwidth. It is new to me (although I am sure Allen knows all about it), but since my DW accuses me of reinventing 28,000 years of weaving a millenium at a time, I may, as the old story goes, have yawned in class and therefore missed the French revolution.

Cheers,

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Tom.

Ashenhurst's Formula

As an alternative to just wrapping yarn around a ruler, and estimating the best ends per inch for weaving a particular yarn, Ashenhurst's formula offers a more precise method of arriving at a sett.

[This information was provided by Donna Maurer.]

To find the diameter number (D) of a yarn

For firm yarns such as worsted wool and cotton
 $D = 0.9 \times \text{square root (yarn count} \times \text{standard yards/lb)}$

For soft yarns such as woollen yarns and tweed yarns
 $D = 0.84 \times \text{square root (yarn count} \times \text{standard yards/lb)}$

Ashenhurst's formula gives the maximum sett of a yarn. The formula is based on:

number of ends of warp in one repeat of the pattern

number of times the weft passes from one side of the fabric to the other (intersections)

the thread diameter number (D)

Maximum sett = $D \times \text{ends per repeat} / (\text{ends} + \text{intersections})$

Few cloths would be woven to this standard of firmness which gives the maximum sett possible for a square cloth (with the same epi & ppi) and the same yarn for warp and weft. A good working sett is about 3/4 of this number or slightly more

Example:

An 8/2 cotton has 2 plies of size 8 yarn, with a final count of 4.

It has 3360yd/lb (840yd/lb x 4).

$D = 0.9 \times \text{sq rt}(4 \times 840)$
= 52

Maximum sett (plain weave)
= $52 \times 2 / (2+2)$
= 26

Maximum sett (2/2 twill)
= $52 \times 4 / (4+2)$
= 34

Webmaster: Nancy M. McKenna.

Copyrighted 1999 Nancy M McKenna, all rights reserved.

<http://www.angelfire.com/il/faena/>

--

Tom Vogl

29 Scotchman's Lane

West Tisbury, MA 02575

"Intuition is the result of 20 years experience" K. C. Long

Voice: 508-693.6065

Fax: 508-696.0625

tpv@world.std.com

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To reply privately, send message to Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 17 18:18:30 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA13611; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 18:18:30 -0700 (MST)
Received: from goose.prod.itd.earthlink.net (goose.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.18]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA13599; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 18:18:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: from glen (pool0185.cvx20-bradley.dialup.earthlink.net [209.179.250.185]) by goose.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id RAA22490 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 17:18:37 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <007b01bf3162\$adbc0640\$b9fab3d1@glen>
From: "Jim/Penny Peters" <pjpeters@earthlink.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
References: <383336AC.18AA5C@world.std.com>
Subject: Re: Ashenhurst's Formula
Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1999 17:17:26 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Peggy Osterkamp taught me to use the Ashenhurst in just a slightly different way. Find the YYP, take the square root of that and multiply by .9==diameters per inch. Max sett for plain weave, multiply by .5. Max sett for twill, multiply by .67. Then depending on the use of the fabric, multiply by either .8 if a balanced Looking weave is what you are after, .6-.7 for clothing, .65 for wollen, .5-.6 for light and delicate fabrics. (Threads magazine, Oct/Nov '86) Penny Peters

To reply privately, send message to "Jim/Penny Peters" <pjpeters@earthlink.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 17 19:36:57 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA01845; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 19:36:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA01834; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 19:36:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 3544 invoked by alias); 18 Nov 1999 02:37:05 -0000
Received: (qmail 3535 invoked from network); 18 Nov 1999 02:37:04 -0000
Received: from ip129.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.129) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 18 Nov 1999 02:37:04 -0000
Message-ID: <38333FB6.80DEE4AE@netbistro.com>
Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1999 15:52:22 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: mind sets
References: <199911172318.QAA16625@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Well, I ran into the mind set of Hand vs Power head on when I first bought my AVL in 1981, and my computer with weaving software in 1986!

A Canadian Master Weaver and former teacher was absolutely *appalled* at my purchase of the AVL, and made no bones about it. Others similarly accused me of no longer "hand" weaving because of the applied technology. So the closed mind set that Allen speaks of did exist, and in pockets does still. Look at the contrary comments made in reference to the Churchill Weavers "factory" on the other list not so very long ago. I am very grateful to the founders of this list which gives me the opportunity to relate to others who do not have this prejudice against efficient equipment.

Given my attitude of wanting to actually earn a "living" and choosing equipment that I hoped would make that dream a reality, I persevered in spite of negative comments about my equipment, my "standards" of weaving and finishing because I knew what I was doing and didn't *much* care what other weavers thought - only my customers.

I guess I've lived out in left field for so long, I think it's home base..... :}

Long live open and curious minds!!!!

Laura Fry

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 17 19:41:07 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA02788; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 19:41:07 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA02780; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 19:41:03 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.17(src addr [206.63.102.17]) (755 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11oHVX-0002ckC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 18:41:11 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <38334511.5E3D@nas.com>
Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1999 17:15:14 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: a barrier, ideology, isms, and being contrary!?
References: <1.5.4.16.19991116214223.2a1797ec@aeroinc.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

keating/weaver's croft wrote:

it's all weaving.
> am i being contrary!
> nope?
> susank
>

Yes and we need more of you contrary folks ! ;) Thanks for opening

WeaveTech Archive 9911

the topic further.
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 17 19:41:18 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA02879; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 19:41:18 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA02865; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 19:41:16 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.17(src addr [206.63.102.17]) (826 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11oHVj-0002caC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 18:41:23 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <3833489E.1209@nas.com>

Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1999 17:30:23 -0700

From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: weavetech@list-server.net

Subject: Re: doing it for you

References: <199911170041.RAA01232@salmon.esosoft.net> <38324D22.11C385EF@netbistro.com>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net

Precedence: bulk

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

do make

> provision for regular maintenance checks, and repairs.

>

> Laura Fry

> with Doug reading over her shoulder

>

Hmm...so Doug, what would one budget for your services, excluding parts, for a year on that (or those) particular loom?

Thanks,
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 17 20:13:11 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA09786; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 20:13:11 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA09775; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 20:13:09 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.17(src addr [206.63.102.42]) (768 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11oI0b-0002cHC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 19:13:17 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <38335D83.5AE3@nas.com>

Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1999 18:59:36 -0700

From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: mind sets
References: <199911172318.QAA16625@salmon.esosoft.net> <38333FB6.80DEE4AE@netbistro.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> I guess I've lived out in left field for so long, I think it's
> home base..... :}
>
> Long live open and curious minds!!!!
>
> Laura Fry
>
> Love the sound of that toast all around the World!

Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 17 21:52:24 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA29045; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 21:52:24 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail.aeroinc.net (aeroinc.net [208.247.248.6]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA29037; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 21:52:22 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host aeroinc.net [208.247.248.6] claimed to be mail.aeroinc.net
Received: from Keating (208.247.251.123)
by mail.aeroinc.net with MERCUR-SMTP/POP3/IMAP4-Server (v3.10.07 AS-0098309)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Wed, 17 Nov 1999 22:13:30 -0600
Message-Id: <1.5.4.16.19991117221546.2aa7a2de@aeroinc.net>
X-Sender: wevrscroft@aeroinc.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (16)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@list-server.net
From: "keating/weaver's croft" <wevrscroft@aeroinc.net>
Subject: Re: a barrier,ideology,isms, and being contrary!?
Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1999 22:13:30 -0600
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

hi myra,
i loved the fact that you initiated this whole powerloom discussion! i was gonna respond with a question to tweek/pique the dialogue even more right at the start but decided against it. i wanted to see how aff and t vogl responded. glad i waited as i was able to gather my thoughts. the post you are talking about is the result.
i appreciate you response to it.
thanks
thanks again
and i would love to hear what you come to in your loom acquisition!
your with a hug
susank

WeaveTech Archive 9911

At 05:15 PM 11/17/99 -0700, you wrote:

>keating/weaver's croft wrote:

> it's all weaving.

>> am i being contrary!

>> nope?

>> susank

>>

>Yes and we need more of you contrary folks ! ;) Thanks for opening

>the topic further.

>Myra

>

>

>

>To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>

To reply privately, send message to "keating/weaver's croft" <wevrscroft@aeroinc.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 02:29:37 1999

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id CAA15911; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 02:29:37 -0700 (MST)

Received: from mail (root@ns3.minx.net.uk [212.1.130.144]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id CAA15892; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 02:29:33 -0700 (MST)

X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host root@ns3.minx.net.uk [212.1.130.144] claimed to be mail

Received: from [212.1.153.153] (helo=e1l6i5)

by mail with smtp (Exim 2.12 #1)

id 11o0uu-0006Jq-00

for weavetech@List-Server.net; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 10:35:52 +0000

Message-ID: <002301bf31a8\$3b806440\$999901d4@e1l6i5>

From: "Rachel Dufton" <rach.dufton@millenium-uk.net>

To: "weavetech" <weavetech@List-Server.net>

Subject: Ashenhurst's Formula

Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 09:33:04 -0000

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net

Precedence: bulk

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I was introduced to Ashenhurst when doing a weaving diploma and have used it constantly ever since. I 'm not mathematically minded, but have found it very simple and easy to remember. The only trouble is those odd cones of yarns one aquires which don't have a count number!

By the way, Tom, shouldn't

D = 0.9 x square root etc read

D = 0.95 ?? (sorry to quibble!)

Rachel Dufton

To reply privately send message to rach.dufton@millenium-uk.net

To reply privately, send message to "Rachel Dufton" <rach.dufton@millenium-uk.net>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 04:39:23 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA24032; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 04:39:23 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.jjj.net (root@smtp.jjj.net [209.235.31.137]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA24021; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 04:39:22 -0700 (MST)
Received: from HENRY (usr1-6.connex.net [209.116.252.164] (may be forged))
by smtp.jjj.net (8.9.1/8.9.0) with SMTP id GAA10600
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 06:38:38 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.16.19991118063908.2fc7dc50@smtp.jjj.com>
X-Sender: wheat@smtp.jjj.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (16)
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 06:39:08 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Wheat Carr <wheat@craftwolf.com>
Subject: Re: POWERLOOMS (long)
In-Reply-To: <3831CEE1.7171@nas.com>
References: <199911161743.MAA06567@mailbox.syr.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>> " ... how does one budget "

Long ago, it almost seems like another life, a car ran over one of my motorcycles (The Harley 350 Sprint dirt bike, not the 1200 Super Glide). For more than a year anything that involved more than one foot required assistance. And with plaster from toe to hip, I could certainly get onto the floor and do what had to be done under the loom, but trust me getting back up with 35 pounds of plaster was not something I could do.

My solution was barter - I found several people who were willing to trade an occasional few hours do what I could not in exchange an equal number of hours of instruction in some skill where I was qualified to teach - usually crochet or embroidery.

To reply privately, send message to Wheat Carr <wheat@craftwolf.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 05:42:11 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA08054; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 05:42:11 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp4.erols.com (smtp4.erols.com [207.172.3.237]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA08044; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 05:42:08 -0700 (MST)
Received: from LOCALNAME (216-164-129-169.s423.tnt1.lnhva.md.dialup.rcn.com [216.164.129.169])
by smtp4.erols.com (8.8.8/smtp-v1) with SMTP id HAA01269
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 07:42:08 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <38342767.76DF@erols.com>
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 08:20:56 -0800
From: Anne Wells <arwells@erols.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-DH397 (Win16; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: edges on lace curtains
References: <KNMDLHNDGGAKCAA@angelfire.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Sara Nordling wrote:

> I am making plans to weave some curtains for my kitchen in Bronson lace. ... The fabric will be 50/50 lace and plain weave. I want to put an edge on the fabric. So far the design has used 10 of my 16 shafts. Now, is it wiser to use plain weave or basket weave. If I do plain weave, should I beam those onto my second beam

Hi Sara -

I've done a fair amount of Bronson Lace (just to be sure we are talking the same structure, this is the *unit* weave, right?, frequently called Atwater-Bronson, or Bronson-Atwater, threading something like 131312 141412, and so on. The "other" Bronson is frequently called "spot" Bronson.)

OK. So now we are talking the same language, yes? <g> Anyway, I really enjoy weaving this! I would not use basket weave edges, as they will not match the rest of the weaving. I would definitely use plain weave (which does not require any more shafts) but would also definitely beam it separately, unless this is a very short warp??? Probably not short, given you are weaving fabric for curtains.

Anne in Annandale
arwells@erols.com

To reply privately, send message to Anne Wells <arwells@erols.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 06:19:00 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA13488; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 06:19:00 -0700 (MST)
Received: from snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.62]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA13477; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 06:18:59 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 63.14.66.209 (1Cust209.tnt1.asheville2.nc.da.uu.net [63.14.66.209]) by snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id FAA10381 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 05:19:00 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <3833FCF8.1037@earthlink.net>
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 08:19:53 -0500
From: Betty Carlson <bettycarlson@earthlink.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; I; 68K)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #649
References: <199911181057.DAA08971@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I was demonstrating on an 8S loom at the Southern Highlands Craft Fair. I had brought along computer drafts for my AVL. Answering a query about those drafts, I explained that the pattern on my loom in my studio was computer controlled. The next remark stopped me cold! The questioner said "Shame on you!"

The most interest I had, however, on that particular day was from folks who had worked in the textile mills. Having done a small amount of designing with two of the area mills I was familiar with their world, too.

Betty C

To reply privately, send message to Betty Carlson <bettycarlson@earthlink.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 08:52:44 1999

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA19121; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 08:52:44 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA19111; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 08:52:43 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42]) by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id KAA22895 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 10:52:46 -0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 10:52:46 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911181552.KAA22895@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@list-server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: POWERLOOM (long)
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>I know you have lots of experience with your students' attitudes, so I
>do not pretend to deny your perception of this list...but lets give it a
>try, Allen.

Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

Will do.

> my attention is place
>on learning the mechanics of the loom, the structure of fabric, the
>movements of the weaver, the most efficient studio set-up.

susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>

This is an excellent starting point since it avoids getting too technique specific early on. There are ergonomic principles which are practised in mill operation where manual, repetitive yarn handling tasks are performed from which handloom weavers could learn a lot.

>As handweavers on floor looms, in countries with relatively advanced
>technology, what sort of system do we partake in?

Carrie Brezine <cbrezine@standard.com>

A substantial question that bears much consideration. Unlike early, pre-industrial revolution weavers, when the handloom was the sole choice, our contemporary menu offers so many choices in technology that finding what is appropriate requires a level of thought of almost soul searching proportions. In order to pursue this like of thought, however, value judgements frequently attached to how one actually makes a fabric need to be suspended.

> tell the student what one method for
>achieving that tolerance is, and then let the student find their own
>comfort level of achieving the desired result.

Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>

I guess it's the "...their own comfort level..." part that bothers me more than the rest of Tom's points. My mind doesn't work in "...comfort levels..." when it comes to how I make cloth. My total focus is on how can

WeaveTech Archive 9911

I do this, that or the other task with the least amount of effort consistent with the closest approximation to perfection. As someone in this discussion once pointed out, such an approach may generate an initial level of DIS-comfort until a new way of performing a task is learned. Too often, the desire to avoid this initial discomfort prevents learning that could otherwise take place.

>DO NOT FALL INTO THE IDEA THAT AUTOMATED WILL DO THE JOB FOR YOU!!!!

"Sue Brunton" <brunton@zeuter.com>

Had Sue not been so emphatic, I would have been tempted to emphasise the quote myself. This is exactly the basis of my earlier point that a mindset which assumes that automatic equals magical is not correct.

>"you don't want an automated loom, especially if you have the antique loom!
>and why bring the computer into your weaving?"
>my response was contrary. all were means to an end for me;
>weaving.

"keating/weaver's croft" <wevrscroft@aeroinc.net>

>Others similarly accused me of no longer "hand" weaving because of the
>applied technology. So the closed mind set that Allen speaks of
>did exist, and in pockets does still. Look at the contrary comments
>made in reference to the Churchill Weavers "factory" on the other
>list not so very long ago.

> The air assist is good in theory, but has proved
>problematical - to *me* - in terms of speed (lack of) and rapidity of
>wearing out.

Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

I suppose we will have to ignore this kind of narrow mindset if the discussion is to be at all useful and progressive because in all my years I have never been successful in changing it.

> Different, but not divorced from the same basic necessities required for
>good weavability in Handweaving. In fact, more demanding of a solid knowledge
>of the basics.

> For those that want to enrich their weaving expertise by taking advantage
>of what the Mills have to offer, why not, that is to your advantage. But it
>will not come without a sound foundation of weaving principles to build on.

Tom Beaudet <TBeau1930@aol.com>

In the interest of focusing the discussion, the quoted statements above seem to distill into the common thread of everyone needing to acquire a certain critical mass of basic technical/mechanical knowledge as the basis for getting into more of the nuts and bolts. It will be important to maintain some sense of organisation to the discussion and I would suggest that focusing on broad basic mechanical concepts as applied to power loom function. These can be understood easily once basic stuff is understood and if related to what many handloom weavers already know. There is lots of powerloom related literature available which can and should be consulted.

This is among the most important discussions we could be having and it should be continued.

AAF

WeaveTech Archive 9911

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562
-5300
mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 09:05:38 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA22375; Thu, 18 Nov 1999
09:05:38 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id
JAA22340; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 09:05:34 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (dc-hiper97.idsonline.com [205.177.251.97])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA12871
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 11:05:26 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991118110402.046617f0@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: jstoll@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 11:04:02 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Janet Stollnitz <jstoll@cpcug.org>
Subject: Re: POWERLOOM
In-Reply-To: <199911181552.KAA22895@mailbox.syr.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 10:52 AM 11/18/99 -0500, AFF wrote:

>
>There is lots of
>powerloom related literature available which can and should be consulted.
>

Allen,

Are you willing to post some references?

Janet

Janet Stollnitz jstoll@cpcug.org
Silver Spring, MD

To reply privately, send message to Janet Stollnitz <jstoll@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 09:53:08 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA05589; Thu, 18 Nov 1999
09:53:08 -0700 (MST)
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 09:53:08 -0700 (MST)
Message-Id: <199911181653.JAA05589@salmon.esosoft.net>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Margaret Copeland <busys@cdsnet.net>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Subject: Re: mind sets
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1999 15:52:22 -0800
> From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
> Subject: Re: mind sets
>
> Well, I ran into the mind set of Hand vs Power head on when I first
> bought my AVL in 1981, and my computer with weaving software in 1986!
>
> A Canadian Master Weaver and former teacher was absolutely *appalled*
> at my purchase of the AVL, and made no bones about it. Others
> similarly accused me of no longer "hand" weaving because of the
> applied technology.

Here is my little speech on closed minds and weaving equipment. Many of the weavers who claim a doobby loom is not a hand weaving loom will champion their own low castle jack looms as "it" and the representation of what a "real" hand loom is like. The irony is that this type of loom wasn't even around before the middle of this century. A possibly more representational hand loom for early America and European (not all parts) would be a Swedish-style frame loom. Some of these even had fly shuttles ! I have a friend and excellent weaver who does Lithuanian-style belts on a belt loom. We got into quite a philosophical disagreement as to whether my doobby woven cloth could or should be juried as "handwoven" compared to her wonderful belts. She felt because I had a doobby chain and two treadles that my cloth could not involve the same difficulty in execution and implicitly the same quality !! This again I felt to be ironic. If a juror were looking at both of our efforts and trying to pick a winner (weird contest), I'd think she'd be looking for quality of execution and a design statement. If we were to be juried on what was supposedly harder to do, I don't know how anybody could compare ?

- Margaret Copeland
<http://home.cdsnet.net/~busys>

To reply privately, send message to Margaret Copeland <busys@cdsnet.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 09:54:59 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA06115; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 09:54:59 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA06102; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 09:54:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42]) by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id LAA00485 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 11:55:01 -0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 11:55:01 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911181655.LAA00485@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: POWERLOOM
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 11:04 AM 11/18/99 -0500, you wrote:

>Are you willing to post some references?

>Janet Stollnitz <jstoll@cpcug.org>

I otherwise would, but am stretched a bit thin this week with grading exams. However, if someone wants to scan the bibliography from HWT and post it to the list one time, I can grant permission. If one person would care to do this, let him/her contact me off list for permission and the correct page citations.

Unfortunately, I wouldn't be free to do this myself for atg least three weeks because of end of the semester work. However, this bibliography is fairly complete as to powerloom references and all of the books can be had through interlibrary loan if not housed at anyone's local library.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562
-5300
mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 11:59:59 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA09033; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 11:59:59 -0700 (MST)
Received: from hamachi.synopsys.com (hamachi.synopsys.com [204.176.20.26]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA09027; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 11:59:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from marathon.synopsys.com (marathon.synopsys.com [146.225.7.203]) by hamachi.synopsys.com (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTTP id KAA18851 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 10:59:32 -0800 (PST)
Received: from synopsys.com (ca11 [146.225.39.12]) by marathon.synopsys.com (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTTP id KAA08657 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 10:59:32 -0800 (PST)
Received: from lmeyer-pc ([192.168.93.127]) by synopsys.com (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id KAA01995 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 10:59:31 -0800 (PST)
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19991118110412.00a8f3a0@ca11>
X-Sender: lmeyer@ca11
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 11:04:12 -0800
To: weavetech@list-server.net
From: Lynn Meyer <lmeyer@netbox.com>
Subject: Re: mind sets

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>From: Betty Carlson <bettycarlson@earthlink.net>

>

>I was demonstrating on an 8S loom at the Southern Highlands Craft Fair.
>I had brought along computer drafts for my AVL. Answering a query about
>those drafts, I explained that the pattern on my loom in my studio was
>computer controlled. The next remark stopped me cold! The questioner
>said "Shame on you!"

I've run into this too. I've had some success at modifying people's opinion by pointing out that I do the creative part of setting up the threading, tie-up, etc., and that the computer just does the "mechanical" work of filling in the drawdown. And of course I choose which pattern I like best, too.

When it comes to electronic dobbies, which I don't have yet but will some day, I like to point out that it's the modern-day equivalent of a drawboy at the medieval drawlooms. And with child labor laws these days... :-)

But to me, really, the computer almost seems an extension of myself. Being a professional software developer since 1981 has a lot to do with that; it's a tool, a very capable tool, which I enjoy.

>From: Margaret Copeland <busys@cdsnet.net>

>

>I have a friend and excellent weaver who does Lithuanian-style belts
>on a belt loom. We got into quite a philosophical disagreement as to
>whether my doobby woven cloth could or should be juried as "handwoven"
>compared to her wonderful belts. She felt because I had a doobby chain
>and two treadles that my cloth could not involve the same difficulty
>in execution and implicitly the same quality !! This again I felt
>to be ironic. If a juror were looking at both of our efforts and
>trying to pick a winner (weird contest), I'd think she'd be looking
>for quality of execution and a design statement. If we were to be
>juried on what was supposedly harder to do, I don't know how anybody
>could compare ?

>

> - Margaret Copeland

Oh dear! Does this mean we should weave wearing blindfolds, and with one hand tied behind our backs? It's easy to *make* something artificially harder to do, if one really wants to!

Lynn

=====
Lynn Meyer, Silicon Valley (San Francisco Bay Area), CA, USA
<LMeyer@netbox.com>

To reply privately, send message to Lynn Meyer <lmeyer@netbox.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 13:56:54 1999

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA07527; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 13:56:54 -0700 (MST)

Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA07520; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 13:56:52 -0700 (MST)

Received: (qmail 3088 invoked by alias); 18 Nov 1999 20:56:59 -0000

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: (qmail 3073 invoked from network); 18 Nov 1999 20:56:58 -0000
Received: from ip119.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.119)
by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 18 Nov 1999 20:56:58 -0000
Message-ID: <38344761.999C784@netbistro.com>
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 10:37:21 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: knowing the tools - got long again!
References: <199911181653.JAA05609@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Margaret Copeland observes:

"If we were to be juried on what was supposedly harder to do, I don't know how anybody could compare ?"

We couldn't, and to me, that is the whole point. Once the cloth is woven, there are no doobby footprints, no fly shuttle tracks left to advertise that those mechanical enhancements were used. Why then do so many "hand" weavers look askance at them? And beyond this list, many still do - I remember the guild booth Seattle did at a regional conference in the early '80's which focused on CAD. The controversy!

We seem, finally, to be getting beyond this, as Marge Coe observed. There is now a large enough community of "hand" weavers using mechanically assisted looms that there is more and more acceptance. But ignorance still reigns supreme as when some people say that they "can't" do such and such because they "only" have 4s. My whole point to them is that they can do anything they want - they just have to be willing to weild a pick up stick and take more time at it than someone with additional shafts available.

When adding additional mechanical enhancements, we actually make the job of weaving more complex in terms of keeping said enhancements working properly. Discovering the tolerances involved is part of the challenge. Repairing it when it wears out or breaks is another issue. With the air assist now on both the fly shuttle and treadle I can no longer repair the loom if part of this equipment breaks. I could learn how, but I'd rather weave. I am not willing to wallow in the shallow end of the learning curve while I have an in-house loom mechanic! (Bad Attitude Laura!)

I, too, would appreciate a list of resources - most libraries in NA, at least, can get most books on inter-library loan. I also get Textile World, but the technology is so far beyond me that I can't relate. It is interesting to browse through tho.

Their web site, for anyone interested:

<http://www.textileworld.com>

This publication has been continually available to the textile industry since the late 1800's. Our library has a couple of reels of microfilm of the early dates, and it makes for fascinating reading. If you are ever in Prince George, B. C. schedule some time to look at this.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

I have been collecting old books on wet finishing, most published in the early part of this century. While in Portland, I discovered that it is possible to tour the Pendleton Woolen Mill, including their wet finishing facility. Guess what I'll be doing next trip to Portland, OR????

I think that increased knowledge about textile mills and current technology could only suffice to help present day "hand" weavers. While most of us could never have the type of equipment available in our studios, some of us could, and really, we should be celebrating the creation of wonderfully constructed, beautifully designed cloth that *functions as it should for its intended purpose*! It seems to me that an awful lot of wannabe weavers get stuck in the "look how clever I have been" part of the learning curve instead of using a "critical" eye to see how they could improve.

Like Allen, I strive for perfection. Rarely do I achieve it. But I don't let my lack of success ever stand in the way of trying, and I'm willing to share my mistakes in the hopes that others will learn from them.

Laura Fry
who is *supposed* to be weaving, but is spending a lot of time thinking.....

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 14:50:09 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA19623; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 14:50:09 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA19592; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 14:50:06 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.44(src addr [206.63.102.44]) (1105 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11oZRP-0002c7C@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 13:50:07 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <383386BE.4978@nas.com>
Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1999 21:55:27 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: a barrier, ideology, isms, and being contrary!?
References: <1.5.4.16.19991117221546.2aa7a2de@aeroinc.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

keating/weaver's croft wrote:

>
> hi myra,
> i loved the fact that you initiated this whole powerloom discussion!

Well, we are not done yet, are we? I just bet there is much, much more to be said from a lots of points of view and experience.

For example, the weaving list is having a discussion about tendinitis

WeaveTech Archive 9911

again.

I wonder if we could hear-read some posts from those on weavetech that have experience with both hand looms and automated looms as to their ergonomic comparisons? What are the occupational hazards?

Thanks
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 16:07:59 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA07157; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 16:07:59 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA07149; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 16:07:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.44(src addr [206.63.102.28]) (762 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11loaep-0002ciC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 15:08:03 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <38347345.687B@nas.com>
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 14:44:39 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: POWERLOOM (long)
References: <199911181552.KAA22895@mailbox.syr.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Allen Fannin wrote:

>
>
> This is among the most important discussions we could be having and it
> should be continued.

>
If I am correct, I think the younger generation's term for this statement would be "AWESOME!"

Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 16:26:16 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA10537; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 16:26:16 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail.igrin.co.nz (mail.igrin.co.nz [202.49.244.12]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA10521; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 16:26:11 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mcwarr.igrin.co.nz (pppka-03.igrin.co.nz [202.49.245.38]) by mail.igrin.co.nz (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id MAA29588 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 12:29:17 +1300
Message-Id: <199911182329.MAA29588@mail.igrin.co.nz>
From: "Michael Warr and Jean McIver" <mcwarr@igrin.co.nz>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 12:25:31 +1300
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: More Mindsets?
In-reply-to: <0.4b155ba8.25641be4@aol.com>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Any hand weaver I have spoken to has said that the ultimate loom is a countermarche. They say it gives more even tension throughout the warp, and a good shed.

For some time I have wondered if this is all a fallacy. All dobbie looms are rising shed looms (with the other half of the warp stationary). And I wonder what shedding mechanism industrial looms have? I would guess it would be the same. I also weave linen on such a loom, and turn out presentable product. Are we being duped into a false belief because hand weavers have believed in this fallacy for some time, or am I missing something here?

I'm particularly interested in replies from those of you who have run commercial mill operations.

Jean McIver
Parapara, New Zealand
Mailto:mcwarr@igrin.co.nz
Home Page: <http://www.igrin.co.nz/~mcwarr>
Creative Fibre site: <http://www.creativefibre.org.nz>

To reply privately, send message to "Michael Warr and Jean McIver" <mcwarr@igrin.co.nz>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 17:08:45 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA18074; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 17:08:45 -0700 (MST)
Received: from edtnps05.telusplanet.net (edtnps05.telusplanet.net [198.161.157.105]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA18064; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 17:08:43 -0700 (MST)
Received: from edtnnt1-port-146.agt.net ([161.184.192.146]:1096 "HELO pmarriot") by smtp2.telusplanet.net with SMTP id <S65591AbPKSALr>;
Thu, 18 Nov 1999 17:11:47 -0700
Message-ID: <001f01bf3222\$761aad0c\$92c0b8a1@pmarriot>
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>
To: "weave tech" <weavetech@list-server.net>
Subject: mindset
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 17:10:17 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2014.211
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2014.211
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I know many weavers who feel it is not good weaving unless completely finished by hand, no machine finishing of any kind. One of them has a computer assist on her loom as well. Makes me weak..
Pamela

WeaveTech Archive 9911

wanting, yearning, dreaming of computer assist so I do not have to hang under the mighty colonial anymore and have way more treadling options available... would also like to try the fly shuttle, and all the other bells and whistles just as long as I can keep weaving.

Pamela Marriott
Dancing Sheep Studio
Weaving & Graphics
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

To reply privately, send message to "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 18:08:39 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA29354; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 18:08:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: from saturn.CS.Arizona.EDU (ralph@saturn.CS.Arizona.EDU [150.135.1.73]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA29337; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 18:08:37 -0700 (MST)
Received: (from ralph@localhost) by saturn.CS.Arizona.EDU (8.8.7/8.7.3) id SAA15447 for weavetech@list-server.net; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 18:05:58 -0700
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 18:05:58 -0700
From: Ralph Griswold <ralph@cs.arizona.edu>
Message-Id: <199911190105.SAA15447@saturn.CS.Arizona.EDU>
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: power loom references
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I'll do what Allen suggested by way of scanning and posting the bibliography from HWT if no one else has already done that.

Ralph

To reply privately, send message to Ralph Griswold <ralph@cs.arizona.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 21:10:49 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA11930; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 21:10:49 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail.aeroinc.net (aeroinc.net [208.247.248.6]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA11903; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 21:10:44 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host aeroinc.net [208.247.248.6] claimed to be mail.aeroinc.net
Received: from Keating (208.247.251.102)
by mail.aeroinc.net with MERCUR-SMTP/POP3/IMAP4-Server (v3.10.07 AS-0098309)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 22:07:15 -0600
Message-Id: <1.5.4.16.19991118220936.2f77258c@aeroinc.net>
X-Sender: wevrscroft@aeroinc.net (Unverified)
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (16)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@list-server.net
From: "keating/weaver's croft" <wevrscroft@aeroinc.net>
Subject: Re: power loom references
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 22:07:15 -0600
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

good, please do ralph. i was hopin' someone would take up the suggestion.
tia
susank

WeaveTech Archive 9911

At 06:05 PM 11/18/99 -0700, you wrote:

>I'll do what Allen suggested by way of scanning and posting the bibliography
>from HWT if no one else has already done that.

>

> Ralph

>

>To reply privately, send message to Ralph Griswold <ralph@cs.arizona.edu>

>

To reply privately, send message to "keating/weaver's croft" <wevrscroft@aeroinc.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 21:10:55 1999

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA12019; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 21:10:55 -0700 (MST)

Received: from mail.aeroinc.net (aeroinc.net [208.247.248.6]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA11902; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 21:10:44 -0700 (MST)

X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host aeroinc.net [208.247.248.6] claimed to be mail.aeroinc.net

Received: from Keating (208.247.251.102)

by mail.aeroinc.net with MERCUR-SMTP/POP3/IMAP4-Server (v3.10.07 AS-0098309)

for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 22:07:11 -0600

Message-Id: <1.5.4.16.19991118220932.2f77706e@aeroinc.net>

X-Sender: wevrscroft@aeroinc.net (Unverified)

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (16)

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

To: weavetech@list-server.net

From: "keating/weaver's croft" <wevrscroft@aeroinc.net>

Subject: Re: a barrier, ideology, isms, and being contrary!?

Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 22:07:11 -0600

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net

Precedence: bulk

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

are you gonna post these questions to the list?

you should.

i thought what laura fry wrote about the care of the mechanics of her loom was a much needed slice of real life info.

you are so right, there is so much to discuss here.

looking forward to it all

yours

susan

At 09:55 PM 11/17/99 -0700, you wrote:

>keating/weaver's croft wrote:

>>

>> hi myra,

>> i loved the fact that you initiated this whole powerloom discussion!

>

>Well, we are not done yet, are we? I just bet there is much, much more

>to be said from a lots of points of view and experience.

>

>For example, the weaving list is having a discussion about tendinitis

>again.

>I wonder if we could hear-read some posts from those on weavetech that

>have experience with both hand looms and automated looms as to their

>ergonomic comparisons? What are the occupational hazards?

>

>Thanks

>Myra

>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>
>
>To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
>

To reply privately, send message to "keating/weaver's croft" <wevrscroft@aeroinc.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 18 22:08:51 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id WAA22178; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 22:08:51 -0700 (MST)
Received: from pimout7-int.prodigy.net (pimout7-ext.prodigy.net [207.115.59.180]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id WAA22152; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 22:08:48 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host pimout7-ext.prodigy.net [207.115.59.180] claimed to be pimout7-int.prodigy.net
Received: from myHost (BZMNB103-06.splitrock.net [209.254.40.54])
by pimout7-int.prodigy.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id AAA421192
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 00:08:56 -0500
Received: from 192.168.2.5 by hostname ([192.168.2.1] running VPOP3) with SMTP for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 18 Nov 1999 22:06:33 -0700
Message-ID: <093701bf324b\$a28abac0\$0502a8c0@von>
From: "Yvonne Coopmans" <Yvonne@anwg.org>
To: "Weavetech" <weavetech@list-server.net>
Subject: Re. Nyquist method
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1999 22:05:01 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2014.211
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2014.211
X-Server: VPOP3 V1.3.0c - Registered to: Jerome Coopmans
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hello all,

I'm a bit behind on my reading, however I remembered that I saved this description of the Nyquist system some time ago from the Weaving List. Regrettably, and uncharacteristically, I didn't save the author's name, so if you recognize this, please accept my appreciation for your description.

Yvonne in now chilly Bozeman

Nyquist Tie-On

1. Divide the warp into bouts of no more than an inch. I find about 3/4" is better. Tension all the ends in each bout together & tie an overhand knot at the end of the bout. That's the easy part to explain.
2. You'll now need one doubled length of stout cord for each bout. I use seine twine, about 15" per bout. Double the cord, slip the looped end around the apron bar and put the two ends thru the loop. Do this as many times as you have bouts of ends. (After the first time you do this, just leave 'em there.) You should now have two loose ends of cord for each bout.
3. This is the hard part to put into words. You need to put a snitch knot in the bout. Here's how I do it (I think Janet Stollnitz, who taught me, does it differently, but the result is the same). Put both thumbs into the center of the bout. Twist your hands up & around (or down & around, it doesn't matter), till what you have is a loop of each side of the bout on

WeaveTech Archive 9911

each thumb. Put the two loops together so that they form the snitch knot, and slip the two ends of the cord thru the loops. Tie the cords to each other in what is the first part of a square knot.

4. To tighten the tension on a bout, tighten the half-square knot of the cords.

What's so beautiful about this method is that the more tension you put on the warp, the *tighter* the snitch knots become in gripping the cord. They just *do not* slip. If you find a threading error, you just open the half square knot, slip the bout off, fix the error & redo the bout. Takes 10 seconds.

I use this in front and a similar system in back (shown on p. 52 of my edition of Chandler--she calls it "Lark's head knot method") and have my loom waste on an 8-shaft floor loom down to about 18"-20". Combine this w/ a dummy warp and the only waste you have is a bit at the front & whatever is left when the knots from your dummy warp are right up against the heddles.

To reply privately, send message to "Yvonne Coopmans" <Yvonne@anwg.org>

```
>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Fri Nov 19 04:46:26 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA13801; Fri, 19 Nov 1999
04:46:26 -0700 (MST)
Received: from europe.std.com (europe.std.com [199.172.62.20]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id EAA13792; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 04:46:24 -0700 (MST)
Received: from world.std.com (root@world-f.std.com [199.172.62.5])
    by europe.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id GAA14682
    for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 06:46:25 -0500 (EST)
Received: from world.std.com (ppp0c121.std.com [208.192.102.121])
    by world.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id GAA15645
    for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 06:45:22 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <38353868.3C3DD102@world.std.com>
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 06:45:44 -0500
From: Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #652 -- Technology
References: <199911191057.DAA06553@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net
```

Hi,

I have a suggestion: Let us make the distinction between "Studio" weaving and "Factory" weaving rather than between "hand"weaving and "machine"weaving. After all, the loom was one of the first, if not the first machine (as distinct from tool) ever invented by homo sapiens. Everything since has been incremental improvements on an previously invented device. (We all know that there is nothing that cannot be done better the second time around, right?)

I believe this change in terminology would allow the discussion to focus on the question of what aspects of factory weaving are appropriate (technologically, financially, psychologically, etc.) for what tasks in the studio. In the course of the discussion, we should not loose sight of the fact that different individuals approach the same task from

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>I know many weavers who feel it is not good weaving unless completely
>finished by hand, no machine finishing of any kind. One of them has a
>computer assist on her loom as well. Makes me weak..
>Pamela
>wanting, yearning, dreaming of computer assist so I do not have to hang
>under the mighty colonial anymore and have way more treading options
>available... would also like to try the fly shuttle, and all the other
>bells and whistles just as long as I can keep weaving.
>
>Pamela Marriott
>Dancing Sheep Studio
>Weaving & Graphics
>Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada
>pmarriot@telusplanet.net
>
>
>To reply privately, send message to "Pamela Marriott"
<pmarriot@telusplanet.net>
>

To reply privately, send message to "Kathleen Stevens" <hndwvnds@ccrtc.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 07:26:26 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA09151; Fri, 19 Nov 1999
07:26:26 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA09137; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 07:26:24 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42])
by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id JAA25058
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 09:26:27 -0500 (EST)
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 09:26:27 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911191426.JAA25058@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: POWERLOOM (long)
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 02:44 PM 11/18/99 -0700, you wrote:

>Allen Fannin wrote:

>> This is among the most important discussions we could be having and it
>> should be continued.

>>

>If I am correct, I think the younger generation's term for this
>statement would be "AWESOME!"

> Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

WHO YOU CALLIN' OLD???

AAF

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215

WeaveTech Archive 9911

College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300

mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 07:37:23 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA12448; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 07:37:23 -0700 (MST)
Received: from saturn.CS.Arizona.EDU (ralph@saturn.CS.Arizona.EDU [150.135.1.73]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA12438; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 07:37:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: (from ralph@localhost) by saturn.CS.Arizona.EDU (8.8.7/8.7.3) id HAA17242 for weavetech@list-server.net; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 07:34:37 -0700
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 07:34:37 -0700
From: Ralph Griswold <ralph@cs.arizona.edu>
Message-Id: <199911191434.HAA17242@saturn.CS.Arizona.EDU>
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: HWT references
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I have scanned them and will post them to this list when I have Allen's permission, which I've requested.

Ralph

To reply privately, send message to Ralph Griswold <ralph@cs.arizona.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 07:38:55 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA12855; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 07:38:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA12844; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 07:38:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42]) by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id JAA00551 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 09:38:56 -0500 (EST)
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 09:38:56 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911191438.JAA00551@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: power loom references
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 06:05 PM 11/18/99 -0700, you wrote:

>I'll do what Allen suggested by way of scanning and posting the bibliography
>from HWT if no one else has already done that.

>Ralph Griswold <ralph@cs.arizona.edu>

Thanks for the offer. Art McGaffney has already been given permission and

WeaveTech Archive 9911

will do it. More later.

AAF

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300

mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 07:45:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA14324; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 07:45:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo25.mx.aol.com (imo25.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.69]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA14315; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 07:45:13 -0700 (MST)
From: RUSLYN@aol.com
Received: from RUSLYN@aol.com
by imo25.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.160e80d3 (4575)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 09:44:44 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.160e80d3.2566bc5b@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 09:44:43 EST
Subject: Re: Run of the Mill book
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 10
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Thanks to Tom Beaudet my daughter found the Run of the Mill book by Steve Dunwell at her college library. The history is fascinating, wonderful photos and line drawings.

Lynn Silberschlag
Tucson, AZ
ruslyn@aol.com

To reply privately, send message to RUSLYN@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 08:04:23 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA19136; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 08:04:23 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Rt66.com (mack.rt66.com [198.59.162.1]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA19090; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 08:04:11 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host mack.rt66.com [198.59.162.1] claimed to be Rt66.com
Received: from none (pmn23.rt66.com [198.59.176.216])
by Rt66.com (8.9.3/8.9.1) with SMTP id IAA19751
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 08:04:11 -0700 (MST)
From: "Art McGathey" <mcart@rt66.com>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: RE: power loom references
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 08:03:03 -0700

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Message-ID: <000001bf329f\$2d6d7440\$d8b03bc6@rt66.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
In-Reply-To: <199911191438.JAA00551@mailbox.syr.edu>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I'll have the Bibliography up in about an hour. It will be scanned with an optical character reader and be a normal text message.

Arthur McGathey in NM
mcart@rt66.com
Loom Construction References
<http://www.halfwaytree.com/looms>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
>[mailto:owner-weavetech@List-Server.net]On Behalf Of Allen Fannin
>Sent: Friday, November 19, 1999 7:39 AM
>To: weavetech@List-Server.net
>Subject: Re: power loom references
>
>
>At 06:05 PM 11/18/99 -0700, you wrote:
>>I'll do what Allen suggested by way of scanning and posting the
>bibliography
>>from HWT if no one else has already done that.
>
>>Ralph Griswold <ralph@cs.arizona.edu>
>
>Thanks for the offer. Art McGaffney has already been given permission and
>will do it. More later.
>
>AAF
>ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
>ECR Department
>224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
>College for Human Development
>Syracuse University
>Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
>Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
>FAX: (315) 443-2562
> -5300
> mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
> http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin
>
>
>To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
>

To reply privately, send message to "Art McGathey" <mcart@rt66.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 08:34:11 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA26350; Fri, 19 Nov 1999

WeaveTech Archive 9911

08:34:11 -0700 (MST)

Received: from imo-d03.mx.aol.com (imo-d03.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA26342; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 08:34:08 -0700 (MST)

From: EVESTUDIO@aol.com

Received: from EVESTUDIO@aol.com

by imo-d03.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.30e2296e (3995)

for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 10:33:28 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <0.30e2296e.2566c7c8@aol.com>

Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 10:33:28 EST

Subject: Re: mindset

To: weavetech@list-server.net

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 45

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net

Precedence: bulk

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

In a message dated 11/19/1999 7:08:44 AM Central Standard Time, hndwvnds@ccrtc.com writes:

<< I think the bigger picture is the problem of Asian countries dumping below cost fibers on the US economy hurting our mills and eventually our sources for our personal yarns we need for our work and the prices we need for that work. >>

I totally agree. I have maintained in the past and continue to use the reference to the effect of: We will all be sorry sooner or later that we support these countries who undercut us. In this country we have proliferation of discount stores and shoddy merchandise produced in these other countries....and to make matters even worse these factories are the brainchildren of our fellow countrymen. Not only that but these unscrupulous persons copy original work of Americans and take it back to these places and mass produce this work at a fraction of the cost upon the backs of children and others who need the meager earnings to survive.

I wish I had a wet noodle with a little sting in it for these people who do that.

Regards, E

To reply privately, send message to EVESTUDIO@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 09:20:04 1999

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA09063; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 09:20:04 -0700 (MST)

Received: from Rt66.com (mack.rt66.com [198.59.162.1]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA09030; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 09:20:00 -0700 (MST)

X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host mack.rt66.com [198.59.162.1] claimed to be Rt66.com

Received: from none (pmd10.rt66.com [198.59.176.43])

by Rt66.com (8.9.3/8.9.1) with SMTP id JAA02597

for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 09:19:59 -0700 (MST)

From: "Art McGathey" <mcart@rt66.com>

To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>

Subject: HWT Bibliography / power loom references

Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 09:18:44 -0700

Message-ID: <000101bf32a9\$c122ac00\$d8b03bc6@rt66.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
In-Reply-To: <199911191438.JAA00551@mailbox.syr.edu>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Bibliography

Aitken, J. B.
Automatic Weaving.
London: Columbine Press, 1964.

Alexander, P., and Hudson, R. F.
Wool: Its Chemistry and Physics.
London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1963.

American Society for Testing Materials.
ASTM Book of Standards, vol. 24 and 25.
Philadelphia: ASTM, 1975.

Atwater, M. M.
Shuttlecraft Book of American Handweaving, revised edition.
New York: Macmillan, 1951.

Barker, A. F.
An Introduction to the Study of Textile Design.
New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1903.

Baumont, R.
Standard Cloths: Structure and Manufacture.
London: Scott, Greenwood and Son, 1916.

Beck, S. W.
The Draper's Dictionary.
London: The Warehousemen and Drapers' Journal Office, 1882.

Bell, J. W.
Practical Textile Chemistry.
New York: Chemical Publishing Co., 1956.

Besancon.
Encyclopedia of Physics, second edition.
New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1974.

Boner, C. J.
Manufacture and Application of Lubricating Greases.
New York: Reinhold Publishing Corp., 1954.

Booth, J. E.
Principles of Textile Testing.
New York: Chemical Publishing Co., 1969.

Brearley, A., et al.
An Outline of Statistical Methods for Use in the Textile Industry.
Plainfield, New Jersey: Textile Book Service, 1975.

British Standards Institution.
Methods of Test for Textiles, B. S. Handbook no. 11.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

London: British Standards House, 1963.

Bronson, J. and R.
Domestic Manufacturer's Assistant, reprint edition.
Boston: Chas. Branford Co., 1949.

Cahill, J. F.
"For Determining Yarn Diameters,"
Textile World, vol. 90, p. 86 ff.

Carmichael, W. L., Linton, G. E., and Price, I.
Callaway Textile Dictionary,
Callaway Mills, Georgia: 1947.

Clark, W. A. G.
Clark's Weave Room Calculations, third edition.
New York: Clark Publishing Co., 1949.

Collins, G. E.
"Fundamental Principles that Govern the Shrinkage of Cotton Goods by
Washing,"
Journal of the Textile Institute, vol. 30 (1939), p. 46.

Colour Index, second edition.
Bradford, England: the Society of Dyers and Colourists, Bradford, England;
and Lowell, Mass.: the American Society of Textile Chemists and Colorists,
1956.

Cooper, W. D.
An Introduction to the U.S. Textile Industry of the 70's.
Raleigh, N.C.: School of Textiles, North Carolina State University.

Emory, Irene.
Primary Structure of Fabrics.
Washington, D.C.: Textile Museum, 1966.

Enrick, N. L.
Industrial Engineering Manual for the Textile Industry.
New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1962.

--Management Control Manual for the Textile Industry.
New York: Rayon Publishing Corp., 1964.

--Time Study Manual for the Textile Industry.
New York: Textile Book Publishers, 1960.

Fairweather and Silwa.
Van Nostrand Reinhold Metric Handbook.
New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1972.

Fox, J. H.
The Woollen Manufacture at Wellington Somerset.
London: Arthur L. Humphreys, 1914.

Fox, T. W.
The Mechanism of Weaving.
London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1922.

Fundamentals of Textile Designing.
Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1949.

Garner, W.
Textile Laboratory Manual, third edition.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

London: Haywood Books, 1966.

Geyer, J. C., and Perry, W. A.
Textile Waste Treatment and Recovery.
Washington, D.C.: The Textile Foundation, Inc., 1936.

Gibb, G. S.
The Saco-Lowell Shops.
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Goldberg, J. B.
Fabric Defects.
New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Gray.
Encyclopedia of Microscopy and Microtechnique.
New York. Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1973.

Grosberg, P.
An Introduction to Textile Mechanics.
London: Ernest Baum, Ltd., 1968.

Grover, E. B.
Textile Processing: Continuous Filament Yarns.
Raleigh, N.C.: The Technical Press, 1951.

-- and Hamby, D. S.
Handbook of Textile Testing and Quality Control.
New York: Textile Book Publishers, 1960.

Hall, A. J.
Handbook of Textile Finishing.
New York: Chemical Publishing Co., 1955.

Textile Finishing, third edition.
New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co., 1966.

Hamby, Dame S.
American Cotton Handbook, third edition.
New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Hauston, W. A.
Mechanics for Textile Students, reprint.
Manchester, England: ' The Textile Institute, 1968.

Hartsuch, B. E.
Introduction to Textile Chemistry.
New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1950.

Heyr, A. N.
Fiber Microscopy.
New York: Textile Book Publishers, 1954.

Hooper, L.
Handloom Weaving: Plain and Ornamental.
London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1920.

Howell, Mieszkis, and Tabor.
Friction in Textiles.
London: Butterworth Publications, 1959.

Jackson, L. H.
Yarn and Cloth Calculations.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

New York: Textile Book Publishers, 1947.

Jones, C. E. M., Pearson, G., and Smith, R. M.
Cumulative Index to the Journal of the Textile Institute, second edition.
Manchester, England: The Textile Institute, 1971.

Journal of the Textile Institute. Manchester,
England: The Textile Institute.

Kaswell, E. Wellington
Sears Handbook of Industrial Textiles.
New York: Wellington Sears Co., Inc., 1963.

Knowlton, E.
Pepperell's Progress: History of a Cotton Textile Company 1844-1945.
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Lamprey, L.
The Story of Weaving.
New York:
Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1939.

Landstreet, C. B.
"A Mechanical Device for Measuring Yarn Diameter,"
Textile Bulletin, Sept. 1958~ pp. 83-85.

Lourie, J.
Textile Graphics--Computer Aided.
New edition. New York: Fairchild Publications Inc., 1973

Marsh, J. T.
An Introduction to Textile Bleaching.
London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1946.

-- An Introduction to Textile Finishing.
New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1951.

Martindale, J. G.
A Selected Bibliography of Textile Engineering.
Manchester, England: The Textile Institute, 1973.

Matthews, J. M.
Textile Fibers, fifth edition,
ed., Mauersberger, H. R. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1947.

Mauersberger, H. R., and Reed, H. E.
Rayon Warping.
Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1943.

Meredith, R., and Hearle, J. W. S.
Physical Methods of Investigating Textiles.
New York: Textile Book Publishers, 1959.

Midellebrook, W.
Secondary Aspects of the Powerloom.
London: Emmott and Co., Ltd., 1955.

Miller, E.
Textiles: Properties and Behavior.
New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1969.

Mitchum, Carl and McKay, Robert.
Bibliography of the Philosophy of Technology.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Moncrieff, R. W.
Man Made Fibers.
New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970.

Morton, W. E. and Hearle, J. W. S.
Physical Properties of Textile Fibres.
London: Butterworth and Co., 1962.

Morton, W. E., and Hearle, J. W. S.
Physical Properties of Textile Fibres, second edition.
New York: Halstead, division John Wiley, 1975.

Morton, W. E., and Wray, G. R.
An Introduction to the Study of Spinning.
London: Longmans Green and Co., Ltd., 1962.

Murphy, Wm. S.
The Textile Industries, volumes 1-8.
London: The Gresham Publishing Co., 1910.

Navin, T. R.
The Whittin Machine Works Since 1831.
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Nisbet, H.
Grammar of Textile Design, second edition.
London: Scott, Greenwood and Son, 1919.

-- Preliminary Operations of Weaving.
London: Emmott and Co., Ltd., 1914.

Nissan, A. H.
Textile Engineering Processes.
New York: Textile Book Publishers, 1959.

Oelsner, G. H.
A Handbook of Weaves.
New York: Dover Publications, Inc.

Petukhov, B. V.
The Technology of Polyester Fibers.
New York: Macmillan Co., 1963.

Posselt, E. A.
Posselt's Textile Library, vol. no. I and ff.
London: Sampson Low, Marston, and Co., Ltd., ca. 1885.

-- Technology of Textile Design. London:
Sampson Low, Marston, and Co., Ltd., 1889.

Preston, J. M.
Modern Textile Microscopy.
London: Emmott and Co., Ltd., 1933.

Pye, David.
The Nature and Art of Workmanship.
London: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

-- The Nature and Art of Workmanship.
New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1971. (paperback).

WeaveTech Archive 9911

-- The Nature of Design.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Quinn.
Application of Modern Physical Techniques of Tribology.
New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1971.

Review of Textile Progress, vol. no. I to date.
Manchester, England: The Textile Institute and the Society of Dyers and Colourists.

Schwartz, E. R.
Textiles and the Microscope.
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1934.

The Shirley Institute Summary of Current Literature, classifications 1-10.
London: Cotton, Silk, and Man Made Fibres Research Association.

Stearns, J. K.
Woolen and Worsted Looms.
Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1948.

Textile Terms and Definitions Committee.
Textile Terms and Definitions, sixth edition.
Manchester, England: The Textile Institute, 1970.

Textile World.
New York: McGraw-Hill Co.

Timmerman, J. F.
Woolen and Worsted Finishing.
Chicago: American School of Correspondence, 1909.

Troup, A. J., Stearns, J. K., and International Correspondence School Staff.
Yarns and Calculations.
Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1950.

Umpleby, F.
Textile Design.
Chicago: American School of Correspondence, 1909.

U. S. Institute for Textile Research, Inc.
Textile Research: A Survey of Progress.
Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge Technology Press, 1932.

Van Nostrand Scientific Encyclopedia.
New York. Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1968.

Von Bergen, W.
Wool Handbook, third edition.
New York: Interscience Publishers, 1970.

Walton, P.
Story of Textiles, new edition.
Boston: Tudor Publishing Co., 1936.

Ward, K. Jr.
Chemistry and Chemical Technology of Cotton.
New York: Interscience Publishers, Inc., 1955.

Watson, J.
Theory and Practise of the Art of Weaving by Hand and Power.
Glasgow: George Watson, 1863.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Watson, W.
Advanced Textile Design and Colour.
London: Longmans Green and Co., Ltd., 1947.

-- Textile Design and Colour, fifth edition.
London: Longmans Green and Co., Ltd., 1946.

Weave Constructions and Cloth Analyses.
Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1905.

Whitman, J. H.
Textile Calculations. London:
Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1920.

Winding and Twisting.
Scranton, Pa.: Inter-
national Textbook Co., 1948.

Woodhouse, T.
Healds and Reeds for Weaving.
Manchester, England: Emmott and Co., Ltd., 1920.

--and Mulve, T.
Textile Design: Pure and Applied.
London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1912

Wool Abstracts.
London: Wool Industrial Research Association.

Woolen and Worsted Warp Preparation and Weaving.
Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1905.

Worst, E.
Foot Power Loom Weaving, third edition.
Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1924.

Wray, G. R.
Modern Yarn Production.
London: Columbine Press, 1960.

To reply privately, send message to "Art McGathey" <mcart@rt66.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 09:46:09 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA16287; Fri, 19 Nov 1999
09:46:09 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mtiwmhc02.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc02.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.37])
by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA16267; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 09:46:07 -0700 (MST)
Received: from worldnet.att.net ([12.67.148.247])
by mtiwmhc02.worldnet.att.net (InterMail v03.02.07.07 118-134)
with ESMTP id <19991119164539.FCNB1865@worldnet.att.net>
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 16:45:39 +0000
Message-ID: <38357F91.F32EDA9@worldnet.att.net>
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 11:49:21 -0500
From: Grand Larseney <fiberweaver@worldnet.att.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en]C-WorldNet (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: mindset
References: <0.30e2296e.2566c7c8@aol.com>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

The really pathetic thing about the imports is that so much of that is made on our original machinery from the mills that shut down. When the equipment is liquidated, who do you think is buying it?
Carol in the Flatlands of MI

To reply privately, send message to Grand Larseney <fiberweaver@worldnet.att.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 10:45:44 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA03916; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 10:45:44 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Rt66.com (mack.rt66.com [198.59.162.1]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA03907; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 10:45:41 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host mack.rt66.com [198.59.162.1] claimed to be Rt66.com
Received: from none (pmj21.rt66.com [198.59.176.118])
by Rt66.com (8.9.3/8.9.1) with SMTP id KAA18184
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 10:45:44 -0700 (MST)
From: "Art McGathey" <mcart@rt66.com>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Bibliography Source
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 10:44:35 -0700
Message-ID: <000001bf32b5\$b449be0\$76b03bc6@rt66.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
In-Reply-To: <38357F91.F32EDA9@worldnet.att.net>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

The previously posted bibliography is from: Allen Fannin, Handloom Weaving Technology rev. ed., 1998 New York, Design Books, dist by Lyons Press.

Some formatting was changed to allow posting to this list.

To reply privately, send message to "Art McGathey" <mcart@rt66.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 12:23:55 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA29301; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 12:23:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA29292; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 12:23:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 25003 invoked by alias); 19 Nov 1999 19:23:59 -0000
Received: (qmail 24978 invoked from network); 19 Nov 1999 19:23:58 -0000
Received: from ip112.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.112)
by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 19 Nov 1999 19:23:58 -0000
Message-ID: <38358444.C9861AD7@netbistro.com>
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 09:09:24 -0800

WeaveTech Archive 9911

From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: laying blame
References: <199911191620.JAA09093@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I think it's unproductive to lay blame on cheap imports for NA attitudes re: hand vs power!

What we are discussing is the approbation fellow NA weavers heap on those of us who do use mechanically enhanced tools - which thankfully is being reduced because of people who go ahead and use such equipment regardless of others opinions.

What might be of more value is for those of us who generally use mechanically enhanced equipment to produce just one piece of cloth without it all, enter it into an exhibit somewhere, have people assume that we could "only" execute such a piece *because* we have mechanically assisted equipment, then reveal that we did it all with a pick up stick. I already have my piece woven.....a pick up Beiderwand jacket done for my DB - a train engineer. :)

Laura Fry
who as a Canadian is also "forbidden" to export into the US unless leaping through hoops set impossibly high in order to prevent "cheap" imports from flooding the US market.....

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 12:35:39 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA01932; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 12:35:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.jjj.net (root@smtp.jjj.net [209.235.31.137]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA01915; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 12:35:34 -0700 (MST)
Received: from HENRY (usr1-2.connex.net [209.116.252.160])
by smtp.jjj.net (8.9.1/8.9.0) with SMTP id OAA24009
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 14:34:43 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.16.19991119143527.19af1c60@smtp.jjj.com>
X-Sender: wheat@smtp.jjj.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (16)
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 14:35:27 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Wheat Carr <wheat@craftwolf.com>
Subject: Re: Bibliography Source
In-Reply-To: <000001bf32b55be449be0\$76b03bc6@rt66.com>
References: <38357F91.F32EDA9@worldnet.att.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 10:44 AM 11/19/99 -0700, you wrote:
>The previously posted bibliography is from: Allen Fannin, Handloom Weaving
>Technology rev. ed., 1998 New York,

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Thanks to both Art for his work and Allen for his permission, what a wonderful resource you have shared.

To reply privately, send message to Wheat Carr <wheat@craftwolf.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 13:20:00 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA14096; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 13:20:00 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA14076; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 13:19:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.28(src addr [206.63.102.37]) (1036 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11louVg-0002cBC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 12:19:56 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)
Message-ID: <383582F4.768@nas.com>
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 10:03:48 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #652 -- Technology
References: <199911191057.DAA06553@salmon.esosoft.net> <38353868.3C3DD102@world.std.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Tom Vogl wrote:

>
> Hi,
>
> I have a suggestion: Let us make the distinction between "Studio"
> weaving and "Factory" weaving rather than between "hand"weaving and
> "machine"weaving.

A studio could be a factory and vice versa. Could you define your terms. What I am interested in is the differences between the machinery used in both factory and studio settings. Certainly a comparison of the settings would be appropriate as well.

Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 13:20:12 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA14167; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 13:20:12 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA14156; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 13:20:10 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.28(src addr [206.63.102.37]) (709 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11louVz-0002cEC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 12:20:15 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Message-ID: <38358D37.2A11@nas.com>
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 10:47:36 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: HWT Bibliography / power loom references
References: <000101bf32a9\$c122ac00\$d8b03bc6@rt66.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Art McGathey wrote:

Thanks Art and Allen. This should give all of us plenty of fodder for continuation of the discussion on automated looms.
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 14:24:17 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA01494; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 14:24:17 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail.igrin.co.nz (mail.igrin.co.nz [202.49.244.12]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA01480; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 14:24:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mcwarr.igrin.co.nz (pppka-06.igrin.co.nz [202.49.245.41])
by mail.igrin.co.nz (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id KAA10145
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 10:27:29 +1300
Message-Id: <199911192127.KAA10145@mail.igrin.co.nz>
From: "Michael Warr and Jean McIver" <mcwarr@igrin.co.nz>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 10:23:29 +1300
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: mindset
In-reply-to: <0.30e2296e.2566c7c8@aol.com>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> << I think the
> bigger picture is the problem of Asian countries dumping below cost fibers
> on the US economy hurting our mills and eventually our sources for our
> personal yarns we need for our work and the prices we need for that work. >>
>
> I totally agree. I have maintained in the past and continue to use the
> reference to the effect of: We will all be sorry sooner or later that we
> support these countries who undercut us.

I just have to jump in here being from a country that continually undercuts the USA in some commodities. Firstly we undercut your producers because we can produce these products more efficiently. Secondly you allow these imports into your country, because you want to get more of your exports into these countries, not because you want to support them in some altruistic fashion. Don't think that us tiny countries, including Asian countries, have much say in this. The USA rules the market.

Jean McIver

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Parapara, New Zealand
Mailto:mcwarr@igrin.co.nz
Home Page: <http://www.igrin.co.nz/~mcwarr>
Creative Fibre site: <http://www.creativefibre.org.nz>

To reply privately, send message to "Michael Warr and Jean McIver" <mcwarr@igrin.co.nz>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 14:47:17 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA07260; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 14:47:17 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail1.ync.net (mail1.ync.net [206.185.20.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA07249; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 14:47:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from SuButler (tcv90-ARC-004.151.ync.net [206.185.20.151])
by mail1.ync.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id QAA01017
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 16:04:36 -0600 (CST)
Message-ID: <001f01bf32d8\$265b36e0\$0400a8c0@SuButler>
From: "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Re: laying blame
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 15:50:51 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I have been reading this thread with interest, however one question keeps returning to my mind...when I read Laura's statement:

>What we are discussing is the approbation fellow NA weavers heap on
>those of us who do use mechanically enhanced tools - which thankfully
>is being reduced because of people who go ahead and use such equipment
>regardless of others opinions.

...which I feel is in direct response to those weavers who use mechanically enhanced tools and somehow imply superiority over other weavers. For quite some time I have witnessed some weavers who have mechanized equipment behave in such a fashion as to belittle those who do not use same (Laura I am not saying this about you personally!!).....when did weaving become so political?

I now ask - **Who** are these NA weavers who heap on blame and **Why** should anyone care what they say? I will agree when computerized looms were first available I was privy to some heated debates among guild members as to whether or not it constituted hand weaving. Those who still hold these prejudices I simply dismiss. After all, one can only be made to feel badly about something if they **allow** themselves to feel badly.....if I choose to use a computer in my weaving, whose business is it but my own?...and if my fellow weaver chooses to work only with a pickup stick, who cares? As Laura stated in an earlier post, the goal is similar in most instances...to make perfect cloth.....

This discussion can be a means to a better understanding of the differences in producing cloth in a studio situation vs. a mill situation, but I feel would be better served if one "side" did not try to induce the other to agree.

Su :-) who happily weaves on both computerized and standard looms...but has never even been to a mill.....

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To reply privately, send message to "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 15:17:10 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA13782; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 15:17:10 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA13777; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 15:17:08 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-16.idsonline.com [209.8.42.16])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id RAA10850
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 17:16:47 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991119171127.006e4324@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 17:11:27 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Re: handlooms/mill looms
In-Reply-To: <383582F4.768@nas.com>
References: <199911191057.DAA06553@salmon.esosoft.net>
<38353868.3C3DD102@world.std.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>What I am interested in is the differences between the machinery
>used in both factory and studio settings.

Myra--I urge you to visit a textile mill. If there are none in your area, plan a vacation where there are some. If nothing else, plan a trip to the Boston area and spend a day (or more) in Lowell. There you can visit the American Museum of Textile History, which has a couple of working mill looms or you can go to an actual restored mill (sorry--I forget the name, begins w/ a B). You will be given ear plugs and you can go into a room where some 80 or so powerlooms are hard at work, tended by one or two people.

This, I think, is one very big difference between the so-called power looms that handweavers use and those in use at mills. Our looms, no matter how automated, still tend to need a weaver sitting at them. Looms in mills do not. That said, I will add that I have seen a setup that could be either a large studio or a very small mill that had both the kind of AVL that we use and (I think) 4 small AVL true power looms, the latter tended by one person, the former operated by one weaver each, just as we would. The studio is in Chico, within walking distance of AVL. If you're taking a class there, you might have the folks at AVL call & see if your class can visit. That is how I got to see it. The owner of the studio is or has been on this list and can perhaps add to this discussion. (I don't mean to be cagey, but I don't think it's fair specify who it is without her permission.)

Bottom line: words can go only so far. Go visit a mill and see for yourself what some of the differences are.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 17:58:55 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA15351; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 17:58:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA15342; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 17:58:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.45(src addr [206.63.102.45]) (1510 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11oyrh-0002bRC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 16:58:57 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)
Message-ID: <3835E428.213F@nas.com>
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 16:58:32 -0700
From: Ernst & DelBoca <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: handlooms/mill looms
References: <199911191057.DAA06553@salmon.esosoft.net> <38353868.3C3DD102@world.std.com> <3.0.3.32.19991119171127.006e4324@cpcug.org>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Ruth Blau wrote:

>
> >What I am interested in is the differences between the machinery
> >used in both factory and studio settings.
>
> Myra--I urge you to visit a textile mill. If there are none in your area,
> plan a vacation where there are some. If nothing else, plan a trip to the
> Boston area and spend a day (or more) in Lowell.)
>
> Bottom line: words can go only so far. Go visit a mill and see for
> yourself what some of the differences are.

I have visited several mills, large and small, including Pendleton and a custom wool processing mill in Canada. There is no opportunity in those visits to have the kind of discussion which should be possible with a list such as this and the expertise it possesses.

I hope you are not suggesting we drop the topic for there should be a wealth of information all of us can utilize for our individual situations.

Myra

To reply privately, send message to Ernst & DelBoca <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 18:06:33 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA16920; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 18:06:33 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.nwlink.com (smtp.nwlink.com [209.20.130.57]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA16915; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 18:06:31 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [207.202.172.199] (ip199.r4.d.bel.nwlink.com [207.202.172.199]) by smtp.nwlink.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id RAA25863 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 17:06:39 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: alcorn@pop.nwlink.com (Unverified)
Message-Id: <103130303b45b854e92ad@DialupEudora>
In-Reply-To: <000101bf32a9\$c122ac00\$d8b03bc6@rt66.com>
References: <199911191438.JAA00551@mailbox.syr.edu>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 17:09:40 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Alcorn <alcorn@nmlink.com>
Subject: Re: HWT Bibliography / power loom references
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

WOW! A big thank You to both Art and Allen. This list will keep us off the streets for a while.

To reply privately, send message to Alcorn <alcorn@nmlink.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 18:06:39 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA16973; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 18:06:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.nmlink.com (smtp.nmlink.com [209.20.130.57]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA16948; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 18:06:37 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [207.202.172.199] (ip199.r4.d.bel.nmlink.com [207.202.172.199]) by smtp.nmlink.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id RAA25883 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 17:06:45 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: alcorn@pop.nmlink.com (Unverified)
Message-Id: <l03130306b45b8b09eb90@DialupEudora>
In-Reply-To: <003301bf3085\$996cef20\$7ec6b8a1@pmarriot>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 17:09:40 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Alcorn <alcorn@nmlink.com>
Subject: Re: speaking of warping
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Re warping and tieing in bundles onto the apron.

I have never used an apron for either the warp or the cloth. If one insists on using a liner, a better solution is either wall paper liner or wooden slats.

If I warp back to front, I slip a steel rod in the winding loop and then make a slip know at each end using the sectional warp cords. This is especially important when warping with linen.

If warping front to back, the bouts are tied in 2" sections as the sectional non-removable pegs are set on 2" centers.

When winding on, the warp is tightened in 1" bouts for every revolution of the warp beam.

None of the above is necessary if sectionally warping.

Like Yvonne Coopmans and the Nyquist method I tie the warp at the breast beam in 1/2 to 1" bouts, depending on the epi, using overhand knots. I use a doubled length of carpet warp perhaps 5 times the width of the warp. I tie one end of the lacing cord to the steel rod, thread the cord through the middle of the first bout top to bottom, under the steel bar. This is repeated for each bout. When all bouts are laced I tighten the cord so

WeaveTech Archive 9911

that all the bouts are about 1 1/2" from the steel bar. At this point the loose end of the cord is tied to the steel bar. To keep it from slipping, one end of the doubled cord is wound one way 3 times around, the other end wound 3 times in the opposite direction. It is pretty easy to adjust the tension between the bouts. I find that it helps to judge the tension by feeling it behind the beater. The warps have been very even.

To reply privately, send message to Alcorn <alcorn@nlink.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 20:19:22 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA11484; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 20:19:22 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA11477; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 20:19:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 27630 invoked by alias); 20 Nov 1999 03:19:31 -0000
Received: (qmail 27621 invoked from network); 20 Nov 1999 03:19:31 -0000
Received: from ip126.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.126) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 20 Nov 1999 03:19:31 -0000
Message-ID: <383613FD.408F9F9C@netbistro.com>
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 19:22:37 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: superior?
References: <199911200058.RAA15370@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I could generate a list of names of people who have come to me personally to tell me I could no longer label my woven goods "handwoven" because I a) used a doobby, b) used a computer. Their pronouncements were not sought out, but were freely given - and completely ignored!

No one is superior by virtue of their equipment. No one is superior, period.

:)

Laura Fry

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 19 20:26:02 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA12394; Fri, 19 Nov 1999 20:26:02 -0700 (MST)
Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1999 20:26:02 -0700 (MST)
Message-Id: <199911200326.UAA12394@salmon.esosoft.net>
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)
From: tnewman@midcoast.com.au (Trudy Newman)
Subject: warp tie-on
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

WeaveTech Archive 9911

It is interesting to hear of different ways of tying on warps. There is not doubt it can be problematical, and of course, like everything else in weaving, the methods that suits "you" best are the "right" ones. However, it needs to be kept in mind that the warp, whatever its value, is still the cheapest part of the process. Your time in warping, threading and weaving is the expensive bit, and so whatever saves time in those areas is perhaps the way to go.

Trudy

Trudy Newman
27 Allunga Ave PORT MACQUARIE NSW 2444
AUSTRALIA. Ph/fax:(02) 6582 2722
tnewman@midcoast.com.au

To reply privately, send message to tnewman@midcoast.com.au (Trudy Newman)

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 20 04:52:51 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA11496; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 04:52:51 -0700 (MST)
Received: from supai.oit.umass.edu (mailhub.oit.umass.edu [128.119.175.6]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA11492; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 04:52:49 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host mailhub.oit.umass.edu [128.119.175.6] claimed to be supai.oit.umass.edu
Received: from autio (v90-232-165.dialup.umass.edu [128.119.232.165]) by supai.oit.umass.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #38130) with SMTP id <0FLH00C9TVNZQZ@supai.oit.umass.edu> for WeaveTech@List-Server.net; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 06:52:49 -0500 (EST)
Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 06:53:56 -0500
From: Autio <autio@pssci.umass.edu>
Subject: Re: superior?
X-Sender: autio@mailsrv-unix.oit.umass.edu
To: WeaveTech@List-Server.net
Message-id: <4.1.19991120062024.068e4bc0@mailsrv-unix.oit.umass.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At the risk of really putting my foot into my mouth....

To me the question is not what kind of equipment you use, from backstrap loom to mill-type "Look Ma, No Hands!". If you are designing the piece and setting up the equipment and doing what needs to be done to run it, that is what counts. That said, the distinction I would make is between run size: Unique (one to five of an item, perhaps all with variations), Limited production (10's-100's of duplicates), and Mill Run (1000's of copies). To me, those matter far more than how you did it. Obviously, economics and personal taste will dictate what you produce, but when I pay for handwoven or see it in a show, I want something unique or very limited in production, no matter how well made or designed.

The one thing we can do as handweavers that mills can't do (because of the economic constraints, not technology) is make unique items. The more unique designs you make, the more of yourself shows up in the design. That personal touch, as opposed to mass trained, producing for mass audience tastes, is what makes handweaving interesting and worthwhile. Handweavers reach their stage of proficiency by almost as many routes as there are handweavers - as opposed to mill textile designers who graduate from a limited number of mill-oriented programs (with similar curricula and texts)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

geared to a much larger (averaged) target client. We do not have millions of dollars worth of equipment to support or need to find the mass market. Collectively we provide a deep pool of vastly creative people who will find many routes to a far greater variety of unique and beautiful end-products (and a greater variety of flops and inefficiencies <g>). Our potential for innovation is collectively unlimited. Slavishly copying mill procedures designed to produce thousands of copies on outlandishly expensive equipment for average buyers is not. Learn them by all means if you are interested, but learn more as well.

Laurie Autio, donning flame-proof suit

To reply privately, send message to Autio <autio@pssci.umass.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 20 05:20:28 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA13833; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 05:20:28 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Namesrv.Mountain.Net (root@Namesrv.Mountain.Net [198.77.1.1]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA13827; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 05:20:26 -0700 (MST)
Received: from access.mountain.net (slip7-3.Spencer-WV.Mountain.Net [198.77.53.102]) by Namesrv.Mountain.Net (8.9.3/8.9.0) with ESMTMP id HAA00372 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 07:20:26 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3836932D.731A24A1@access.mountain.net>
Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 07:25:17 -0500
From: susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>
X-Sender: "susan ernst" <vegalyra@access.mountain.net> (Unverified)
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en]C-gatewaynet (Win98; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: "weavetech@List-Server.net" <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: what to call it
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> Tom Vogl wrote:
> I have a suggestion: Let us make the distinction between "Studio"
> weaving and "Factory" weaving rather than between "hand"weaving and
> "machine"weaving.

as i read the recent powerloom thread i note that the references are broken into handloom weavers and powerloom weavers, mills and studios, computers and drawdown, doobby and pick up.....but for me i read them with my own bias. those whom i think are earning their living solely through handloom weaving activities and those who produce handloom woven products when they are not earning a living in another trade. it puts things in a different light. not superior, not better, not to the left, not to the right, just different.

Allen Fannin wrote:

> Attitude that there is no one right way to do something seems to be >endemic to handloom weaving.....

i am committed to earning a living through weaving (not profitable enough yet, still washing boats!). when allen says something to the tune of there is only one way to sley a reed what i hear is there is one method of sleying the reed that is quicker, less stressful on body parts and will promote the production of a superior cloth. more efficient, better profits. i do not interpret his statement as ...my way is the best and only way.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Su Butler wrote:

> This discussion can be a means to a better understanding of the
> differences in producing cloth in a studio situation vs. a mill situation,
> but I feel would be better served if one "side" did not try to induce >the other to
agree.

this has not been a one side - other side discussion. i think it is
very circular and diverse. keep it up! se.

i wonder if gourmet clubs discount the ability of a chef if she uses an
electric noodle maker?

To reply privately, send message to susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 20 05:33:13 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA15275; Sat, 20 Nov 1999
05:33:13 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id
FAA15258; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 05:33:11 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-12.idsonline.com [209.8.42.12])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id HAA14884
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 07:32:52 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991120072729.006df8c8@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 07:27:29 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Re: handlooms/mill looms
In-Reply-To: <3835E428.213F@nas.com>
References: <199911191057.DAA06553@salmon.esosoft.net>
<38353868.3C3DD102@world.std.com>
<3.0.3.32.19991119171127.006e4324@cpcug.org>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Myra wrote:

>> >What I am interested in is the differences between the machinery
>> >used in both factory and studio settings.

And I replied:

>> Myra--I urge you to visit a textile mill. <snip>

And Myra wrote again:

>I have visited several mills, large and small, including Pendleton and a
>custom wool processing mill in Canada. There is no opportunity in those
>visits to have the kind of discussion which should be possible with a
>list such as this and the expertise it possesses.
>I hope you are not suggesting we drop the topic for there should be a
>wealth of information all of us can utilize for our individual
>situations.

Of course I'm not suggesting that you drop this discussion. Please think
back to when the discussion started. You said it might not be appropriate
for this list, and I specifically wrote back & said it *is* appropriate.
But please reread what you wrote (quoted above) that caused me to suggest
you visit a mill. You stated that you are interested in the differences in

WeaveTech Archive 9911

machinery in mills and studios. What I said was that words could go only so far, and that at some point perhaps one should visit a mill. Nothing in that statement says the discussion should be dropped.

The role that Amy & I (as co-admin of this list) play is to be sure the whole thing doesn't dissolve into a flame war. As we've already seen, the use of mechanical assists in handweaving can be controversial. Less so on this list, perhaps, than on others, but one person in this discussion has already suggested that too many users of computer-assisted weaving tend to look down on those who don't use such equipment, a potentially inflammatory statement. I know many users of both types of equipment, and I've never witnessed behavior of this kind.

If you look at your "Welcome to WeaveTech" letter, you'll see that it specifically says, "This list encourages vigorous debate, even about potentially controversial topics. List members must be able to debate and disagree politely, without name-calling and without taking offense where none is intended." IOW, we're grownups, and we should be able to handle controversial subjects. But we're also colleagues, so we should be able to handle them with civility.

So carry on. Keep it civil & keep it on topic, and you can discuss this subject from now to the next millennium <ggg>. Those who are bored w/ the discussion are familiar enough w/ their keyboards to find their delete keys.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 20 06:06:17 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA18535; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 06:06:17 -0700 (MST)
Received: from ccrtc.com (mail.ccrtc.com [205.243.45.34]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA18531; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 06:06:16 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host mail.ccrtc.com [205.243.45.34] claimed to be ccrtc.com
Received: from stevensj_home.indy.tce.com [206.230.133.51] by ccrtc.com (SMTPD32-5.05) id A6D01AA50038; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 08:05:36 -0500
Message-ID: <001b01bf3355\$c4cbf1c0\$3385e6ce@stevensj_home.indy.tce.com>
From: "Kathleen Stevens" <hndwvnds@ccrtc.com>
To: <weavetech@list-server.net>
Subject: Re: handlooms/mill looms
Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 07:50:04 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Myra and others,

Another way to see and learn about the commercial world of textiles is to read some copies of Textile World magazine, a trade magazine. It is excellent and very up to date on the latest machinery, trade etc etc. They

WeaveTech Archive 9911

have a site: textileworld.com Any large university or college that has an art/textile dept. should have the magazine in their racks for you to read. There are other publications as well. If textiles are our business, we should be educated about the whole field. Cheers, Kathleen
hndwvnds@ccrtc.com PS. I have to send this message as a reply because otherwise my message bounces back. I had trouble with my pc yesterday - that may be the problem. Sorry about this.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ernst & DelBoca <archfarm@nas.com>
To: weavetech@list-server.net <weavetech@list-server.net>
Date: Friday, November 19, 1999 7:58 PM
Subject: Re: handlooms/mill looms

>Ruth Blau wrote:

>>

>> >What I am interested in is the differences between the machinery
>> >used in both factory and studio settings.

>>

>> Myra--I urge you to visit a textile mill. If there are none in your area,

>> plan a vacation where there are some. If nothing else, plan a trip to the

>> Boston area and spend a day (or more) in Lowell.)

>>

>> Bottom line: words can go only so far. Go visit a mill and see for
>> yourself what some of the differences are.

>

>I have visited several mills, large and small, including Pendleton and a
>custom wool processing mill in Canada. There is no opportunity in those
>visits to have the kind of discussion which should be possible with a
>list such as this and the expertise it possesses.

>I hope you are not suggesting we drop the topic for there should be a
>wealth of information all of us can utilize for our individual
>situations.

>

>Myra

>

>To reply privately, send message to Ernst & DelBoca <archfarm@nas.com>

>

To reply privately, send message to "Kathleen Stevens" <hndwvnds@ccrtc.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 20 06:45:13 1999

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA23702; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 06:45:13 -0700 (MST)

Received: from mail1.ync.net (mail1.ync.net [206.185.20.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA23698; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 06:45:12 -0700 (MST)

Received: from SuButler (tcv90-ARC-004.181.ync.net [206.185.20.181])
by mail1.ync.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id IAA22764

for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 08:02:32 -0600 (CST)

Message-ID: <003b01bf335d\$f77cf580\$0400a8c0@SuButler>

From: "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>

To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>

Subject: Re: handlooms/mill looms

Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 07:48:44 -0600

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

WeaveTech Archive 9911

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>but one person in this discussion has
>already suggested that too many users of computer-assisted weaving tend to
>look down on those who don't use such equipment, a potentially
>inflammatory statement

HI Ruth...are you referring to what I posted with this statement??? This is clearly not what I said and if you reread the post you will see it said *some* not *too many* weavers behave in this way.....I also stated that *I* had witnessed this, and NOT that every weaver who uses mechanically enhanced tools behaves in this fashion!!

I also said that I felt the Laura's experience with those who criticize *because* she uses mechanically enhanced equipment is *countered* by the opposing viewpoint from weavers who feel intimidated because they have 4S etc.....I said this view was "in direct response....."

>...which I feel is in direct response to those weavers who use mechanically enhanced tools and somehow imply superiority over other weavers. For quite some time I have witnessed some weavers who have mechanized equipment behave in such a fashion as to belittle those who do not use same

....I simply meant I had witnessed the flip side of Laura's statement....yes she is justified in saying people have been critical of her choice to utilize mechanization in her weaving...but I have also been on the receiving end of people who judge and criticize because I use more shafts than they do....and been refused entrance into study groups because some group members didn't feel I had the "capacity" to weave appropriate samples without computer aided weaving (even though the study group was NOT a computer aided study group!).....so if you are referring to me, I guess I had better make another statement so those that do not read the whole post but choose to extract and attack will understand...my whole point is that there will always be some weavers who have such a lack of self confidence they feel the need to attack others who are more successful...no matter what! I ask again, when did weaving become so political? It would be nice if we could set aside all this prejudice and defensiveness, and talk about the subject at hand...that of the differences of mill weaving vs. studio weaving.....

Su :-) apbutler@ync.net

To reply privately, send message to "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 20 09:07:09 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA12381; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 09:07:09 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail-01.cdsnet.net (mail-01.cdsnet.net [206.107.16.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA12373; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 09:07:07 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 14212 invoked from network); 20 Nov 1999 16:07:09 -0000
Received: from d01a8123.dip.cdsnet.net (HELO cdsnet.net) (208.26.129.35) by mail.cdsnet.net with SMTP; 20 Nov 1999 16:07:09 -0000
Message-ID: <3836C7C3.A19B6184@cdsnet.net>
Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 08:09:40 -0800
From: Margaret Copeland <busys@cdsnet.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.03 [en] (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: superior?
References: <199911201306.GAA18550@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I'm just going to throw out some thoughts about the superiority debate over "hand woven" and "mill woven" cloth. My parallel will be the huge home hobbyist knitting machine. I'm hoping people know what a knitting machine is. Most knitting machines are made in Japan and there are some made in Europe. As recently as ten years ago the home machine knitter became "computerized" in a way similar to how hand looms now have a computerized interface. You can create various patterns on your computer screen and knit away with the computer controlling the knitting needle patterns. There are motorized interfaces that move the yarn across the needles etc. There is software to control the shaping of the garment. In many ways (due to the nature of knitting machines) these processes are more advanced than with hand weavers and PC's.

OK - the analogy - machine knitters face the problem of labeling their wares as "machine knitted", "frame knitted (mostly UK expression for the same thing)", and "hand knitted". In a sense their wares are hand knitted - not made by a big circular commercial knitting machines that makes hundreds of yards of tee shirt interlock at the push of the button. This labeling has caused a *cry of foul!* from the truly hand knitted by two knitting needles crowd and who sell expensive sweaters this way.

In many third world countries like Peru the knitting machine has arrived. A lot of the "hand knit" sweaters of alpaca are done on the knitting machine. In my opinion it makes a superior garment and controls the stretch in the sweater. However as a consumer if you buy a "hand knitted" Peruvian alpaca sweater maybe this is an important-to-you part of the sale. You may have an image that some Peruvian has patiently spent *their* time on *your* sweater with two knitting needles. In reality they may be made in a small collective with knitting machines. In the US, there are small companies that make lots of ski caps on the knitting machines. Their wares are sold to L.L.Bean and others.

The knitting machine (like the computerized hand loom) is also used for serious sampling and prototyping. I have a good friend that does this type of design work. Many designs are ALSO worked up on two knitting needles and then to the knitting machine and then to Southeast Asia as a pattern sent by Fax.

- Margaret Copeland
<http://home.cdsnet.net/~busys>

To reply privately, send message to Margaret Copeland <busys@cdsnet.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 20 10:09:25 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA22728; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 10:09:25 -0700 (MST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: from europe.std.com (europe.std.com [199.172.62.20]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA22721; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 10:09:24 -0700 (MST)
Received: from world.std.com (root@world-f.std.com [199.172.62.5]) by europe.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id MAA16382 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 12:09:28 -0500 (EST)
Received: from world.std.com (ppp0c123.std.com [208.192.102.123]) by world.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id MAA05485 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 12:08:24 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3836D4D1.68DA6680@world.std.com>
Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 12:05:21 -0500
From: Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: definition
References: <199911201306.GAA18550@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi,

As per request, here is the distinction I was trying to make between studio and factory. Factories make large quantities of relatively few different things/patterns/designs; studios make relatively small quantities of relatively many different things/patterns/designs. Ford put it well regarding factory output (of the model T): You can buy it in any color you like, as long as it is black.

Cheers,

T.
--

Tom Vogl
29 Scotchman's Lane
West Tisbury, MA 02575
"Intuition is the result of 20 years experience" K. C. Long

Voice: 508-693.6065
Fax: 508-696.0625
tpv@world.std.com

To reply privately, send message to Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 20 10:25:01 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA25485; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 10:25:01 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp4.erols.com (smtp4.erols.com [207.172.3.237]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA25477; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 10:25:00 -0700 (MST)
Received: from LOCALNAME (216-164-131-29.s29.tnt2.lnhva.md.dialup.rcn.com [216.164.131.29]) by smtp4.erols.com (8.8.8/smtp-v1) with SMTP id MAA20692; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 12:25:00 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <38370C98.1E54@erols.com>
Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 13:03:20 -0800
From: Anne Wells <arwells@erols.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-DH397 (Win16; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weaving@quilt.net, weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: W-Update on Erica's book

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Earlier this fall I posted a note about the availability of Erica's new book, Tejido Huave, saying I am her distributor for U.S. folks. Well. Erica has finally gotten some time at home, after a busy fall of teaching and traveling, to print a supply of these books. So if you are NOT in the U.S. or Canada (a few persistent people pushed me into figuring out how to mail things to Canada at a reasonable price: not easy! <g>) and you are interested in the book, please contact Erica directly at: ederuiter@hetnet.nl. She will be happy to quote prices, give more info about the book, and so on. U.S. and Canada interested people can still email me.

Thanks, and apologies to you all overseas that we didn't get this done sooner. I didn't keep a list of names, so you really need to email Erica directly (not the List, please), if you are still interested in the book.

Anne Wells
arwells@erols.com

To reply privately, send message to Anne Wells <arwells@erols.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 20 10:57:38 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA01801; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 10:57:38 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.vci.net (smtp.vci.net [207.162.160.12]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA01782; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 10:57:35 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Bonnie (ppp-166-106.vci.net [207.162.166.106] (may be forged))
by smtp.vci.net (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id LAA01233
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 11:57:39 -0600
Message-Id: <3.0.32.19991120115827.007a8d70@mail.vci.net>
X-Sender: brdatta@mail.vci.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 11:58:32 -0600
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Bonnie Datta <brdatta@vci.net>
Subject: Re: superior?
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 08:09 AM 11/20/99 -0800, Margaret wrote:

> I'm just going to throw out some thoughts about the superiority
debate over "hand woven" and "mill
>woven" cloth. My parallel will be the huge home hobbyist knitting machine.

I too have been thinking of parallels, and the two that keep popping into my mind are pretty off-topic...

Back in my more settled days I took great pleasure and pride in my garden, and I really *did* think that my produce was better-tasting. Of course, it hardly compared to some of my farming relatives' gardens in output -- most had enough to freeze or can to last the winter. And as I listen to the radio and watch TV now I get glimpses of real mega-agriculture -- another dimension entirely.

Another similar situation compares the hobby/game fisher, the family-owned commercial fishing enterprise, and the enormous corporate entities that

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>knitted". In a sense their wares are
>hand knitted - not made by a big circular commercial knitting machines
>that makes hundreds of yards of tee
>shirt interlock at the push of the button. This labeling has caused a *cry
>of foul!* from the truly hand
>knitted by two knitting needles crowd and who sell expensive sweaters this
>way.

Thanks for your report. It was a real eye opener.

In school, I sweated bullets creating my "Knit 1" samples on a nonmotorized, noncomputerized knitting machine. I remember the agony of setting up the needles for a pattern and knitting a complex pattern by toggling hand controls before each pass only to have a loop slip off a needle and a run ruin the sample. I'd thought all hobbyist knitting machines were such engines of terror and their enthusiasts either masochists or wizards. My school also had a few commercial flat bed (?) computerized, motorized machines (as well as a circular machine) but these were reserved for the more advanced students.

Years ago, I enjoyed being a handknitter but had to give it up due to the wear on my finger joints. The machine knitting I did was much more difficult than anything I ever did with two knitting needles.

So much for machines taking away drudgery,
Jane

Jane Eisenstein janee@softweave.com <http://www.softweave.com/>

To reply privately, send message to Jane Eisenstein <janee@softweave.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 20 17:14:18 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA27391; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 17:14:18 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA27386; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 17:14:16 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.45(src addr [206.63.102.45]) (713 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11pKe5-0002ZaC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 16:14:21 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <3836F689.691E@nas.com>
Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 12:29:14 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: what to call it
References: <3836932D.731A24A1@access.mountain.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

susan ernst wrote:

>

> this has not been a one side - other side discussion. i think it is

WeaveTech Archive 9911

> very circular and diverse. keep it up! se.

Excellent, post, Susan.
Thanks,
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 20 17:14:20 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA27419; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 17:14:20 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA27401; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 17:14:19 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.45(src addr [206.63.102.45]) (946 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11pKe9-0002b0C@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 16:14:25 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <3836F81C.7305@nas.com>
Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 12:35:57 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: handlooms/mill looms
References: <001b01bf3355\$c4cbf1c0\$3385e6ce@stevensj_home.indy.tce.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Kathleen Stevens wrote:

>
> Myra and others,
> Another way to see and learn about the commercial world of textiles is to
> read some copies of Textile World magazine, a trade magazine. I

Indeed; would you have an address for it? I have been trying to find such trade journals for some time. A quick scan of the bibliography just posted to the list from HWT does not include it.

Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 20 17:14:29 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA27483; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 17:14:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA27468; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 17:14:27 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.45(src addr [206.63.102.45]) (873 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11pKeI-0002ZaC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 16:14:34 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)
Message-ID: <3836FB6F.A8E@nas.com>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 12:50:09 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: definition
References: <199911201306.GAA18550@salmon.esosoft.net> <3836D4D1.68DA6680@world.std.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Tom Vogl wrote:
> You can buy it in
> any color you like, as long as it is black.

So we are definitely talking "studio" as related to the subject and utilization of automated looms, because we now know that in the studio the automated loom, or the handloom, allows many colors and their combinations, eh?
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 20 17:56:42 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA06179; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 17:56:42 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Rt66.com (mack.rt66.com [198.59.162.1]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA06134; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 17:56:34 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host mack.rt66.com [198.59.162.1] claimed to be Rt66.com
Received: from none (pmg14.rt66.com [198.59.176.79])
by Rt66.com (8.9.3/8.9.1) with SMTP id RAA22505
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 17:56:41 -0700 (MST)
From: "Art McGathey" <mcart@rt66.com>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Two Questions
Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 17:55:27 -0700
Message-ID: <000601bf33bb\$19d73b60\$4fb03bc6@rt66.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600
Importance: Normal
In-Reply-To: <3.0.3.32.19991119171127.006e4324@cpug.org>
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

First:

Does anyone have any experience with this title from the HWT bibliography?
Sounds promising.

Hauston, W. A.
Mechanics for Textile Students, reprint.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Manchester, England: ' The Textile Institute, 1968.

Second:

Is there a quantitative measurement of drape-ability or limpness of a fabric? Note that I am not asking what effects it (fiber, yarn diameter, sett, weave) but can a number be assigned to it? (Perhaps this says something about my personality) I envision a piece of fabric extending horizontally over a right angle, such as a table, and allowed to drape over the angle. The distance between the upright of the right angle and the fabric may be measured, a specific distance from the angle . . . perhaps throw fabric density in there somewhere . . . I dunno. Does it exist?

To reply privately, send message to "Art McGathey" <mcart@rt66.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 20 22:06:05 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id WAA13862; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 22:06:05 -0700 (MST)
Received: from lh2.rdc1.sdca.home.com (ioracle@ha2.rdc1.sdca.home.com [24.0.3.67]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id WAA13858; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 22:06:03 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host ioracle@ha2.rdc1.sdca.home.com [24.0.3.67] claimed to be lh2.rdc1.sdca.home.com
Received: from home.com ([24.4.66.128]) by lh2.rdc1.sdca.home.com (InterMail v4.01.01.00 201-229-111) with ESMTP id <19991121050615.UDEV11592.lh2.rdc1.sdca.home.com@home.com> for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 20 Nov 1999 21:06:15 -0800
Message-ID: <38377DAD.DC991D0D@home.com>
Date: Sat, 20 Nov 1999 21:05:49 -0800
From: Rosemarie Dion <rdion@home.com>
Organization: @Home Network
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en]C-AtHome0407 (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: power looms
References: <199911201057.DAA04579@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Reflections on the power loom vs.. hand weaving discussion:
Weaving on my AVL 16 shaft production compu-dobby loom in the quiet of my sun filled home studio brings to mind the very different experiences my father had. He wove braid in a New England mill. He designed the patterns, set-up the machines and then taught young workers how to tend the machines. When we visited him in the mill on rare occasions, the atmosphere was oppressive, dark, dusty, and LOUD. The grease from the machines seemed ingrained in his hands, and he always spoke as if he was straining to be heard above that daily roar. None of us aspired to be a part of his work-a-day world.

This is what power looms bring to my mind. This was 50 years ago.

To reply privately, send message to Rosemarie Dion <rdion@home.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 07:02:00 1999

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA16729; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 07:02:00 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (imo12.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.2]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA16725; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 07:01:59 -0700 (MST)
From: Lorele3773@aol.com
Received: from Lorele3773@aol.com
by imo12.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.e811cbcd (2616)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 09:01:26 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.e811cbcd.25695536@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 09:01:26 EST
Subject: Re:studio vs. automation
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 45
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I was very privileged to be able to tour the Burlington Ind. factory over the summer with a friend who designs for their Home Products division. To say the least, it was an eye opener.

I don't wish to question anyone's decision making process concerning a desire to advance their weaving, but...

From my limited experience I must say that factory looms are just that; designed for a factory environment. Even on the simplest 4S hobby looms the adjustments and tweaking points HAD to be maintained by "Maintenance Depts." Factories are set up thus. When a thread broke, yes, the "weaver" was able to back the process up and replace the mistake. But if the thread delivery system failed or the air jets misfired or the back "electronic sensor thread break heddles" (sorry, Allen. Don't know the correct terminology) quit sensing and the looms shut down (or didn't shut down but kept on creating a bigger mess), maintenance was called. It's not that the handweaver can't learn to keep the loom running, but more of where one wants to place his priorities. Actually, the mechanics of these looms, to me, are very intriguing and could be interesting to "play" with. But that would be time taken away from my own designing and weaving. By talking to some of the workers it was evident that a long loom run was not a normal happening. These machines tended to need a fair amount of baby-sitting, or at least a peek every so often. I guess that is why the designers are not even in the plant with the looms. They get cluttered offices away from the noise and DUST.

I guess if a production weaver wanted to advance to a faster mode and was willing to take the limitations placed on him by the technology, whether modern or dated, these looms might have a place in a "studio." Securing the services of a time-tested knowledgeable loom mechanic would be first on my priority list. Learning where the closest machine shop was located that could replicate a broken piency-part to specs, in a timely manner, would be next. I think I would also apprentice myself to a factory to pick up on some of the tricks-of-the-trade that only experience can teach.

PS Factory life isn't for me!

Lorelei

To reply privately, send message to Lorele3773@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 08:25:20 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA28154; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 08:25:20 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (smtp7.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.128.51]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA28150; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 08:25:18 -0700 (MST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: from mindspring.com (user-2iveajs.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.42.124])
by smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id KAA12436
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 10:25:21 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <38380F0F.41191593@mindspring.com>
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 10:26:07 -0500
From: Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>
Organization: bnathans
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: factory vs. studio debate
References: <199911202221.PAA12289@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Tom's comment about factory means "any color so long as it's black" is WAY off the mark. Color and change of color is no problem for computerized factory work. Have you seen those inexpensive factory woven cotton and/or synthetic blankets sold everywhere for \$30 to maybe \$80 with every conceivable design on them, from wonderful to horrible.... They are double or triple woven. Some of them are wonderfully designed. and basically very inexpensive. I couldn't tell them from a handwoven item. For all I know they may be set up on cottage industry looms in some developing country.

In western China on this last trip we went to a craft institue where they train people in embroidery, woodworking, etc. Tom Wilson, our tour leader who has been there many times, was saying "Now in this room we will see 20 or 30 women embroidering the hats that every man wears in the Muslim communities. We then walked into a room that had a hummongous embroidery machine turning out 10 hat bases in about 3 minutes flat!! No more hand embroidered hats!!

The disappearance of hand embroidery depresses me, but also the fact that they seemed to use only one pattern over and over again on this machine, when I'm sure it could be programed to do an infinite number of diverse things. I had noticed this hat for sale all over the area, and it really is a very pleasant design. But not the only one.....

Something my second weaving teacher, Nell Znamierowski said has always rung true to me... Let the weaving factory do what it does well. Hand weavers should concentrate on what the factories can't do.....

And maybe when we try to get our "home" style looms to do production work that it wasn't designed to do, we are moving away from "hand weaving". Simply in pragmatic terms it doesn't make sense to me.

--

Barbara Nathans Bellport, Long Island, New York

To reply privately, send message to Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 08:44:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA00647; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 08:44:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo25.mx.aol.com (imo25.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.69]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA00642; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 08:44:13 -0700 (MST)
From: RUSLYN@aol.com
Received: from RUSLYN@aol.com
by imo25.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.9c8afded (4313)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 10:43:42 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.9c8afded.25696d2e@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 10:43:42 EST
Subject: Re: Myra's Background
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 10
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Myra,

I am just curious as to what your background is and what makes this handlooms/mill looms, discussion so important to you. Thanks,

Lynn Silberschlag
Tucson, AZ
ruslyn@aol.com

To reply privately, send message to RUSLYN@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 09:24:16 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA06051; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 09:24:16 -0700 (MST)
Received: from ccrtc.com (mail.ccrtc.com [205.243.45.34]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA06031; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 09:24:14 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host mail.ccrtc.com [205.243.45.34] claimed to be ccrtc.com
Received: from stevensj_home.indy.tce.com [206.230.133.77] by ccrtc.com (SMTPD32-5.05) id A6B5229E004A; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 11:23:33 -0500
Message-ID: <000601bf343a\$9386dd60\$4d85e6ce@stevensj_home.indy.tce.com>
From: "Kathleen Stevens" <hndwvnds@ccrtc.com>
To: <weavetech@list-server.net>
Subject: Re: handlooms/mill looms
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 11:07:56 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Myra,

Please just pull up textileworld.com and you will get the info you want.

Cheers, Kathleen

-----Original Message-----

From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
To: weavetech@list-server.net <weavetech@list-server.net>
Date: Saturday, November 20, 1999 7:14 PM
Subject: Re: handlooms/mill looms

>Kathleen Stevens wrote:

>>

>> Myra and others,

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>> Another way to see and learn about the commercial world of textiles is to
>> read some copies of Textile World magazine, a trade magazine. I
>
>Indeed; would you have an address for it? I have been trying to find
>such trade journals for some time. A quick scan of the bibliography
>just posted to the list from HWT does not include it.
>
>Myra
>
>
>
>To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
>

To reply privately, send message to "Kathleen Stevens" <hndwvnds@ccrtc.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 10:51:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA19845; Sun, 21 Nov 1999
10:51:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail.igrin.co.nz (mail.igrin.co.nz [202.49.244.12]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id KAA19841; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 10:51:13 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mcwarr.igrin.co.nz (pppka-05.igrin.co.nz [202.49.245.40])
by mail.igrin.co.nz (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id GAA24278
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 06:54:44 +1300
Message-Id: <199911211754.GAA24278@mail.igrin.co.nz>
From: "Michael Warr and Jean McIver" <mcwarr@igrin.co.nz>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 06:50:30 +1300
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re:studio vs. automation
In-reply-to: <0.e811cbcd.25695536@aol.com>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>Even on the simplest 4S dobby looms the
> adjustments and tweaking points HAD to be maintained by "Maintenance Depts."

The only home business I have seen using commercial equipment, is a spinning plant.
The husband does all the maintenance of the machines, which is an intensive job, and
one that has to be learned. I agree that most handweavers would not want to be
getting into such mechanical work, as it would take you away from designing and
weaving. It's a bit like those couples who grow their wool, spin it, dye it, weave it
and
sell it - you either have to be superwoman (or man), or more often no process is done
very well.

Jean McIver
Parapara, New Zealand
Mailto:mcwarr@igrin.co.nz
Home Page: <http://www.igrin.co.nz/~mcwarr>
Creative Fibre site: <http://www.creativefibre.org.nz>

To reply privately, send message to "Michael Warr and Jean McIver" <mcwarr@igrin.co.nz>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 11:43:34 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA29393; Sun, 21 Nov 1999

WeaveTech Archive 9911

11:43:34 -0700 (MST)

Received: from Namesrv.Mountain.Net (root@Namesrv.Mountain.Net [198.77.1.1]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA29385; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 11:43:32 -0700 (MST)
Received: from access.mountain.net (slip7-1.Spencer-WV.Mountain.Net [198.77.53.100]) by Namesrv.Mountain.Net (8.9.3/8.9.0) with ESMTP id NAA14197 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 13:43:35 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <38383E78.7A901A9E@access.mountain.net>
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 13:48:24 -0500
From: susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>
X-Sender: "susan ernst" <vegalyra@access.mountain.net> (Unverified)
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en]C-gatewaynet (Win98; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: "weavetech@List-Server.net" <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: mindset visited again
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

KATHLEEN STEVENS wrote:

> Another way to see and learn about the commercial world of textiles is >to read some copies of Textile World magazine, a trade magazine.

thank you for this suggestion, what a source! after reading just the first paragraph of this article the difference between weaving for profits and weaving for reasons beyond financial are so clearly demonstrated. take a look at the first few sentences of the article.

> Weaving

> The Best Selvage: Necessity, Not Choice

>

> A new generation of selvage motions is offering today's weaver better performance, improved quality and reduced waste

>

> By K. G. Melling,
> Consulting Editor

>

> From loom to cutting room, cost-effective manufacture of a quality product is essential to maintaining a
> competitive, profitable edge. Regardless of the process the objectives are the same: conserving costs by
> increasing performance and quality while simultaneously reducing waste. Wasting time, effort, materials or
> fabric reduces cost effectiveness and even fractional waste still mounts up on an annual basis.

before i chose handloom weaving as a means of financial support i would approach a project asking myself: what fibers, colors, structure would be the coolest in this project...what would i like to learn...what would be interesting to work with. maybe, just maybe i would consider the cost and production times. clearly, as the article demonstrates to me, cost and production time dictate the project. this is the mindset that we should approach our journey into the powerloom discussion with., the understanding that production costs dictate much of the techniques used.

> Margaret Copeland wrote:

> OK - the analogy - machine knitters face the problem of labeling >their wares as "machine knitted", "frame knitted (mostly UK expression >for the same thing)", and "hand knitted".

WeaveTech Archive 9911

i do production machine knitting and designing for an organization appalachian by design, (check out our chenille christmas stockings in garnett hill and wool sweaters in real goods) and the u s gov't approved terminology for this type of product is "handloom knitted"

se

To reply privately, send message to susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 12:13:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA05296; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 12:13:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from phnxpop1.phnx.uswest.net (phnxpop1.phnx.uswest.net [206.80.192.1]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA05291; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 12:13:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 8791 invoked by alias); 21 Nov 1999 19:10:31 -0000
Delivered-To: fixup-weavetech@list-server.net@fixme
Received: (qmail 3982 invoked by uid 0); 21 Nov 1999 19:07:12 -0000
Received: from dialupp184.phnx.uswest.net (HELO uswest.net) (209.180.141.184) by phnxpop1.phnx.uswest.net with SMTP; 21 Nov 1999 19:07:12 -0000
Message-ID: <383841E9.92AA2DF9@uswest.net>
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 12:03:05 -0700
From: kip broughton <cynthb@uswest.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: handlooms/mill looms
References: <000601bf343a\$9386dd60\$4d85e6ce@stevensj_home.indy.tce.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi Phyl,

Yes, I agree the information was valuable. That's why I passed it along to Larry. I was just surprised to see it in the Woven Word.

> No handlng charge for freight? Great.
> Sounds like you are almost done.
>

Not really. The weaving has just begun. I am not pleased with the first row - I didn't beat hard enough and they are too long. I considered resleying with an 8 dent reed instead of the 10 and decided against that, too, since that would make them too wide.

> Sun City Handweavers has a team in place. they are
> weaving the scarves. One color with contrast for
> instructors. The other color with reverse contrast
> for the committee.
>
> and OUR COLORS...yes.
>

Can you tell me more about these scarves? What yarn do you need? There will be 3/2 left but it may not drape well. According to Lynn one color weft for the committee and another weft for workshop leaders. I hadn't thought that far ahead but it is a good plan. If we need more yarn what does the budget allow? This second batch of yarn is another almost \$ 100, and that is the wholesale price.

> Thursday meeting went well, I thought.
> A custodian will clean up every night.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>

Yours is the first word about that meeting. Did it go well?

Cynthia

To reply privately, send message to kip broughton <cynthb@uswest.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 12:13:20 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA05349; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 12:13:20 -0700 (MST)
Received: from phnxpop1.phnx.uswest.net (phnxpop1.phnx.uswest.net [206.80.192.1]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA05332; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 12:13:19 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 11567 invoked by alias); 21 Nov 1999 19:12:35 -0000
Delivered-To: fixup-weavetech@list-server.net@fixme
Received: (qmail 10554 invoked by uid 0); 21 Nov 1999 19:11:43 -0000
Received: from dialupp184.phnx.uswest.net (HELO uswest.net) (209.180.141.184) by phnxpop1.phnx.uswest.net with SMTP; 21 Nov 1999 19:11:43 -0000
Message-ID: <383842F8.D34BC0F@uswest.net>
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 12:07:36 -0700
From: kip broughton <cynthb@uswest.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: handlooms/mill looms
References: <000601bf343a\$9386dd60\$4d85e6ce@stevensj_home.indy.tce.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Sorry about the last message. Somehow it was mis addressed.
Cynthia Broughton

To reply privately, send message to kip broughton <cynthb@uswest.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 12:27:44 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA07940; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 12:27:44 -0700 (MST)
Received: from home.humboldt1.com (home.humboldt1.com [206.13.45.1]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA07924; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 12:27:41 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [206.13.45.198] (ppp98-pm4.humboldt1.com [206.13.45.198]) by home.humboldt1.com (Pro-8.9.2/Pro-8.9.2) with ESMTP id LAA20134 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 11:28:49 -0800 (PST)
Message-Id: <l03110701b45dec4c7866@[209.77.208.29]>
In-Reply-To: <003b01bf335d\$f77cf580\$0400a8c0@SuButler>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 12:32:26 -0700
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>
Subject: Decades calendar
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

We have just finished our annual fiber arts calendar and I would like to let you know a little more about this year's theme "Decades". Each

WeaveTech Archive 9911

month represents one of the decades of the 20th century (plus the 1890's and "the 21st century) as interpreted by two of the four artists working in collaboration.

One member of each pair presented the other member with something which to them is indicative of the era in question. The "something" was then further developed (usually woven) into a sample that embodied that era. The team then designed the page that accompanies the piece. The diversity and variety is amazing. Since I am the least artistic; they let me do the bookkeeping and sales "-)! , I can brag about this production. It is really a wonderful ensemble; we all agree this is the "best one yet"

If you would like to know more about the calendar in general or any of the specifics of the samples, email me privately and I'll elaborate further. I can also let you know how to order a copy if you would like.
Thanks, Terri

To reply privately, send message to Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>

```
>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 12:29:54 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA08406; Sun, 21 Nov 1999
12:29:54 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (imo12.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.2]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id MAA08392; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 12:29:52 -0700 (MST)
From: Carpenma@aol.com
Received: from Carpenma@aol.com
    by imo12.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.17111148 (4000)
    for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 14:29:18 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.17111148.2569a20e@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 14:29:18 EST
Subject: Re: factory vs. studio debate
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 45
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net
```

In a message dated 11/21/1999 1:27:13 PM Mid-Atlantic Standard Time, bnathans@mindspring.com writes:

```
> Hand
> weavers should concentrate on what the factories can't do.....
>
```

I am beginning to wonder what the answer to this implied question is. Certainly it would not be cost-effective for factories to make individually unique items or even limited runs. But aside from this, what can hand weavers do that can't be done in factories?

Peg in Georgia

To reply privately, send message to Carpenma@aol.com

```
>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 12:50:08 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA11584; Sun, 21 Nov 1999
12:50:08 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id MAA11564; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 12:50:04 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.5(src addr [206.63.102.5]) (2653 bytes) by cleese.nas.com
    via sendmail with P:\smtp\R:inet_hosts/T:smtp
```

WeaveTech Archive 9911

(sender: <archfarm@nas.com>)
id <m11pczv-0002cEC@cleese.nas.com>
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 11:50:07 -0800 (PST)
(Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)
Message-ID: <38383992.4609@nas.com>
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 11:27:33 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: factory vs. studio debate, handloom vs power loom
References: <199911202221.PAA12289@salmon.esosoft.net> <38380F0F.41191593@mindspring.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Dear List Members:

Now that we are into this discussion a bit, I would like to clarify something about my initiation of it on this list - weaveTECH, as I sense a resistance (you know how every now and then you have to stop to adjust something on your loom to get it running smoother?). I chose to explore the subject here rather than on the weave list because I understood this list was devoted to and had the capacity to discuss the technological aspects of weaving - for any type of loom. Beyond the description that came with subscription, I assumed weavetech is comprised of weavers who utilize many advanced weaving tools - those utilized in many environments, especially production (commercial enterprise rather than hobby) environments.

Is there a more appropriate list available for this discussion, perhaps one utilized within "the industry," an internet forum, for "appropriate technology-scaled production enterprises" - the scale of operation one might find in the villages of the British Isles, South and Central America, the sort of forum that might be frequented by members of the Churchill Weavers, the Textillery, or designers within some of the large mills?

If so, I, and any of you who want to tag along, can relocate the topic there, as my intent is not to diminish the usefulness and importance and satisfaction of hand weaving, or to damage anyone's self esteem as a hand weaver. I have no doubt society, as presented by Jack Lenor Larson at Prince George, British Columbia several years ago, will continue to place a good value on the hand crafted, the hand woven product, as technology becomes more predominant.

But I also have no doubt that many of us actually need to be able to understand and utilize the more technologically oriented aspects and equipment associated with weaving. If there is no other "list," I would hope this topic, discussed here, will serve others as well as myself, hand weaver as well as fully automated weaver or member of "the industry."

Myra
(Looking for a comfort zone for each of us)

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 12:50:21 1999

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA11699; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 12:50:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA11690; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 12:50:19 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.5(src addr [206.63.102.5]) (761 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11pd0B-0002beC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 11:50:23 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <38383D0B.18B8@nas.com>
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 11:42:22 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: handlooms/mill looms
References: <000601bf343a\$9386dd60\$4d85e6ce@stevensj_home.indy.tce.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Kathleen Stevens wrote:

>
> Myra,
> Please just pull up textileworld.com and you will get the info you want.

Thank you kindly. Maury also alerted me to this site just now. Great folks on this list!
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 15:16:39 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA06278; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 15:16:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.38]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA06261; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 15:16:35 -0700 (MST)
Received: from bernie ([12.72.34.224]) by mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net (InterMail v03.02.07.07 118-134) with SMTP id <19991121221612.UOSN11314@bernie> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 22:16:12 +0000

Message-ID: <001201bf3409\$8027b860\$e022480c@bernie>
From: "Donald E Goodrich" <bgweave@worldnet.att.net>
To: <weavetech@list-server.net>
References: <l03110701b45dec4c7866@[209.77.208.29]>
Subject: Re: Decades calendar
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 03:16:37 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2014.211
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2014.211
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

WeaveTech Archive 9911

I want to second what terri said about the calendar, I received mine and had 15 weavers at study group last wed. and they just loved it.

They loved the 60's and we could all relate to one decade or another because we ranged in age from 91 to 20+ so it was a fun shareing time.

terri you and your friends keep up the good work.
bernie
az

To reply privately, send message to "Donald E Goodrich" <bgweave@worldnet.att.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 17:37:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA02600; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 17:37:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from home.humboldt1.com (home.humboldt1.com [206.13.45.1]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA02587; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 17:37:13 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [216.100.37.126] (ppp516-pm6.humboldt1.com [216.100.37.126]) by home.humboldt1.com (Pro-8.9.2/Pro-8.9.2) with ESMTP id QAA02393 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 16:38:25 -0800 (PST)
Message-Id: <l03110700b45e303d6124@[206.13.45.198]>
In-Reply-To: <001201bf3409\$8027b860\$e022480c@bernie>
References: <l03110701b45dec4c7866@[209.77.208.29]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 17:42:02 -0700
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>
Subject: Re: Decades calendar
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Bernie

Thanks so much for the praise. I too loved the 60's sample. Vikki and I were both in our early 20s during this very impressionable period and that is one reason that she and I chose to do this one. Dorothy is 70 and Carolyn is only 35 so they couldn't "relate"; I mean like far-out!

If any of those people would like to be on our mailing list or order a calendar, just give them my email address.
Thanks again,
Terri

To reply privately, send message to Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 17:55:51 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA06402; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 17:55:51 -0700 (MST)
Received: from vesta.plain.co.nz (root@vesta.plain.co.nz [202.36.174.1]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA06394; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 17:55:48 -0700 (MST)
Received: from chch.planet.org.nz (ppp65243.cyberxpress.co.nz [202.49.65.243]) by vesta.plain.co.nz (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id NAA24207 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 13:55:48 +1300
Message-ID: <38384B6E.DBA19934@chch.planet.org.nz>
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 08:43:42 +1300
From: afield <afield@chch.planet.org.nz>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win95; I)
X-Accept-Language: en

WeaveTech Archive 9911

MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: Textile Institue
References: <199911211057.DAA26967@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I belong to the Textile Institute, a world-wide organization, and I get many trade magazines. Their web site is <http://www.texti.org>

I am going to the NZ branch of the Textile Institute Conference this week, my first, although I have been a member for about 3 years, so it will be interesting. I find the magazines useful, particularly in new types of yarns that are produced, new machinery, and fashion predictions. It is a great way to learn about what is happening in that parallel world.

Re the discussion about industrial weaving and what we can learn from it, it is not just the weavers themselves who make comments about my use of a compu-dobby, but the general public. My studio is in the Arts Centre in Christchurch and I work at the looms and encourage the public to watch at one end, while I have a retail gallery area at the other end.

I continually get comments, (like 4 times in one day once) 'it is cheating to use a computer'. I explain that my other looms require me to pre-select a weave structure by tying different treadles to different shafts, which is just what I do on the AVL but with a computer, but I can see many are not convinced. I also get comments like 'You do what the computer tells you'. to which I reply. 'The computer does what I tell it'. I don't mention the times I tell it wrong!

At least seeing a loom in action is educating the public to some extent, but it is an uphill battle.

Anne Field

--

Anne Field - Arts Centre - Christchurch - New Zealand.
See <http://www.annefield.co.nz>

To reply privately, send message to afield <afield@chch.planet.org.nz>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 20:53:39 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA12551; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 20:53:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (smtp10.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.200.246]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA12536; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 20:53:38 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mindspring.com (user-33qtjkm.dialup.mindspring.com [199.174.206.150]) by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id WAA26469 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 22:53:47 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3838BEEE.AACFFC68@mindspring.com>
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 19:56:34 -0800
From: glen black <willgee@mindspring.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: factory vs. studio debate
References: <0.17111148.2569a20e@aol.com>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>From my own past experience, handweavers have the luxury of experiment, which in a mill must be very product oriented. We can, if we wish, spend a month or two just investigating an unlikely material..monofilament, ribbon, packing twine, or unlikely techniques..clasped or linked warps and wefts..all the corduroy relatives, enlarged and varied..woven of wool and raffia if it sparks the imagination. I had the good fortune to be given early samples of mylar monofilament (actually stable stretched slit mylar} and teflon coated fiberglass yarn. All these can inspire a lot of play in handweaving and who knows what end product. We can "turn on a dime", put a warp on one day and a completely different one tomorrow. glen black

=
> >
>

> Certainly it would not be cost-effective for factories to make individually
> unique items or even limited runs. But aside from this, what can hand
> weavaers do that can't be done in factories?
>
> Peg in Georgia
>
> To reply privately, send message to Carpenma@aol.com

To reply privately, send message to glen black <willgee@mindspring.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 21:28:14 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA19352; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 21:28:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA19347; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 21:28:12 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.45(src addr [206.63.102.45]) (1241 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp/R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11pl5Q-0002bnC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 20:28:20 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <38389CDD.4F9F@nas.com>
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 18:31:10 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: Textile Institue
References: <199911211057.DAA26967@salmon.esosoft.net>
<38384B6E.DBA19934@chch.planet.org.nz>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

afield wrote:

>
> I belong to the Textile Institute, a world-wide organization, and I get many
> trade magazines. Their web site is <http://www.texti.org>

Thank you!

WeaveTech Archive 9911

> I continually get comments, (like 4 times in one day once) ' it is cheating to
> use a computer'. I explain that my other looms require me to pre-select a weave
> structure by tying different treadles to different shafts, which is just what I
> do on the AVL but with a computer, but I can see many are not convinced. I also
> get comments like ' You do what the computer tells you'. to which I reply. 'The
> computer does what I tell it'.

And to think, the loom was the original computer.

Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 21 23:07:51 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id XAA06321; Sun, 21 Nov 1999
23:07:51 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id XAA06314; Sun, 21 Nov 1999 23:07:50 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 4330 invoked by alias); 22 Nov 1999 06:08:01 -0000
Received: (qmail 4318 invoked from network); 22 Nov 1999 06:08:00 -0000
Received: from ip103.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.103)
by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 22 Nov 1999 06:08:00 -0000
Message-ID: <3838DE7B.CC20343F@netbistro.com>
Date: Sun, 21 Nov 1999 22:11:07 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: definitions
References: <199911220055.RAA06416@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

While we are mulling over definitions for how to define the scale of
weaving we do - studio/factory as Tom suggested - how about defining
Weaver?

To me, a Weaver can dress the loom, and has the physical skills to
operate a loom - throwing the shuttle, treadling, beating. This is
the job I do most frequently.

I can also take a design vision from my primary client, and attempt to
translate the picture or textile into "her" vision - when I do this,
I consider myself a weaving "technician".

When I am generating the vision, then I am the "designer". I also
act as my own "technician" and follow that up by being my own
"weaver".

It may be that it will be impossible to come up with nice neat and
tidy definitions - it seems to me that these things are laid out on
a spectrum with no clear boundaries. We may be hair-splitting....
again! But then, the nature of weaving is that of either/or, up/down,
and perhaps we are bound to feel the need for such clear cut
definitions by our very natures???

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Cheers,

Laura Fry

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 01:22:03 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id BAA25309; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 01:22:03 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo-d08.mx.aol.com (imo-d08.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.40]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id BAA25301; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 01:22:01 -0700 (MST)
From: TBeau1930@aol.com
Received: from TBeau1930@aol.com
by imo-d08.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.36a48b89 (3954)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 03:21:26 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.36a48b89.256a5706@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 03:21:26 EST
Subject: Drape, Hand, etc.
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 45
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi Art:

<< Is there a quantitative measurement of drape-ability or limpness of a fabric? Note that I am not asking what effects it (fiber, yarn diameter, sett, weave) but can a number be assigned to it? (Perhaps this says something about my personality) I envision a piece of fabric extending horizontally over a right angle, such as a table, and allowed to drape over the angle. The distance between the upright of the right angle and the fabric may be measured, a specific distance from the angle . . . perhaps throw fabric density in there somewhere . . . I dunno. Does it exist?>>

To my knowledge such a measure does not exist. Probably because the term Drape, like Hand are purely aesthetic values usually arrived at by the customer based on what unique characteristic they want in a fabric, in conjunction with the Mill finisher and what they can produce.

The Finishing Mill is more heavily reliant on aesthetic, subjective values. The Greige Mill has a good mix of both Art and Science.

Keep those beaters moving.

Tom Beaudet

To reply privately, send message to TBeau1930@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 04:43:07 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA22056; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 04:43:07 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id EAA22040; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 04:43:05 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-38.idsonline.com [209.8.42.38])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id GAA28361

WeaveTech Archive 9911

for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 06:42:39 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991122063715.006e87c0@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 06:37:15 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: AVL
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I understand that there have been significant changes at AVL recently. Since many, many on this list are AVL owners, there is no doubt great interest in how those now in charge at AVL see the future of this company.

Is anyone at AVL reading still this list? Might you tell us what the changes have been and what is your vision of the future AVL? Will you lean more towards your commercial customers? Will you continue to support handweavers & handweaving? Do you expect to manufacture and support the whole line of looms you now make, or will you be dropping some? Will you continue the AVL school? Will you continue to have booths at Convergences? Regional conferences? Who will be your liaison to this and the other internet weave list? My sense is that we on WeaveTech greatly value the presence of vendors & suppliers on the list. Your comments have been useful and helpful, and we have appreciated the fact that our comments (both good & bad) are listened to.

We wish AVL all the best as it evolves, but we want to be certain we won't be left behind as owners of looms that can no longer be supported.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 05:14:25 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA26092; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 05:14:25 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo24.mx.aol.com (imo24.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.68]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA26080; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 05:14:21 -0700 (MST)
From: TBeau1930@aol.com
Received: from TBeau1930@aol.com
by imo24.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.6015eeda (2618)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 07:13:46 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.6015eeda.256a8d79@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 07:13:45 EST
Subject: Re: Mill life
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 45
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi Rosemarie and listers all:

WeaveTech Archive 9911

<< Weaving on my AVL 16 shaft production compu-dobby loom in the quiet of my sun filled home studio brings to mind the very different experiences my father had. He wove braid in a New England mill. He designed the patterns, set-up the

machines and then taught young workers how to tend the machines. When we visited him in the mill on rare occasions, the atmosphere was oppressive, dark, dusty, and LOUD. The grease from the machines seemed ingrained in his hands, and he always spoke as if he was straining to be heard above that daily roar. None of us aspired to be a part of his work-a-day world. This is what power looms bring to my mind. This was 50 years ago. >>

I grew up in a Textile Mill town in eastern CT where the only game in town were the Mills. Lots of them and all kinds.

Many of my peers found the atmosphere of the Mills as you did. Absolutely intolerable. They found their livelihood in other lines of work in town or migrated out.

Some hated the Mill but stuck it out because it meant a job and a paycheck.

Then there were those of us that as soon as we walked thru the Mill Gate (and for me was some 50+ years ago) we knew we had found our mecca.

To me, the sounds of the Mill, loud or soft were a Symphony, the aroma of the Fiber (especially the Wools) a bouquet, and the grime and grease from the machinery like a right of passage. Of being Baptized. I loved it, and still do.

As in weaving, at some point we find our comfort zone or we find it's just not for us<g>. Life is good.

Keep those Beaters moving.

Tom Beaudet

To reply privately, send message to TBeau1930@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 06:52:09 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA10631; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 06:52:09 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo-d01.mx.aol.com (imo-d01.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.33]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA10622; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 06:52:08 -0700 (MST)
From: Carpenma@aol.com
Received: from Carpenma@aol.com
by imo-d01.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.5b41254e (4247)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 08:51:37 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.5b41254e.256aa469@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 08:51:37 EST
Subject: Re: factory vs. studio debate
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 45
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

In a message dated 11/22/1999 1:55:42 AM Mid-Atlantic Standard Time, willgee@mindspring.com writes:

WeaveTech Archive 9911

> handweavers have the luxury of experiment,
> which in a mill must be very product oriented

Where do mills get their ideas from? Do they have idea people on staff (who would, then, presumably have some of this "luxury of experiment")? Do they buy ideas from handweavers? And would there be a difference between larger and smaller mills in the way they derive ideas?

Peg in Georgia

To reply privately, send message to Carpenma@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 09:53:21 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA26964; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 09:53:21 -0700 (MST)
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 09:53:21 -0700 (MST)
Message-Id: <199911221653.JAA26964@salmon.esosoft.net>
Subject: Re: Power looms
To: weavetech@list-server.net
From: JMadelady@aol.com
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi All AS I have not read my Email for a while, I missed the discussion of the evils of power looms. To add my two cents, I think that my loom allows me to be really creative in ways that are not possible on a standard loom . So add me to the list of those at home base..great line.....Linda.Jmadelady

To reply privately, send message to JMadelady@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 10:54:57 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA12691; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 10:54:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from umailsrv2.umd.edu (umailsrv2.umd.edu [128.8.10.76]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA12638; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 10:54:46 -0700 (MST)
Received: from dinouye (bay1-16.dial.umd.edu [128.8.22.16])
by umailsrv2.umd.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.0) with SMTP id MAA12090
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 12:54:45 -0500
Message-Id: <4.1.19991122124328.0098e2f0@pop.mail.yahoo.com>
X-Sender: bonnieinouye@pop.mail.yahoo.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 12:57:33 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>
Subject: invite and comments
In-Reply-To: <199911221057.DAA13207@salmon.esosoft.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Anyone in the Washington, D.C, area is invited to my studio open house on December 3 through 6. I'm near the University of Maryland and will send directions and details to you if you wish, privately and not to the list please.

I've demonstrated many times (and will do so during the open house) and am still surprised when folks think a computer does the work for me. Most of them use a word processor but do not expect it to write their letters and articles for them. I use my weaving software primarily to design each

WeaveTech Archive 9911

piece and to investigate new ways to use weave structures. One time I demonstrated at the Textile Museum and several people told me "the ancient Peruvians didn't need computers", to which I replied that they could spend a year to finish one piece but I cannot afford this. Weaving was a very highly respected profession in their culture. I could add that Shakespeare wrote very well without a word processor, but that doesn't mean I must dip a quill into a bottle of ink! I think we are lucky to have the tools we use today.

Most of my work is designed for the piece. This is something that factories don't usually do, although those triple-weave throws that Margaret mentions are an exception. I can weave fabric for a jacket and make one large design to fit the back, something smaller perhaps for the sleeves, and yet another for the front pieces. I prefer non-repeating designs, partly because I get bored weaving something over and over. I use longish warps so I can't "turn around on a dime" as was suggested, but there are infinitely many ways to weave each warp.

Bonnie Inouye
binouye@geocities.com
www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347

To reply privately, send message to Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 11:06:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA16138; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 11:06:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA16113; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 11:06:12 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 15440 invoked by alias); 22 Nov 1999 18:06:17 -0000
Received: (qmail 15431 invoked from network); 22 Nov 1999 18:06:17 -0000
Received: from ip126.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.126) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 22 Nov 1999 18:06:17 -0000
Message-ID: <383962B7.F4F358B7@netbistro.com>
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 07:35:19 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: measuring drape
References: <199911221057.DAA13207@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I suspect that measuring drape will turn out to be about as exact a measurement as measuring insulation. I spent about a year searching industrial literature for an equivalent of the R rating for houses, referred to as a "clo" rating. By the end of that year, it became obvious to me that there were so many variables that any sort of accurate measurement that would have any meaning would be impossible!

Cheers,

Laura Fry

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 11:14:41 1999

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA18815; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 11:14:41 -0700 (MST)
Received: from ccrtc.com (mail.ccrtc.com [205.243.45.34]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA18786; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 11:14:33 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host mail.ccrtc.com [205.243.45.34] claimed to be ccrtc.com
Received: from stevensj_home.indy.tce.com [206.230.133.78] by ccrtc.com (SMTPD32-5.05) id A20D85F3005A; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 13:13:49 -0500
Message-ID: <002201bf3513\$1a307fa0\$4e85e6ce@stevensj_home.indy.tce.com>
From: "Kathleen Stevens" <hndwvnds@ccrtc.com>
To: <weavetech@list-server.net>
Subject: Re: invite and comments
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 12:57:53 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Good luck with your open house---and remember -- have fun. I have found that some of my most difficult customers at first, turned out to be the very best, multi-order clients. This is true, I found for me, with the weaving and also in real estate, when I was an agent---I only do referrals now. So even if you have to educate them---just remember, it goes with the job---ha ha. I would love to take part with you in this venture. Maybe we could, in the future, switch studios and items for open houses---that is, sent each other items for each other's studio open house. My studio (the one opened to the public) is a separate house, small, only 1,200 sq ft but adequate for my needs. Cheers, Kathleen

-----Original Message-----

From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Date: Monday, November 22, 1999 12:55 PM
Subject: invite and comments

>Anyone in the Washington, D.C, area is invited to my studio open house on
>December 3 through 6. I'm near the University of Maryland and will send
>directions and details to you if you wish, privately and not to the list
>please.

>

>I've demonstrated many times (and will do so during the open house) and am
>still surprised when folks think a computer does the work for me. Most of
>them use a word processor but do not expect it to write their letters and
>articles for them. I use my weaving software primarily to design each
>piece and to investigate new ways to use weave structures. One time I
>demonstrated at the Textile Museum and several people told me "the ancient
>Peruvians didn't need computers", to which I replied that they could spend
>a year to finish one piece but I cannot afford this. Weaving was a very
>highly respected profession in their culture. I could add that Shakespeare
>wrote very well without a word processor, but that doesn't mean I must dip
>a quill into a bottle of ink! I think we are lucky to have the tools we
>use today.

>

>Most of my work is designed for the piece. This is something that
>factories don't usually do, although those triple-weave throws that
>Margaret mentions are an exception. I can weave fabric for a jacket and

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>make one large design to fit the back, something smaller perhaps for the
>sleeves, and yet another for the front pieces. I prefer non-repeating
>designs, partly because I get bored weaving something over and over. I use
>longish warps so I can't "turn around on a dime" as was suggested, but
>there are infinitely many ways to weave each warp.
>Bonnie Inouye
>binouye@geocities.com
>www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347
>
>To reply privately, send message to Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>
>

To reply privately, send message to "Kathleen Stevens" <hndwvnds@ccrtc.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 13:08:29 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA20831; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 13:08:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.thegrid.net (smtp.thegrid.net [209.162.1.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA20795; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 13:08:25 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 29243 invoked from network); 22 Nov 1999 20:08:26 -0000
Received: from pop.thegrid.net (209.162.1.5)
by smtp.thegrid.net with SMTP; 22 Nov 1999 20:08:26 -0000
Received: from [216.224.130.144] (slo-ts1-h1-130-71.ispmodems.net [216.224.130.71])
by pop.thegrid.net (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id MAA27391
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 12:08:25 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: i546534@mail.thegrid.net
Message-Id: <l03130302b45f5b4cbf6f@[216.224.130.144]>
In-Reply-To: <4.1.19991120062024.068e4bc0@mailsrv-unix.oit.umass.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 13:06:29 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>
Subject: Re: superior?
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 6:53 AM -0500 11/20/99, Autio wrote:

>At the risk of really putting my foot into my mouth....

Is there room in your mouth for my foot, too. Laurie?

>...the distinction I would make is between run size: Unique ..., Limited
>production ..., and Mill Run To me, those matter far more than how you
>did it.

AND

>...when I pay for handwoven or see it in a show, I want something unique or
>very limited in production, no matter how well made or designed. The one
>thing >we can do as handweavers that mills can't do (because of the
>economic
>constraints, not technology) is make unique items.

I think you're really onto something here, Laurie. When we were in Oaxaca Mexico we saw a lot of technically wonderful backstrap weaving, but it tended to be the same design over and over again, cranked out en masse for the tourists. I just wasn't the least bit interested in owning any of that stuff. We did, however, drool over and purchase a handwoven rug made by a small family who still natural-dye their own yarns. The product was much more unique and, to me, was truly "handwoven" in every sense of the world. Although the pattern of the rug was not totally unique to our rug, the color decisions, and the colors themselves, were. No two of this family's

WeaveTech Archive 9911

rugs will ever look exactly the same. And, I'm unlikely to ever see these colors in commercially-dyed yarn.

So it is in my own work. E.g., I sell some rayon chenille scarves. I make them 3 at a time, so the warps are common to the 3. The wefts are all different, but all simple. For myself, I am finishing a 3-yard long rayon chenille scarf woven in carefully controlled clasped weft to produce geometric shapes that move around along the length of the scarf. I couldn't buy this unique item anywhere, and probably no one would want it enough to ever pay what I would have to charge to sell it. It's a totally unique item. Handwoven to the core. What kind of loom I used in weaving it doesn't matter a bit.

The question is: what does the end-user want and is he/she willing to pay or willing to personally do, whatever it's going to take to get that product? *How* it was made probably isn't all that relevant. Heaven knows I have glazed over on this question of "is it *hand*woven" depending on the type of loom that is utilized? just as I tend to glaze over on the questions of "is it art?" and "is it art, or is it craft"? I know the answers and that's all that matters to me.

>Laurie Autio, donning flame-proof suit

Sally Knight, hiding behind Laurie

++++
Sally G. Knight in Los Osos (on the Central Coast of California)
along with the wonderful hairballs: George, Max, Claire, and
Spike O. Reilly and his kittens: Roxanne W. Furrperson,
Shasta Sue Latte, & Theodore Edward (sometimes known as
Teddy Dammit)

<cronewest@thegrid.net>

++++

To reply privately, send message to Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 13:34:33 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA28860; Mon, 22 Nov 1999
13:34:33 -0700 (MST)
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 13:34:33 -0700 (MST)
Message-Id: <199911222034.NAA28860@salmon.esosoft.net>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Alcorn <alcorn@pop.nwlink.com>
Subject: Re: factory vs. studio debate
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

But aside from this, what can hand
>weavaers do that can't be done in factories?
>
>Peg in Georgia

I have never seen factory woven honeycomb. Probably anything that takes a lot of hand manipulation would not be profitable for factory weaving.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Francie Alcorn

To reply privately, send message to Alcorn <alcorn@pop.nwlink.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 13:35:19 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA29098; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 13:35:19 -0700 (MST)
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 13:35:19 -0700 (MST)
Message-Id: <199911222035.NAA29098@salmon.esosoft.net>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Alcorn <alcorn@pop.nwlink.com>
Subject: Re: factory vs. studio debate, handloom vs power loom
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Dear Myra,

I would hate to see you leave the list.

This discussion of factory vs studio has been both interesting and informative. As a hobbyist most of what has been discussed has not been applicable. That does not mean I cannot learn terminology and methods of high volume production. This discussion has given me a much greater appreciation for the machinations (Thank you Allen), difficulties, and perhaps beauty (Thanks, Tom) of the factory environment.

What would be of additional interest is the finances of cloth factories.

Have factory jobs made textile workers in third world countries better off financially.

Francie Alcorn

To reply privately, send message to Alcorn <alcorn@pop.nwlink.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 13:45:10 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA01967; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 13:45:10 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.thegrid.net (smtp.thegrid.net [209.162.1.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA01947; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 13:45:05 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 5627 invoked from network); 22 Nov 1999 20:45:10 -0000
Received: from pop.thegrid.net (209.162.1.5)
by smtp.thegrid.net with SMTP; 22 Nov 1999 20:45:10 -0000
Received: from [216.224.130.144] (slo-ts1-h1-130-71.ispmodems.net [216.224.130.71])
by pop.thegrid.net (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id MAA00927
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 12:45:09 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: i546534@mail.thegrid.net
Message-Id: <l03130304b45f65c7361d@[216.224.130.144]>
In-Reply-To: <0.e811cbcd.25695536@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 13:45:48 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>
Subject: Re:studio vs. automation
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 9:01 AM -0500 11/21/99, Lorele3773@aol.com wrote:

>These machines tended to need a fair amount of baby-sitting, or at least a
>peek every so often. I guess that is why the designers are not even in the

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>plant with the looms. They get cluttered offices away from the noise and
>DUST.

> I guess if a production weaver wanted to advance to a faster mode and was
>willing to take the limitations placed on him by the technology, whether
>modern or dated, these looms might have a place in a "studio." Securing the
>services of a time-tested knowledgeable loom mechanic would be first on my
>priority list. Learning where the closest machine shop was located that
>could replicate a broken piency-part to specs, in a timely manner, would be
>next. I think I would also apprentice myself to a factory to pick up on some
>of the tricks-of-the-trade that only experience can teach.

> PS Factory life isn't for me!

Lorelei, you said a mouthful in your post. I think that every person ought to have to work in a manufacturing mill for a year or two somewhere in their adult life, because otherwise we haven't a *clue* how stuff is made in our industrial world.

I was just as ignorant as they come until I put in a couple years, maybe 18 or 20 or so years ago, in a small plastics manufacturing plant in Arizona. We made housings for the computer industry, mostly for Hewlett-Packard. Because I was the personnel administrator at the plant, I knew all the people and processes, and attended all the shifts. Wow! That was the most eye-opening experience I had had since living in New York City as a young adult (who had grown up in small-town Wisconsin).

One indelable (sp?) lesson was the importance of the machinists to the plant. Without them, frankly, we were all dead meat, from the top administrator down through the janitor. It was the machinists/mechanics/whatever you want to call them, who kept the whole plant operating. A lousey mechanic could just destroy the profitability of a product or a period of time. A good one could make everyone comparably well-to-do by maximizing efficiency and minimizing all types of waste (material, time, electricity, etc.).

To this day I am absolutely fascinated by factories and feel quite at home in them. But, it's *real* clear to me that what I do in my home/studio has nothing whatsoever to do with factory production, no matter whether I have hobby bars, fly-shuttles, computers or not.

Sally Knight

++++
Sally G. Knight in Los Osos (on the Central Coast of California)
along with the wonderful hairballs: George, Max, Claire, and
Spike O. Reilly and his kittens: Roxanne W. Furrperson,
Shasta Sue Latte, & Theodore Edward (sometimes known as
Teddy Dammit)

<cronewest@thegrid.net>

++++

To reply privately, send message to Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 13:52:32 1999

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA03753; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 13:52:32 -0700 (MST)

Received: from smtp.thegrid.net (smtp.thegrid.net [209.162.1.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA03747; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 13:52:31 -0700 (MST)

Received: (qmail 6874 invoked from network); 22 Nov 1999 20:52:37 -0000

Received: from pop.thegrid.net (209.162.1.5)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

by smtp.thegrid.net with SMTP; 22 Nov 1999 20:52:37 -0000
Received: from [216.224.130.144] (slo-ts1-h1-130-71.ispmodems.net [216.224.130.71])
by pop.thegrid.net (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id MAA14676
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 12:52:36 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: i546534@mail.thegrid.net
Message-Id: <103130305b45f6b337c42@[216.224.130.144]>
In-Reply-To: <38383E78.7A901A9E@access.mountain.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 13:53:15 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>
Subject: Re: mindset visited again
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 1:48 PM -0500 11/21/99, susan ernst wrote:
>before i chose handloom weaving as a means of financial support i would
>approach a project asking myself: what fibers, colors, structure would
>be the coolest in this project...what would i like to learn...what would
>be interesting to work with. maybe, just maybe i would consider the
>cost and production times. clearly, as the article demonstrates to me,
>cost and production time dictate the project. this is the mindset that
>we should approach our journey into the powerloom discussion with., the
>understanding that production costs dictate much of the techniques used.

You've hit the nail right on the head, Susan, considering that your key phrase is in the first line: "as a means of financial support". Thanks for your contribution to the discussion.

Sally

+++++
Sally G. Knight in Los Osos (on the Central Coast of California)
along with the wonderful hairballs: George, Max, Claire, and
Spike O. Reilly and his kittens: Roxanne W. Furrperson,
Shasta Sue Latte, & Theodore Edward (sometimes known as
Teddy Dammit)

<cronewest@thegrid.net>

+++++

To reply privately, send message to Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 15:44:46 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA04522; Mon, 22 Nov 1999
15:44:46 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id
PAA04495; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 15:44:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-44.idsonline.com [209.8.42.44])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id RAA26655
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 17:44:19 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991122173858.006bfbc8@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 17:38:58 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Reply from AVL
Mime-Version: 1.0

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Peter has written to me in response to my posting about AVL to assure us that AVL will continue to support the handweaving community, and he asked me to relay the following to the list:

>I have made some moves that...are fantastic and bode very well for our future. Unfortunately, the
>ink isn't dry on the agreements yet, so my lips are sealed. We will, of
>course, reveal all. I expect that an official announcement will be
>forthcoming on or about January 1, 2000.

So while we're sipping our bubbly on New Year's Eve, we can raise a toast to the future of AVL--may it prosper in the new millennium.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 17:38:17 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA02204; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 17:38:17 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA02195; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 17:38:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.44(src addr [198.182.208.203]) (1111 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11q3yN-0002cYC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 16:38:19 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <3839C4AD.14CB@nas.com>
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 15:33:19 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: POWER LOOM THREAD
References: <199911222034.NAA28860@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Since it appears a contentious tone is creeping into the discussion by the manner in which the Subject line is being titled on posts, may I suggest we again take a moment to adjust semantics? :)

"vs." implies "against" according to my Webster's.

The original request was for a "comparison" between hand loom and power loom technologies which, according to Webster's, is more accurately expressed with

"vis-a-vis"

WeaveTech Archive 9911

We will likely find a much more constructive flow in the discussion and our way of thinking about the topic with this fine tuning. :)

Many thanks,
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 22 17:38:29 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA02281; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 17:38:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA02267; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 17:38:26 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.44(src addr [198.182.208.203]) (1261 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp/R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11q3yb-0002cQC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 22 Nov 1999 16:38:33 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <3839D331.1773@nas.com>
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 16:35:17 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: factory vs. studio debate, handloom vs power loom
References: <199911222035.NAA29098@salmon.esosoft.net> <3839C6DB.259E@nas.com> <3839CDFA.5AE9@nas.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> Alcorn wrote:

> Dear Myra,

>

> I would hate to see you leave the list.

>

> This discussion of factory vs studio has been both interesting and

> informative. This discussion has given me a much greater

> appreciation

>

>

Hi Francis, & Cotechies

Oh, I would not be leaving the list, but there may be a more appropriate venue for the topic. However, I have high hopes this list can yet become comfortable with and accommodating of this techie thread. I feel much fuller from the inputs already, just as yourself.

As Tom says, "keep those beaters moving." I would add, "with whichever type of loom you use." ;)

Best regards,
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 23 06:37:52 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA15248; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 06:37:52 -0700 (MST)
Received: from europe.std.com (europe.std.com [199.172.62.20]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA15241; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 06:37:50 -0700 (MST)
Received: from world.std.com (root@world-f.std.com [199.172.62.5])
by europe.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTMP id IAA15559
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 08:37:53 -0500 (EST)
Received: from world.std.com (ppp0c123.std.com [208.192.102.123])
by world.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTMP id IAA05185
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 08:36:02 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <383A9860.8BC3EC2E@world.std.com>
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1999 08:36:32 -0500
From: Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #664 - machines
References: <199911231057.DAA20951@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi, all,

It occurs to me that there is yet another factor in the technology level discussion we are almost having, and that is the economics of the situation, which has been touched upon only occasionally. Not just how much does the loom/gadget/adjunct cost, but what is the cost of the space they take and the upkeep they need.

I know weavers whose studios are a room in their house or garage into which they and their loom barely fit. No matter how much they would like to use, say, a warping mill, there is no room for it and there may not be enough real estate available to build an extension, even if they could afford it. Others have an entire (formerly 40 cow) barn. What their needs are in terms of achieving the same saving of time in their work (say, for example, warping 25 yards) is entirely different. A second hand factory product that requires 15 feet of space behind the loom might be quite useful to the latter but not to the former.

That is why I would love to hear someone who knows both factory and studio weaving, describe in some detail some of the tools and gadgets that may be of use to the studio weaver that are used in factories, where to get them, and how much is a reasonable price (usually second hand - few of us can afford them new without an IPO <ggg>). That way each of us can decide whether such a gadget would be useful/affordable to us in our particular circumstances (what we weave, how much space we have, and how many \$ we are willing/able to invest in our weaving).

Cheers,

T.

--

Tom Vogl
29 Scotchman's Lane
West Tisbury, MA 02575
"Intuition is the result of 20 years experience" K. C. Long

Voice: 508-693.6065
Fax: 508-696.0625
tpv@world.std.com

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To reply privately, send message to Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 23 08:00:27 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA02564; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 08:00:27 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA02545; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 08:00:19 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42]) by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id KAA21286 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 10:00:22 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1999 10:00:22 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911231500.KAA21286@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@list-server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: HANDLOOM/POWERLOOM (long)
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

TO ALL:

Because I am leaving town for the rest of the week, I will delay a more detailed post on this subject until I get back next Mon. However, some thoughts are in order.

First, Tom is right in his post that this is:

> the technology level discussion we are almost having,

Tue, 23 Nov 1999 08:36:32 -0500

Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>

The operative word here being "...almost..."

Second, I see two things happening. One, we have yet to discuss the nuts and bolts of the thing which start us off in the first place, the powerloom and two we seem to still be struggling with understanding what we mean by handloom. This latter questions seems to be the point from which the discussion has not yet departed.

I believe this to be so because handloom weaving is in a strange place. The handloom and by implication, the handloom weaver, is no longer necessary as the sole means of cloth production. Many handloom weavers pursue this activity strictly avocationally as do many amateur woodworkers, amateur astronomers and amateur whatever. Yet there seems to have evolved this anachronous sub-group of handloom weavers whose pursuit has driven them beyond the limited involvement of most amateurs yet not fully into 100% professional involvement and concurrently evolving are those who are or wish to be in a position to use the handloom, however it may be assisted, as means of generating an income on which they would be willing to become accustomed to living.

This somewhat convoluted population of handloom weavers has generated a cloudy atmosphere of a psycho-political nature in which things which ought not to be taken personally and which to this observer are not meant to be personal have prevented the discussion on the issue of who are handloom weavers and what is handloom weaving from moving forward.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

In the interest of kicking this off dead center, I would offer the following: We need to agree on some basic points, the first of which being there is no real value implied in how a piece of textile product is made. As Laura pointed out previously,

>Once the cloth is
>woven, there are no doobby footprints, no fly shuttle tracks left to
>advertise that those mechanical enhancements were used.

Thu, 18 Nov 1999 10:37:21 -0800

Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

Then we need to agree that handloom weaving, regardless of how anachronistic it is, has become and will probably remain a significant part of the menu of human activities from which anyone can select to pursue at any style.

We need to agree further that regardless of the level at which anyone chooses to pursue handloom weaving, there is no intrinsic value of one style of pursuit over another.

Finally, the only place where there seems to be confusion over just what constitutes a handloom or not is within the field of handloom weaving itself, absurd as that may be. In the textile mill trade we understand very clearly the difference between a handloom and a powerloom. First, all looms require some form of power not because of some arbitrary definition, but because of the laws of physics. Work is basically the product of energy (read: power) expended over time. All looms perform work and since work requires power, all looms require some form of power therefore all looms are some form of power loom. Now, the differentiation comes with the source of that power which is in either of two forms, human or electric and that's where handlooms break off from powerlooms. Now perhaps we can see the difficulty of the term powerlooms since logically, all looms are power looms because all looms require some form of power.

(As an aside, there were certain electricly powered looms which did not have fully automatic bobbin changing where the weaver had to manually change the empty bobbins in the shuttle. These were called "hand" looms, shortened from "hand changing" loom. But this parenthetical point should not be used to cloud this discussion.)

So, if we accept that any loom which operates from some form of human power, regardless of whether and/or how that power may be assisted is indeed a handloom and that any loom which operated completely from electrical power is a "power" loom, perhaps we can move the discussion forward.

Something about which to think during the rest of this week.

Kind regards and thanks.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300

<mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 23 11:37:38 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA02264; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 11:37:38 -0700 (MST)
Received: from hotmail.com (f64.law4.hotmail.com [216.33.149.64]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA02258; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 11:37:37 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host f64.law4.hotmail.com [216.33.149.64] claimed to be hotmail.com
Received: (qmail 79439 invoked by uid 0); 23 Nov 1999 18:37:13 -0000
Message-ID: <19991123183713.79438.qmail@hotmail.com>
Received: from 209.192.110.204 by www.hotmail.com with HTTP;
Tue, 23 Nov 1999 10:37:12 PST
X-Originating-IP: [209.192.110.204]
From: "gregg johnson" <gregg_j@hotmail.com>
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: from a new member
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1999 10:37:12 PST
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi! I am new to the list but have been lurking for a few weeks. The discussion has been interesting so I thought I would join in. First let me introduce myself. I am Gregg Johnson, a hand weaver and currently in charge of the Textile program at Penland School of Crafts, which job allows me to weave for my own pleasure and enjoyment while selling what I weave. I do not have to rely only on my weaving for my income and hence do not have to produce a repeatable line of work. I weave functional wearable cloth using mixed warps of any natural fiber i can get (including rayon) and make sweaters, coats vests and other garments, many of which are suitable for men (pardon the pun). I have no desire to duplicate anything that a mill could produce or that I could buy elsewhere.

I came to weaving in mid life after a career in the computer/corporate world so I am comfortable with computers and use a compu-dobby on my 40" AVL. I 'grew up' as a weaver in the South Coast Handweavers Guild in southern California, then apprenticed with Randall Darwall and wove for him for 4 years before coming to Penland. I teach individuals, short workshops and longer classes. I am not degreed in Art (I have an MBA in management and a MS in Computer Science), so cannot teach at the university level even if jobs were available. I have toured many mills (and always lusted after all that yarn!) but have never worked in one.

I suppose anything that a human can make once, a human could also make a machine to replicate, so the difference between hand weaving and power-loom weaving is theoretically nonexistent. However, once the cost comes into play, there are a lot of things not yet mentioned in the discussion that machines do not (yet?) do that handweavers can do. I have never heard of a machine that makes baskets, although I may have missed something. True tapestry (with slits and all) is not woven by machine - what the industry calls tapestry is something else altogether. I have never seen clasped weft from a machine, nor the brooks bouquet or other hand manipulated structures. Twined wefts are not machine produced. Machines cannot turn warp threads into weft threads and then back into warp. Machines have a great deal of trouble with irregular setts or mixed warps using ends of different characteristics, unless it is regular enough to be divided among multiple beams. Powerlooms are not designed to vary the beat while the weaving is in progress. There are lots of things machine don't do (even if they could!).

WeaveTech Archive 9911

The biggest difference I see between powerloom weaving in industry and handloom weaving in the studio relates to when design decisions have to be made. Hand weavers do have to limit an infinity range of cloth possibilities to a smaller range (if still infinite!) when they decide on the warp and set, just as do mills. Because most handlooms can control a smaller number of sets of threads than can powerlooms, the range of weave structures seems smaller to handloom weavers, But of course, if one is willing to do pickup, this 'limitation' does not apply. Now that small Jacquard heads are coming on the market for the small studio, even this is no longer a distinction between the mill and the studio, but cost is still a factor.

Handweavers, however, can defer a lot of the design process for weft choices until they are actually throwing the shuttle, and can respond to what they see in the web as they weave. Discontinuous wefts can be randomly inserted into a shed while handweaving, but not with the power loom. the beat can be altered as the weave progresses, and shuttle changes can happen in any irregular manner, without regard to which side of the loom the shuttle is on. In general, a much more spontaneous cloth can be produced by the handweaver. Of course, once that cloth is made, a machine could then be set up to duplicate it mile after mile in exact repeat, but then this rarely happens does it, unless the original cloth is sold to a mill as a "design". Even then, yarn choices, sett, beat and cost issues usually result in a very different cloth coming out of the mill than the sample that went in!

Please continue this discussion, as it has provided much food for thought!

Cheers, Gregg

to respond privately please address Gregg_j@hotmail.com

Get Your Private, Free Email at <http://www.hotmail.com>

To reply privately, send message to "gregg johnson" <gregg_j@hotmail.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 23 12:13:53 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA10260; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 12:13:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net (smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net [207.172.4.60]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA10233; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 12:13:45 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp1.erols.com ([207.172.3.234])
by smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net with esmtp (Exim 2.12 #3)
id 11qLNQ-0006n5-00; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 14:13:20 -0500
Received: from LOCALNAME (216-164-137-78.s332.tnt4.lnhva.md.dialup.rcn.com [216.164.137.78])
by smtp1.erols.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id OAA10035;
Tue, 23 Nov 1999 14:13:15 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <383B1A53.4E85@erols.com>
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1999 14:50:59 -0800
From: Anne Wells <arwells@erols.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-DH397 (Win16; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weaving@quilt.net, weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: W-Eureka, almost!
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

First, apologies to those getting this message twice: I know there are

WeaveTech Archive 9911

drawloom weavers on both Lists. but some only on one or the other. I really would appreciate and am anxious for some answers, so am trying to reach all who may be able to help.

My first warp on the drawloom was weaving along just fine. I wove some diamonds and such, just doodling freehand at the loom. I wanted to be sure that the pattern/ground shafts were interacting properly, were threaded properly, and so forth. Next, I made a more complicated pattern and wove it. Much to my amazement, the pattern shows up just as planned on the left side of the loom, but then transitions to something else as one looks across to the right. Well, since I had woven the diamonds in my free style experiments, I knew the pattern shaft threading was not at fault, and I thought I had checked the ground shafts, also. So I decided that there must have been a complicated treadling error that I somehow made (I ignored the fact that some regular shapes *did* show up, however). So, I wove the pattern twice more. Hmmmm. Still this odd transition across the face of the cloth. I checked all the threadings again, and sat and just thought.

Well, here's the answer: 8 is not a factor of 20. Yes, I had an 8 shaft straight twill threaded on the ground shafts, and a 20 shaft point twill on the pattern shafts. But (!!!!) since 8 is not a factor of 20, the units (of 4 threads) do not coincide with the pattern shafts in a regular manner. That means that although the pattern does weave regularly (how could it not?!?), the weft/warp faced cloth appears in different parts of the pattern, causing an overall different look to the design as one moves from left to right across the cloth. It's sort of like an Escher print, just not as grand. The cause of this is that the specific units threaded in the pattern shafts are not always associated with the same ground shafts.

It occurs to me that everyone else must know this, although I can't say that in all my reading I ever came across it. If properly managed, I should be able to get some very interesting transitions and designs, rather than "just" a repeating pattern across the cloth. My question is this: where can I read about this?? Who has thought this through and figured out all the details??

I am most anxious to find some reading material on this.... thanks for any help -
Anne in Annandale
arwells@erols.com

To reply privately, send message to Anne Wells <arwells@erols.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 23 12:16:42 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA10949; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 12:16:42 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (smtp7.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.128.51]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA10930; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 12:16:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mindspring.com (user-2ivea67.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.40.199]) by smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id OAA12642 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 14:16:44 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <383AE84A.46E21F28@mindspring.com>
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1999 14:17:30 -0500
From: Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>
Organization: bnathans
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #665
References: <199911231837.LAA02280@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

AFF's remarks seem to me to describe lucidly and unemotionally the differences we have been fumbling around trying to define, (between handloom and powerloom weaving) while advancing the discussion to a higher level, to its next stage.....

It would be very helpful if the participants keep these definitions in mind and proceed from there.....

Indeed, perhaps the questions need to be rephrased in light of these definitions.....

<Barbara Nathans Bellport, Long Island, New York

To reply privately, send message to Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 23 12:22:34 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA12207; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 12:22:34 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (smtp7.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.128.51]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA12195; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 12:22:32 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mindspring.com (user-2ivea67.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.40.199]) by smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id OAA26267 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 14:22:37 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <383AE9AB.D548A98F@mindspring.com>
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1999 14:23:23 -0500
From: Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>
Organization: bnathans
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #665
References: <199911231837.LAA02280@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

And thank you, Greg Johnson, for answering so completely the question about what handweavers can do that factory looms can't.

Barbara Nathans Bellport, Long Island, New York

To reply privately, send message to Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 23 12:27:50 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA13480; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 12:27:50 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.thegrid.net (smtp.thegrid.net [209.162.1.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA13377; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 12:27:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 4916 invoked from network); 23 Nov 1999 19:27:34 -0000
Received: from pop.thegrid.net (209.162.1.5) by smtp.thegrid.net with SMTP; 23 Nov 1999 19:27:34 -0000
Received: from [216.224.130.108] (slo-ts1-h1-130-93.ispmodems.net [216.224.130.93]) by pop.thegrid.net (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id LAA24821 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 11:27:33 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: i546534@mail.thegrid.net

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Message-Id: <103130302b460a18b5750@[216.224.130.108]>
In-Reply-To: <19991123183713.79438.qmail@hotmail.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1999 12:28:13 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>
Subject: Gregg Johnson's comments
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 10:37 AM -0800 11/23/99, gregg johnson wrote:

>In general, a much more spontaneous cloth can be produced by the handweaver.

Gregg, thank you **so** much for your clear and clearly-expressed comments. I strongly encourage you to submit them to Handwoven magazine. I see a wonderful article here because you are "zeroing in" on an issue with which I have struggled since I started weaving not all that long ago. When I have to write up an little autobiographical statement, I say that I am interested in producing textiles that cannot be made in industrial settings. But then the textile engineers tell me that, given enough money, a machine can make anything (I'm still dubious). And, from recent List discussions, I'm really coming around to believe that **what** "handweavers" produce is a more useful distinction than the equipment on which we produce it. So, the question has remained, hanging in the air: what can handweavers do that is unique to handweaving? I think Groucho would say the duck has dropped: the secret word is "spontaneous". Yes! That's it!

I continue to tediously think in terms of specific examples 'cuz, well, that's how I think. I'm thinking of my 3-yard clasped weft chenille scarf. The weft was, indeed, quite spontaneous. I knew in advance what colors and yarns I would use and that the design line would be geometric, but the exact geometries and colors were decided as I went. Because I **can** do that! That is a significant insight.^(See note below.)

Now it seems to me that the simpler the loom, the greater the potential for spontaneity and vice versa, and, the more complex the loom, the less potential for spontaneity. Generally speaking, of course. When you look at equipment decisions from this point of view, how much "assist" a weaver uses really doesn't matter. What matters then is: what kind of equipment gets the weaver the cloth and weaving experience the weaver wants (more spontaneous or less). (Economic concerns, or lack thereof, always remaining in the equation of course. The backstrap-weavers repeating the same design over and over again don't need the spontaneity-potential of the backstrap loom, but it's the only equipment they can afford and, they weave on it very efficiently.)

^The "spontaneity potential" really is important. E.g., a quilt can be totally preplanned and controlled during production, or totally spontaneous. It can be entirely made by hand with the very simplest of equipment (a needle and a pair of scissors), or factory-made with somewhat more, but not **very** more, sophisticated equipment. Another example: stained (leaded) glass allows for very, very little spontaneity, especially in design, yet it can only be entirely handmade. No machine will ever be able to make even a part of a stained (leaded) glass panel.

Well, just the idle thoughts of an idle mind that is otherwise pretty much caught up with her email in-box. Back to work.

Sally

+++++

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Sally G. Knight in Los Osos (on the Central Coast of California)
along with the wonderful hairballs: George, Max, Claire, and
Spike O. Reilly and his kittens: Roxanne W. Furrperson,
Shasta Sue Latte, & Theodore Edward (sometimes known as
Teddy Dammit)

<cronewest@thegrid.net>

+++++

To reply privately, send message to Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 23 14:35:58 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA13826; Tue, 23 Nov 1999
14:35:58 -0700 (MST)
Received: from firefly.prairienet.org (firefly.prairienet.org [192.17.3.3]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA13812; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 14:35:56 -0700 (MST)
Received: from lizard (pnet-ppp-11.dacc.cc.il.us [198.88.201.231])
by firefly.prairienet.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id PAA29901
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 15:35:07 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <3.0.5.16.19991123152618.28efbc04@prairienet.org>
X-Sender: bjstultz@prairienet.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (16)
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1999 15:26:18
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Brenda Stultz <bjstultz@prairienet.org>
Subject: Re: W-Eureka, almost!
In-Reply-To: <383B1A53.4E85@erols.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I have only limited experience on my drawloom, but I do not think the
number of ground shafts has to be a factor of the number of pattern shafts.
In order to have it be a regular pattern, ie matching across the web, you
need to have the same number of threads per pattern shaft that are
contained in one repeat of the ground pattern. In your case of an 8 shaft
twill on the ground shafts you should have 8 threads per pattern shaft.
With 4 threads per pattern shaft you only have half of threads of the
ground pattern instead of the full of 8 threads. Does this make sense?

Brenda

> Well, here's the answer: 8 is not a factor of 20. Yes, I had an 8
>shaft straight twill threaded on the ground shafts, and a 20 shaft point
>twill on the pattern shafts. But (!!!!) since 8 is not a factor of 20,
>the units (of 4 threads) do not coincide with the pattern shafts in a
>regular manner. That means that although the pattern does weave
>regularly (how could it not?!?), the weft/warp faced cloth appears in
>different parts of the pattern, causing an overall different look to the
>design as one moves from left to right across the cloth.

To reply privately, send message to Brenda Stultz <bjstultz@prairienet.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 23 15:03:02 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA20684; Tue, 23 Nov 1999
15:03:02 -0700 (MST)
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1999 15:03:02 -0700 (MST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Message-Id: <199911232203.PAA20684@salmon.esosoft.net>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Alcorn <alcorn@pop.nwlink.com>
Subject: Re: W-Eureka, almost!
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Yes, I had an 8
>shaft straight twill threaded on the ground shafts, and a 20 shaft point
>twill on the pattern shafts. But (!!!!) since 8 is not a factor of 20,

Not only is 8 not a factor of 20, it is not a factor of 38 (or 39 depending on whether you go to the bottom of the point with the next 1), the actual number of warp threads in a 20 shaft point twill repeat.

Combining different numbers of shafts in the pulled versus the ground weaves is addressed by Jim Ahrens in Complex Weavers Compillation II. Nicki Lyons also addresses the problem in her article in Compillation II when she describes weaving samples of Jim's combinations.

Francie Alcorn

To reply privately, send message to Alcorn <alcorn@pop.nwlink.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 23 15:23:28 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA25849; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 15:23:28 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA25825; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 15:23:25 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 16127 invoked by alias); 23 Nov 1999 22:23:32 -0000
Received: (qmail 16106 invoked from network); 23 Nov 1999 22:23:31 -0000
Received: from ip154.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.154) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 23 Nov 1999 22:23:31 -0000
Message-ID: <383B1195.A0337140@netbistro.com>
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1999 14:13:41 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: studio efficiencies
References: <199911231837.LAA02280@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

As someone who started weaving as a means for an income (living or not - and for almost 6 years it was the only income for DH and me) I made the following choices:

AVL "production" loom, 60" wide, 16 shaft (all that was available in 1981), 1" sectional beam, auto cloth advance and double box fly shuttle.

Subsequent changes were made to the loom to make it more efficient for me, then the compu-dobby was added, and most recently the air assist.

Auxiliary equipment - an electric bobbin winder which was subsequently supplanted (although not entirely) by an old Whitin bobbin winder. It will keep automatically winding and doffing bobbins as long as bobbins

WeaveTech Archive 9911

are kept supplied in the carousel, and a weft package that it can wind from. Came with industrial shuttles which I vastly prefer over the light AVL shuttles, at least on my 60" width. Perhaps the light shuttles are fine on the narrower width looms.

An inspection table at comfortable standing height which also doubles as an off loom beaming rack. An extra sectional beam was built, so that I could be weaving and another beam could be in preparation. As my "standard" warps were either 40 yards or 100 yards, this became a very handy tool.

A stand was constructed from an old Nalley's potato chip rack which holds 36 ends. This takes up very little room and warps are wound off the top of the cones. As the majority of my warps are smooth, and coned, this tool became very helpful. I don't have individual thread tensioning beyond a very rudimentary guide system. As I beam at about 60 yards/minute, I haven't found this to be an enormous problem, especially with the heavier yarns I mostly use.

Alternately, the Leclerc spool rack. It originally held 50 packages, but DH added another rail so that it will take 60. This is usually used for very fine yarns. I have only gone beyond 60 epi for one project, and for that I borrowed another spool rack.

My studio has grown from a corner in the living room to about 80% of the basement - a not unreasonable % as it did for quite some number of years provide our only income, and has since provided a significant portion of our family income today.

Ultimately, as Tom notes, it will be economic factors that will determine each individual's investment in their equipment. What we can't afford to make more efficient, we have to make up for with more labour intensity. And perhaps that is the biggest difference between mill and studio - we are willing to discount the value of our labour and labour longer to get that special effect that we see in our fiber visions, and never mind what happens to the bottom line. Mills can never forget the bottom line, ever, or mistakes will impact on hundreds of lives, not just one or two.....

Laura Fry

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 23 15:34:13 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA28470; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 15:34:13 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA28398; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 15:34:00 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.27(src addr [206.63.102.27]) (970 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11q0Vh-0002dXC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 14:34:05 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)
Message-ID: <383AD60F.239E@nas.com>
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1999 10:59:45 -0700
From: Ernst & DelBoca <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #664 - machines

WeaveTech Archive 9911

References: <199911231057.DAA20951@salmon.esosoft.net> <383A9860.8BC3EC2E@world.std.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Tom Vogl wrote:

> That way
> each of us can decide whether such a gadget would be useful/affordable
> to us in our particular circumstances (what we weave, how much space we
> have, and how many \$ we are willing/able to invest in our weaving).
>
...and into the calculation we can put a factor for return on the
product to determine its amortization capability.

Myra

To reply privately, send message to Ernst & DelBoca <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 23 17:55:58 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA04153; Tue, 23 Nov 1999
17:55:58 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp4.erols.com (smtp4.erols.com [207.172.3.237]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id RAA04146; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 17:55:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from LOCALNAME (216-164-139-90.s344.tnt5.lnhva.md.dialup.rcn.com
[216.164.139.90])
by smtp4.erols.com (8.8.8/smtp-v1) with SMTP id TAA02932
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Tue, 23 Nov 1999 19:56:03 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <383B6AA5.557A@erols.com>
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1999 20:33:42 -0800
From: Anne Wells <arwells@erols.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-DH397 (Win16; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: W-Eureka, almost!
References: <199911232203.PAA20684@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Thank you, Francie. I got out some paper and scissors, to see how I can
shift the groups (I had groups of 4 threads per unit) along the pattern
threads, and I'm still messing around. I'll check these articles. I'm
so glad to have something to read! <big smile>
Anne

Alcorn wrote:

>
> Yes, I had an 8
> >shaft straight twill threaded on the ground shafts, and a 20 shaft point
> >twill on the pattern shafts. But (!!!!) since 8 is not a factor of 20,
>
> Not only is 8 not a factor of 20, it is not a factor of 38 (or 39 depending
> on whether you go to the bottom of the point with the next 1), the actual
> number of warp threads in a 20 shaft point twill repeat.
>
> Combining different numbers of shafts in the pulled versus the ground
> weaves is addressed by Jim Ahrens in Complex Weavers Compillation II.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

> Nicki Lyons also addresses the problem in her article in Compilation II
> when she describes weaving samples of Jim's combinations.
>
> Francie Alcorn
>
> To reply privately, send message to Alcorn <alcorn@pop.nwlink.com>

To reply privately, send message to Anne Wells <arwells@erols.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 24 02:42:06 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id CAA13841; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 02:42:06 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo26.mx.aol.com (imo26.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.70]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id CAA13821; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 02:42:00 -0700 (MST)
From: TBeau1930@aol.com
Received: from TBeau1930@aol.com
by imo26.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.8f154afc (4537)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 04:41:22 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.8f154afc.256d0cc2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 24 Nov 1999 04:41:22 EST
Subject: Factory woven Honeycomb
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 45
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi Francie and listers all:

<< I have never seen factory woven honeycomb. Probably anything that takes a lot of hand manipulation would not be profitable for factory weaving.>>

Honeycomb weaves on power Looms were and I assume still are being woven . We developed Smoke Stack scrubbers(Filters) using the Honeycomb weave in our Buffalo plant in the early 70's.

In Apparel and Drapery; Honeycomb, Huckaback, Gauze and Granite or Crepe were common in the first half of the century.

As you touched on above, the only consideration is profitability. The differentiation between what a Factory will or will not weave is economic, not feasibility. If the market is there, a machine or adaptation to a machine will be developed to produce the goods.

When considering profitability, the powers to be at any plant evaluate the impact on the bottom line from every aspect. If the market is there, they or their competitors will go after it.

Keep those Beaters moving.

Tom Beaudet

To reply privately, send message to TBeau1930@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 24 05:18:08 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA05354; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 05:18:08 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Namesrv.Mountain.Net (root@[198.77.1.1]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA05344; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 05:18:06 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host root@[198.77.1.1] claimed to be

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Namesrv.Mountain.Net
Received: from access.mountain.net (slip7-3.Spencer-WV.Mountain.Net [198.77.53.102])
by Namesrv.Mountain.Net (8.9.3/8.9.0) with ESMTP id HAA27500
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 07:16:55 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <383BD84E.3C4FE28D@access.mountain.net>
Date: Wed, 24 Nov 1999 07:21:34 -0500
From: susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>
X-Sender: "susan ernst" <vegalyra@access.mountain.net> (Unverified)
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en]C-gatewaynet (Win98; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: "weavetech@List-Server.net" <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: moving the discussion forward
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

ALLEN FANNIN wrote:

> So, if we accept that any loom which operates from some form of human power,
> regardless of whether and/or how that power may be assisted is indeed a
> handloom and that any loom which operated completely from electrical power
> is a "power" loom, perhaps we can move the discussion forward.

buy me a ticket, i'm in!

se

To reply privately, send message to susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 24 07:31:40 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA29494; Wed, 24 Nov 1999
07:31:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from scaup.prod.itd.earthlink.net (scaup.prod.itd.earthlink.net
[207.217.121.49]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA29488; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 07:31:38 -
0700 (MST)
Received: from glen (pool0271.cvx20-bradley.dialup.earthlink.net [209.179.251.16])
by scaup.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id GAA14504
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 06:31:40 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <000d01bf3688\$8592b620\$10fbb3d1@glen>
From: "Jim/Penny Peters" <pjpeters@earthlink.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
References: <0.8f154afc.256d0cc2@aol.com>
Subject: Re: Factory woven Honeycomb
Date: Wed, 24 Nov 1999 06:30:55 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> When considering profitability, the powers to be at any plant evaluate
> the impact on the bottom line from every aspect. If the market is there,
they
> or their competitors will go after it.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>
> Tom Beaudet

In the age of the internet, perhaps the profitability of the handwoven piece may assert itself as the handweaver can market to the niche audience that is looking for the unique. We are not there yet--still too messy for ordering on the web, needing the programs for secure server etc -- difficult aspects for most small producers to cope with. Penny Peters

To reply privately, send message to "Jim/Penny Peters" <pjpeters@earthlink.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 24 07:37:24 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA00953; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 07:37:24 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail.inetone.net (mail.inetone.net [206.105.172.6]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA00934; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 07:37:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: from inetone.net [208.0.8.82] by mail.inetone.net with ESMTTP (SMTPD32-5.05) id A8243B910032; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 09:37:24 -0500
Message-ID: <383BF909.60D15F2F@inetone.net>
Date: Wed, 24 Nov 1999 09:41:13 -0500
From: Belle Thomas <maidenspg@inetone.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: Gregg Johnson's comments
References: <l03130302b460a18b5750@[216.224.130.108]>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Sally Knight wrote:

>
> At 10:37 AM -0800 11/23/99, gregg johnson wrote:
> >In general, a much more spontaneous cloth can be produced by the handweaver.
>
> Gregg, thank you *so* much for your clear and clearly-expressed comments....
> I think Groucho would say
> the duck has dropped: the secret word is "spontaneous". Yes! That's > it!

Well...Sally and I apparently experienced a mutual "aha" on reading your comments, Gregg.

Up until now, I'd described the weaving that I fancy most as anything that is well-planned enough to produce a viable structure, yet still artful in execution. Most of all, my desire is to produce handwovens that lack the "constipated" look. Likely, that is possible on any equipment. I feel inclined now to explain my weaving goal with the word "spontaneous". hmmm...why didn't I think of that? <smiillllle>

For those of us who haven't gone beyond design software and the flyshuttle...and feel guilty about it (because labor saving equipment makes us more productive in a financial sense)...this truly *would* be an empowering topic for an article in "Handwoven".

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Thanks for your cogent thoughts.

Regards,
Belle Thomas

To reply privately, send message to Belle Thomas <maidenspg@inetone.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 24 08:19:48 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA11977; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 08:19:48 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp5.mindspring.com (smtp5.mindspring.com [207.69.200.82]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA11963; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 08:19:46 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mindspring.com (user-2ive6ec.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.25.204]) by smtp5.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id KAA02243 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 10:19:48 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <383C0245.D0EFF11A@mindspring.com>
Date: Wed, 24 Nov 1999 10:20:37 -0500
From: Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>
Organization: bnathans
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re:factory honeycomb
References: <199911241057.DAA23411@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

And many a 5 and 10cent store "dish cloth" used to be honeycomb---- haven't looked recently.

Barbara Nathans Bellport, Long Island, New York

To reply privately, send message to Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 24 09:44:21 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA01700; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 09:44:21 -0700 (MST)
Date: Wed, 24 Nov 1999 09:44:21 -0700 (MST)
Message-Id: <199911241644.JAA01700@salmon.esosoft.net>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Alcorn <alcorn@pop.nwlink.com>
Subject: Re: W-Eureka, almost!
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Brenda writes:

In your case of an 8 shaft
>twill on the ground shafts you should have 8 threads per pattern shaft.
>With 4 threads per pattern shaft you only have half of threads of the
>ground pattern instead of the full of 8 threads

This is almost true for damask, but the pattern will still march across the web if the number of ground shafts is a factor of the number of warp threads in each pattern unit. It is quite nice to have an 8 shaft satin for the ground and use only half units of 4 threads.

WeaveTech Archive 9911

When you consider lampas and other more complex weaves than damask, you must go far beyond matching ground versus pattern unit. You need to consider the ground of the basic cloth, the ground of the tie downs, and you must consider color. In some amazing 13th century tissue samples from Regensburg at the Victoria and Albert Museum, the ground was a simple plain weave. In some of the samples, besides the patterned supplementary weft, there was also a patterned supplementary warp, and some brocading.

I would like to know more about the looms upon which these fabrics were woven.

Francie Alcorn

To reply privately, send message to Alcorn <alcorn@pop.nwlink.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 24 10:34:21 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA13209; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 10:34:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA13188; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 10:34:18 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-30.idsonline.com [209.8.42.30])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id MAA11470
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 12:33:48 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991124122822.006c2d34@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Wed, 24 Nov 1999 12:28:22 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Re: Spontaneous weaving
In-Reply-To: <19991123183713.79438.qmail@hotmail.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Gregg wrote:

>In general, a much more spontaneous cloth can be produced by the
>handweaver.

Doesn't this take us back to the Franquemont Dictum: Weaving is more like jazz than brain surgery.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Nov 24 11:37:14 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA28409; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 11:37:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.thegrid.net (smtp.thegrid.net [209.162.1.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA28399; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 11:37:13 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 9090 invoked from network); 24 Nov 1999 18:37:18 -0000
Received: from pop.thegrid.net (209.162.1.5)
by smtp.thegrid.net with SMTP; 24 Nov 1999 18:37:18 -0000
Received: from [216.224.130.96] (slo-ts1-h1-130-96.ispmodems.net [216.224.130.96])
by pop.thegrid.net (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id KAA29796
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 24 Nov 1999 10:37:17 -0800 (PST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

X-Sender: i546534@mail.thegrid.net
Message-Id: <103130303b461eeadf534@[216.224.130.96]>
In-Reply-To: <3.0.3.32.19991124122822.006c2d34@cpcug.org>
References: <19991123183713.79438.qmail@hotmail.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Wed, 24 Nov 1999 11:37:59 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>
Subject: Re: Spontaneous weaving
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 12:28 PM -0500 11/24/99, Ruth Blau wrote:

>Gregg wrote:

>>In general, a much more spontaneous cloth can be produced by the
>>handweaver.

>

>Doesn't this take us back to the Franquemont Dictum: Weaving is more like
>jazz than brain surgery.

OR--

Handweaving is more like jazz than brain surgery.

OR--

Handweaving can be, but doesn't have to be, more like jazz than brain surgery.

Sally

++++
Sally G. Knight in Los Osos (on the Central Coast of California)
along with the wonderful hairballs: George, Max, Claire, and
Spike O. Reilly and his kittens: Roxanne W. Furrperson,
Shasta Sue Latte, & Theodore Edward (sometimes known as
Teddy Dammit)

<cronewest@thegrid.net>

++++

To reply privately, send message to Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 25 12:33:04 1999

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA16446; Thu, 25 Nov 1999
12:33:04 -0700 (MST)

Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA16442; Thu, 25 Nov 1999 12:33:03 -0700 (MST)

Received: (qmail 27508 invoked by alias); 25 Nov 1999 19:33:09 -0000

Received: (qmail 27497 invoked from network); 25 Nov 1999 19:33:08 -0000

Received: from ip171.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.171)
by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 25 Nov 1999 19:33:08 -0000

Message-ID: <383D69CD.C5FD5674@netbistro.com>

Date: Thu, 25 Nov 1999 08:54:37 -0800

From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: weavetech@List-Server.net

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Subject: Re: drawloom(?) background
References: <199911251057.DAA20356@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

A couple of years ago I was gifted with a linen towel which looks to be woven on at least a draw loom, more likely a Jacquard. The background looks like a variant of some sort of huck, while the pattern is in satin. Haven't done an actual analysis.

A recent rummage through my linen closet revealed this gift tucked away wrapped in tissue. Finally decided to live by own "rule" - use it and enjoy it! It is now in my kitchen to be used.... :)

Laura Fry
who has been fascinated by complex textiles right from the beginning....

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Nov 25 16:16:56 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA15768; Thu, 25 Nov 1999 16:16:56 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA15764; Thu, 25 Nov 1999 16:16:54 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 441 invoked by alias); 25 Nov 1999 23:17:03 -0000
Received: (qmail 434 invoked from network); 25 Nov 1999 23:17:02 -0000
Received: from ip182.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.182) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 25 Nov 1999 23:17:02 -0000
Message-ID: <383DACEE.D678FD36@netbistro.com>
Date: Thu, 25 Nov 1999 13:41:02 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: Devore' chenille
References: <199911251057.DAA20356@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Had an opportunity to do some testing with this yarn. Preliminary sampling indicates that it might just be possible to weave structures other than plain weave.

I did blocks of plain and 2/2 basketweave, 3/1-1/3 twill stripes and blocks, and an advancing twill treadling using 3/1, 2/2 and 1/3 twill in the tie up. Tossed the sample into the washing machine and the dryer, and voila! No worms.....

No guarantees, but it might be worth a try. The 1/3-3/1 twill stripes give a subtle but effective stripe effect, and the same woven in counterchanged blocks ditto. The advancing twill is more subtle yet, but does produce a texture and in a larger piece of cloth for a

WeaveTech Archive 9911

garment (cape?, ruana?) could look very plush (pun intended!) :)

Interesting how design challenges come our way and spur us in directions that we would not have followed on our own....

Laura Fry

waiting on more yarn in order to finally finish the current mega warp

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Nov 26 22:18:16 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id WAA29221; Fri, 26 Nov 1999 22:18:16 -0700 (MST)
Date: Fri, 26 Nov 1999 22:18:16 -0700 (MST)
Message-Id: <199911270518.WAA29221@salmon.esosoft.net>
To: "Weavetech" <weavetech@list-server.net>
From: "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>
Subject: Help please
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

HI all....I just got my new AVL SDL. and have it all put together....but I cannot for the life of me, get the warp beam adjusted so I can move it! I am not all that familiar with looms requiring a cable as the brake system, but I did bring the cable from the J-hook straight up and over, around the beam 4.5 times and down to the brake pedal. (Note - although it stated the cable must not cross anywhere, the last go round it had to lie on top of the already wrapped cable as there was simply no more room on the beam to accept another wrap of the cable) It was nearly impossible to attach the cable to the string....oops I mean automatic tensioning system <g>....but the sectional beam is stuck firmly.....can someone help me please????? I would be most appreciative....

Su :-) apbutler@ync.net

P.s. If anyone has any tips on properly adjusting the sliding beater, I would be forever grateful.....

To reply privately, send message to "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 27 00:11:55 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id AAA18082; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 00:11:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: from new.burgoyne.com (new.burgoyne.com [209.197.0.17]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id AAA18070; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 00:11:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from loom (pmf11.burgoyne.com [209.197.3.115])
by new.burgoyne.com (8.9.3/8.9.1) with SMTP id AAA12399
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 00:11:52 -0700
From: "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: RE: Help please
Date: Sat, 27 Nov 1999 00:09:55 -0700
Message-ID: <NDBBIFBOMLMBGFHHPCKLIEHJCDA.jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
Importance: Normal
In-Reply-To: <199911270518.WAA29221@salmon.esosoft.net>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Su,

The cable must not cross itself. It will not work if it does. So -- can you adjust the string (or automatic tensioning system) length to get it to work. Or else the cable needs to follow a different path at the start.

To reply privately, send message to "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 27 05:40:38 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA18217; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 05:40:38 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail1.ync.net (mail1.ync.net [206.185.20.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA18211; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 05:40:37 -0700 (MST)
Received: from SuButler (tcv90-ARC-004.185.ync.net [206.185.20.185]) by mail1.ync.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id GAA12176 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 06:40:37 -0600 (CST)
Message-ID: <001801bf38d4\$6d200360\$0400a8c0@SuButler>
From: "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Re: Help please
Date: Sat, 27 Nov 1999 06:39:19 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>Su,

>The cable must not cross itself. It will not work if it does. So -- can you adjust the string (or automatic tensioning system) length to get it to work. Or else the cable needs to follow a different path at the start.

Hi Judie....after many frustrating hours last night adjusting and readjusting, I took the whole cable off. Looking back at what passes for the manual, I noticed it had a measurement for the length of cable required for use of the sectional beam...it was to measure 74 1/4 inches....well guess what, mine measures 114"! No wonder I couldn't get it around the beam without crossing it!! Guess I will have to wait till Monday so they can send me the proper sized cable....how frustrating! Thank you so much for getting back to me on this!
Su :-) apbutler@ync.net

To reply privately, send message to "Su Butler" <apbutler@ync.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 27 08:53:51 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA09690; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 08:53:51 -0700 (MST)
Received: from spamgaaf.compuserve.com (as-img-6.compuserve.com [149.174.217.151]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA09679; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 08:53:49 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host as-img-6.compuserve.com [149.174.217.151] claimed to be spamgaaf.compuserve.com

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: (from mailgate@localhost)
by spangaaf.compuserve.com (8.9.3/8.9.3/SUN-1.7) id KAA27766
for weavetech@list-server.net; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 10:53:11 -0500 (EST)
Date: Sat, 27 Nov 1999 10:52:27 -0500
From: Anita Bell <75274.24@compuserve.com>
Subject: RE: Help Please
To: weavetech <weavetech@list-server.net>
Message-ID: <199911271052_MC2-8EC7-E8F@compuserve.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Disposition: inline
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>>I did bring the cable from the J-hook straight up and over, around the beam 4.5 times and down to the brake pedal.<<<

I have the plain beam, cable goes around the beam 3 times only and it is tight. I am reading the instructions and cannot find where it says how many times to wrap it around, it just says wrap and do not cross, try one less wrap. Have you measured to see if you have the right size cable? There is a difference in the length of the sectional and plain beam. Another thing is start winding with the cable hooked at the end of the J-hook, or from the center of the loom. If you start from the outside by the supports it tends to push against the center end. And do you have the J-hook in the proper hole? =

As to the sliding beater, follow the instructions pg. 3-18 and 3-19, specially nos. 7, 8 & 9. Keep on trying, my husband put it together and had to repeat that several times before getting it right. He says to make sure the loom is "square" as if it is not you will have problems installing the beater. To check if the loom is square measure from corner to corner left front to right back and vice versa. =

If you have any questions let me know and when you warp the loom I have some myself. I have woven about two yards already and getting used to it. =

Anita Bell
75274.24@compuserve.com

To reply privately, send message to Anita Bell <75274.24@compuserve.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 27 12:30:27 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA17362; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 12:30:27 -0700 (MST)
Received: from linknet.kitsap.lib.wa.us (linknet.kitsap.lib.wa.us [198.187.135.22]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA17356; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 12:30:25 -0700 (MST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: from linknet.kitsap.lib.wa.us (linknet.kitsap.lib.wa.us [198.187.135.22])
by linknet.kitsap.lib.wa.us (8.9.2/8.9.2) with ESMTP id LAA09198
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 11:20:19 -0800 (PST)
Date: Sat, 27 Nov 1999 11:20:19 -0800 (PST)
From: AE Silas <asilas@krl.org>
X-Sender: asilas@linknet.kitsap.lib.wa.us
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: HANDLOOM/POWERLOOM (long)
In-Reply-To: <199911231500.KAA21286@mailbox.syr.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.S04.4.05.9911271116190.20183-100000@linknet.kitsap.lib.wa.us>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> energy (read: power) expended over time. All looms perform work and since
> work requires power, all looms require some form of power therefore all
> looms are some form of power loom.
>
> So, if we accept that any loom which operates from some form of human power,
> regardless of whether and/or how that power may be assisted is indeed a
> handloom and that any loom which operated completely from electrical power
> is a "power" loom, perhaps we can move the discussion forward.

Sounds like a good working distinction to me! Thanks, Allen. Maybe this
and your other points, well taken, will get this discussion moving forward
instead of in circles.

Anne in Bainbridge

Anne Silas
asilas@krl.org
Bainbridge Island, Washington, USA

"I'm not expendable, I'm not stupid, and I'm not going."

To reply privately, send message to AE Silas <asilas@krl.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 27 16:09:41 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA16935; Sat, 27 Nov 1999
16:09:41 -0700 (MST)
Received: from emerald.lightlink.com (root@emerald.lightlink.com [205.232.34.14]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA16928; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 16:09:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: from adore.lightlink.com (incaed@adore.lightlink.com [205.232.34.20])
by emerald.lightlink.com (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id SAA21754
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 18:09:46 -0500
Date: Sat, 27 Nov 1999 18:09:46 -0500 (EST)
From: Ed Franquemont <incaed@lightlink.com>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: HANDLOOM/POWERLOOM (long)
In-Reply-To: <Pine.S04.4.05.9911271116190.20183-100000@linknet.kitsap.lib.wa.us>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSU.4.10.9911271808470.4540-100000@adore.lightlink.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

It seems to me the question is not one of source of power but of degree of

WeaveTech Archive 9911

automation.

Ed Franquemont

To reply privately, send message to Ed Franquemont <incaed@lightlink.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Nov 27 17:16:44 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA26065; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 17:16:44 -0700 (MST)
Received: from ecpport2.midcoast.com.au (ecpport2.ecopost.com.au [203.28.64.15]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA26056; Sat, 27 Nov 1999 17:16:42 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host ecpport2.ecopost.com.au [203.28.64.15] claimed to be ecpport2.midcoast.com.au
Received: from tnewman (mcport28-222.midcoast.com.au [203.12.28.222]) by ecpport2.midcoast.com.au (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id LAA08213 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 28 Nov 1999 11:16:17 +1100
Message-ID: <000d01bf3935\$ce953c80\$db1c0ccb@tnewman>
From: "Trudy Newman" <tnewman@midcoast.com.au>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Re: devore chenille
Date: Sun, 28 Nov 1999 11:15:59 +1100
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

What is this wonderful sounding stuff? Chenille with gaps in it?

Trudy

Trudy Newman
27 Allunga Ave PORT MACQUARIE NSW 2444
AUSTRALIA. Ph/fax:(02) 6582 2722
tnewman@midcoast.com.au

To reply privately, send message to "Trudy Newman" <tnewman@midcoast.com.au>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 28 11:09:51 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA04824; Sun, 28 Nov 1999 11:09:51 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.thegrid.net (smtp.thegrid.net [209.162.1.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA04816; Sun, 28 Nov 1999 11:09:50 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 15936 invoked from network); 28 Nov 1999 18:09:55 -0000
Received: from pop.thegrid.net (209.162.1.5)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

by smtp.thegrid.net with SMTP; 28 Nov 1999 18:09:55 -0000
Received: from [216.224.130.48] (slo-ts1-h1-130-48.ispmodems.net [216.224.130.48])
by pop.thegrid.net (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id KAA22330
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 28 Nov 1999 10:09:53 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: i546534@mail.thegrid.net
Message-Id: <103130300b46720462eba@[216.224.130.98]>
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSU.4.10.9911271808470.4540-100000@adore.lightlink.com>
References:
<Pine.S04.4.05.9911271116190.20183-100000@linknet.kitsap.lib.wa.us>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Sun, 28 Nov 1999 10:10:33 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>
Subject: Re: HANDLOOM/POWERLOOM
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 6:09 PM -0500 11/27/99, Ed Franquemont wrote:
>It seems to me the question is not one of source of power but of degree of
>automation.

Please elaborate, Ed. How would you differentiate between the 2?

Sally

++++
Sally G. Knight in Los Osos (on the Central Coast of California)
along with the wonderful hairballs: George, Max, Claire, and
Spike O. Reilly and his kittens: Roxanne W. Furrperson,
Shasta Sue Latte, & Theodore Edward (sometimes known as
Teddy Dammit)

<cronewest@thegrid.net>

++++

To reply privately, send message to Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 28 13:44:04 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA27180; Sun, 28 Nov 1999
13:44:04 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA27172; Sun, 28 Nov 1999 13:44:02 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 10421 invoked by alias); 28 Nov 1999 20:44:09 -0000
Received: (qmail 10411 invoked from network); 28 Nov 1999 20:44:07 -0000
Received: from ip148.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.148)
by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 28 Nov 1999 20:44:07 -0000
Message-ID: <384166C8.100E95CA@netbistro.com>
Date: Sun, 28 Nov 1999 09:30:48 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: devore' chenille
References: <199911281057.DAA15681@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

This yarn is a knitted construction with areas of plain knitted "core" and areas with fuzzy chenille. I think it is available from Silk City. (The yarn is supplied to me by my client.) When woven in plain weave, you get areas of plain weave (core on smooth warp) and areas of plush (chenille on smooth warp). The effect is kind of "moth eaten". The areas do not seem to have a regular repeat so they don't occur the same place every time.

Laura Fry

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 28 14:58:22 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA12007; Sun, 28 Nov 1999 14:58:22 -0700 (MST)
Received: from emerald.lightlink.com (root@emerald.lightlink.com [205.232.34.14]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA11995; Sun, 28 Nov 1999 14:58:20 -0700 (MST)
Received: from adore.lightlink.com (incaed@adore.lightlink.com [205.232.34.20]) by emerald.lightlink.com (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id QAA27883 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 28 Nov 1999 16:58:25 -0500
Date: Sun, 28 Nov 1999 16:58:26 -0500 (EST)
From: Ed Franquemont <incaed@lightlink.com>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: HANDLOOM/POWERLOOM
In-Reply-To: <103130300b46720462eba@[216.224.130.98]>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSU.4.10.9911281643350.21979-100000@adore.lightlink.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

For me the issue is how much of the process can be programmed into the machine so the machine repeats its steps without intervention of the weaver. When the weaver must herself make each step repetitively and perfect herself as part of the process, the involvement of the weaver is greater, the potential for error larger, the mark of the weaver on each shot of weft more intimate. The result is more personalized cloth where the process of making the fabric is of at least equal importance as the process of design of the fabric.

I think AAF is correct in comparing this debate with that of woodworking. There are many things that our machines today do not do very well or at least very efficiently that we can accomplish by hand. But the machines will approximate the hand processes in very acceptable ways. In my years as a builder, I substituted routers for elaborate hand plans, planed and edged boards with machines, and I think never made a fitted join by hand. I was much more productive, and could make a living working this way, which means my customers could afford my products. But I never would pretend that what I did was the same as that done by people ancient and modern who made fine boxes, musical instruments, veneer inlay, and carved table legs by hand. The process is fundamentally different when the maker controls the tool along each inch. I think the textile process is very different when the weaver must insert each weft and control the feel of the cloth constantly rather than program the loom just once to do this.

Ed Franquemont

WeaveTech Archive 9911

On Sun, 28 Nov 1999, Sally Knight wrote:

```
> At 6:09 PM -0500 11/27/99, Ed Franquemont wrote:
> >It seems to me the question is not one of source of power but of degree of
> >automation.
>
> Please elaborate, Ed. How would you differentiate between the 2?
>
> Sally
>
> ++++++
> Sally G. Knight in Los Osos (on the Central Coast of California)
> along with the wonderful hairballs: George, Max, Claire, and
> Spike O. Reilly and his kittens: Roxanne W. Furrperson,
> Shasta Sue Latte, & Theodore Edward (sometimes known as
> Teddy Dammit)
>
> <cronewest@thegrid.net>
> ++++++
>
>
>
> To reply privately, send message to Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>
>
```

To reply privately, send message to Ed Franquemont <incaed@lightlink.com>

```
>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sun Nov 28 18:33:54 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA24297; Sun, 28 Nov 1999
18:33:54 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo-d03.mx.aol.com (imo-d03.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.35]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA24283; Sun, 28 Nov 1999 18:33:52 -0700 (MST)
From: Carpenma@aol.com
Received: from Carpenma@aol.com
        by imo-d03.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.ae0faf44 (4249)
        for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Sun, 28 Nov 1999 20:33:12 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.ae0faf44.257331d7@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 28 Nov 1999 20:33:11 EST
Subject: Re: HANDLOOM/POWERLOOM
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 45
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net
```

We inadvertently damaged a machine-made oriental rug. It had gotten a spot of damp that lingered and one day when I vacuumed it, all the knots were pulled out and I had bare floor showing! We took it, along with a hand-knotted oriental that needed new fringe, to a repair person. The rug was a total loss. Had it been a hand-knotted rug, the damage could have been

WeaveTech Archive 9911

repaired (though I shudder at the cost).

Peg in Georgia

To reply privately, send message to Carpenma@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 06:21:04 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA09502; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 06:21:04 -0700 (MST)
Received: from bc.mountain.net (root@BC.Mountain.Net [198.77.1.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA09498; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 06:21:02 -0700 (MST)
Received: from access.mountain.net (slip7-2.Spencer-WV.Mountain.Net [198.77.53.101]) by bc.mountain.net (8.9.3/8.9.0) with ESMTP id IAA16856 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 08:32:38 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <38427EDA.CA5B52C2@access.mountain.net>
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 08:25:46 -0500
From: susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>
X-Sender: "susan ernst" <vegalyra@access.mountain.net> (Unverified)
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en]C-gatewaynet (Win98; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: "weavetech@List-Server.net" <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: "handwoven/powerwoven?"
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

ED FRANQUEMONT wrote:

> the mark of the weaver on each shot of weft more intimate. The >result is more personalized cloth

sounds more like making love than weaving! i would be very interested in examining two samples or products, one handloom woven and one powerloom woven to see if it is possible to identify the process by which the sample was made. i would venture to guess once it is wet finished and the sweat has been washed away and you can't tell the difference.

> where the process of making the fabric is of at least equal >importance as the process of design of the fabric.

this could only be so to the handweaver. it is representative of a personal philosophical principle.

> I was much more productive, and could make a living working
> this way, which means my customers could afford my products.

an investment in powerloom weaving equipment would be made for the purpose of reducing production time hence, an affordable product.

> I think the textiel process is very different when the weaver >must insert each weft and control the feel of the cloth >constantly rather than program the loom just once to do this.

yes, the process is very different but is the product?

to those of you on the list who are using powerlooms, what is the production difference? let's take a 9" X 72" scarf. what is your total production time? what is your weaving time? how many inches/minute? give those of us who handloom weave something concrete to compare with. what saves you the most time?

WeaveTech Archive 9911

se

To reply privately, send message to susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 07:20:04 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA22531; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 07:20:04 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA22496; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 07:19:59 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-40.idsonline.com [209.8.42.40])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id JAA26026
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 09:19:04 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991129091332.006c41cc@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 09:13:32 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Re: "handwoven/powerwoven?"
In-Reply-To: <38427EDA.CA5B52C2@access.mountain.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>to those of you on the list who are using powerlooms, what is the
>production difference? let's take a 9" X 72" scarf. what is your total
>production time? what is your weaving time? how many inches/minute?

Tho I sell (or try to <ggg>) nearly everything I weave, I have never made these calculations, nor do I plan to. I'm very competitive in other aspects of my life, and I can just see myself comparing myself to others & wanting to improve my inches per minute, etc. This would take the fun out of weaving for me (and probably put more burden on my already troubled right elbow). Just b/c I try to make a living out of this craft doesn't mean I shouldn't have fun as I do it.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 07:40:40 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA27328; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 07:40:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from europe.std.com (europe.std.com [199.172.62.20]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA27300; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 07:40:34 -0700 (MST)
Received: from world.std.com (root@world-f.std.com [199.172.62.5])
by europe.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTMP id JAA10887
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 09:40:36 -0500 (EST)
Received: from world.std.com (ppp0c124.std.com [208.192.102.124])
by world.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTMP id JAA26482
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 09:38:54 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3842901E.DE3849F6@world.std.com>
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 09:39:26 -0500
From: Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 06:09 PM 11/27/99 -0500, you wrote:
>It seems to me the question is not one of source of power but of degree of
>automation.

Ed Franquemont <incaed@lightlink.com>

Why?? The discussion has been stalled on the matter of "degree" since too much personal preference gets in the way of seeing this more objectively.

If we continue to focus on "...degree of automation..." we'll get right back into the morass of trying to determine when the so-called automation crosses the line from a handloom into something else. An exercise in futility. This is all notwithstanding that the term "automation" can be an emotionally laden one for many who lack machine as well as hand experience.

Does this mean that a handloom which has a self-acting take-up is really functionally different than on which the same amount of pick count accuracy is achieved through the effort and skill of the operator? Or does this mean that a handloom operator with a dobby, electronic or otherwise is functionally different than one who manipulates the warp manually to create the same pattern? Remember Laura's comment that the cloth carries no equipment fingerprint?

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300

mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 08:05:19 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA02929; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 08:05:19 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA02920; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 08:05:17 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42])
by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id KAA28510
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 10:05:20 -0500 (EST)
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 10:05:20 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911291505.KAA28510@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: HANDLOOM/POWERLOOM
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

WeaveTech Archive 9911

At 04:58 PM 11/28/99 -0500, you wrote:

> For me the issue is how much of the process can be programmed
>into the machine so the machine repeats its steps without intervention of
>the weaver. When the weaver must herself make each step repetitively and
>perfect herself as part of the process, the involvement of the weaver is
>greater, the potential for error larger, the mark of the weaver on each
>shot of weft more intimate. The result is more personalized cloth where
>the process of making the fabric is of at least equal importance as the
>process of design of the fabric.

Ed Franquemont <incaed@lightlink.com>

This is precisely why the discussion can get so muddled,... the glorification of defects. The "...mark of the weaver on each shot..." is purely in the mind of the beholder but does not exist in the concrete world. Nothing whatsoever observable distinguishes a pick thrown manually from one thrown otherwise. Nothing. It's far too easy to assume that a weaver working primitively is somehow "better", "happier", "more involved" etc., than one working otherwise. I am fortunate in having done it from the most primitive to the most highly evolved technologically and absolutely nothing in that evolution hindered the intimacy of my involvement. We cannot lose sight of the fact that the technological evolution happens because people simply get tired of wearing themselves out doing things the hard way and seek ways of easing their burden. The romantic notion that glorifies the hard way perhaps stems from not having had to fight the hard way when no other choice was closely available. I grew up with old black folks who, despite the loss of job it meant, were happy not to have to chop and pick cotton when other mechanical means were created.

AAF

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300

mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 08:41:21 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA12311; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 08:41:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA12293; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 08:41:20 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42])
by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id KAA16355
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 10:41:23 -0500 (EST)
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 10:41:23 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911291541.KAA16355@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: "handwoven/powerwoven?"

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 08:25 AM 11/29/99 -0500, you wrote:

>to those of you on the list who are using powerlooms, what is the
>production difference? let's take a 9" X 72" scarf. what is your total
>production time? what is your weaving time? how many inches/minute?
>give those of us who handloom weave something concrete to compare with.
>what saves you the most time?

> susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>

When we made single width scarf samples in our sampling facility on completely manual handlooms, a 9" X 72" sample, which was exactly our most common size, at 20ppi, woven at 60ppm, our normal pace, actual weaving time was 24 minutes per piece at 100% efficiency. If frequent shuttle changes were required by the pattern, the time could go as high as 30 minutes per piece. Now, when we went to doing the samples on a foot-powered but somewhat automatic loom, the pick rate went up to 80ppm and the shuttle changing, take-up and let-off were all automatic so the weaving time went down to 18 minutes. When the sampling requirements caused us to weave three pieces across the warp, the time went down further to 6 minutes per piece. Finally when this was all translated to our regular production on power looms, the speed went up to 140ppm and the number of pieces across the warp went up to 5 (they were woven wider to allow for finishing shrinkage to 9" wide). Simple arithmetic will show that the time per piece went down to 1.6 minutes at 100% efficiency. Our actual efficiency was more on the order of 90%.

In all of the above, there was not a single particle of involvement, intimacy, quality or anything else lost in the process. I can assure everyone of that because I was there and did it myself.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300

<mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 08:59:40 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA17575; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 08:59:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA17552; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 08:59:38 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42]) by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id KAA26919 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 10:59:39 -0500 (EST)
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 10:59:39 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911291559.KAA26919@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: "handwoven/powerwoven?"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 09:13 AM 11/29/99 -0500, you wrote:

>>to those of you on the list who are using powerlooms, what is the
>>production difference? let's take a 9" X 72" scarf. what is your total
>>production time? what is your weaving time? how many inches/minute?
>
>Tho I sell (or try to <ggg>) nearly everything I weave, I have never made
>these calculations, nor do I plan to. I'm very competitive in other
>aspects of my life, and I can just see myself comparing myself to others &
>wanting to improve my inches per minute, etc. This would take the fun out
>of weaving for me (and probably put more burden on my already troubled
>right elbow). Just b/c I try to make a living out of this craft doesn't
>mean I shouldn't have fun as I do it.

Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

In my instance, there was an enjoyment in solving the problem of how to reduce the time and maintain everything else. At the same time, reducing the labor to save wear and tear on me didn't cut into the fun in the least.

Because of my particular and peculiar mind-set, I don't quite see why calculating things like this takes away the fun. I didn't do it for competitive reasons nor to compare myself with others, but simply to cut down on the amount of work I had to do to get the same product.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300

mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 09:03:14 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA18887; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 09:03:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: from europe.std.com (europe.std.com [199.172.62.20]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA18880; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 09:03:13 -0700 (MST)
Received: from world.std.com (root@world-f.std.com [199.172.62.5])
by europe.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id LAA24963
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 11:03:16 -0500 (EST)
Received: from world.std.com (ppp0c125.std.com [208.192.102.125])
by world.std.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id KAA03980
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 10:59:33 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3842A306.DEA7877B@world.std.com>
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 11:00:06 -0500
From: Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

> these calculations, nor do I plan to. I'm very competitive in other
> aspects of my life, and I can just see myself comparing myself to others &
> wanting to improve my inches per minute, etc.

i am interested in those figures so that i can compare production costs
not compare myself to others. i am interested in finding out if there
is a real \$\$\$ justification for investing in learning about this
equipment.

for me, this discussion relates to \$\$\$\$, improvement of income and
consideration to physical limitations (i am 5' 110lbs, before
thanksgiving, 46ys). competition with and/or comparisons to others
isn't relevant. when i get a sense of production times possible with
handlooms and powerlooms then i have something concrete to deal with. i
can take my handloom woven times and compare them to powerloom woven
times. i will not be able to make any lifestyle decisions or come to
any true conclusions until i educate myself with real data.

se

To reply privately, send message to susan ernst <vegalyra@access.mountain.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 10:42:02 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA17342; Mon, 29 Nov 1999
10:42:02 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo21.mx.aol.com (imo21.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.65]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id KAA17295; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 10:41:53 -0700 (MST)
From: Magstrands@aol.com
Received: from Magstrands@aol.com
by imo21.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.c79e9ad4 (4543)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 12:41:23 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.c79e9ad4.257414c3@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 12:41:23 EST
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #673
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL for Macintosh sub 54
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi all.... In regards to Susan Ernsts question on time comparison, that
question alone was a very large factor in my decision to get my studio more
automated.... First off let me say that I have AVL doobby hand looms and also
AVL automated looms..I have made this comparison by having a person weave a
solid black scarf at the same time as having my IDL do the same... the
results were surprising... My handweavers can out weave my autos almost 1 1/2
to 1 ... the value of the IDL's to me is the fact that I can run 4 at a time
and they don't get tired... I can get 10-12 scarves a day (8hrs) off each
auto, and my crew weaves 15-17 a day ea. I thought this was interesting...
My "powerlooms" are not like the description of the ones in the mills..mine
are made of a wood frame and are nice looking but need constant adjustments
(babysitting)

I look at them as somewhat of a double-edged sword... they're great when they
work and are VERY frustrating when they don't... I've also taken the black
scarves off of my handlooms and off of my IDL and finished them seperately to
get a comparison between man and machine and could not tell the difference at
all... I think its also interesting that I have my crew do the complicated
weaveing and let my autos do the simple stuff.. I can count on my weavers and
not on my autos.. One bad shot renders a scarf worthless as far as selling as
a first and after to much waste I am reserved to this fact.. This conclusion

WeaveTech Archive 9911

saves my sanity.. I had big plans for my autos and am now of the mind that I could have fed alot of families by hiring weavers, for the cost of 1 of these autos.. but I had to make a decision and here we are now.. So Susan back to your question, and to repeat what Laura has already said there is no equipment tracks left on my finished goods... the difference is in the physical aspect... After hearing so much about the grease and noise of heavy machinery I do have a new appreciation for how my looms look and feel... they are definetly noisy and don't have that nice sound that handweaving has.. As far as doing production weaving in itself, it seems to me that that is a decision to weavers as to how are we going to do this.. I think alot of us start off just trying to weave faster in order to make more and then we end up trying to simplify our process out of fatigue... I started with a 4h Harrisville in my living room back in '78.. I wove every day of the year for Xmas time.. I'd sell at crafts fairs and then start over in Jan. for the next year... In my case I couldn't afford to weave for pleasure because materials were to expensive so my pleasure came from the process of weaving not necessarily having alot of handwoven things ... as demand grew I also realized I could do more with a flyshuttle than by hand ... This was an incredible step for me.. going from so traditional .. It was like going from a treadle sewing machine to an electric one... but with time and certain decisions in life I've evolved to what I'm doing now... I get the response that many of you have mentioned about not doing real weaving and I'm tired of having to explain my reasoning to folks .. so I have been reluctant to get to involved in this discussion .. but when Susan had such a good direct question I found myself at my keyboard.. The one common thread that we all seem to have is the fact that we all work very hard at what we do, for the love of it, the economics of it all, and it seems that the more we get involved in the process of all that comes with this job, we get not only creative in our designs but in our process as well... I would think that all of our studios are as different as night and day and we all have very different ways of doing the same things, warping, weaving etc... Personally I think thats what makes all of our situations as well as our products unique.. so to power or not to power is as individual as each of us... we all don't have to have the same attitude as the next one we just need to be open enough to hear and learn from this discussion.. well my short note has turned into a long book.. so I'll bow out for now... Sue

To reply privately, send message to Magstrands@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 10:59:14 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA21760; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 10:59:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA21736; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 10:59:10 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42])
by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id MAA04730
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 12:59:15 -0500 (EST)
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 12:59:15 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911291759.MAA04730@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #673
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 12:41 PM 11/29/99 EST, you wrote:

>AVL automated looms..I have made this comparison by having a person weave a

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>solid black scarf at the same time as having my IDL do the same... the
>results were surprising... My handweavers can out weave my autos almost 1 1/2
>to 1 ...

>Magstrands@aol.com

This finding does not surprise me in the least. What is being offered as a "powerloom" or "industrial loom" bears no resemblance to the real thing. Our production looms worked, period. Once properly set up and adjusted, they did not require constant tweaking except when radically different good were being woven. Even in those circumstances, the tweaking might not be much more than a slight change in shed geometry, change in roll covering and the usual pick gear change. Because these looms, unlike what is offered to handloom weavers, assume that such changes are part of the job, provide for extremely easy means of accomplishing it. One mill in which I was the weave room manager ran 24/7 and while we had to have 1-3 loom fixers on a shift, much of what they did was start-up after a warp change. There was PM (preventive maintenance) but our level of efficiency on the shuttle looms was at least 82% and on the air jets, above 90% and much of the problems had more to do with yarns than the looms themselves. We have all heard Laura Fry, who is as skilled a handloom operator as any I know, talk about how her AVL with air assist is slower weaving than without, the physical labor aside. So, when the term "powerloom" is bandied about, we need to understand more fully just what a relatively simple machine this is and how extremely reliable real power looms are, when set up, operated and adjusted by people who know what to do when.

AAF

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300

<mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 11:42:21 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA03830; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 11:42:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.thegrid.net (smtp.thegrid.net [209.162.1.11]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA03783; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 11:42:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 3032 invoked from network); 29 Nov 1999 18:42:20 -0000
Received: from pop.thegrid.net (209.162.1.5)
by smtp.thegrid.net with SMTP; 29 Nov 1999 18:42:20 -0000
Received: from [216.224.130.32] (slo-ts1-h1-130-32.ispmodems.net [216.224.130.32])
by pop.thegrid.net (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id KAA02326
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 10:42:18 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: i546534@mail.thegrid.net
Message-Id: <103130302b4687852804f@[216.224.130.32]>
In-Reply-To: <199911291505.KAA28510@mailbox.syr.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 10:42:59 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>
Subject: Re: HANDLOOM/POWERLOOM

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 10:05 AM -0500 11/29/99, Allen Fannin wrote:

>Nothing whatsoever observeable distinguishes a pick thrown manually from one
>thrown otherwise. Nothing.

Generally, I would tend to agree. But! What about a clasped-weft pick?
Or some other weaver-controlled pick? An inlay, for example, or a tapestry?

Maybe we get stalled-out in the discussion because we are trying to put all
of weaving into just 2 pidgeon holes: handpowered or electricpowered.
Maybe we *do* need a different way to classify/differentiate, maybe a
system that has more than just these 2 pidgeon holes. Then again, maybe
trying to classify, pidgeon-hole, is about as useful as arguing the
question, "what is art". Terrific for those who like to argue such things,
but a snore for most people. Real life is seldom black and white, almost
always shades of grey.

Just my humble opinion,
Sally

++++
Sally G. Knight in Los Osos (on the Central Coast of California)
along with the wonderful hairballs: George, Max, Claire, and
Spike O. Reilly and his kittens: Roxanne W. Furrperson,
Shasta Sue Latte, & Theodore Edward (sometimes known as
Teddy Dammit)

<cronewest@thegrid.net>

++++

To reply privately, send message to Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 11:51:53 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA06577; Mon, 29 Nov 1999
11:51:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo16.mx.aol.com (imo16.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.6]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id LAA06537; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 11:51:46 -0700 (MST)
From: Carpenma@aol.com
Received: from Carpenma@aol.com
by imo16.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.b90c0fbe (4189)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 13:51:18 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.b90c0fbe.25742526@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 13:51:18 EST
Subject: Re: "handwoven/powerwoven?"
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 45
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

In a message dated 11/29/1999 11:22:01 AM Mid-Atlantic Standard Time,
vegalyra@access.mountain.net writes:

> what saves you the most time?

WeaveTech Archive 9911

I don't think Ed is talking about saving time.

Peg in Georgia

To reply privately, send message to Carpenma@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 11:57:16 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA08377; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 11:57:16 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo28.mx.aol.com (imo28.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.72]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA08334; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 11:57:09 -0700 (MST)
From: Carpenma@aol.com
Received: from Carpenma@aol.com
by imo28.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.7c35a6f3 (4189)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 13:56:34 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.7c35a6f3.25742661@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 13:56:33 EST
Subject: Re: HANDLOOM/POWERLOOM (long)
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 45
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

In a message dated 11/29/1999 12:48:48 PM Mid-Atlantic Standard Time, aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu writes:

> Remember Laura's comment that the cloth carries no
> equipment fingerprint?
>

I would like to hear Ed's reply to this in the light of what he said in his email that compared woodworking and weaving. If I remember correctly, he basically said that so far as woodworking goes, cabinetry does carry an "equipment fingerprint." If I am interpreting what he said correctly, I would like him to comment on the weaving analogy in this light.

Peg in Georgia

To reply privately, send message to Carpenma@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 12:56:11 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA25436; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 12:56:11 -0700 (MST)
Received: from umailsrv2.umd.edu (umailsrv2.umd.edu [128.8.10.76]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA25383; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 12:56:03 -0700 (MST)
Received: from dinouye (bay5-28.dial.umd.edu [128.8.23.28])
by umailsrv2.umd.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.0) with ESMTP id OAA28537
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 14:56:03 -0500
Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991129141300.009b2730@pop.mail.yahoo.com>
X-Sender: bonnieinouye@pop.mail.yahoo.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 14:58:44 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Bonnie Inouye <bonnieinouye@yahoo.com>
Subject: speedy
In-Reply-To: <199911291541.IAA12328@salmon.esosoft.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Precedence: bulk

Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Allen has impressed us all with the quick production of scarves on his power loom, but we know that most of us don't have the space or finances to set up this kind of equipment whether we would want it or not. It seems to me that the time involved in producing one scarf is not the only consideration here. Setting up and maintaining the equipment, marketing and shipping the orders, buying and storing the quantities of yarn needed for such a business, training employees, and more, need to be done well. All those scarves need to be finished perfectly too. Those of us who make our scarves one at a time and want to sell them, need to understand how a larger operation works. When I charge, say, \$50 for a scarf, I need to be sure that the scarf itself is worth this amount. Not because it took me so many minutes or hours to make plus such an amount for materials, but because it is an exceptionally lovely or interesting scarf and will last a long time and be soft and warm (well, functional).

I am curious about Allen's present position. If you could make woven textiles with such speed and efficiency, why stop? Or are you still taking orders for those power looms? Please note that I am not accusing you of anything. I am concentrating on teaching myself and have made fewer items for sale in the past couple of years. Partly I found that marketing is difficult for me, but even more I have found that teaching presents such interesting challenges.

If I do something over and over, even if the pattern changes, I will become more efficient at making it and also I will get bored. So I add more challenges! How could I make this design grow without repeating? Can I make the same kind of design but in a 3-dimensional textile? Could I move this 16-shaft technique to a 4-shaft loom, or perhaps take the theory to tablet weaving? (I've just made a piece with an advancing sequence in tablets, and one with beads.) What makes this structure work, and how can I explain the theory in a way that will be easy to understand?

At the Peter Collingwood exhibit currently showing at the Textile Museum in Washington, DC, we can see the results of innovative thinking by another weaver (in addition to Allen) who sought efficiency. I jotted down this quote from the exhibit:

"I rather like finding a problem, and then finding a technical solution. For me speed is terribly important, in order to make a piece in a limited time, so it can sell at a competitive price and make the whole thing possible." -Peter Collingwood. The show is just wonderful. Like Allen, Peter was supporting a family by producing woven textiles, but instead of buying power looms, Peter devised techniques for making pieces that are not done in mills. The exhibit runs through January 23, 2000. (www.textilemuseum.org)

Bonnie Inouye

www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347

To reply privately, send message to Bonnie Inouye <bonnieinouye@yahoo.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 13:19:41 1999

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA02504; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 13:19:41 -0700 (MST)

Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA02496; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 13:19:40 -0700 (MST)

Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42])

by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id PAA26790

for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 15:19:45 -0500 (EST)

Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 15:19:45 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <199911292019.PAA26790@mailbox.syr.edu>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: HANDLOOM/POWERLOOM
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 10:42 AM 11/29/99 -0800, you wrote:
>At 10:05 AM -0500 11/29/99, Allen Fannin wrote:
>
>>Nothing whatsoever observeable distinguishes a pick thrown manually
>>from one thrown otherwise. Nothing.
>
>Generally, I would tend to agree. But! What about a clasped-weft pick?
>Or some other weaver-controlled pick? An inlay, for example, or a >tapestry?

Sally Knight <cronewest@thegrid.net>

The clasped-pick or other partial pick fabrics are special exceptions and while a valuable consideration in this discussion, they have never been considered in the general scheme of fabrics having filling selvege to selvege. It is certainly true that at this point powerlooms do not do these kinds of fabrics, but then neither did early handlooms when there were no handlooms. Looms making tapestry were always in a sub-class by themselves.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562
-5300
mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 13:25:23 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA04183; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 13:25:23 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA04165; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 13:25:20 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.20(src addr [198.182.208.204]) (1551 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11sXMQ-0002eeC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 12:25:22 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)
Message-ID: <3842C787.5C4F@nas.com>
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 11:35:53 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: HANDLOOM/POWERLOOM (long)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

References: <199911291448.JAA20422@mailbox.syr.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Allen Fannin wrote:

> Remember Laura's comment that the cloth carries no
> equipment fingerprint?
>

If we can agree to respect and sidestep philosophical perspectives for a bit, I would appreciate a practical discussion by means of comparisons of PRODUCTION handlooms vis-a-vis automated (electrically powered) looms or hybrids based on the following differences. To visual the differences, use as the object to be woven a double bed size wool blanket:

1. Specifications of the loom and complement of equipment to be used,
2. Ergonomic design and occupational hazards,
3. Energy requirements - human as well as manufactured power,
4. Time to produce,
5. Quality of end product,
6. Studio - Physical plant (space requirements for loom and associated equipment, activities, and the supporting systems - power, air, temperature, water, light, floor design to carry the equipment,

surface

finishes, furnishings - other than weaving equipment, etc.

Thank you kindly,
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 13:26:22 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA04436; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 13:26:22 -0700 (MST)
Received: from ntmsg5.standard.com (exchange3.standard.com [198.107.111.39]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA04430; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 13:26:20 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host exchange3.standard.com [198.107.111.39] claimed to be ntmsg5.standard.com
Received: by ntmsg5 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0) id <VK3WYR4Z>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 12:25:50 -0800
Message-ID: <6F916C7B1D3BD21194FE00805FA7E47A07109F26@exchange1bg3>
From: Carrie Brezine <cbrezine@standard.com>
To: "Weavetech (E-mail)" <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: accumulating picks; defects; primitive
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 12:25:45 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Ed wrote:

> For me the issue is how much of the process can be programmed
> into the machine so the machine repeats its steps without intervention of
> the weaver. When the weaver must herself make each step repetitively and
> perfect herself as part of the process, the involvement of the weaver is

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>greater, the potential for error larger, the mark of the weaver on each
>shot of weft more intimate. The result is more personalized cloth where
>the process of making the fabric is of at least equal importance as the
>process of design of the fabric.

Ed Franquemont <incaed@lightlink.com>

Alan replied:

>This is precisely why the discussion can get so muddied,... the glorification of defects. The "...mark of the weaver on each shot..." is purely in the mind of the beholder but does not exist in the concrete world. Nothing whatsoever observable distinguishes a pick thrown manually from one thrown otherwise. Nothing.

I disagree. I find that cloth made on a backstrap loom with a stick shuttle feels different to me than purchased yardage reeled off a bolt. I am not making a value judgement as each has an important place in my life; but they do feel different to me. I cannot provide a clear counter-example to the assertion that picks thrown differently are indistinguishable. However, I find that the accumulation of picks thrown a certain way produces an observable difference in the cloth. Part of the fascination for me is that this difference does not lie in any one spot and cannot be attributed to any one aspect of the cloth.

Also, I did not mark anything in Ed's post glorifying defects. Let's define "defects" before we decide if they are being glorified. For some purposes, a regular consistent beat could be a defect.

>It's far too easy to assume that a weaver working primitively is somehow "better", "happier", "more involved" etc., than one working otherwise. I am fortunate in having done it from the most primitive to the most highly evolved technologically and absolutely nothing in that evolution hindered the intimacy of my involvement.

I would be interested to hear a working definition of "primitive". It disturbs me that we may have a group of techniques classed as primitive, and that this wording may lead weavers away from exploring such techniques. Amazing fabrics can be achieved with simple equipment, as we all know. By discarding some procedures or equipment as primitive, might we also be in danger of losing the mindset which allows those amazing fabrics to happen?

Carrie

To reply privately, send message to Carrie Brezine <cbrezine@standard.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 13:28:27 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA05158; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 13:28:27 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA05143; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 13:28:26 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Room215.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42])
by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id PAA02056

WeaveTech Archive 9911

for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 15:28:32 -0500 (EST)
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 15:28:32 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199911292028.PAA02056@mailbox.syr.edu>
X-Sender: aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: HANDLOOM/POWERLOOM (long)
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 01:56 PM 11/29/99 EST, you wrote:

>In a message dated 11/29/1999 12:48:48 PM Mid-Atlantic Standard Time,
>aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu writes:

>

>> Remember Laura's comment that the cloth carries no
>> equipment fingerprint?

>>

>I would like to hear Ed's reply to this in the light of what he said in his
>email that compared woodworking and weaving. If I remember correctly, he
>basically said that so far as woodworking goes, cabinetry does carry an
>"equipment fingerprint."

Carpenma@aol.com
>Peg in Georgia

I'm in agreement that woodworking carries an "...equipment fingerprint..."
For example there is a certain round bottom to the inside of the socket cut
of a dovetail joint made with some routers because the cutting bit, while
having the dovetail angle, is round and the end of the cut is therefore
round. But if the woodworker drilled a round hole and then chiseled out the
rest of the joint, there would be a rounded portion as if it were routed.

However filling passed from selvege to selvege looks the same regardless of
the loom on which it is done. One might argue that the evenness of
pickcount is some kind of textile fingerprint. To this I would counter that
a highly skilled weaver is capable of weaving as accurate and consistent a
pick count as any powerloom. I know because I trained lots of handloom
weavers to do so. To the question of why a handloom weaver would weave as
accurately as a powerloom I would reply, "Why not?". Weaving accurately
and consistently is absolutely natural and stems from skill developed over
many years of practise. Any weaving which is not accurate and consistent
where design requires it is not good weaving regardless of whether it is
done on a handloom or powerloom.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall Rm 215
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562

-5300
mailto:aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
<http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin>

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 16:32:13 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA26504; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 16:32:13 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA26416; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 16:31:58 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 29446 invoked by alias); 29 Nov 1999 23:32:06 -0000
Received: (qmail 29434 invoked from network); 29 Nov 1999 23:32:06 -0000
Received: from ip166.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.166) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 29 Nov 1999 23:32:06 -0000
Message-ID: <38430DC7.296A9EB6@netbistro.com>
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 15:35:35 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: fabric with "soul"
References: <199911292026.NAA04462@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

To add another dimension to this discussion of fabric with "soul", I would like to recommend that anyone who has not seen Jack Lenor Larsen's book "Material Wealth" to take a gander.

"machine" made? Undoubtedly. "soul-less"? Well, that's really a judgement call, isn't it? That's sort of like telling someone that *their* religion is a cult.....

The only person who can decide what equipment to use, and how to use it, is themselves.

If there *must* be a definition of "hand" woven, then the definition as stated by the Dept. of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Canada, works for me. To paraphrase:

Each action of the loom must be initiated by the weaver.

This works for me - it includes everything from the backstrap to my AVL with all the bells and whistles. It doesn't include the AVL IDL, even tho as Sue points out, a scarf produced on the IDL and one produced by a "hand" loom cannot be identified according to the equipment used.

As someone pointed out, we are trying to draw black and white distinctions in a grey world. Can we get past what kind of equipment we use and respect each other for the creative impulse that leads us to try to create functional AND beautiful (soul-full) cloth????

Laura Fry

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 17:23:52 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA10291; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 17:23:52 -0700 (MST)
Received: from fog.powercom.net (fog.powercom.net [216.114.0.132]) by salmon.esosoft.net

WeaveTech Archive 9911

(8.8.5) id RAA10285; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 17:23:50 -0700 (MST)
Received: from sarav ([207.7.41.88])
by fog.powercom.net (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id SAA62484
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 18:28:19 -0600 (CST)
(envelope-from sarav@powercom.net)
Message-ID: <003601bf3ac9\$56d684c0\$582907cf@sarav>
From: "Sara von Tresckow" <sarav@powercom.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
References: <6F916C7B1D3BD21194FE00805FA7E47A07109F26@exchange1bg3>
Subject: Re: accumulating picks; defects; primitive
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 18:24:59 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>I disagree. I find that cloth made on a backstrap loom with a
>stick shuttle feels different to me than purchased yardage reeled off a
>bolt. I am not making a value judgement as each has an important place in
>my life; but they do feel different to me. I cannot provide a clear
>counter-example to the assertion that picks thrown differently are
>indistinguishable. However, I find that the accumulation of picks thrown a
>certain way produces an observable difference in the cloth. Part of the
>fascination for me is that this difference does not lie in any one spot and
>cannot be attributed to any one aspect of the cloth.

I can attest to this with the following:

At a visit to the Viking Museum at Haithabu (near Schleswig, Germany) there was a display of birds eye twill reproduction fabric - TWO samples. One woven on a warp weighted loom, the other on a horizontal 4-harness loom. The yarns and sett were identical. There was a SUBTLE, yet perceptible difference in the two fabrics - the warp weighted examples being slightly more imprecise, yet somehow softer and definitely appealing. I would say that neither of the two fabrics could have been deemed "better"

Sara von Tresckow
sarav@powercom.net
Fond du Lac, WI

To reply privately, send message to "Sara von Tresckow" <sarav@powercom.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 18:32:57 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA27292; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 18:32:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from ntmsg5.standard.com (exchange3.standard.com [198.107.111.39]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA27288; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 18:32:56 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host exchange3.standard.com [198.107.111.39] claimed to be ntmsg5.standard.com
Received: by ntmsg5 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
id <VK3WYVR4>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 17:32:30 -0800
Message-ID: <6F916C7B1D3BD21194FE00805FA7E47A07109F35@exchange1bg3>
From: Carrie Brezine <cbrezine@standard.com>
To: "Weavetech (E-mail)" <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: weaving a blanket--one perspective

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 17:32:31 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At the risk of introducing the primitive into this discussion, I offer the following answers to Myra's questions, for purposes of comparison. I hope those more knowledgeable than I will correct any misinformation.

Production Loom: backstrap

1. Specifications of the loom and complement of equipment to be used,

For warping: two sturdy stakes and something to drive them into securely (the ground, a wall).

For weaving: two sturdy loom bars; heddle rod; shed roll; shed sword; stick shuttle; beating implement (if shed sword not sufficient); pickup sticks if desired. Backstrap. Hefty cord to tie further loom bar to something. String for heddles. Something immovable to tie on to (house, tree, grand piano).

2. Ergonomic design and occupational hazards,

Ergonomics are infinitely adjustable. Comfort depends on position in which you sit or kneel, angle at which warp slants away from the weaver, and where on the body the backstrap is positioned. I find it least stressful around my hips, rather than waist. I cannot say that I've ever found it comfortable for long periods of time.

Hazards to the weaver, besides stiffness, are hard to imagine. Implements such as loom bars and, for that matter, string can always be used in lethal ways but are unlikely to cause injury by themselves. There are perhaps greater hazards to the warp than in other methods of production, since it is not protected by a frame, and could be idly strummed by passers by, or tripped over and disarranged (it's happened to me).

3. Energy requirements - human as well as manufactured power, Light to see.

Two skilled hands capable of manipulating sheds and passing the shuttle.

4. Time to produce,

Three weeks? Four? I am guessing wildly. Ed has some data on this I believe.

5. Quality of end product,

Depends on the skill of the weaver. Could be mediocre; may be exceptional. It is likely that the end product will be unlike any other, even others produced by the same weaver. Can certainly be as warm/soft/thick/complex as blankets produced by other means.

6. Studio - Physical plant (space requirements for loom and associated

equipment, activities, and the supporting systems - power, air,

temperature, water, light, floor design to carry the equipment, surface finishes, furnishings - other than weaving equipment, etc.

Space to sit, well lit, with an immovable something approximately the warp length away to tie on to. The warp is moveable, so studio location can vary with the time of day, season, weather, or caprice. I find it most

WeaveTech Archive 9911

comfortable to have a pillow to sit on but this is not strictly necessary.

Just one perspective. Myra, thank you for framing this question.

To reply privately, send message to Carrie Brezine <cbrezine@standard.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 19:10:48 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA06696; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 19:10:48 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo-d04.mx.aol.com (imo-d04.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.36]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA06686; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 19:10:46 -0700 (MST)
From: RUSLYN@aol.com
Received: from RUSLYN@aol.com
by imo-d04.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.be4724b4 (4413)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 21:10:17 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.be4724b4.25748c09@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 21:10:17 EST
Subject: Myra's Request
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 10
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Myra, In regard to your last post copied below, are we starting up a business for you? If so, bring it out in the open.

Lynn Silberschlag
ruslyn@aol.com

<< >

If we can agree to respect and sidestep philosophical perspectives for a bit, I would appreciate a practical discussion by means of comparisons of PRODUCTION handlooms vis-a-vis automated (electrically powered) looms or hybrids based on the following differences. To visual the differences, use as the object to be woven a double bed size wool blanket:

1. Specifications of the loom and complement of equipment to be used,
2. Ergonomic design and occupational hazards,
3. Energy requirements - human as well as manufactured power,
4. Time to produce,
5. Quality of end product,
6. Studio - Physical plant (space requirements for loom and associated equipment, activities, and the supporting systems - power, air, temperature, water, light, floor design to carry the equipment, surface finishes, furnishings - other than weaving equipment, etc.

Thank you kindly,
Myra
>>

To reply privately, send message to RUSLYN@aol.com

WeaveTech Archive 9911

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 19:21:18 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA09995; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 19:21:18 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA09916; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 19:21:07 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.26(src addr [206.63.102.19]) (3739 bytes) by cleese.nas.com via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:inet_hosts/T:smtp (sender: <archfarm@nas.com>) id <m11scuj-0002dbC@cleese.nas.com> for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 18:21:09 -0800 (PST) (Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <384321AB.4DBB@nas.com>
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 18:00:31 -0700
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: weaving a blanket--one perspective
References: <6F916C7B1D3BD21194FE00805FA7E47A07109F35@exchange1bg3>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Carrie Brezine wrote:

>
> At the risk of introducing the primitive into this discussion, I
> offer the following answers to Myra's questions, for purposes of comparison.
> I hope those more knowledgeable than I will correct any misinformation.
>
> Production Loom: backstrap
>
> 1. Specifications of the loom and complement of equipment to be
> used,
> For warping: two sturdy stakes and something to drive them into
> securely (the ground, a wall).
> For weaving: two sturdy loom bars; heddle rod; shed roll; shed
> sword; stick shuttle; beating implement (if shed sword not sufficient);
> pickup sticks if desired. Backstrap. Hefty cord to tie further loom bar to
> something. String for heddles. Something immovable to tie on to (house,
> tree, grand piano).
>
> 2. Ergonomic design and occupational hazards,
> Ergonomics are infinitely adjustable. Comfort depends on position
> in which you sit or kneel, angle at which warp slants away from the weaver,
> and where on the body the backstrap is positioned. I find it least
> stressful around my hips, rather than waist. I cannot say that I've ever
> found it comfortable for long periods of time.
> Hazards to the weaver, besides stiffness, are hard to imagine.
> Implements such as loom bars and, for that matter, string can always be used
> in lethal ways but are unlikely to cause injury by themselves. There are
> perhaps greater hazards to the warp than in other methods of production,
> since it is not protected by a frame, and could be idly strummed by passers
> by, or tripped over and disarranged (it's happened to me).
>
> 3. Energy requirements - human as well as manufactured power,
> Light to see.
> Two skilled hands capable of manipulating sheds and passing the
> shuttle.
>
> 4. Time to produce,
> Three weeks? Four? I am guessing wildly. Ed has some data on this

WeaveTech Archive 9911

> I believe.
>
> 5. Quality of end product,
> Depends on the skill of the weaver. Could be mediocre; may be
> exceptional. It is likely that the end product will be unlike any other,
> even others produced by the same weaver. Can certainly be as
> warm/soft/thick/complex as blankets produced by other means.
>
> 6. Studio - Physical plant (space requirements for loom and
> associated
> equipment, activities, and the supporting systems - power, air,
>
> temperature, water, light, floor design to carry the equipment,
> surface finishes, furnishings - other than weaving equipment, etc.
> Space to sit, well lit, with an immovable something approximately
> the warp length away to tie on to. The warp is moveable, so studio location
> can vary with the time of day, season, weather, or caprice. I find it most
> comfortable to have a pillow to sit on but this is not strictly necessary.
>
> Just one perspective. Myra, thank you for framing this question.
>
> To reply privately, send message to Carrie Brezine <cbrezine@standard.com>

Yes, from the ground up is just fine as a starter ;)
Now, for the next type of loom, please?
Myra

To reply privately, send message to Myra <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 19:21:18 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA09996; Mon, 29 Nov 1999
19:21:18 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cleese.nas.com (root@cleese.nas.com [198.182.207.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id TAA09967; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 19:21:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 206.63.102.26(src addr [206.63.102.19]) (1125 bytes) by cleese.nas.com
via sendmail with P\:\smtp\R:\inet_hosts/T:\smtp
(sender: <archfarm@nas.com>
id <m11scur-0002eFC@cleese.nas.com>
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 18:21:17 -0800 (PST)
(Smail-3.2.0.96 1997-Jun-2 #4 built 1999-Apr-17)

Message-ID: <38432306.743B@nas.com>
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 18:06:18 -0700
From: Ernst & DelBoca <archfarm@nas.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Macintosh; U; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #673
References: <199911291759.MAA04730@mailbox.syr.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Allen Fannin wrote:

>
> At 12:41 PM 11/29/99 EST, you wrote:
>
> >AVL automated looms..I have made this comparison by having a person weave a
> >solid black scarf at the same time as having my IDL do the same... the
> >results were surprising... My handweavers can out weave my autos almost 1 1/2

WeaveTech Archive 9911

> >to 1 ...

>

> This finding does not surprise me in the least. What is being offered as a
> "powerloom" or "industrial loom" bears no resemblance to the real thing.

What is this real thing - real power loom, Allen? Please describe the
differences as you see them.

Myra

To reply privately, send message to Ernst & DelBoca <archfarm@nas.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 19:46:21 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA16484; Mon, 29 Nov 1999
19:46:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (smtp10.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.200.246]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA16474; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 19:46:18 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mindspring.com (user-2ivealp.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.42.185])
by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id VAA17672
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 21:46:23 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <38433AA7.DAFACB59@mindspring.com>
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 21:47:03 -0500
From: Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>
Organization: bnathans
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re:handloom/powerloom discussion
References: <199911300210.TAA06712@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

This has been fascinating to me, even though the subject has not been a
major pre-occupation of mine. I have this fuzzy idea that I'm not in
competition with power-loom, but that's about as much thought as I've
given it up to now.

What I have learned is a fuller understanding of the "power loom"
business and of where Allen is coming from, some clearer, broader,
definitions of the craft I do so love, and a continuing amazement at how
weaving speaks to the core of so many people in so many different ways.

I hope those who are thinking about earning a living from weaving will
have gleaned some useful information about directions to pursue. Economy
of scale is a phrase that comes to mind.

I hope those of us pestered by the unenlightened about their
"mechanical" devices can ignore them with a harder shell-- or blow them
away with wonderful definitions.

Barbara Nathans Bellport, Long Island, New York

To reply privately, send message to Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 19:52:32 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA18339; Mon, 29 Nov 1999
19:52:32 -0700 (MST)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Received: from smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (smtp10.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.200.246]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA18327; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 19:52:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mindspring.com (user-2ivealp.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.42.185]) by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id VAA27891 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 21:52:38 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <38433C25.B9E62073@mindspring.com>
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 21:53:25 -0500
From: Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>
Organization: bnathans
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #676
References: <199911300210.TAA06712@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I forgot to remark on something Sara said, "At a visit to the Viking Museum at Haithabu (near Schleswig, Germany) there was a display of birds eye twill reproduction fabric - TWO samples. One woven on a warp weighted loom, the other on a horizontal 4-harness loom. The yarns and sett were identical. There was a SUBTLE, yet perceptible difference in the two fabrics - the warp weighted examples being slightly more imprecise, yet somehow softer and definitely appealing. I would say that neither of the two fabrics could have been deemed "better"

As a lapsed spinner, I think the difference in such fabrics may be attributed to the difference in handspun yarn with its very subtle gradations, and perfectly even machine spun yarn. I think there is a substantial difference between fabrics made with hand vs. power spun yarns!!!

(Keep those spindles turning??)

--

Barbara Nathans Bellport, Long Island, New York

To reply privately, send message to Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 22:52:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id WAA28583; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 22:52:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from uhura.concentric.net (uhura.concentric.net [206.173.118.93]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id WAA28565; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 22:52:13 -0700 (MST)
Received: from marconi.concentric.net (marconi.concentric.net [206.173.118.71]) by uhura.concentric.net (8.9.1a/(98/12/15 5.12)) id AAA03198; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 00:52:24 -0500 (EST) [1-800-745-2747 The Concentric Network]
Received: from oemcomputer (ts007d03.tuc-az.concentric.net [208.177.52.63]) by marconi.concentric.net (8.9.1a) id AAA19944; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 00:52:23 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <005401bf3af6\$6b6043e0\$3f34b1d0@oemcomputer>
From: "Marge Coe" <MargeCoe@concentric.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
References: <6F916C7B1D3BD21194FE00805FA7E47A07109F35@exchange1bg3> <384321AB.4DBB@nas.com>
Subject: Re: weaving a blanket--one perspective
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 22:47:40 -0700

WeaveTech Archive 9911

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

----- Original Message -----
From: Myra <archfarm@nas.com>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Sent: Monday, November 29, 1999 6:00 PM
Subject: Re: weaving a blanket--one perspective

> Carrie Brezine wrote:
> >
> > At the risk of introducing the primitive into this discussion,

<snip, snip>

> > Just one perspective. Myra, thank you for framing this question.

>
> Yes, from the ground up is just fine as a starter ;)
> Now, for the next type of loom, please?
> Myra

Hey, Myra how about you describing your loom, your warping equipment, your studio?

Margaret

To reply privately, send message to "Marge Coe" <MargeCoe@concentric.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 23:10:12 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id XAA02051; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 23:10:12 -0700 (MST)
Received: from uhura.concentric.net (uhura.concentric.net [206.173.118.93]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id XAA02045; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 23:10:11 -0700 (MST)
Received: from marconi.concentric.net (marconi.concentric.net [206.173.118.71]) by uhura.concentric.net (8.9.1a/(98/12/15 5.12)) id BAA05673; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 01:10:23 -0500 (EST) [1-800-745-2747 The Concentric Network]
Received: from oemcomputer (ts007d03.tuc-az.concentric.net [208.177.52.63]) by marconi.concentric.net (8.9.1a) id BAA23871; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 01:10:19 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <006801bf3af8\$ecf14b00\$3f34b1d0@oemcomputer>
From: "Marge Coe" <MargeCoe@concentric.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
References: <199911291541.IAA12328@salmon.esosoft.net> <3842A306.DEA7877B@world.std.com>
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #673 Machine/Hand
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 23:05:36 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

----- Original Message -----

From: Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>

> Maybe it is time to change the tenor of the discussion from the
> preferences/benefits/vices of hand/machine weaving to what seems to me
> to be the real issue. What, if anything, has the factory weaving
> community to offer the handweaving community in terms of practical
> devices (from looms to snips to warping aids) or methods that will
> benefit the studio weaver at a cost/investment that the studio weaver
> can afford.

There seems to be an implicit assumption that these two worlds are parallel instead of going at different angles. The factories I'm familiar with are of the noisy/greasy/dirty/noisy/dark/noisy ilk that others described more eloquently. (And as I wrote a long while back I still respond to the smell of lanolin, the smell of a piece fresh from the loom, as a comfort smell--fulfilling the role apple pie plays in others' lives.)

One aspect that seems to have been sidestepped in the hand/automation discussion is that the factory vivid in my mind was no where near cutting-edge as far as technology was concerned. In fact in those days they were a bit disgruntled that the axis nations had been able to rebuild their factories with new equipment, courtesy of the victors, while the victors had to make do with textile factories that had been turned into munitions manufacturers for a number of years, and squeeze in their old equipment. They couldn't then and probably can't even now afford to retool for each technological advancement. I envision computers making their way into the business/accounting office, then the design department, and slowly very, very slowly antiquated but none the less usable equipment being replaced machine by machine. Of course the cloth they made then and those that survive still make now is superior worsted suiting, smooth, fine, incredibly fine, that I've never seen even closely duplicated by handweaving--and with the interminable number of grays, and conservative blues this fabric comes in who'd want to? We're talking about high-level boredom here ladies, believe me!

Margaret

To reply privately, send message to "Marge Coe" <MargeCoe@concentric.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Nov 29 23:59:28 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id XAA10434; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 23:59:28 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id XAA10395; Mon, 29 Nov 1999 23:59:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 6840 invoked by alias); 30 Nov 1999 06:59:33 -0000
Received: (qmail 6832 invoked from network); 30 Nov 1999 06:59:33 -0000
Received: from ip152.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO netbistro.com) (204.239.167.152) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 30 Nov 1999 06:59:33 -0000
Message-ID: <384376A5.37F09939@netbistro.com>
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 23:03:01 -0800
From: Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)

WeaveTech Archive 9911

X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re:silly season...
References: <199911300610.XAA02069@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

When I weave lots I get to think lots.....

If the term "weaver" is so controversial then perhaps we could pc it???

Fabric fabricator?
Interlacement Interpreter?
Cloth Constructor?
Textile Technician?

These terms cover all my current textile endeavors - weaving, bobbin lace, ply-splitting (a *very* new interest courtesy of a generous student in a recent workshop in Portland!), plus my past and presently rusty skills - counted cross-stitch, knitting, sewing, needlepoint, various other needlework endeavours..... making no mention whatsoever of the tools I would use.....

What can I tell you - silly season has arrived???? ;)

Laura Fry
who may have woven one too many mega warps for her mental health???

To reply privately, send message to Laura Fry <laurafry@netbistro.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 30 05:09:55 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA25013; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 05:09:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mb09.swip.net (mb09.swip.net [193.12.122.212]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA24998; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 05:09:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Familjen (d212-151-33-163.swipnet.se [212.151.33.163])
by mb09.swip.net (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMT
id NAA04795 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>;
Tue, 30 Nov 1999 13:09:27 +0100 (MET)
Message-Id: <199911301209.NAA04795@mb09.swip.net>
Date: Tue, 30 Nov 1999 13:11:45 +0200
From: Kerstin Froberg <kerstin.froberg@swipnet.se>
Subject: equipment "footprints"
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
X-Mailer: EMBLA 1.2.1
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Of course some weaving equipment leaves "footprints" - that is how (some, at least) archeologists determine what kind of loom was used at a certain time, at a certain place.

A friend of mine is a weaving teacher at a school that specializes

WeaveTech Archive 9911

in ancient methods and equipment. The students weave on backstrap looms, warp-weighted looms, and (don't know the correct term in English, here) circular looms (where the warp goes either in a spiral, or is wound one full circle, turns around a rod, goes back the full circle, turns and so on). Having worked with this kind of equipment for some thirty years, she has gained some experience... There are "phenomena" (which can also be called "imperfections" or "mistakes") typical for each type of loom, she says.

For instance, a very wide warp-weighted loom (say 2 - 2,5 meters wide) often was worked by two weavers simultaneously. They each had a "shuttle" which they passed each other at approximately the middle of the loom - which is one of the ways it can be determined that a specific piece was woven on a wide warp-weighted loom. (See Martha Hoffman's book, the exact title of which escapes me for the moment, for further reference)

Or for instance, on the circular loom. If warped in a spiral, it soon develops certain tension irregularities (which are quite different from the tension irregularities it develops when warped back-and-forth), which explains why some archeological finds have the "mistakes" they do...

(Maybe these irregularities would not happen today, should we use the same type of equipment, in this era of striving for total perfection - but that is another question altogether...)

Kerstin in Sweden

To reply privately, send message to Kerstin Froberg <kerstin.froberg@swipnet.se>

```
>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Tue Nov 30 06:09:24 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA03810; Tue, 30 Nov 1999
06:09:24 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id
GAA03805; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 06:09:22 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-28.idsonline.com [209.8.42.28])
    by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id IAA14305
    for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 08:08:30 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991130080258.006cfefc@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Tue, 30 Nov 1999 08:02:58 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Double two-tie threading
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net
```

Our multishaft study group is spending the year studying the double two-tie threading. So far we've covered plain weave & basket weave in one session, then twills. The next session, which Anne from Annadale will be moderating with dubious assistance from yours truly, will cover unit weaves that can be woven on this threading. After that, we move on to networks and several other topics.

Here's my question: I've been playing w/ the threading in the computer and now on my loom for a couple of weeks. It seemed to me right from the start that I should be able to get a honeycomb out of this threading, but try as

WeaveTech Archive 9911

I might, I can't get it to work. I thought I was close when I created what I called a fudged or fake honeycomb in which the tabbies for the thick weft weren't exactly true tabbies, but I still couldn't get the floats for cell that is not currently weaving to behave.

Here's the threading (I'm working on 16 shafts, but to simplify, I'll use 8): 1 3 2 4 1 5 2 6 1 7 2 8. Each group of four threads can be repeated without restriction: e.g. 1 3 2 4 1 3 2 1 4 1 5 2 6 1 5 2 6 etc.

Plain weave is accomplished on this threading by weaving 1&2 vs. all other shafts. What I was playing w/ to get honeycomb was using shaft 1 by itself for one of the cell outlines and shaft 2 by itself for the other. I tried this b/c I couldn't get the normal tabbies for double two-tie to work for a honeycomb. (I don't mind the resulting "wide sett" for the cell outlines b/c I'm outlining the cells w/ rag.) I thought I had it, but when I tried it on the loom, I found my "inactive" cell threads floating on top rather than on the underside. I thought that should be easy to fix, but as soon as I dropped the floats to the underside, various other things got screwed up. I've played around w/ the possibility that the cell structure itself needn't be plain weave, but that doesn't seem to solve the problem.

Has anyone else tried this & solved it? Or is it possibly not solvable? It's very annoying that honeycomb seems so close. It just feels as if this threading *should* weave honeycomb.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 30 07:06:42 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA15011; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 07:06:42 -0700 (MST)
Received: from fog.powercom.net (fog.powercom.net [216.114.0.132]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA15002; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 07:06:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from sarav ([207.7.41.85])
by fog.powercom.net (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id IAA03185
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 08:11:06 -0600 (CST)
(envelope-from sarav@powercom.net)
Message-ID: <003801bf3b3c\$47107280\$552907cf@sarav>
From: "Sara von Tresckow" <sarav@powercom.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
References: <199911300210.TAA06712@salmon.esosoft.net> <38433C25.B9E62073@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #676
Date: Tue, 30 Nov 1999 08:07:45 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Replying to Barbara regarding the fabric swatches in Haithabu (Germany) - BOTH samples were of the same batch of handspun - produced by the archaeologists at the museum, going for the grist found in some bog

WeaveTech Archive 9911

textiles. Therefore differences in the fabric were definitely attributable to the devices used.

Sara von Tresckow
sarav@powercom.net
Fond du Lac, WI

To reply privately, send message to "Sara von Tresckow" <sarav@powercom.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 30 08:05:03 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA27273; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 08:05:03 -0700 (MST)
Received: from kang.svc.tds.net (kang.svc.tds.net [204.246.1.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA27222; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 08:04:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from tds.net (new-chmiusr0-a68.chatham.tds.net [208.166.200.68])
by kang.svc.tds.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id JAA20569
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 09:05:03 -0600 (CST)
Message-ID: <3843E73D.4AF389A5@tds.net>
Date: Tue, 30 Nov 1999 10:03:25 -0500
From: Iris Charmer <icharmer@tds.net>
Organization: Weaver in the Woods
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en]C-3M;TDSNET (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: Double two-tie threading
References: <3.0.3.32.19991130080258.006cfefc@cpcug.org>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Ruth Blau wrote:

>

> Our multishaft study group is spending the year studying the double two-tie
> threading . . .

> It seemed to me right from the start
> that I should be able to get a honeycomb out of this threading . . .

Does someone in your group have Barret & Smith's monograph from the early '80s? On p. 57 there's something awfully close to honeycomb using "half treading units." If you don't have access to it I'll be glad to give more detail or lend you the book. I love this weave, but have only explored the twill and double weave aspects.

This morning's work is a black silk warp for some square scarves in double two tie twill. With only 8S, it will give me squares with plain twill borders around a plaited look field.

To reply privately, send message to Iris Charmer <icharmer@tds.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 30 09:40:59 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA22582; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 09:40:59 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo-d08.mx.aol.com (imo-d08.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.40]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA22570; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 09:40:57 -0700 (MST)
From: Magstrands@aol.com
Received: from Magstrands@aol.com
by imo-d08.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.4.) id t.0.713e9cc3 (4236)
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 11:40:29 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <0.713e9cc3.257557fd@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 30 Nov 1999 11:40:29 EST

WeaveTech Archive 9911

Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #676
To: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL for Macintosh sub 54
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi again.. I have a simple question for Allen, why is it that whenever AVL is mentioned you have an attitude toward these looms.. I'm just curious .. do you have one or have you had one .. what are your experiences with this type of loom... as far as my IDL goes it is a nice looking piece of equipment compared to what I picture a mill loom looks like but looks aren't everything...they work for me because they make selvages, and what I understand with powerlooms in the mill they don't... Also Allen if your mill produced so much so fast then it must have been lucrative for you why aren't you doing it now... especially if you were so good at it.. it just seems to me that as soon as we mention that we use AVLS you blow us off and put that company down instantly.. I should probably write to you personally, but since you've replied so many times with the same underlying attitude, I want your opinion on what looms do you prefer, or what looms do you use, and why?.. just curious..Sue

To reply privately, send message to Magstrands@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 30 10:07:18 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA29973; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 10:07:18 -0700 (MST)
Received: from hotmail.com (f125.law4.hotmail.com [216.33.149.125]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA29966; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 10:07:17 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host f125.law4.hotmail.com [216.33.149.125] claimed to be hotmail.com
Received: (qmail 10931 invoked by uid 0); 30 Nov 1999 17:06:48 -0000
Message-ID: <19991130170648.10930.qmail@hotmail.com>
Received: from 209.192.110.199 by www.hotmail.com with HTTP;
Tue, 30 Nov 1999 09:06:48 PST
X-Originating-IP: [209.192.110.199]
From: "gregg johnson" <gregg_j@hotmail.com>
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Weaving instruction
Date: Tue, 30 Nov 1999 09:06:48 PST
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Penland School of Crafts will offer an intensive 8 week concentration in weaving from March 12 to May 5 2000 at the school in the blue ridge mountains of North Carolina. The course, taught by Lizbeth Shannon, is intended to take a small group (10-12) of students of any weaving background to the next level of accomplishment. Mz Shannon is a production handweaver who worked for many years in the commercial textile industry in the areas of design and product development. AVL computobby and computer assisted design using Mac or IBM compatible hardware will be included, but will not be the sole (or even primary) emphasis of the class. Work study grants are available. Anyone interested may contact the registrar at 828-765-2359.

Get Your Private, Free Email at <http://www.hotmail.com>

WeaveTech Archive 9911

To reply privately, send message to "gregg johnson" <gregg_j@hotmail.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 30 12:37:24 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA13714; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 12:37:24 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA13699; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 12:37:22 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (laurel-md-47.idsonline.com [209.8.42.47])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id OAA20003
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 14:36:31 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991130143100.006cd210@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Tue, 30 Nov 1999 14:31:00 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Re: Double two-tie threading
In-Reply-To: <3843E73D.4AF389A5@tds.net>
References: <3.0.3.32.19991130080258.006cfefc@cpcug.org>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

>Does someone in your group have Barret & Smith's monograph from the
>early '80s? On p. 57 there's something awfully close to honeycomb using
>"half treading units."

Yes, many of us are using it. This is not the world's easiest text to work with, but it's pretty comprehensive. I thought I'd combed it pretty thoroughly on my honeycomb quest, but I'll definitely check out p. 57. Thanks!

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
across the Potomac River from Washington, DC

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 30 16:02:10 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA04077; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 16:02:10 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail1.javanet.com ([205.219.162.10]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA04032; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 16:02:02 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host [205.219.162.10] claimed to be mail1.javanet.com
Received: from eunismit (armory-us1486.javanet.com [209.94.153.235])
by mail1.javanet.com (8.9.3/8.9.2) with SMTP id SAA15957
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 18:00:57 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <000201bf3b86\$b7aba880\$eb995ed1@eunismit>
From: "Eunice Smith" <eunismit@javanet.com>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Double Two-Tie
Date: Tue, 30 Nov 1999 17:59:19 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

WeaveTech Archive 9911

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Since Double Two-Tie Unit Weave has been mentioned recently on the list, I just want to let you know that I have several copies that I would let go for the original price. The later price was higher. E-Mail me for further information.

Eunice Smith <mailto:eunismit@javanet.com>

To reply privately, send message to "Eunice Smith" <eunismit@javanet.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Nov 30 17:07:18 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA18905; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 17:07:18 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mw3.texas.net (mw3.texas.net [206.127.30.13]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA18894; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 17:07:16 -0700 (MST)
Received: from linda (tcnet33-015.austin.texas.net [209.99.102.204])
by mw3.texas.net (2.4/2.4) with SMTP
id SAA02654 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 18:07:24 -0600 (CST)
Received: by localhost with Microsoft MAPI; Tue, 30 Nov 1999 18:09:16 -0600
Message-ID: <01BF3B5E.03FADCC0.ljburris@texas.net>
From: Linda Boehm Burris <ljburris@texas.net>
To: "'Weave Tech Digest'" <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Date: Tue, 30 Nov 1999 18:09:09 -0600
Organization: Linda's Designs
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet E-mail/MAPI - 8.0.0.4211
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Allen wrote:

>So, when the term "powerloom" is bandied about, we need to
>understand more fully just what a relatively simple machine this is and how
>extremely reliable real power looms are, when set up, operated and adjusted
>by people who know what to do when.

It would be helpful to know what these "real" power looms cost. Allen, can you give us a ball park figure? Also, What are the operating costs (eg electricity). I have a feeling that these kind of looms cost more to run.

Linda

To reply privately, send message to Linda Boehm Burris <ljburris@texas.net>