There is chenille and then there is chenille. I have worked with cotton chenille in 2/2 twill and in complex twill on 8 shafts with longer floats. The cotton chenille I have does not worm at all and seems less prone to wear.

I have some old (like 69 or 70's) rayon chenille that does not worm at all and it wears well. When I got one of these out a while ago and compared it to the new chenille......

The old one had more core threads than the new one, as a result the fuzz was held in place more securely. AND the strands were balanced in twist. That is, they did not tend to untwist when I hung a wight in a single strand.

The old one had more core threads than the new one, as a result the fuzz was held in place more securely. AND the strands were balanced in twist. That is, they did not tend to untwist when I hung a wight in a single strand.

>From the samples I just looked at, the new ones have 2 or 3 core singles stands all with the same twist and the old ones have core stands that are cabled, ie 2 s singles twisted to z. Two of the z stands twisted to s cable with the fuzz between them. This makes a huge difference in the stability of the yarn.

I made an outfit for my mother, long skirt and vest in 1975 from the old chenille in 2/2 twill. Nothing moved in the weave, no worming, no wear except seat squash which steamed back up. The yardage was washed by hand in soapy hot water, but never agitated. I pressed the fabric before washing and then steamed the seams during sewing. Both were lined and the fabric now has grown a bit. The full length skirt is now 1" longer than it used to be. But, is it ever UGLY. The colors my mom chose were steel blue, orange and blue TARTAN??? The steel blue was the dominant color but nothing could save it from...
terminal ugly.

I could never figure out what people were talking about when they mentioned worming because I never saw it till my old stash ran out in the late 80's.

Ingrid

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

When You Are Warped, What's Weft

*italic*

Ingrid Boesel, the weaving half of Fiberworks PCW

Visit us at:  http://www3.sympatico.ca/fiberworks.pcw

To reply privately, send message to Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Fri Jan  1 15:36:10 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA11147; Fri, 1 Jan 1999 15:36:10 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA11135; Fri, 1 Jan 1999 15:36:09 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 11394 invoked by alias); 1 Jan 1999 22:36:17 -0000
Received: (qmail 11381 invoked from network); 1 Jan 1999 22:36:16 -0000
Received: from ip136.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO unknown) (204.239.167.136)
by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 1 Jan 1999 22:36:16 -0000
Message-ID: <MAPI.Id.0016.00617572616672793030303830303038@MAPI.to.RFC822>
In-Reply-To: <199901011100.EAA08865@salmon.esosoft.net>
References: Conversation <199901011100.EAA08865@salmon.esosoft.net> with last message <199901011100.EAA08865@salmon.esosoft.net>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
From: "Laura Fry" <laurafry@netbistro.com>
Subject: Re: chenille waffle weave
Date: Fri, 01 Jan 99 12:04:05 PST
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"; X-MAPIextension=".TXT"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Regardless of "dry" cleaning or wet finishing,
I don't think I would want a waffle weave chenille anything because of the tendency of the long floats to catch and snag....

Laura Fry
just because you _can_ doesn't mean you should.....

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Sat Jan  2 11:50:33 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA19628; Sat, 2 Jan 1999 11:50:33 -0700 (MST)
Received: from alpha.netvision.net.il (alpha.netvision.net.il [194.90.1.13]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA19622; Sat, 2 Jan 1999 11:50:31 -0700 (MST)
Dear Barbara:

I am about to embark on the weaving of wedding canopes, or at least one. I am going to use my drawloom with silk and cotton because I envision a silky satin base. Otherwise, I am not sure about many of the other requirements. For instance, did you weave together or separately the side panels which hang around the canope, or did you do them at all? What did you do about the polls? I was thinking of Beduoin wrapping.

Regards,

Yehudit

To reply privately, send message to "Yehudit Abrahams" <gabraham@netvision.net.il>
Saturday, I started wondering about a technique that would adequately tie the chenille (and protect against worming) and yet not be so slow--perhaps a structure with only one end and shot of thin per thick instead of two. This brought to mind Summer & Winter. Has anyone tried using S&W as a thick & thin technique? Again, I'd use sewing thread or something nearly as fine for the thin and chenille for the thick.

Might this work? Any feedback?

Ruth
rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia USA

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

> I started wondering about a technique that would adequately tie the chenille (and protect against worming) and yet not be so slow--perhaps a structure with only one end and shot of thin per thick instead of two. This brought to mind Summer & Winter. Has anyone tried using S&W as a thick & thin technique?

HI Ruth,...I have used chenille (rayon) with sewing thread in Summer and Winter structure in the fashion you are suggesting. One shot of tie down for every shot of chenille. I made a lovely jacket out of the resulting, drapey fabric. Unfortunately the buyer returned the jacket to me for repairs just a month after purchase, the cause - worming of the chenille! So I too the jacket apart, sewed along every single *%#@!*

worming of the chenille! I don't believe two tie downs would have made any difference, as I believe the chenille is at fault). I am curious about Ingrid's post regarding the difference in the core warp of the currently available chenille.....I have some old chenille in which the core warp is cotton, not rayon, and appears to contain 4 more threads in the core warp, .....that chenille rarely warms. When I use the chenille currently available, with fewer threads in the core
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warp, and those threads being rayon, I have much more difficulty taming the chenille. Sorry to be a wet rag, but my experience was not favorable.....

Regards,
Su :-)

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Mon Jan  4 07:15:39 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA21251; Mon, 4 Jan 1999 07:15:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail.mc.net (mail.mc.net [209.172.128.4]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA21244; Mon, 4 Jan 1999 07:15:38 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 19936 invoked from network); 4 Jan 1999 14:16:34 -0000
Received: from tntemode2-138.mc.net (HELO Butler-Home.cl.na.sb.com) (209.172.134.138)
   by mail.mc.net with SMTP; Mon, 4 Jan 1999 14:16:34 -0000
Message-ID: <008a01be37fe$931c9f60$8a86acd1@Butler-Home.cl.na.sb.com>
From: "Al and Su Butler" <apbutler@mc.net>
To: <weaving@quilt.net>, <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: THIRD ANNUAL NON-HOLIDAY SERVIETTE (NAPKIN) EXCHANGE
Date: Mon, 4 Jan 1999 08:23:32 -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 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4
X-Spam-Rating: mail.mc.net 1.6.1 0/1000/N
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

THIRD ANNUAL NON-HOLIDAY SERVIETTE (NAPKIN) EXCHANGE

Since the non-holiday serviette (napkin) exchanges have been such a success, it is time to have another one. Although the serviette or napkin mom has changed, the guidelines remain essentially the same as last year. All weavers are invited to participate as long as you have an e-mail address or a friend who is willing to receive and send e-mail for you.

There are no restrictions on design, color, just remember that the napkins must be functional. All serviettes should measure between 18" x 18" and 20" x 20" - however, I can't envision measuring each one, but these are dinner napkins. Participants may submit anywhere from 5 to 11 napkins. You will receive an assortment of as many napkins as you send in.

Administrative questions will be handled off the list, but feel free to post weaving questions to the list.

SIGN-UP DEADLINE: June 30, 1999
Send e-mail message to: <apbutler@mc.net>

RECEIPT OF NAPKINS: September 15, 1999 Napkins received after the deadline will be returned unopened to the sender.

DISTRIBUTION OF NAPKINS: October 1, 1999

ELIGIBILITY: Anyone subscribing to the Weavers Digest/List or WeaveTech List and friends who
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have access to e-mail

MEASUREMENTS:  18" x 18" to 20" x 20"

FIBER:  Cotton, Linen, Cottolin, Hemp, Ramie.  No synthetics or limp rayons.

COLOR AND DESIGN:  Your choice

FINISHING:  Hem or fringe carefully.  Wash and press.

QUANTITY:  5-11 napkins (You will not receive one of your own; therefore, you might want to keep one.)

RECORD SHEET:  Please send as many copies of your weaving notes as napkins. Participants want to know what you used and how you did it. Be certain to include your email address on your record sheet.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND PHOTOGRAPH:  Please enclose a brief written sketch about yourself and a photograph (may be photocopied) of you or your studio or pet or whatever you wish. The photograph is optional. Enclose as many copies as napkins.

FEE:  Include a check or money order for $6.00 in US currency to cover the cost of return mail. (Sorry for the price increase, but the US postal service has raised their rates!) Any funds leftover will be donated to the Handweaver's Guild of America. Anyone wishing to submit an international reply coupon must first contact me.

LABEL:  Please include a self-stick, self-addressed label for return mail.

Additional details will be posted as I think of them. In the meantime start thinking napkins or serviettes.

Su :-)

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Su Butler    <apbutler@mc.net>
Woodstock, IL
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Mon Jan  4 10:57:53 1999
Received: (salmon=localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA11484; Mon, 4 Jan 1999 10:57:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from emerald.tufts.edu (pmdf@emerald.tufts.edu [130.64.1.16]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA11479; Mon, 4 Jan 1999 10:57:51 -0700 (MST)
Received: from localhost by emerald.tufts.edu (PMDF V5.1-12 #29517) with ESMTP id <0F5100A01R8KB@emerald.tufts.edu> for weavetech@list-server.net; Mon, 4 Jan 1999 12:57:56 -0500 (EST)
Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1999 12:57:56 -0500 (EST)
From: Jessica Polito <jpolit01@emerald.tufts.edu>
Subject: Re: Summer & Winter T&T?
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Message-id: <Pine.OSF.4.05.9901041238410.12023-100000@emerald.tufts.edu>
X-Envelope-to: weavetech@list-server.net
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
On Mon, 4 Jan 1999, Ruth Blau wrote:

> This brought to mind Summer & Winter. Has anyone tried using S&W as a
> thick & thin technique? Again, I'd use sewing thread or something
> nearly
> as fine for the thin and chenille for the thick.
> > Might this work? Any feedback?
> > Ruth

There's an article in an old Weaver's magazine (issue number 22) about a
paired two-tie weave similar to summer & winter that has a thick&thin warp
and weft. Instead of the 1P2P threading of S&W, it uses 12PQ, where P and
Q are two different pattern shafts, both with thick yarn. The treadling
is similar; two thins followed by two thicks.

I tried something very similar to this a while ago, with cotton chenille
as the think and I don't even remember what as the thin. It worked pretty
well, as I recall; I haven't been weaving for all that long, and haven't
gotten into the habit yet of taking good notes, so i can't tell you much
more. Of course, it doesn't have the breadth of patterning possibilities,
as you can only get three blocks on an 8-harness loom, but you can get
some nice effects when the different blocks are different colors.

Hope that's helpful,
--jessica
jpolito@post.harvard.edu

To reply privately, send message to Jessica Polito <jpolit01@emerald.tufts.edu>

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Jan 4 21:31:21 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA03294; Mon, 4 Jan 1999
21:31:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: from umailsrv2.umd.edu (umailsrv2.umd.edu [128.8.10.76] ) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id VAA03288; Mon, 4 Jan 1999 21:31:19 -0700 (MST)
Received: from teststat (bay7-46.dial.umd.edu [128.8.23.174])
by umailsrv2.umd.edu (8.9.0/8.9.0) with SMTP id XAA16604
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 4 Jan 1999 23:25:08 -0500
Message-Id: <3.0.32.19990104232422.006ba440@pop.umail.umd.edu>
X-Sender: di5@pop.umail.umd.edu (Unverified)
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1999 23:24:39 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>
Subject: AVL school
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

AVL Looms is starting a weaving school, with short classes like workshops
to be held in Chico, California. I'm scheduled to teach the first one, but
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it doesn't have enough people signed up yet, and they just told me the minimum number is 5. Imagine this: 5 people, 5 AVL looms (if we get more than 5, some work at computers while others weave) all beautifully threaded before you get there, so you can weave samples with end-feed shuttles and even some flyshuttles, multishaft looms, and they even supply all the weft yarns, bobbin winders, etc. I've also been promised that my assistant will be the very interesting woman I've been corresponding with there, who trained as a weaver in Europe and is the tech support person for an AVL software program. February 16-19, 1999. It's on the AVL home page, and they can send you a brochure about the school if you call their 800 number.

I hope this is allowed, and I won't say anything about it again. I'm going to Ecuador on Wednesday, will be back the 24th of January, will miss you all and I'll write something about my trip when I return.

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 Tue Jan 5 05:22:54 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA06388; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 05:22:54 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA06379; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 05:22:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (asc221.idsonline.com [207.176.21.221]) by cpcug.org (8.8.4/8.6.12) with SMTP id HAA10287 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 07:22:54 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19990105072143.006bc9b4@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Tue, 05 Jan 1999 07:21:43 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: double-box flyshuttle
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 a question about double box flyshuttles. I don't now use a loom with a flyshuttle, and have played with one only once. I don't think I've ever even seen a double box fs. Here's my question: must the two shuttles alternate one after the other? Or does the weaver choose the shuttle? Or can you set a pattern for the use of the shuttle so that they can alternate automatically in some sequence other than one-for-one?

I ask this question in the context of my experiments in thick & thin (and my daydreaming about a computer-assisted loom). The shuttle sequence in T&T is two picks of fine to one pick of thick. Can this be done with a double-box flyshuttle? T&T seems to me to have wonderful possibilities, but it is sooooooooo slow.

Ruth
rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia USA

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 5 05:30:07 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA07408; Tue, 5 Jan 1999
Su wrote:
> I have used chenille (rayon) with sewing thread in Summer and
> Winter structure in the fashion you are suggesting. One shot of tie down
> for every shot of chenille. I made a lovely jacket out of the resulting,
> drapey fabric. Unfortunately the buyer returned the jacket to me for
> repairs just a month after purchase, the cause - worming of the chenille!
> So I too the jacket apart, sewed along every single *%#@#!* warp and weft
> intersection, and returned the finished jacket to her.

What a horrible experience and what a tedious solution! My hat is off to
you, Su. That's one customer whose money I think I would have refunded.

Aside from that, though, I'm really surprised the fabric reacted this way.
I can see that you would shy away from trying this again, but might a
closer sett have saved the day? Did you use rayon sewing thread as well
as rayon chenille? I find the rayon sewing thread (which I use for
tabletweaving) to be so slick as to be almost beyond my ability to control.
It might not have enough "grab" to hold the chenille in place.

I guess it's back to sampling (against my principles!). Another sample
warp for summer & winter T&T.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia USA

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

I have been quietly lurking over the holidays and enjoying the weaving talk. Finally have time to ask a question and to respond to one.

Ruth wrote:
> I started wondering about a technique that would adequately tie 
> the chenille (and protect against worming) and yet not be so slow--perhaps 
> a structure with only one end and shot of thin per thick instead of two. 
> This brought to mind Summer & Winter. Has anyone tried using S&W as a 
> thick & thin technique? Again, I'd use sewing thread or something nearly 
> as fine for the thin and chenille for the thick.

I have done S&W with chenille and it worked quite well. Used a thinner chenille (@1450 yds/lb) for the warp with 20/2 cotton for tabby and thicker chenille (@1000 yds/lb) for the pattern. Packed it in as tight as I could. Washed in machine and tumbled dry. Figured if it could take regular machine washing and drying it would survive and seemed to do just fine—even washed one again to test...

Now for my question. I hope someone can help since there seems to be a lot of AVL weavers out there...

Is anyone running their AVL (doesn't matter whether 16 or 24) on a Mac with Weavemaker software? It seems the software does not wrok the way AVL planned. Unfortunately for me, it doesn't work the way planned or the way it is supposed to. I have contacted AVL about this a while ago, but have not heard anything back. Hoping someone else is using it so that I can compare notes, so to speak, and see if it is a software bug or if I have some sort of conflict. Any help would be appreciated!

Thanks,
Diane Kelly

You can reach me privately at kelde@erols.com

To reply privately, send message to Diane Kelly <kelde@erols.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan  5 06:05:29 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA11789; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 06:05:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mtiwhc01.worldnet.att.net (mtiwhc01.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.36]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA11785; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 06:05:28 -0700 (MST)
Received: from default ([12.68.10.104]) by mtiwhc01.worldnet.att.net (InterMail v03.02.05 118 121 101) with ESMTP 
   id <1999010510459.ECV25716@default> 
   for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 13:04:59 +0000
From: "Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard" <hubbard182@worldnet.att.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: Re: chenille
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1999 07:54:40 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
Happy New Year, everyone.

I have used rayon chenille successfully as weft in fairly open twills (but haven't tried S&W) on perle cotton warps. Much to my continued surprise and delight, no item has been returned for worming so far. I don't have an explanation for why this combination works and some others don't. Every time I do it, I wonder if this is the time that I'll get into trouble. It makes me a bit nervous to not know why this works. I don't think it could be just yarn quality. I've done it with yarns from too many sources - tho' admittedly, I haven't looked closely at the cores of the yarns to see the differences.

Also, it has been my impression that cotton chenille does not worm. Does anyone have experience in either of these areas?

Martha

To reply privately, send message to "Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard"
<hubbard182@worldnet.att.net>

---

At 07:21 AM 1/5/99 -0500, you wrote:
Here's my question: must the two shuttles alternate one after the other? Or does the weaver choose the shuttle? Or can you set a pattern for the use of the shuttle so that they can alternate automatically in some sequence other than one-for-one?

REPLY:

If by a "...two box fly shuttle..." you mean what in the trade would be known as a 2X2, you would be referring to a lay having two boxes on each end. This is not a common arrangement on power looms, but there is no physical reason mitigating against it.

With a 2X2 box lay you can run up to three shuttles since there must always be an empty box. Unless the box changing mechanism on the loom requires
otherwise, you can establish any shuttle rotation you want as long as there is always an empty box on the end of the lay into which the shuttle can go and as long as you can change boxes on either end of the lay at will. Setting up the shuttle rotation is a bit complex, but does not rise to the level of quadratic equations.

> I ask this question in the context of my experiments in thick & thin (and my daydreaming about a computer-assisted loom). The shuttle sequence in T&T is two picks of fine to one pick of thick. Can this be done with a double-box flyshuttle?

> rsblau@cpcug.org
> Arlington, Virginia USA

The shuttle rotation you propose here above would be quite easy since you could simply assign the shuttle weaving the heavy pick to one box and the fine pick to the other, both on the same end of the lay. When you weave the two heavy picks, that shuttle would simply return to the box from which it originated after its two picks. The shuttle weaving the fine pick would alternate between one side and the other since it is weaving only one pick at a time. You would only have to change boxes when changing from heavy to fine picks and back. The heavy pick could weave between the top boxes while the fine pick weaves between the bottom boxes. With this arrangement you would be more easily able to see when the heavy filling is exhausted and a bobbin change is required.

Hope this helps.

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

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

> The shuttle sequence in
> T&T is two picks of fine to one pick of thick. Can this be done with a
> double-box flyshuttle?

Yup! The double-box fly-shuttle on my AVL is operated by a handle in the center
of the beater--as the upper box on one side is put into position even with the
race, the lower box on the other side matches it to receive the shuttle. You
can select which shuttle you use with each pick and I expect a rhythm develops
(not having actually used it yet you see <g>).

I'm doubt this system allows the use of three shuttles as described in Allen's
detailed response. You can't select from each of the four boxes at any given
time to send or receive, only between the two pairs--I'd have to think through
this further.

Margaret

-----------------------------------------
MargeCoe@concentric.net
Tucson, AZ, USA
-----------------------------------------

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

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 5 07:30:18 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA25875; Tue, 5 Jan 1999
07:30:18 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo26.mx.aol.com (imo26.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.70]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id HAA25867; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 07:30:16 -0700 (MST)
From: AmyFibre@aol.com
Received: from AmyFibre@aol.com
by imo26.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id QNNHo00811
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 09:29:40 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <7e6d2205.369221d4@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1999 09:29:40 EST
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: chenille
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 226
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

In a message dated 1/5/99 7:05:46 AM Central Standard Time,
hubbard182@worldnet.att.net writes:

> Also, it has been my impression that cotton chenille does not worm.

I do countless baby blankets with cotton chenille (900 ypp) as weft. It has
never wormed (knock on wood!), but my theory has been that because it is
cotton it shrinks into the fabric in finishing, and the warp is 8/2 cotton
which also shrinks. These two shrinkages then hold the cotton chenille in
WeaveTech Archive 9901

more tightly than I could ever beat it.

As for T&T, rayon chenille and worms -- this may or may not be relevant, but my largest mass of worms came on a shadow weave scarf with 1450 ypp rayon chenille and finer (2400 ypp??) rayon floss. Longest float was 2 ends or 2 picks. As Ruth said, I'd guess that rayon thread might not have enough grip.

Amy
amyfibre@aol.com

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

At 07:24 AM 1/5/99 -0700, you wrote:

> Yup! The double-box fly-shuttle on my AVL is operated my a handle in the center
> of the beater--as the upper box on one side is put into position even with the race, the lower box on the other side matches it to receive the shuttle.
>
> I'm doubt this system allows the use of three shuttles as described in Allen's detailed response. You can't select from each of the four boxes at any given time to send or receive, only between the two pairs--I'd have to think through this further.

>MargeCoe@concentric.net
>Tucson, AZ, USA

REPLY:

Unfortunately, the AVL system does not allow for the kind of complete flexibility it should. Sadly, another example of how handloom equipment needs continual rethinking of its design. Ideally, a multi-box handloom fly shuttle should operate exactly as it does on a power loom, the boxes on each end of the lay should be independently moveable so that any box on the left can send or receive a shuttle to or from any box on the right. AVL arrangement does not.

AAF

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall
The boxes are arranged so that either when those on right move up, those on left move down OR both sides go up or down together. In either case their is some sort of lever at the centre of the batten so that the batten-pulling hand can control the upward or downward movement of the boxes at will, thus deciding which shuttle will go across next.

So with two boxes you could start with your thick and thin weft shuttles both at the right side, say, the thick in the upper, the thin in the lower box. Then send the thin across from the right lower box to the left lower box and back again for the next pick. Then move the boxes so the picker sends the thick across from the right upper box to the left upper box, where it stays during the next 2 picks of thin and so on.

With 3 boxes you can use 3 colours or thicknesses. I've heard of experts who handled 4 shuttles with only 3 boxes, cleverly moving the boxes up or down, in mid-flight of the shuttle, so that it landed in an empty one! But that took practice and confidence.

Peter Collingwood

<peter@plysplit.demon.co.uk>
REPLY:

On the AVL system in the present discussion, the box changing mechanism is designed to only move the boxes in one way. The boxes on both ends of the lay move at the same time. This cannot be altered. In addition, when the boxes on the left move up those on the right move down and vice versa. This is a very limiting arrangement to at very best.

Since there must always be one empty box, I wonder if Peter's "...experts..." can in fact do as he reports, use more shuttles than there are boxes. As for timing of the box movement, again, while under the control of the handloom operator, it is done exactly as would be

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

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
> That's one customer whose money I think I would have refunded.

   HI Ruth...I did offer, but she wanted the jacket, so I fixed it.

> but might a closer sett have saved the day?

   I believe the sett was appropriate for the structure.

> Or did you use rayon sewing thread as well

   as rayon chenille

No I used cotton sewing thread. I do not think it was the sett, tie down thread or weaving. Quite frankly I think it was the chenille. I have found a variety of quality in rayon chenille, and that which is made with a partially cotton binder warp seems to do the least amount of worming. The currently available chenilles, which have 100% rayon binder warps are the most "wormy". Any weaving I do with this type of chenille, other than plain weave, seems to be subject to worms. Very frustrating. My stash of older yarns is all but defunct, so I guess I will have to learn to deal with the new variety. Wish we could persuade the manufacturers to return to the cotton warp.......

Ruth, I would love to hear the results of your experiments...but I do forewarn you, just because it comes out of the washer intact, does not mean a few weeks or months down the road it will still be so......just my .02......
Su :-)

To reply privately, send message to "Al and Su Butler" <apbutler@mc.net>
At 03:07 PM 1/5/99 +0000, you wrote:

>With 3 boxes you can use 3 colours or thicknesses. I've heard of experts
>who handled 4 shuttles with only 3 boxes, cleverly moving the boxes up
>or down, in mid-flight of the shuttle, so that it landed in an empty
>one! But that took practice and confidence.

>Peter Collingwood

><peter@plysplit.demon.co.uk>

REPLY:

On the AVL system in the present discussion, the box changing mechanism is
designed to only move the boxes in one way. The boxes on both ends of the
lay move at the same time. This cannot be altered. In addition, when the
boxes on the left move up those on the right move down and vice versa. This
is a very limiting arrangement to at very best.

Since there must always be one empty box, I wonder if Peter's
"...experts..." can in fact do as he reports, use more shuttles than there
are boxes. As for timing of the box movement, again, while under the
control of the handloom operator, it is done exactly as would be done on a
powerloom, with no stopping of the loom and no interruption in the weaving
movements. As soon as a shuttle is boxed on the receiving side, while the
lay is coming forward to the front center position, the boxes should begin
to change and the change should be completed before the lay reaches back
center position for the next pick. This, as Peter indicated, takes lots of
practise, but if practised slowly at first, speed will come.

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

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Ruth,
I use AVL's double box occasionally with shadow weave fabrics. It takes me a while to get both hands coordinated with each other, but a rhythm does develop with only a rare head-on collision of shuttles! The industrial boxes Allen described sound great, but avl's work in pairs. I don't know about their 4 box model.

Janice Jones

To reply privately, send message to JNBJ@aol.com
AmyFibre@aol.com wrote:

> but my theory has been that because it is
cotton it shrinks into the fabric in finishing, and the warp is 8/2 cotton
> which also shrinks. These two shrinkages then hold the cotton chenille in
> more tightly than I could ever beat it.

Devil's advocate hat wearing day, but . . . I know I read somewhere, a long time
ago in a land far away, that cotton itself does not shrink! <gasp> The gaps
between warp and weft close up during finishing so the end product is smaller in
size than before finishing, but the fiber itself does not shrink. Anyone else
read that? Is it so?

Margaret

-----------------------------------------
MargeCoe@concentric.net
Tucson, AZ, USA

To reply privately, send message to Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>
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> a variety of quality in rayon chenille, and that which is made with a
> partially cotton binder warp seems to do the least amount of worming. The
> currently available chenilles, which have 100% rayon binder warps are the
> most "wormy". Any weaving I do with this type of chenille, other than plain
> weave, seems to be subject to worms. Very frustrating. My stash of older
> yarns is all but defunct, so I guess I will have to learn to deal with the
> new variety. Wish we could persuade the manufacturers to return to the
> cotton warp......
>
> I'm just curious, frankly. I do not nor have I ever, I don't think, woven
> with chenille. Its just not in my repetoire. However, I'm closely
> involved with the furniture manufacturing industry and thus the upholstery
> mills. Chenille is and has been one of the hottest 'wovens' for the last
couple of years. I find it interesting that the yarns they are using and
> the weaves (which, in many cases, are 'backed') hold up remarkably well.
> Has anyone investigated this angle--sofas or chairs that are used day in
> and day out (and not packed anymore than handwoven) wear for years, and
certainly without worming. It does pique my curiosity and I may look into
> this (and the yarns used) just because it DOES pique my curiosity. Perhaps
> Allen has something to add to this. Oh, and the chenilles are pretty much
> across the board, money wise-meaning that you can find them at the 'cheap'
> end of the fabrics and at the high. As my husband describes the expensive
> ones--they are 'hunky' (you would be surprised how the fabric people talk
> about fabrics <G>-altho' he is a designer and just using their reference)
> meaning very lush, thick, heavy chenilles.
>
---
Diane B. Fields
Designer/colorist/weaver of interior textiles
picnic@twave.net
To reply privately, send message to "Diane B. Fields" <picnic@twave.net

---
Diane B. Fields
Designer/colorist/weaver of interior textiles
picnic@twave.net
To reply privately, send message to "Diane B. Fields" <picnic@twave.net

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 5 09:10:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA16621; Tue, 5 Jan 1999
09:10:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA16615; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 09:10:14 -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 LAA14840
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 11:10:17 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1999 11:10:17 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199901051610.LAA14840@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: double box fs
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net

At 10:44 AM 1/5/99 EST, you wrote:
It takes me a
> while to get both hands coordinated with each other, but a rhythm does develop
> with only a rare head-on collision of shuttles!
> Janice Jones

> To reply privately, send message to JNB@aol.com

REPLY:
No handloom weaver should ever feel badly about having what is called a smash!

We had a 4X4 power loom on which we were running seven shuttles and somewhere about half way through a 176 pick filling repeat there was an error that sent two opposite shuttles into the shed at better than 130ppm, which at 54" width translates to approximately 25 mph. Since I was responsible for the start-up of that loom, no expletives were deleted until the mess was fixed! Point being, despite the mess, it was fixable, weaving continued and I wasn't struck dead by lightning!

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562
E-mail: <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Web:  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 Jan  5 09:18:40 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA18417; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 09:18:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail.mc.net (mail.mc.net [209.172.128.4]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA18408; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 09:18:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 23965 invoked from network); 5 Jan 1999 16:19:45 -0000
Received: from tntmodem3-9.mc.net (HELO Butler-Home.cl.na.sb.com) (209.172.135.9) by mail.mc.net with SMTP; 5 Jan 1999 16:19:45 -0000
Message-ID: <009b01be38d8$f36dbfe0$0987acd1@Butler-Home.cl.na.sb.com>
From: "Al and Su Butler" <apbutler@mc.net>
To: <weavetech@list-server.net>
Subject: Re: chenilles
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1999 10:26:44 -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 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4
X-Spam-Rating: mail.mc.net 1.6.1 0/1000/N
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

HI Diane....

This of course is just my own opinion, but I believe you have said it all...
>the weaves (which, in many cases, are 'backed') hold up remarkably well.<

I believe the backing is what prevents the chenille from worming.

>Oh, and the chenilles are pretty much
>across the board, money wise-meaning that you can find them at the 'cheap'
>end of the fabrics and at the high

- 22 -
A trip through a mill outlet yarn store will show you a variety of chenille yarns. One thing I have noticed on my trips through outlets stores in North Carolina is much of the chenille used in a mill situation is not 100% rayon, rather has a high nylon content, as well as cotton. I wonder if this enters into the equation at all. I have purchased some of the "hunky" chenille, woven fabric for upholstery and had no worming. I *only* have worming when I use rayon chenille....no other. Someone once told me rayon chenille has no grabbing capabilities at all, and actually acts like a little caterpillar and crawls out of the structure. Any fiber with "grab" won't do this....certainly not to the degree rayon chenille will.

I am no expert, just have many years experience with different types of chenille yarns....so take this for what it is worth.....I, too, am intensely curious as to the "why's" of all this....Su :-)...struggling to stay warm......

---

Hi, Ruth,

I've done some summer and winter with a dark, fine, but not super-fine, warp alternating with a heavier, brightly colored dyed warp. When I wove using a dark silk weft (single shuttle), the fabric had a nice drape and the pattern showed well because the bright pattern warps stood out on the dark ground. I thought of this as turned summer and winter. You can use this same threading as a turned overshot if you change the tie-up and treading. I have not tried using chenille in this but think it would work well for the summer and winter, not for the overshot. I'd like to try some with a fine silk weft, actually-- I like the silk with rayon chenille combination.

Any time you find that alternating shuttles is taking up time, consider turning the draft. That said, I don't have 2 back beams and have to be careful about mixing fibers in the warp this way. One problem with a turned summer and winter threading is that you will wish for more treadles.

It's perfect for a computer-assisted loom, you can basically draw pictures in loom-controlled weaves. My workshop for MAFA this July will cover this technique. Ruth, the tied weaves-- summer and winter, diversified plain weave, and more-- are a big reason for buying a computer-assisted loom.
Did you see Martha Hubbard's wonderful garments at her booth at Convergence? I think one reason she doesn't have problems with worming is that her yarns are set closely. Her fabrics have a wonderful hand, and we're lucky to have her on this list.

In addition to turned summer and winter, look at Lucille Creighton's work in turned taquete. Terrific garments, included in several recent Convergence fashion shows.

Bonnie Inouye
binouye@geocities.com
www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347

To reply privately, send message to Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>

Ruth wrote, concerning a thick and thin weave for chenille:

> As I was finishing the warp on
> Saturday, I started wondering about a technique that would adequately tie
> the chenille (and protect against worming) and yet not be so slow--perhaps
> a structure with only one end and shot of thin per thick instead of two.
> This brought to mind Summer & Winter. Has anyone tried using S&W as a
> thick & thin technique? Again, I'd use sewing thread or something nearly
> as fine for the thin and chenille for the thick.

I have had fun with something I call thick and thin 1/1 lampas, and wrote an article for Weaver's issue 28, page 40 presenting a runner in that technique. I also wove some vest fabric using the same technique. The ties and pattern weave tabby in the runner, 2/1 twill in the vest. I have since routinely added thin warp and weft ties to any experimental design I came up with which had overlong floats and woven as lampas. The thin weft matches the thick warp in color and vice versa.

Christine Spangler has done some very interesting work with tied weaves, featuring one tie thread alternating with a pattern thread. If you attended the CW seminars in Atlanta or have a friend who was there, the handbook has some handouts showing Christine's work. I took one of her seminars and have additional fascinating material on the topic.

Jo Anne
While I haven't used the structure for chenille (yet)
I think it might work - double two-tie unit weave
woven S&W (dukagang fashion).  One tie, one
pattern.  I wrote up the technique for Weavers
a couple of years ago - if anyone is interested I
could dig out the issue.

Laura Fry
starting her Bozeman fashion show entry - another
full size sample
Like Marge I haven't yet quite figured out how to use three shuttles in an AVL two box fs, but other than that, it is very easy to use. I've now got a four box on my AVL, and yes, it does make my underslung beater heavier to move.

As you choose whichever shuttle you want for each pick, it is very versatile. When weaving placemats, I can keep my "fugitive" weft shuttle in one box while weaving with my "real" weft. No hunting around for the other shuttle when needed.

I've woven diversified plain weave - two fine picks, one thick, summer and winter, colour and weave effects, you name it. You do have to concentrate a bit to make sure you get the right shuttle at the right time, especially in a complicated colour sequence (which I do quite often for the fashion designer I weave for) In other words, I can't listen to a book tape during these cloths!!! :D

When I bought the air assist last spring, I also went to a four box fly as I am doing a lot more three colour weaves in production. I haven't regretted it one bit, and I liked the two box right from the start (I ordered my AVL with it in 1981).

Like any new piece of equipment, it takes a bit of getting used to, but if you are seriously interested in doing two shuttle production, it is well worth it IMHO.

Laura Fry

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

I have Weavemaker 3.02 (the latest version) with a Compudobby I. I have no cartridges (got a used loom, ugh and AVL no longer has them for the I). It works okay with cartridges supposedly. The problem is, the #3 button on the control box does nothing. According to manual, it sets back to start of pattern (Pick 1). According to AVL, not supposed to do this. Mine does neither. I have a Mac IIci dedicated to loom, without anything but software and system software. The older version of the program did what the manual says. I got very used to it cause I do a lot of designing, color samples, etc. and was great to use even though there were some other bugs with the version. That is why I miss it. Peter was supposed to get back to me or try to find a cartridge but I never heard back. They did not know it was working as it was.

Anyway, after all that, does yours work? (with and without cartridge, or do you always use cartridge?) Have you experienced any other inconsistencies?

Thanks!
Diane Kelly
kelde@erols.com

To reply privately, send message to Diane Kelly <kelde@erols.com>
> Ideally, a multi-box handloom fly shuttle should operate exactly as it
does on a power loom, the boxes on each end of the lay should be
independently moveable so that any box on the left can send or receive a
shuttle to or from any box on the right. AVL arrangement does not.

Allen,
I weave for hours at a time. Once I get mesmerized with the rhythm of
weaving, listening to my music and watching the birds flying past my
window, I'm not sure my head could keep track of which shuttle was where
and thus be able to avoid mid-shed collisions. I, for one, prefer my AVL
4-box fly shuttle just the way it is. If the appropriate empty receiving
box did not move into position automatically, I'd be in real trouble.

Martha

To reply privately, send message to "Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard"
hubbard182@worldnet.att.net
Can anyone recommend a weaving software program for the Macintosh? Most everything that I have looked into is for PC's.

Lois

To reply privately, send message to Lois <books@woodenporch.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 5 10:20:12 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA03772; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 10:20:12 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA03768; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 10:20:10 -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 MAA01213 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 12:20:15 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1999 12:20:15 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199901051720.MAA01213@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: fly shuttles
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 12:02 PM 1/5/99 -0500, you wrote:

>Allen,  
> I weave for hours at a time. Once I get mesmerized with the rhythm of  
>weaving, listening to my music and watching the birds flying past my  
>window, I'm not sure my head could keep track of which shuttle was where  
>and thus be able to avoid mid-shed collisions.

>To reply privately, send message to "Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard"  
<hubbard182@worldnet.att.net>

REPLY:

There would be an initial learning curve, but as with all skills, you would be able to manipulate the boxes at will with out having to concentrate very much since the shuttle rotation would become part of the rhythm.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562
E-mail: <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Web: 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 Jan  5 10:36:17 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA07859; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 10:36:17 +0700 (MST)
Received: from mailc.telia.com (root@mailc.telia.com [194.22.190.4]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA07846; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 10:36:14 +0700 (MST)
Received: from d1o63.telia.com (root@d1o63.telia.com [195.198.44.214]) by mailc.telia.com (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id SAA13307 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 18:36:14 +0100 (CET)
Received: from ixsvzykp (t1o63p410.telia.com [195.198.45.154]) by d1o63.telia.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id SAA21359 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 18:36:13 +0100 (MET)
Message-Id: <199901051736.SAA21359@d1o63.telia.com>
From: "Nilsson, Lovisa" <lovisa@tanum.mail.telia.com>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1999 18:37:36 +0100
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1161
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----=_NextPart_000_01BE38DA.76DBE0E0"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Detta dr ett multipart-meddelande i MIME-format.

----=_NextPart_000_01BE38DA.76DBE0E0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi,
This is where I got my software for Macintosh

Regards
Lovisa in Sweden

----=_NextPart_000_01BE38DA.76DBE0E0
Content-Type: application/octet-stream; name="SwiftWeave Guides You.url"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: SwiftWeave Guides You (Internet-genvdg)
Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="SwiftWeave Guides You.url"

[InternetShortcut]

----=_NextPart_000_01BE38DA.76DBE0E0--

To reply privately, send message to "Nilsson, Lovisa" <lovisa@tanum.mail.telia.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Tue Jan  5 11:08:33 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA05037; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 10:24:16 +0700 (MST)
Received: from mailc.telia.com (root@mailc.telia.com [194.22.190.4]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA05006; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 10:24:11 +0700 (MST)
Received: from d1o63.telia.com (root@d1o63.telia.com [195.198.44.214]) by mailc.telia.com (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id SAA06972 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 18:24:07 +0100 (CET)
I have used SwiftWeave for more than two years.
I am very pleased with it.

Lovisa in Sweden

To reply privately, send message to "Nilsson, Lovisa" <lovisa@tanum.mail.telia.com>
Jo Anne wrote:
>Christine Spangler has done some very interesting work with tied weaves,
>featuring one tie thread alternating with a pattern thread. If you attended
>the CW seminars in Atlanta or have a friend who was there, the handbook has
>some handouts showing Christine's work. I took one of her seminars and have
>additional fascinating material on the topic.

I'm somewhat familiar w/ Chris's work, and had planned to pick her brain on
this subject next time I see her. By a stroke of very good luck, she lives
in this area and is a member of both our guild and our multishaft study group.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia USA

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

---

Kathy Warner <kwarner@halcyon.com> wrote:
>Jo Anne wrote:
>
>Joseph's ideas are certainly worth a try. I find the way the threads
>are arranged can make a difference in the effect. Also, I have had
>good luck using some of the tied weaves for hatbands. I am quite
delighted with the results. One of my hatbands is 24" long with 6
>threads in the warp and 2 threads in the weft. It uses both
>methods: plain and one tie. Load 3/4" threads for the warp and
>2/3" for the weft. The depth of the effects can be changed by
>changing the number of threads in the warp and weft.

Jo Anne wrote:
>Great idea, Kathy. Tie at the ends, and you can make nice plaids
>because each side is a different color. I have a friend who made
>a pair of pants using one color for the waist and the other for
>the legs. Tie at the top of the pants and hang them up side down
>to fray. Then take them down, pull the threads tight, and tie
>them tight at the two sides. This produces a fringe that is already
>singly twisted. I have not yet tried this, but I have plans to.

Kathy Warner wrote:
>Thanks for sharing your thoughts, Ruth. I'm glad to hear that you
>have been successful in your mulishaft projects. I'm interested in
>trying out some of the techniques you described. Could you provide
>more details on the materials you used and the methods you employed?

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia USA

To reply privately, send message to Kathy Warner <kwarner@halcyon.com>

---

Kathy Warner <kwarner@halcyon.com> wrote:
>Jo Anne wrote:
>
>Jo Anne, I think that you should give a demonstration of these
>techniques at the next meeting. The people there would love to see
>the results of your work.

Jo Anne wrote:
>That sounds like a great idea, Kathy. I'll definitely consider it.

---

To reply privately, send message to Kathy Warner <kwarner@halcyon.com>

---

Kathy Warner <kwarner@halcyon.com> wrote:
>Jo Anne, I've been thinking about your ideas and I've decided to give
>a try to one of them. I've been working on a project that requires
>some unusual weaving techniques, and I think your suggestions could
>be very helpful.

Jo Anne wrote:
>That's great, Kathy! I'm glad to hear that you're planning to give
>one of the techniques a try. I hope it works out well for you.

---

To reply privately, send message to Kathy Warner <kwarner@halcyon.com>

---

Kathy Warner <kwarner@halcyon.com> wrote:
>Jo Anne, I've been working on my project and I'm happy to report
>that it's going well so far. I've incorporated some of the
>techniques you suggested and I think it's turning out quite nicely.

Jo Anne wrote:
>That's wonderful, Kathy! I'm glad to hear that your project is
>progressing well. It's always rewarding to see the results of our
>experiments and ideas.

---

To reply privately, send message to Kathy Warner <kwarner@halcyon.com>

---

Kathy Warner <kwarner@halcyon.com> wrote:
>Jo Anne, I've been thinking about our conversation and I've decided
>to try out another technique you suggested. I'm excited to see how
>it turns out.

Jo Anne wrote:
>That's fantastic, Kathy! I'm looking forward to seeing the results
>of your experiments.

---

To reply privately, send message to Kathy Warner <kwarner@halcyon.com>
Can anyone recommend a weaving software program for the Macintosh?

I use two, Swiftweave and Weavemaker One, and own a version of Proweave.

Swiftweave is a little simpler to use, and I probably wouldn't have bothered with anything else IF it had been able to work with Macomber's power supply for the ESP. It will do fabric analysis, making it possible to work backwards from the drawdown to the draft, and insert grounds, but I don't know if it will do two tie-downs per pattern thread. Have to check it out. I don't think you can set "pencil draws straight lines" like you can in Weavemaker, and that is a lovely feature, especially with lots of shafts. It will drive several varieties of looms, just not mine!

I use Weavemaker One most often, because it works with the Macomber. The color picker takes more steps, but you end up with a palette that you can save and use again. Weavemaker has a library of threadings, tie-ups, and treadlings that you can play with when your well is dry. You can draw a long squiggly line in the warp and it will make a network draft out of it. It is really a program for designers working with textile mills, so its capabilities are WAY beyond my needs (if you just click print draft you get four pages of specifications; check out the print options first.) My only quibble is that it wants to start weaving with the dobby on the same pick each time it's turned on, and when I was playing with a 1000-pick sequence starting on pick 837 each and every time I started weaving was VERY inconvenient. The nice young woman at tech support at AVL was mystified and offered to send a replacement disk to see if the original was damaged. Unfortunately she sent a PC disk, and when I called back I got someone else who pooh-poohed the whole thing and said it was Macomber's problem. Naturally Macomber says it isn't, so I'm putting up with it. Actually I love it dearly, except for starting on pick 837!

I don't think I've given Proweave a chance, because I'm such an oaf with the mouse that I can't draw the component parts of the draft in the first place without a lot of stumbling around and cursing. Maybe someone else who's good at it could say something?

I don't know if Fiberworks has an older Mac version out, or when to expect the new one. People who have PC versions swear by it.

You can go to AVL's website and download demos of both Swiftweave and Weavemaker One. They won't save or print, but you'll get an idea of how they are to work with. The Weavemaker site (actually Designer Software) has a scaled-down version to download, called I think Weavenet, which works fine for 8h and no color.

And get yourself a copy of QD-Wif. It will interchange drafts with other weaving programs, either PC or Mac.

Have fun!

Kathy Warner (kwarner@halcyon.com)
half warped & dinking around with 16h point twills

To reply privately, send message to Kathy Warner <kwarner@halcyon.com>
> Faux pas--Sorry for the reply to Janice to the whole list everyone.

Not a faux pas at all, Diane. As long as it's relevant to weaving, I think it should be kept on the list. Some other poor soul might be having exactly the problem you're having, and will be helped by the discussion. Several people replied to me privately about summer & winter thick & thin, and tho' I don't feel at liberty to put on the list what they obviously wanted private, I think others might have wanted to see the info. (I know: some people are shy & don't like to write to the whole list. Others of us are blabberfingered. Who me?)

Ruth

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

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 5 12:30:35 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA04680; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 12:30:35 -0700 (MST)
Received: from darius.concentric.net (darius.concentric.net [207.155.184.79]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA04666; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 12:30:34 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newman.concentric.net (newman [207.155.184.71]) by darius.concentric.net (8.9.1a/(98/08/04 5.11))
 id OAA22869; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 14:30:39 -0500 (EST)
[1-800-745-2747 The Concentric Network]
Received: from concentric.net (ts002d38.tuc-az.concentric.net [206.173.160.98]) by newman.concentric.net (8.9.1a)
 id OAA40986; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 14:30:37 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3692684F.11364089@concentric.net>
Date: Tue, 05 Jan 1999 12:30:23 -0700
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: Software for Macs
References: <36920917.32AC@erols.com> <36920CC0.6D2@erols.com> <3.0.3.32.19990104082535.006b76fc@cpcug.org>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Kathy Warner wrote:

I don't think I've given Proweave a chance, because I'm such an oaf with
the mouse that I can't draw the component parts of the draft in the first
place without a lot of stumbling around and cursing. Maybe someone else
who's good at it could say something?

ProWeave is a graphics oriented program and has design functions in which it
excels. I use the IBM version, but I've seen the Mac version operating and they
are very, very similar. However, when it comes to loom interfaces Fiberworks
PCW is thus far the best I've used. With the WIF format and depending on the
type of design, I find myself designing in ProWeave and exporting to Fiberworks
to use their loom control.

Margaret

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

Another worm sighting, alas. These are in a turned crackle, sett 16 epi as
suggested in Weavers 39, p.36. The weft is unmercerised cotton. Only one
color wormed, and only at the junctions between blocks! This is especially
discouraging because the sample didn't worm at all, and I actually MADE a
sample!! This was supposed to be something fabulous to wear to the opera,
but it's going to be something not-so-fabulous to wear to work. Rats!

Yesterday my copy of Elizabeth Wayland Barber's new book, Mummies of
Urumchi, arrived. It has color photos of some of the fabrics, bands,
braids (kongo-gumi, actually), and promises to be worth reading. I hope
someone close to Washington can get to the Smithsonian to hear her (in a
week or so?) and tell us all about it.

It's too bad those Pazyryk mummies are the subject of turf wars at present.
I'd like to hear what Barber has to say about their clothes compared to the Urumchi find. The woman seems to have worn a maru-genji braid around her middle, for instance.

Kathy Warner (kwarner@halcyon.com)

To reply privately, send message to Kathy Warner <kwarner@halcyon.com>

Laura Fry

After I hit the send key the penny dropped - Ruth asked about fly shuttles for her scarves. In my experience, a fly shuttle does not work well when the web is less than 50% of the weaving width of the loom. If you are seriously thinking of production scarves, you might have to look at a narrower loom with fly shuttle to accommodate scarf widths.....

Laura Fry

To reply privately, send message to "Laura Fry" <laurafry@netbistro.com>
Kathy wrote:
>Yesterday my copy of Elizabeth Wayland Barber's new book, Mummies of
>Urumchi, arrived. It has color photos of some of the fabrics, bands,
>braids (kongo-gumi, actually), and promises to be worth reading. I hope
>someone close to Washington can get to the Smithsonian to hear her (in a
>week or so?) and tell us all about it.

I'm definitely going, and if Janet sent in for tkts in time <ggg>, she's
probably going, too. The most recent Smithsonian Associates program
announcement shows that lecture as sold out. We'll definitely report back.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia USA

---

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

---

Carol in sunny Las Cruces, New Mexico

To reply privately, send message to "Adams, Carol" <chadams@zianet.com>
Laura Fry wrote:

> In my experience, a fly shuttle does not work
> well when the web is less than 50% of the
> weaving width of the loom.

I haven't had anywhere near as much experience as Laura, but I had no problem using a fly shuttle on table runners which, while probably a little wider than scarves, were pretty narrow and nowhere near 50% of the weaving width.

Fly-shuttle beginner's luck perhaps?

Margaret
In a message dated 1/5/99 9:56:03 AM Central Standard Time, MargeCoe@concentric.net writes:

> The gaps between warp and weft close up during finishing so the end product is smaller in size than before finishing, but the fiber itself does not shrink.

I haven't read anything to that effect, or to contradict it, but my own home-done testing (ie. wet a 12" thread with hot water, dry it in the hot dryer or under a hot hair dryer and remeasure) shows about 10-12% "shortening" (ie. what I would call "shrinkage") in 900 ypp natural cotton chenille from Halcyon Yarns. This is confirmed by the contraction measured in finished product (ranges from 10% to 15% depending on structure).

I have similarly tested (yes, I know it is not scientific) other cotton yarns. Mercerized 10/2 pearl cotton does not appear to "shrink" in the same way. Perhaps it depends on the processing *before* it gets to me??

Totally unscientifically yours,

Amy
amyfibre@aol.com

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

A few months ago I bought an end feed shuttle from Robin & Russ. At first I didn't like it; tension wasn't adjustable and wasn't tight enough for the 10/2 cotton I tried it with. I tried it again today with some 1500ypp chenille, and found it just right.

I'd like to have another (for shadow weave, etc.), but this was apparently an odd-lot; R & R has no more. If anyone else bought one of these and is willing to part with it, please contact me (off-list, of course).
WeaveTech Archive 9901

course). It has the imprint 'Hattersley 292 England 10/84' on the underside, and is 12" long, 1.25" high, 1.5" wide.

TIA

To reply privately, send message to Iris Charmer <icharmer@up.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 5 17:54:29 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA18318; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 17:54:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo15.mx.aol.com (imo15.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA18311; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 17:54:28 -0700 (MST)
From: JNBJ@aol.com
Received: from JNBJ@aol.com
   by imo15.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id BKDAa03538
   for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 19:53:53 +1900 (EST)
Message-ID: <d8538917.3692b421@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1999 19:53:53 EST
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: fs web width
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL for Macintosh sub 50
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

<< >> In my experience, a fly shuttle does not work
> well when the web is less than 50% of the
> weaving width of the loom. >>

My experience is far less than Laura's as well, (which is why I so enjoy your posts, Laura) but I've used a fs on 8" wide scarves. The loom is 40", which really has little to do with the problem, I think. It corresponds to the shuttle length, and how much yarn comes out. What I did for the 8" scarves was offset the warp by 2" to the right. The shuttle I use has the yarn coming off the right end, so when the shuttle goes to that side, more yarn comes off. I've done several 40 yd warps with it that way and haven't had a problem except that it really goes against the grain to have the warp off center!

Janice

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 5 19:01:37 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA03867; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 19:01:37 -0700 (MST)
Received: from netexpress.net (root@shamu.netexpress.net [206.65.64.2]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA03861; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 19:01:35 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host root@shamu.netexpress.net [206.65.64.2] claimed to be netexpress.net
Received: from [206.65.65.149] (flexgen-20.netexpress.net [206.65.65.149])
   by netexpress.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id UAA22043
   for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 20:01:41 -0600
X-Sender: dlindell@netexpress.net
Message-Id: <v03007801b2b8739cf846@[206.65.65.149]>
In-Reply-To: <199901051424.HAA24834@salmon.esosoft.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1999 20:04:14 -0600
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
WeaveTech Archive 9901

From: Dick Lindell <hataori@writeme.com>
Subject: Re: double-box flyshuttle
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org> writes:
> Subject: double-box flyshuttle

> Can this be done with a double-box flyshuttle? T&T seems to me to have wonderful possibilities,
> but it is sooooooooo slow.

Well, Ruth, you probably got your answers from AAF & others. *However* you would best not think that running a double flyshuttle on a handloom (*not* AAF's industrial stuff) is not fast at all. It may even rival hand throwing for its slowness. You know it's not always true that what can be done should be done.

Dick Lindell, Weaver
Check out Dick's Die-Cut cards at<http://www.angelfire.com/il/dickshome>
-----
One who elevates their profession iz the best mechanic, whether preaching the gospel, peddling phisic, or skinning eels for a living.
- Josh Billings

Ruth:

Here is a novice AVL double fly box users thoughts.

I love the dfb and really had major concerns about whether this even made sense. I had never used one or truly any fly box except for about 2 embarassingly awkward shots at AVL booth. I didn't limited multi-shuttle weaving - mostly because of the slowness pre fly box days.

To reply privately, send message to Dick Lindell <hataori@writeme.com>
>From my initial "why would anyone want to handweave on that?" to "I must have one" was a short step really, and took only a few years. My comments surely were a reflection of my lack of education about looms and what I really wanted to do with one. (or 4 as the case may be).

You control which shuttle via a shift lever, so you can weave 2 or a zillion shots w/one shuttle and switch to the other shuttle for one shot or more. I found it surprisingly fast and suddenly all those undone projects started marching in front of me (like the raisins?). I find it much faster than hand throwing the second shuttle, though I know some people do that with a single box.

Catherine Markey in Petaluma, CA

To reply privately, send message to Catherine Markey <markeyali@earthlink.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Jan 6 01:31:34 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id BAA18097; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 01:31:34 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp1.mindspring.com (smtp1.mindspring.com [207.69.200.31]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id BAA18092; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 01:31:30 -0700 (MST)
Received: from ibm-customer (user-38ldh3r.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.196.123]) by smtp1.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id DAA25774 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 03:31:29 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19990106003219.006a0004@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: bnathans@pop.mindspring.com
Date: Wed, 06 Jan 1999 00:32:19 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>
Subject: flyshuttle
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

Margaret says:
I had no problem
using a fly shuttle on table runners which, while probably a little wider than scarves, were pretty narrow and nowhere near 50% of the weaving width.

I agree. Being addicted to the fly shuttle, I try it on any width I'm weaving. and it usually works. But then, I only have a single box which I understand is more user friendly if limited. Even with 2 shuttles, it adds to efficiency.

EJ Barber is an entertaining speaker. Sure doesn't look like an academic....

We're off to Burma (Myanmar) with Craft World Tours on Friday... Will report back on textiles...
Barbara Nathans  Bellport, Long Island, NY
(and warm and sunny San Diego, Ca for January, February and March)

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Jan 6 05:43:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA18199; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 05:43:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id FAA18193; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 05:43:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (damascus-md-242.idsonline.com [209.8.42.242]) by cpcug.org
>Kathy wrote:
>>Yesterday my copy of Elizabeth Wayland Barber's new book, Mummies of
>>Urumchi, arrived. It has color photos of some of the fabrics, bands,
>>braids (kongo-gumi, actually), and promises to be worth reading. I hope
>>someone close to Washington can get to the Smithsonian to hear her (in a
>>week or so?) and tell us all about it.

I also have tickets for the lecture. Now to try to find time to read (more
likely peruse) the book before the lecture.

Janet

Janet Stollnitz             jstoll@cpcug.org
Silver Spring, MD

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

>Can anyone recommend a weaving software program for the Macintosh?
>Most everything that I have looked into is for PC's.

I got Swiftweave 5.1 for Mac at Convergence Atlanta. Though I do not have a
computer driven loom, I like the software- but be aware my demands on it and
time spent with it are low. Where are you, Lois? A visit to mid MD possible?
I think you can still download demos of Weavemaker (another Mac program) off the net.

Mary Klotz  foresthrt@aol.com
Forestheart Studio  (301) 845-4447
200 South Main St.  box 112,  Woodsboro (near Frederick) MD 21798
11-5 east coast time;    closed Wed. and Sun.

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

Ruth wrote:
>finished a sample warp of chenille and sewing thread in Madelyn's
>version of diversified plain weave, which she generally calls Thick & Thin,
>tho sometimes seems to call simply diversified plain weave

Can anyone recommend some book(s) that could bring me up to speed on this?

Mary Klotz
WeaveTech Archive 9901

I can recommend ProWeave for the Mac. Although I do not have a Mac I have used ProWeave on them both. It works the same. A very good software.

I'm new to WeaveTech, weave on an AVL 16 Harness computer assisted loom in my studio in my home. Have also a Passap E6000 knitting machine and do my art using both -- sometimes in combination.

Elaine E. Deyo
Reply privately to: EVESTUDIO@aol.com

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

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Wed Jan  6 06:43:37 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA28325; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 06:43:37 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo17.mx.aol.com (imo17.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.7]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA28318; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 06:43:36 -0700 (MST)
From: JNBJ@aol.com
Received: from JNBJ@aol.com
    by imo17.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id XDCZa03212
    for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 08:42:49 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <4615dd89.36936859@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 6 Jan 1999 08:42:49 EST
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: industrial fs
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL for Macintosh sub 50
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Allen,
Thanks for the explanation of the industrial fs box system. Several years ago, I was offered a free industrial sample loom. I desparately wanted it, since I'm fascinated with equipment, but knew I'd probably never figure out how to use it, nor would I want to pay for the electrical upgrade my house would have needed, not to mention a whole host of other challenges. It's now in an historical society's building, but I doubt it's set up.

I was confused at the time when I could see that it had 5 boxes on each side and the man told me I could use 9 different colors/yarns. Now I understand. Thanks, again.

Janice

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

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Wed Jan  6 07:22:31 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA07162; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 07:22:31 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp1.erols.com (smtp1.erols.com [207.172.3.234]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA07156; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 07:22:30 -0700 (MST)
Received: from LOCALNAME (207-172-56-151.s151.tnt12.ann.erols.com [207.172.56.151])
    by smtp1.erols.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id JAA28959
    for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 09:22:31 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <36939BC2.4E42@erols.com>
Date: Wed, 06 Jan 1999 09:22:10 -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: T & T/diversified plain weave

Allen,
Thanks for the explanation of the industrial fs box system. Several years ago, I was offered a free industrial sample loom. I desparately wanted it, since I'm fascinated with equipment, but knew I'd probably never figure out how to use it, nor would I want to pay for the electrical upgrade my house would have needed, not to mention a whole host of other challenges. It's now in an historical society's building, but I doubt it's set up.

I was confused at the time when I could see that it had 5 boxes on each side and the man told me I could use 9 different colors/yarns. Now I understand. Thanks, again.

Janice
Mary -
As Ruth says in her message, sometimes the "Thick 'n Thin" that Madelyn talks and writes about, and teaches, is simply called diversified plain weave (dpw). But they are two different things. Different in threading, treadling, and look (when you look close). I hate for the terms to be used interchangeably, because they are not the same. Maybe I am being too picky!

Klara Cherepov wrote a small book in 1972 on dpw. I have a copy, and we're close enough that maybe we could find a way for you to borrow it!. However, much easier is to look through some of the old Weavers for both the dpw articles and also MvdH's article on Thick 'n Thin, where she shows differences with dpw. BTW, the advantages to MvdH's approach are many: easier threading and easier treadling. Much easier treadling.

Anne in Annandale
arwells@erols.com

> Can anyone recommend some book(s) that could bring me up to speed on this?
> Mary Klotz
>
> To reply privately, send message to Foresthrt@aol.com

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

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Jan  6 07:24:03 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA07678; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 07:24:03 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail-01.cdsnet.net (mail-01.cdsnet.net [206.107.16.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA07661; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 07:24:02 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 17048 invoked from network); 6 Jan 1999 14:24:04 -0000
Received: from d01a8042.dip.cdsnet.net (HELO cdsnet.net) (208.26.128.66)
    by mail.cdsnet.net with SMTP; 6 Jan 1999 14:24:04 -0000
Message-ID: <369372D2.7E541888@cdsnet.net>
Date: Wed, 06 Jan 1999 06:27:31 -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:double-box flyshuttle
References: <199901061100.EAA04375@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

> > Can this be done with a
> > double-box flyshuttle? T&T seems to me to have wonderful possibilities,
> > but it is sssssssssss slow.
> >
> > Well, Ruth, you probably got your answers from AAF & others. *However* you
> > would best not think that running a double flyshuttle on a handloom (*not*
> > AAF's industrial stuff) is not fast at all. It may even rival hand
> > throwing for its slowness. You know it's not always true that what can be
> > done should be done.
I'm an owner of a 40" 16H folding AVL dobby. I got a double box fly shuttle which runs on the lower beater. I was prepared to like it but now the whole assembly sits in my storage room. First of all, I found the center pull very fatiguing for extended weaving sessions. Since I now lift weights, I'm not sure it would even be a problem. At the time I was weaving on commission, it really got tiring to use. Secondly no matter how I adjusted the beater, the shuttles, leveled the loom etc., I still had quite a few mispicks and the shuttle would leave the race. This pitted the floor of the room I was weaving in. I could never weave around kids or pets. The weight on the under slung beater caused the relatively short beater to twist and wobble while beating. I love shadow weave. Shadow weave would be an ideal candidate for the double drop box but not on this loom. I know I can weave faster hand throwing a *single shuttle* on my 40" width than using the fly. I've timed myself. I know if I really practiced it, I could weave double shuttles pretty quickly as well. I've seen a four drop box on a 60" loom in action and I know people who adore the plain vanilla side-snapped fly shuttle.

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

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Jan  6 07:26:35 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA08613; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 07:26:35 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo28.mx.aol.com (imo28.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.72]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA08607; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 07:26:34 -0700 (MST)
From: AmyFibre@aol.com
Received: from AmyFibre@aol.com by imo28.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id VANYa23166 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 09:25:25 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <d7705d15.36937255@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 6 Jan 1999 09:25:25 EST
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Announcement - New PlySplit Braiding List
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 226
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

---- Jan 6, 1999 ----

It is with great anticipation and pleasure that we invite to join a newly formed email discussion group:

    PlySplit@craftwolf.com

Linda Hendrickson is the List-Leader and the List Mentor is Peter Collingwood.
My name is Wheat Carr, my job is "List-Witch", handling all the admin details, thus leaving Linda & Peter free to join in the discussions.

This is the description of the list's focus taken from the web based sign-up page located at:
http://www.craftwolf.com/plysplit/join-ply.htm

"PlySplit is for the focused discussion of all aspects of ply-split braiding --- history, yarns, cord-making, tools, techniques, and contemporary uses of ply-split"
braiding techniques to create both decorative and functional objects.

@CraftWolf.Com invites you to share in the excitement and enthusiasm for these structures, ethnic patterns & beautiful colors thru the discussion of this less widely known fiber art. "

Please note this is *not* a "chat" group. But rather a way to facilitate focused discussion. As such, we expect that the quantity of messages will be fairly low volume.

We sincerely hope you will consider joining us. If you need assistance in getting signed up, please email listlist@craftwolf.com for a copy of our comprehensive "list how to's" message.

At the risk of sounding, flip, the curtains are not hung, and the tools are not quite unpacked and on the shelves, but the table and chairs stand ready for you to join in.

Wheat

--
Wheat Carr mailto:wheat@craftwolf.com

Weaving Weft-Faced? Let's Talk About It
http://www.craftwolf.com/join-mrx.htm

Get Wired For Weaving
http://www.craftwolf.com/artwire1.htm

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

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Jan 6 07:32:31 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA10561; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 07:32:31 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo13.mx.aol.com (imo13.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA10553; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 07:32:29 -0700 (MST)
From: WC3424@aol.com
Received: (from WC3424@aol.com
by imo13.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id SQXKa05309
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 09:31:48 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <4d41b066.369373d4@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 6 Jan 1999 09:31:48 EST
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #141
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 214
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

<< I have used rayon chenille successfully as weft in fairly open twills (but haven't tried S&W) on perle cotton warps. Much to my continued surprise and delight, no item has been returned for worming so far. >>

What yarn size are you using on the perle cotton warps and what is the sett. This might be the answer so many of us are looking to have. You obviously have the perfect sett for same!

Does anyone have difficulty using the fly shuttle on the 60" loom? I have a
WeaveTech Archive 9901

double fly, but I can't for the life of me manage to throw it with ease the full distance. I've checked to see if the batten was level. I have waxed the shuttle race, the shuttle. I have replaced the rubber bands on the fly boxes. Am I missing anything? I've even had physical therapy and am thinking maybe this is just me. After having polio, I might have muscles which have atrophied. The air assist has enabled me to weave for the same difficulty in my legs. But, I am so in hopes there is some little something I'm missing on the fly shuttle.

Thanks! Charlotte Lindsay Allison

To reply privately, send message to WC3424@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Wed Jan 6 09:11:56 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA09641; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 09:11:56 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail2.LCIA.COM (aerodown.com [207.30.138.60]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA09625; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 09:11:55 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host aerodown.com [207.30.138.60] claimed to be mail2.LCIA.COM
Received: from woodenporch.com ([209.26.68.115]) by mail2.LCIA.COM (Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-52462U2500L250S0V35)
with ESMTP id COM for <weavetech@list-server.net>;
Wed, 6 Jan 1999 11:14:27 -0500
Message-ID: <36938B68.A1552EE5@woodenporch.com>
Date: Wed, 06 Jan 1999 11:12:39 -0500
From: Lois <books@woodenporch.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Subject: Re: Mac software
References: <12c61c41.36935c5c@aol.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Thanks Mary.
I'll look into Swiftweave. After 12 years on a PC I switched to a MAC ands have found there is not too much available for the MAC. I'm in FL.
Lois

Foresthrt@aol.com wrote:

> Can anyone recommend a weaving softwear program for the Macintosh?
> Most everything that I have looked into is for PC's.
> I got Swiftweave 5.1 for Mac at Convergence Atlanta. Though I do not have a computer driven loom, I like the software- but be aware my demands on it and time spent with it are low. Where are you, Lois? A visit to mid MD possible?
> I think you can still download demos of Weavemaker (another Mac program) off the net.
> Mary Klotz  foresthrt@aol.com
> Forestheart Studio  (301) 845-4447
> 200 South Main St. box 112, Woodsboro (near Frederick) MD 21798
> 11-5 east coast time;  closed Wed. and Sun.
> To reply privately, send message to Foresthrt@aol.com
<Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard"

I've done this successfully on 20/2 perle cotton sett at 36 and on 20/2 sett at 30. A lot of it was turned twill blocks, using a mixture of 1/3, 2/2 and 3/1 to achieve varying surface effects with the play of the cotton warp versus the rayon chenille. Generally, I try to use the finest chenille that I can. It seems to work better than the heavier stuff with the fine warps. Also, this combination makes the lighter weight fabrics that I like sewing on. If I have trouble getting fabric under the presser foot of my 28 year old sewing machine, it's no fun to work with and doesn't make a crisp looking garment.

Martha

To reply privately, send message to "Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard"
<hubbard182@worldnet.att.net>
As Ruth says in her message, sometimes the "Thick 'n Thin" that Madelyn talks and writes about, and teaches, is simply called diversified plain weave (dpw). But they are two different things.

I think that is why Madelyn is calling it Thick 'n Thin. There are some differences in the look of the finished fabric. But if the T&T will give a look that your like, it is the easiest to thread and weave.

The only resource for the T&T is the magazine or workshop notes.

My loom is 60" and I have an underslung beater. I didn't have any particular problem.
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using it except I did find that the AVL shuttles were on the light side in terms of weight. When I switched to heavier industrial EFS I found that they would easily cross to the other side instead of dying half or 3/4 the way across.

With a slightly heavier shuttle, it seems that small inconsistencies in how the pirn/bobbin is wound create less of a problem in terms of being jerked off the race. If you are really having problems of this nature, you might want to turn the shuttle around so that any jerking would cause the shuttle to be pulled in closer to the reed.

Laura Fry

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Jan 7 06:16:09 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA27699; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 06:16:09 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA27691; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 06:16:07 -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 IAA20356 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 08:16:10 -0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 7 Jan 1999 08:16:10 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199901071316.IAA20356@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: ps on db fs
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 08:58 AM 1/5/99 PST, you wrote:

> Ruth asked about fly shuttles for her scarves. In my experience, a fly shuttle does not work well when the web is less than 50% of the weaving width of the loom. If you are seriously thinking of production scarves, you might have to look at a narrower loom with fly shuttle to accomodate scarf widths.....

REPLY:

While it is somewhat difficult to weave with less than 50% of the loom width, the weaving of scarves does not have to be limited to weaving only one scarf width at a time. We generally wove from three to five scarf width at a time on either our handlooms for samples or on power for production using two sets of doupe ends at the edge of each scarf width including the two outside ones. Nearly all scarves on the market are made this way and the doupe edge we used has never been a durability problem.

On the other hand, there is the warp length trade-off. If the number of
scarves being woven is small, making the warp length too short for efficiency then it would be better to use a loom width which would more appropriately accommodate a single scarf width.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562
E-mail: <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Web: 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 Jan 7 06:36:11 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA01839; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 06:36:11 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA01834; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 06:36:10 -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 IAA23206 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 08:36:12 -0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 7 Jan 1999 08:36:12 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199901071336.IAA23206@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: double-box flyshuttle
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 08:04 PM 1/5/99 -0600, you wrote:
>
>> Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org> writes:
>>Subject: double-box flyshuttle

>Well, Ruth, you probably got your answers from AAF & others. *However* you would best not think that running a double flyshuttle on a handloom (*not* AAF's industrial stuff) is not fast at all. It may even rival hand throwing for its slowness. You know it's not always true that what can be done should be done.

>To reply privately, send message to Dick Lindell <hataori@writeme.com>

REPLY:

Depending on how far along the learning curve a handloom weaver is, a fly shuttle in my experience has always proved faster than a hand thrown shuttle if for no other reason than that a fly shuttle lay, properly designed and operated will eliminated many small but additive hand movements. The key words here being "...properly designed and operated...". This I have found to be true even with a multiple box handloom fly shuttle. My experience is in both handlooms and powerlooms and I discovered the similarities between the two by always trying whatever can be done and then analysing how it may
or may not have worked. It this analysis which is so valuable and should not be missed.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562
E-mail: <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Web:  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 Jan  7 06:44:23 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA03635; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 06:44:23 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA03631; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 06:44:22 -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 IAA24571 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 08:44:25 -0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 7 Jan 1999 08:44:25 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199901071344.IAA24571@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:double-box flyshuttle
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 06:27 AM 1/6/99 -0800, you wrote:

Secondly no matter how I adjusted the beater, the shuttles, leveled
>the loom etc., I still had quite a few mispicks and the shuttle would leave the
>race. This pitted the floor of the room I was weaving in. I could never weave
>around kids or pets. The weight on the under slung beater caused the relatively
>short beater to twist and wobble while beating.

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

REPLY:

This comment goes directly to the heart of a post I just sent in which the key was having a fly shuttle lay which was properly designed and operated. Clearly if the lay in racking (twisting) as described here, then it has not been properly designed. Every time a shuttle takes off from a shed, there is something wrong in the system. Over the years we wove literally millions of picks every year and once a handloom or a power loom picking motion was properly adjusted, shuttles never took off.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
> Secondly no matter how I adjusted the beater,

When I had this problem, I found that I needed to readjust the bolts on the
AVL bottom slung fly shutter and add paper shims in one spot. Then the
shuttle stayed on the race. It should. I throw the shuttle with the beater
all the way back so twist is never a problem. And for some projects I have
used a very light weight end feed shuttle.
I have a 60" AVL, 4 box fly. I weave narrow widths, as narrow as 7 or 8" with no problem. I do off-set the warp to the right, but usually about 3 inches.

I use a hand shuttle when I am doing small amounts of pattern yarn with in a fabric. Such as when doing a small overshot border, I throw the tabby with the fly, then use the hand for the pattern (this is with towels etc, that are narrow) then the fly. This saves switching back and forth each throw and is faster to me, for small areas. If doing something like dw when I will be using the 2 shuttles throughout the fabric then I switch back and forth. I do develop a rhythm, not as fast as single shuttle weaves, obviously, but fast none-the-less.

If you are loosing the shuttle off the race, another solution may be to be sure the REED is even. Sometimes you have to put a shim in the beater where the reed is mounted. It there is a little descrepency in the straightness of the reed it will throw the shuttle off track. I have a lot of pits here and there. My dogs as well as any people! stay clear of the two sides of the loom. My golden retriever will sometimes lie down in the flight of the shuttle, and I will say "Annie, go to the back of the loom" and she gets up and moves back!

I have used 3 shuttles in the boxes, but usually just 2. I got the loom used and this is what it came with, not sorry, they are there if I want them. It is an overhead beater BTW, and I don't notice the weight as a detriment.

Cynthia

Blue Sycamore Handwovens
116 Sycamore Street
Bay St. Louis, MS 39520-4221
cyncrull@datasync.com

To reply privately, send message to Cynthia  S Crull <cyncrull@datasync.com>
In response to Laura's suggestion with the heavier shuttles.

Laura works on 60 inch loom. This means that the shuttle travels almost 2 yards. Lots of momentum needed to get all that way.

With 48 and 40 inch looms the AVL will probably do. I worked with it on my 48 with very few problems.

The problems I had were:

1. uneven thread thickness results in jerking on shuttle, with subsequent dents in the floor.
2. uneven winding of the pirn.
3. incorrect pulling on the handle to shoot the shuttle across

Until I learned to wind good pirns, I had tons of floor dents. Once the winding of the pirns was mastered floor dents were minimized. The yarn should be wound with a fair lot of tension, with even movement and NEVER any hills where the thread could come from the last valley. This causes the shuttle to jerk to an abrupt stop.

If wound with low tension the thread coming off the tip can cause the thread in the next layer to come off too and this causes a jerk, a knot and tangle etc.

There are two kinds of fly shuttle pulls on the AVL (Laura did you or your husband not publish an article on this?)

One handle gets pulled down, the other gets flicked side to side.

The side pull handle gives greater control to the force used and the follow through makes for smoother action. I also find it is less tiring and it is ergonomically better for me. In fact my hands were starting to hurt a lot when I started with the centre down pull handle. With the side pull one, and the new padded handle grip it is much easier.

I visited Jim Aherns with Judie Eatough last April. And it was a great pleasure. Among the amazing things he showed us was a new design for the side pull handle. Instead of pulling or flicking the handle was a lever type with an ergonomic grip. There was a wooden support hanging down from the centre front of the loom. Fastened to this was another lever. This lever was fastened to the support so that about 1/3 of its length was above and 2/3 was below the fulcrum. The pull cords were fastened to the top of this lever and the bottom of the lever was shaped into a handle that could be gripped in your fist, with a rest for the fist at the bottom. The thing worked so well, smoothly, effortlessly that it was amazing.

He had lots of little holes in the support and lever to make adjustments to height and mechanical advantage, that I could see that it was the prototype. He told us that Sharon Alderman was using it now.

I wish I were better at drawing, I want this on my loom.

Ingrid
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When You Are Warped, What's Weft

<i>Ingrid Boesel, the weaving half of Fiberworks PCW

Visit us at:  http://www3.sympatico.ca/fiberworks.pcw

To reply privately, send message to Ingrid Boesel &lt;fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca&gt;

&gt;From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Thu Jan  7 09:11:25 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA09616; Thu, 7 Jan 1999
09:11:25 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo13.mx.aol.com (imo13.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id JAA09586; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 09:11:23 -0700 (MST)
From: EVESTUDIO@aol.com
Received: from EVESTUDIO@aol.com
by imo13.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id HPUWa05340
for &lt;weavetech@List-Server.net&gt;; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 11:10:47 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: &lt;ebca6e14.3694dc87@aol.com&gt;
Date: Thu, 7 Jan 1999 11:10:47 EST
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Winding
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 214
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

If you use thin leather "fingers" to grip your yarn; not too firmly, when your
wind on it will help to control the way the prim is wound. It is easy then to
build the correct shape and when weaving the yarn feeds off much more
smoothly.
Elaine E. Deyo
Reply privately to: EVESTUDIO@aol.com

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

&gt;From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Thu Jan  7 09:29:14 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA14346; Thu, 7 Jan 1999
09:29:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.email.msn.com (smtp.email.msn.com [207.68.143.177]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA14341; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 09:29:13 -0700 (MST)
Received: from compaq - 142.194.201.111 by email.msn.com with Microsoft SMTPSVC;
Thu, 7 Jan 1999 08:28:47 -0800
Message-ID: &lt;000301be3a5a$c6d3f5c0$6fc9c28e@compaq&gt;
From: "Susan Van Iderstine" &lt;Vaniderstine@email.msn.com&gt;
To: &lt;weavetech@list-server.net&gt;
Subject: Re: Summer & Winter T&T?
Date: Wed, 6 Jan 1999 12:53:54 -0400
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

I recently did some sampling using chenille as the pattern thread in a fine
WeaveTech Archive 9901

cotton summer-and-winter weave. It turned out great, much to my surprise. (This was my first attempt at summer-and-winter, hence the sampling. I'm not usually a "sample first" weaver.) The cloth was both sturdy and soft, and the chenille didn't worm at all. I did the samples hoping for ideas for reversible scarves. Haven't made the scarves yet but the samples were so promising that they may be next year's Christmas presents. The chenille just about covered the warp in the pattern areas, giving distinct areas of colour and texture. I'm thinking a jewel-tone warp with a dark or black chenille....

If you do anything with this, please keep me posted as to how it turns out.

Susan Van Iderstine
Vaniderstine@msn.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Date: January 4, 1999 9:27 AM
Subject: Summer & Winter T&T?

>This brought to mind Summer & Winter. Has anyone tried using S&W as a
>thick & thin technique? Again, I'd use sewing thread or something nearly
>as fine for the thin and chenille for the thick.
>
>Might this work? Any feedback?
>
>Ruth

To reply privately, send message to "Susan Van Iderstine" <Vaniderstine@email.msn.com>
to use a separate shuttle for each width? This seems like it would take a great deal of time in the weaving, even though the warping would only have to be done once.

Thanks for any light you can shed on this subject!

Pat Baker
The Trojan Rabbit/Baroque n' Beads
in Baltimore, MD

Allen Fannin wrote:

> At 00:58 AM 1/5/99 PST, you wrote:
> >
> >Ruth asked about fly shuttles for her scarves.
> >In my experience, a fly shuttle does not work
> >well when the web is less than 50% of the
> >weaving width of the loom. If you are
> >seriously thinking of production scarves, you
> >might have to look at a narrower loom with
> >fly shuttle to accommodate scarf widths.....
> >
> >REPLY:
>
> >While it is somewhat difficult to weave with less than 50% of the loom
> >width, the weaving of scarves does not have to be limited to weaving only
> >one scarf width at a time. We generally wove from three to five scarf widths
> >at a time on either our handlooms for samples or on power for production
> >using two sets of doug ends at the edge of each scarf width including the
two outside ones. Nearly all scarves on the market are made this way and the
doug edge we used has never been a durability problem.
>
> >On the other hand, there is the warp length trade-off. If the number of
> >scarves being woven is small, making the warp length too short for
> >efficiency then it would be better to use a loom width which would more
> >appropriately accomodate a single scarf width.
>
> >AAF
> >ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
> >ECR Department
> >224 Slocum Hall
> >College for Human Development
> >Syracuse University
> >Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
> >Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
> >FAX: (315) 443-2562
> >E-mail: <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
> >Web: http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin
>
> >To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

To reply privately, send message to Pat Baker <baker@all-systems.com>
This comment goes directly to the heart of a post I just sent in which the key was having a fly shuttle lay which was properly designed and operated. Clearly if the lay in racking (twisting) as described here, then it has not been properly designed.

1. uneven thread thickness results in jerking on shuttle, with subsequent dents in the floor.
2. uneven winding of the pirn.
3. incorrect pulling on the handle to shoot the shuttle across

If you are loosing the shuttle off the race, another solution may be to be sure the REED is even. Sometimes you have to put a shim in the beater where the reed is mounted.

In response to this comment and a few others: No my reed was properly mounted and is flat. I am a very good and even pirn winder. I've had this problem with very slick and smooth yarns and ones not so smooth. I don't think I should have to be shimming or correcting anything to make the double box work. I took and implemented all the suggestions that AVL gave me. Still no go. Also I am in the habit of throwing the shuttle across the race before I beat up and not when then beater is in the farthest position from the woven warp. I've also given up on the auto pick advance because of the fact that it doesn't work properly unless the fell line is almost on the bumpers. People who have one can visualize this. The fell line should be about parallel to the dobby arm. I do have a special handle on the manual warp advance. Now I only wish for finer teeth on the manual advance sprocket. For fine threads, a 1/2" tooth spacing is too much.

In addition to my frustrations with the above, I've never understood *why* each peddle motion on the AVL can't get you a new shed. This could be accomplished with a cam. With the dobby chain, one peddle lifts all of the weight, one peddle only advances the chain. I've gotten terrible hip problems from extended weaving sessions - the motion is unbalanced for the body. With a compudobby where there is absolutely no mechanical reason to move the chain, there really is no excuse for this design. Weaving would be much faster and more ergonomic. Mr.Ahrens has a dobby loom where each peddle gives you a new shed.

Believe it or not - I still love my AVL loom. - Margaret Copeland
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This comment goes directly to the heart of a post I just sent in which
the&nbsp;
key was having a fly shuttle lay which was properly designed and operated.&nbsp;
Clearly if the lay in racking (twisting) as described here, then it has not&nbsp;
been properly designed.

1. uneven thread thickness results in jerking on shuttle, with subsequent dents in
the floor.&nbsp;
2. uneven winding of the pirn.&nbsp;
3. incorrect pulling on the handle to shoot the shuttle across

If you are loosing the shuttle off the race, another solution may be to be&nbsp;
sure the REED is even.&nbsp; Sometimes you have to put a shim in the
beater&nbsp;
where the reed is mounted.&lt;/PRE&gt;

In response to this comment and a few others: No my
reed was properly mounted and is flat. I am a very good and even pirn winder.
I've had this problem with very slick and smooth yarns and ones not so
smooth. I don't think I should have to be shimming or correcting anything
to make the double box work. I took and implemented all the suggestions
that AVL gave me. Still no go. Also I am in the habit of throwing the shuttle
cross the race before I beat up and not when then beater is in the farthest
position from the woven warp. I've also given up on the auto pick advance
because of the fact that it doesn't work properly unless the fell line
is almost on the bumpers. People who have one can visualize this. The fell
line should be parallel to the dobby arm. I do have a special handle
on the manual warp advance. Now I only wish for finer teeth on the manual
advance sprocket. For fine threads, a 1/2" tooth spacing is too much.
In addition to my frustrations with the above, I've
never understood *why* each peddle motion on the AVL can't get you a new
shed. This could be accomplished with a cam. With the dobby chain, one
peddle lifts all of the weight, one peddle only advances the chain. I've
gotten terrible hip problems from extended weaving sessions - the motion
is unbalanced for the body. With a compudobby where there is absolutely
no mechanical reason to move the chain, there really is no excuse for this
design. Weaving would be much faster and more ergonomic. Mr.Ahrens has
a dobby loom where each peddle gives you a new shed.
Believe it or not - I still love my AVL loom. -
Margaret Copeland</HTML>

-----------------------4CA589B8945255F65154EEB3--

To reply privately, send message to Margaret Copeland <busys@cdsnet.net>
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To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Subject: Re: ps on db fs
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 12:52 PM 1/7/99 -0500, you wrote:

>instead a thin fringe and machine stitching up each side to hold it,
>Is there another method (I think you were
>describing it in this post) that creates a "normal" selvedge and/or do you have
>to use a separate shuttle for each width?

>To reply privately, send message to Pat Baker <baker@all-systems.com>

REPLY:

What you are seeing is not a machine stitching but is the two sets of three
end leno on the edge. There are generally two standard ends, usually
weaving plain, of the same yarn as the body of the scarf and one doup end
crossing every pick or sometimes every other pick made from a strong smooth
twisted filament yarn in each set.

In reeding a warp for multiple scarf widths, a space, about 1/2" - 3/4"
depending on projected shrinkage in finishing, is left in the reed between
each scarf width. The filling passes completely across all the scarf
widths. and when the goods are finished, the individual scarf widths are cut
apart between each of the leno sets so as to leave two sets on the edge of
each scarf.

For the fringe area between each scarf length, there would be a different
filling. We used a dissolveable vinyl yarn which maintained the fringe ends
in their parallel configuration, was able to tolerate the moderate heat of
wet finishing (around 30 - 35 degrees C) but was removed by the application
of water at something less than twice that before the widths were separated.
Once the widths were separated, the lengths were cut in the center of the
fringe area unless a rolled fringe was required. In that case, the fringe
was rolled as soon as the vinyl was removed.

In this way, the scarves were actually treated as piece goods until they
were separated individually. While this sounds complex, in reality it is
quite easy and commonly done where the number of scarves, whether woven on a
handloom or power, would make this method appropriate.

AAF

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562
E-mail: <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Web: 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 Jan  7 17:26:17 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA04355; Thu, 7 Jan 1999
Margaret Copeland wrote:

> In addition to my frustrations with the above, I've never understood
> *why* each peddle motion on the AVL can't get you a new shed. This could
> be accomplished with a cam. With the dobbay chain, one peddle lifts all of
> the weight, one peddle only advances the chain. I've gotten terrible hip
> problems from extended weaving sessions - the motion is unbalanced for the
> body. With a compudobby where there is absolutely no mechanical reason to
> move the chain, there really is no excuse for this design. Weaving would
> be much faster and more ergonomic. Mr. Ahrens has a dobby loom where each
> peddle gives you a new shed.

> Believe it or not - I still love my AVL loom. - Margaret Copeland

I agree with you entirely and for some of the same reasons. I have some
nerve damage in my right leg and find lifting all the shafts with this leg
soon causes me problems. One motion be shed would be ideal, sharing the
weight on each leg. I'd even be happy if there were a way to switch the
right and left pedals as my left leg as no problems and is stronger. (This
is not something I noticed on test-driving an AVL as I did not weave on it
for the length of time I required to cause me problems). I too still love
my AVL, it is the best loom for me that I have found so far.

Sara
WeaveTech Archive 9901

Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Sara and others,

I have heard that it is possible to reverse the functions of the left and right treadles on the AVL Compudobby. Have you asked AVL about doing this?
Tom is this so?

One AVL owner has commented that her right calf muscles are much stronger and larger than her left ones due to weaving on her Compudobby.

Janet (who has blocks on her treadles)

Janet Stollnitz         jstoll@cpcug.org
Silver Spring, MD

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

I changed my fly shuttle pull from AVL's up and down action which is standard on their multiple box fly shuttles, to a side to side pull which was more comfortable for me to use. (I have now had *two* whiplash injuries, and the up and down movement was too much stress on my neck - the side to side movement transfered the work more to my shoulder).

Doug did write this up for Complex Weavers. It is listed in the Index, and if I could find the issue I would be happy to photocopy and send to anyone interested.

Laura Fry
I could be wrong but I'm pretty sure it isn't all that difficult to switch the treadles around on an AVL. I'd contact them and check if it is possible. Seems to me I've heard on someone doing this. Someone on this list?

Darlene Mulholland
darmul@netbistro.com
http://www.pgmoneysaver.bc.ca/weaving/
>Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu> wrote:
>  We generally wove from three to five scarf width
>at a time on either our handlooms for samples or on power for production
>using two sets of doup ends at the edge of each scarf width including the
>two outside ones. Nearly all scarves on the market are made this way and the
doup edge we used has never been a durability problem.

Allen, for some of who are not so well informed, will you please give us
more details on what you mean by "two sets of doup ends at the edge of
each scarf width ". It sounds like something I might like to try if I knew
what iyou were talking about.

Dick Lindell, Weaver
Check out Dick's Die-Cut cards at<http://www.angelfire.com/il/dickshome>
-----
One who elevates their profession iz the best mechanic, whether preaching
the gospel, peddling phisic, or skinning eels for a living.
   - Josh Billings

To reply privately, send message to Dick Lindell <hataori@writeme.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Jan  7 18:55:19 1999
Received: (salmon=localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA27695; Thu, 7 Jan 1999
18:55:19 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo14.mx.aol.com (imo14.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.4]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id SAA27690; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 18:55:18 -0700 (MST)
From: AmyFibre@aol.com
Received: from AmyFibre@aol.com
   by imo14.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id EDQEa05501
   for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 20:54:42 +1900 (EST)
Message-ID: <8fd6b067.36956562@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 7 Jan 1999 20:54:42 EST
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: ADMIN reminders
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 226
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

A couple of reminders to keep the list running smoothly:

1 - if you must quote a prior message (and often it is not necessary at all),
please keep it extremely brief (1-2 sentences maximum). Not only is this
critical for those people who pay by the length of time their messages
download, but it is simply good e-mail etiquette in general. It may be easier
depending on your program) to use cut and paste instead of the "Reply"
function.

2 - if you are writing to me for help with a majordomo-related problem, it is
easiest for me to diagnose the problem if you will try sending your message to
majordomo one more time and this time, copy me in on the message you send to
majordomo, and then forward majordomo's reply. By seeing exactly what you put
in the original message, and the error message generated by majordomo, I can
often see the problem more quickly.

Thanks for your attention, and now, back to our good discussions.

Amy
amyfibre@aol.com

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

Laura,
Wow. I am interested. The pull action is difficult and tiring. Thanks.

Catherine Markey
2109 Gilrix St.
Petaluma, CA 94954

To reply privately, send message to Catherine Markey <markeyali@earthlink.net>

Laura,
Wow. I am interested. The pull action is difficult and tiring. Thanks.
Hi

I did some mug rugs 3 wide to finish up a warp and it was a bit of a pain - too many shuttles to juggle as I had more than one per "rug". I decided that it would be much easier to simply have a longer warp. I think that's what I would do with the scarves - a longer narrower warp would be less time consuming to put on than a short wide one for me.

> I've seen beautiful wool scarves from Scotland with no side selvedge, but > instead a thin fringe and machine stitching up each side to hold it, so I > thought that would be the way to go.

I wonder what was done about the outside edges - would there be scarves with a selvedge on one side and the fringe on the other? Or hemmed on one side? Or would you have just a small width of warp on the outsides to allow a fringe on all the scarves? Interesting!

Darby

> s there another method (I think you were > describing it in this post) that creates a "normal" selvedge and/or do you have > to use a separate shuttle for each width? This seems like it would take a great > deal of time in the weaving, even though the warping would only have to be done > once.

To reply privately, send message to M&D <mdgoode@ns.sympatico.ca>
felt it; the piece that travels along the metal robs moved easily enough.

I've been waxing the bottom of my shuttles and shuttle race with a snow-seal wax to waterproof boots - it contains silicones. This wax works well for this purpose and seems to last better than floor wax. Tonight I decided to use to on the metal bar as well thinking I can't make matters worse and it REALLY makes the shuttle fly! Way less effort than before. I rubbed it on then let it sit a few minutes and really polished it up to get any extra off.

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

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

It is possible to disable the left treadle, using only the right one, which can then be used with either (or alternating) leg. Rabbit Goody made this conversion on Sandy Lommen's loom and she loves it. It involves attaching a spring to the right treadle that will apply enough force to reseat the dobby arm and cables at the end of each treadling. I tried it briefly and decided that I'd rather use two treadles than lift against the spring, even though it wasn't real strong. I can get more information from Sandy for anyone who is interested.

Martha

To reply privately, send message to "Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard" <hubbard182@worldnet.att.net>
If you are weaving with a fine enough weight of cotton/silk etc., (which doesn't full and stabilize as much as wool or some other hair fibres) it is possible to hem along the length.

I would think that your fabric would have to be quite drapable so that the hem would not be stiff on the edge.

I have woven wide widths and cut on the bias, then top-stitched (two rows, one on each edge of the hem) and had no problems with this. Makes weaving wide and producing narrow a possibility.

_______
Very rough ASCII rendition - the angles are 45 degrees - if you catch my drift....

I still have a scarf woven by AAF's weavers - wool and cashmere - no problem with the "fringed" sides ravelling. I bought it in 1986 and have used it fairly regularly since.

Laura Fry

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

<< Tonight I decided to use to on the metal bar as well thinking I can't make matters worse and it REALLY makes the shuttle fly! >>

This sounds great!!! I constantly clean off the rods with alcohol and it's a pain, but it's worked. Just to make sure- you put the wax on the rod that the picker (I think it's called) slides on as it hits the shuttle? Now, since I'm not a skier, tell me what kind to get.

Thanks for taking the chance.

Janice

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

> I've had a problem [to me anyway] since I've gone from a two box to a four box fly shuttle on my AVL. It seems the four box needs WAY more energy to get the shuttle across. I've tried quite a few things but have never really felt it the piece that travels along the metal robs moved easily enough.

I've experienced this problem as well and, until recently, thought I was the only one. My friend Sandy, tells me that she's a great deal stronger now that she uses a 4-box rather than her old 2-box fly shuttle.

I've used Slick 50 and recently silicone spray on the metal bars with varying success. After a while the Slick 50 builds up and creates even more friction. So I cleaned that off very carefully with mineral spirits and started using silicone. It works very well for the first half hour,
but must then be reapplied. Thanks for the tip on the wax. It sounds like the best solution. I'll try it. Did you use furniture or floor wax or plain old paraffin?

The other thing that I think contributes to this is the pulley action. Some of mine seem quite lethargic while others spin freely. I wonder if their ball bearings get gunked up with lint and dirt after a time and if there's a reasonable solution?

Martha

To reply privately, send message to "Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard" <hubbard182@worldnet.att.net>

> I agree with you entirely and for some of the same reasons. I have some nerve damage in my right leg and find lifting all the shafts with this leg soon causes me problems. One motion be shed would be ideal, sharing the weight on each leg. I'd even be happy if there were a way to switch the right and left pedals as my left leg as no problems and is stronger. (This is not something I noticed on test-driving an AVL as I did not weave on it for the length of time I required to cause me problems). I too still love my AVL, it is the best loom for me that I have found so far.

> Sara

Maybe Laura Fry will jump in here. Laura, do you remember the jack plan that Doug drew up for me so one could get the double peddle action? For other AVL owners, I have no idea where one would mount this modification. Anyway... I believe it would be possible to get a shed and advance the chain on the mechanical dobby with one peddle. Switching peddles but keeping the same design only makes one leg do all of the major work - now it would be the other leg. Any one-sided action - leg, arm etc. for the body isn't a great idea. Using the AVL as it is now is like peddling a bike with one leg - you can do it - but why?

- Margaret Copeland

http://home.cdsnet.net/~busys

To reply privately, send message to Margaret Copeland <busys@cdsnet.net>
WeaveTech Archive 9901

Sorry for being so quiet in the corner... But can any one tell me when the VAV days will be held in 1999, and their location?

Eliz Tritthart

To reply privately, send message to "Elizabeth tritthart" <Etritthart@wyellowstone.com>
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make much difference.

Let's hope this continues to work. I don't mind if I have to reapply it fairly often as long as it does the job.

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

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

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Jan  8 09:23:32 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA06860; Fri, 8 Jan 1999 09:23:32 -0700 (MST)
Received: from maild.telia.com (root@maild.telia.com [194.22.190.3]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA06852; Fri, 8 Jan 1999 09:23:28 -0700 (MST)
Received: from d1o63.telia.com (root@d1o63.telia.com [195.198.44.241])
by maild.telia.com (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id RAA19130
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 8 Jan 1999 17:23:28 +0100 (CET)
Received: from ixsvzykp (t1o63p9.telia.com [195.198.44.9])
by d1o63.telia.com (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id RAA19815
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 8 Jan 1999 17:23:27 +0100 (MET)
Message-Id: <199901081623.RAA19815@d1o63.telia.com>
From: "Nilsson, Lovisa" <lovisa@tanum.mail.telia.com>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: SV: Re:when are VAV days in 1999?
Date: Fri, 8 Jan 1999 17:24:47 +0100
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1161
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

> But can any one tell me when the VAV days will be held in 1999, and their location?
Are you talking about the VAV 99 in Sweden?
It will be held in Malmo in the south of Sweden 24-26 September 1999. The programme will be out in mid February.

Lovisa in Sweden

To reply privately, send message to "Nilsson, Lovisa" <lovisa@tanum.mail.telia.com>
Hi Margaret and Sarah:

Why not speak to AVL and get them to send the cables to switch the function of the two treadles. That way you would be able to use the other leg for the heavy lift.

I was contemplating that until I realized that it was my back that was acting up and I ordered the Air Assist. Esp useful now that I have 24 shafts. As soon as I get over this bout of back surgery, the air assist is being installed. Oh yeah, need to have enough money to buy the compressor too. Will let you know when that is done and how I far.

Ingrid Boesel
the weaving half of Fiberworks PCW

---

*If* (a very big "if"--and I don't [yet?] own an AVL) an AVL compudobby could be controlled by just one treadle, perhaps the design should look like the Schacht single-treadle spinning wheel--one wide treadle on which both feet can rest. Tom? Are you listening in on this discussion? These are your customers (and potential customers) speaking.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia USA

---

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Just a couple of thoughts on my experience with the "flying" shuttle on the AVL. ...that is flying out of the warp! I've gone through a window with chenille stinging out two stories down the side of our house. It can certainly wake you up!!!

#1..Make sure that the floor of the shuttle box and the shuttle race are level....

#2. I have used my AVL so much that that backstop had worn a significant hole in it from the metal on the front of the shuttle as it flew back and forth. I had my DH take the backstop off and cut it down level with some sort of saw in his shop....no hole! I think that when I sent the shuttle across, it was hitting the hole at an angle and launching it out into the stratosphere...

Anyway it helped. I have done lots of two shuttle work, and I am going to try and see if I can work out the learning curve on three shuttles. Love how this group keeps stretching my mind.

Georgia of New Mexico
The fly shuttle pull on the AVL can be changed from center pull to throw by contacting AVL and they have the parts and instructions to change it. I have them, just haven't sat down and done it yet. The last few projects were too narrow to bother with the fly shuttle, but I have a bigger one coming up so maybe it will be inspiration to get at it.

Georgean Curran

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

I have a 16h, 40" wide AVL and I switched the pedals without any problem. Just leave the cables attached and swap the peddles at the pivot point. I recently got the new 24h Studio Dobby and ordered it with switched pedals. They had never heard of anyone wanting this, but they figured it out and shipped the loom with the pedals switched. I made sure they also sent the original cables so if I ever sell the loom, I can reconfigure it. True, it still only exercises one leg, but since my left is stronger than my right, this arrangement is fine for me.

Steve
>They had never heard of anyone wanting this, but they figured it out and
>shipped the loom with the pedals switched.

While this is their standard answer, it is my only complaint when dealing
with AVL. Small, I know, but I would prefer a different response. It is
just like those companies that call me with a 'courtesy call.' Not
believable. <gg>

Jim Ahrens has done a prototype dobby head with two arms and each treadle
lifts a new shed. He did it a few years ago. Looks nice, works great. He
only uses a mechanical dobby loom, he has never used a computer. He is
always fun to visit and still tinkering. And his favorite fly shuttles are
very light weight, he does not like the heavy ones at all and never uses
them.

Production always lags research and development. And lots of great ideas
never make it into production. But I do love my loom, and having Jim nearby
has helped me to understand how it works and how to tinker with it. It is
made of wood and the weather is not constant inside my home and sometimes a
paper shim or a little bolt adjustment is needed.

Judie

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Jan  9 10:08:48 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA09584; Sat, 9 Jan 1999
10:08:48 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.jjj.net (postmaster@smtp.jjj.net [209.235.31.137]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA09568; Sat, 9 Jan 1999 10:08:47 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cc429928-a.hwrd1.md.home.com (cc429928-a.hwrd1.md.home.com [24.3.63.99])
by smtp.jjj.net (8.9.1/8.9.0) with SMTP id MAA10796
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 9 Jan 1999 12:07:40 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.16.19990109120756.2147afec@smtp.jjj.com>
X-Sender: wheat@smtp.jjj.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (16)
Date: Sat, 09 Jan 1999 12:07:56 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Although many of you may already know about this, while searching for something else today, stumbled on

http://www.itt.edu/

This is the domain/site for the Institute of Textile Technology in Charlottesville Virginia USA.

It includes the ENTIRE Card Catalog for their Roger Milliken Textile Library and apparently pretty nearly the entire catalog is available thru inter-library loan for a small fee.

They also seem to offer a host of research assistance.

Hope this is helpful to someone

- Wheat Carr mailto:wheat@craftwolf.com
  http://www.craftwolf.com/

To reply privately, send message to Wheat Carr <wheat@craftwolf.com>
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much. I use only Johnson's paste wax, in the flat, round, yellow can. Wonderful stuff! Steel rods or tracks will oxidize, sometimes a lot, depending on the climate, etc. I have this problem in CA, and often clean up with fine steel wool (last resort, leaves tiny steel bits around) or coarse cloth and elbow grease. - Bill Koepp in CA

To reply privately, send message to "Bill Koepp" <bgkoe@netxn.com>

Ingrid, I hope the air assist works as well for you as it has for me. My neck is much better. :)

I'd forgotten about Doug playing around with the treadle action - I'll ask him if he still has the paperwork.

One of the big drawbacks to dobbies (to me) seems to be that when you get all this mechanical assistance attached to your loom the work becomes very unbalanced. One leg lifting all that weight, one arm beating, the other throwing the shuttle. If you are only doing this for short periods of time, it doesn't make too much difference, but when you are weaving for 5+ hours a day, 60 picks per minutes, the repetition of motion becomes injurious.

Nell Znamerowski stayed with me for a week while teaching here, and when I mentioned that I had 8 am appointments at physio, she said, Oh, your back!? All weavers have bad backs......

Our equipment should be as efficient as possible - which is why I made so many little
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adjustments to my loom. But if I am to continue
weaving and earning an income, the air
assist became mandatory.

Laura Fry
whose neck hates her this morning :(  

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Sun Jan 10 06:20:31 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA23730; Sun, 10 Jan 1999
06:20:31 -0700 (MST)
Received: from europe.std.com (europe.std.com [199.172.62.20]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id GAA23725; Sun, 10 Jan 1999 06:20:30 -0700 (MST)
Received: from world.std.com by europe.std.com (8.7.6/BZ5-8-1.0)
id IAA26132; Sun, 10 Jan 1999 08:20:32 -0500 (EST)
Received: from world.std.com by world.std.com (TheWorld/Spike-2.0)
id AA04857; Sun, 10 Jan 1999 08:20:30 -0500
Message-Id: <3698A925.8CFBDE77@world.std.com>
Date: Sun, 10 Jan 1999 08:20:37 -0500
From: Tom Vogl <tpv@world.std.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
Mime-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: Flying shuttles
References: <199901101100.EAA08460@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

"Bill Koepp" <bgkoe@netxn.com> wrote:

" ... Steel rods or tracks will oxidize, sometimes a lot,
depending on the climate, etc. I have this problem in CA, and often
clean up with fine steel wool (last resort, leaves tiny steel bits
around) or coarse cloth and elbow grease."

Instead of steel wool (which does as Bill says) or coarse cloth, let me
recommend the green nylon pot scrubbing pads that are formally known as
"medium duty scouring pads". They work beautifully for me, do not
scratch steel, but do remove all gunk and oxidation (even rust), and
rinse clean. They are available in most hardware and kitchen supply
stores and many supermarkets.

I do wish heddle support rods and other loom ironmongery came in
stainless steel for those of us who live in humid climates.

Cheers,

Tom.

Tom Vogl                             Voice: 508-693.6065
29 Scotchman's Lane                 Fax: 508-696.0625
West Tisbury, MA 02575              tpv@world.std.com

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Sun Jan 10 11:49:49 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA16609; Sun, 10 Jan 1999

- 82 -
Has anyone had the problem of weaving chenille (warp and weft) and it doesn't advance properly on the AVL? I assume it's the grit that isn't deep enough (to catch the yarn and not just its pile) to carry it around the beam. I heard that AVL has a sleeve that goes over the beam for chenille. Does anyone have one or have any solutions to the problem? The beam is quite new so it's not worn.

Thanks for any suggestions.

Janice Jones

To reply privately, send message to JNBJ@aol.com
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(yes! I am still alive... yes I am still weaving.)
Current project has been to try to assemble the 100 shaft drawloom of my dreams. Boy will I have some stories to share. (You'll be giggling over the coffee on this one.)

I am starting to use the Schact 8 shaft as a sample loom to try new techniques, and the AVL as production loom (I have completed two new 24 shaft baby blanket designs this fall - without the use of the flyshuttle) And the drawloom is to see if I can really weave without the use of a computer. It is a very interesting experience, let me tell you. I have great respect for all who learned to weave and draft without the computer.

Best of Weaving to all.
Eliz

To reply privately, send message to "Elizabeth tritthart" <Etritthart@wyellowstone.com>

---

Chenille does want more than your sandpaper beam to grab onto but since you don't have the metal beam cover you could improvise. I'd think you could cover the beam with that rubbery stuff to keep things from shifting in motor homes. If you wound it really, really, tight on the beam then woven with as little tension as possible I think it might work. I used a mixed warp and chenille weft without the beam cover and by loosening the tension got the warp to advance.

If that didn't work how about the burr side of Velcro? I haven't tried either idea - just threw them out for what they are worth. Whatever you put on the beam it will have to be very tight or it will just spin and nothing will advance.

Good luck!

Darlene Mulholland
By diversified weaves does E. Tritthart mean damask-like patterning using a variety of structures?

Perhaps the following publications will yield inspiration - most available through CW library:

Watson, W. Textile Design and Colour.

Perhaps others can add to this list.

Betty Lou Whaley
Does anyone know of a reference that would help me design a small, table-top loom for weaving a velvet band with patterning in two colors, each cut at a different height?

Even a good reference on weaving velvet would help.

Betty Lou Whaley
This is a common problem with rayon chenille. AVL does have such a product, called SoftGrip. It cost me $68 plus shipping for my 48" beam. It does indeed work very well in gripping chenille. When I ordered it at Convergence, Tom cautioned me that it would not be kind to my 36epi silk warps, so I do remove it when I'm not working with chenille. That's an easy matter, since it is wound on and held in place with masking tape.

Martha

To reply privately, send message to "Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard"
<hubbard182@worldnet.att.net>

There's several good articles on velvet in the very early Weavers (#8, 9, 18). The one in #9 on Barbara Setsu Pickett shows equipment.

Laurie Autio

To reply privately, send message to Autio <autio@pssci.umass.edu>

There's several good articles on velvet in the very early Weavers (#8, 9, 18). The one in #9 on Barbara Setsu Pickett shows equipment.

Laurie Autio
After reading about the advancing problems on the AVL, and having some of the same, I read about the beam cover the company came out with to help, especially with mohair and the like. The description sounded vaguely familiar, a cover made of nonskid rubberized material made to fit the beam and be taped in place. So... I made a trek to the dreaded "*!*&%!Mart" and grabbed a roll of Rubbermaid's nonskid drawer liner from the shelf next to the other drawer liners. That roll was 5 feet in length and, I believe, 15" wide. It turns out that the circumference of that front beam is almost exactly 15." You can cut it to fit the length of the beam. (fits perfect, as is, on the 60") It works great on mohair and mixed warps.

Lorelei

To reply privately, send message to Lorele3773@aol.com

TO ALL:

A number of people have asked me to explain further the matter of weaving multiple scarf widths on a wide warp.

The dissolveable vinyl yarn to which I referred is woven as FILLING between each scarf LENGTH as a means of maintaining the warp ends which form the fringe in a parallel orientation until wet finishing is completed.

The terms "...doup..." and "...leno..." refer to a common weave structure in which pairs, triplets or occasionally more, of warp ends are woven such that one end in each group is lifted alternately on the left and then on the right on each pick causing a crossing between it and the remaining end(s) in the group which usually weave 1/1 plain. This can be viewed in diagram form in Watson's "Advanced Textile Design & Colour" as well as other references which are not at my desk presently but which I will post as soon as I retrieve them.

The nature of the leno structure causes it to be very slip resistant in both warp and filling direction yet be very open at the same time. So much so that it is the standard selvage treatment for those shuttleless loom fabrics which do not have a tucked selvage. When used in weaving multiple widths on a wider warp, the edge of each width is held in place by one or more sets of warp ends weaving leno. A space is left in the reeding between the last
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set for one width and the first set of the next width which forms the cut line.

My apologies for the difficulty in trying to explain this in words without being able to show it. This is instance wherein if we were all gathered in one place for real I would be more easily able to help everyone understand. Perhaps if one were to pick out the edge of a mill woven scarf or a shuttleless loom fabric, the leno structure may be better understood.

If this doesn't help, I'll try until something does.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562
E-mail: <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Web: 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 Jan 11 08:17:31 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA19855; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 08:17:31 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail-01.cdsnet.net (mail-01.cdsnet.net [206.107.16.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA19839; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 08:17:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 294 invoked from network); 11 Jan 1999 15:17:31 -0000
Received: from d01a80b8.dip.cdsnet.net (HELO cdsnet.net) (208.26.128.184) by mail.cdsnet.net with SMTP; 11 Jan 1999 15:17:31 -0000
Message-ID: <369A16DD.43009C1@cdsnet.net>
Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1999 07:21:02 -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 not advancing
References: <1999011111100.EAA04698@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: Sun, 10 Jan 1999 13:48:58 EST
> From: JNB@aol.com
> Subject: chenille not advancing
>
> Has anyone had the problem of weaving chenille (warp and weft) and it doesn't advance properly on the AVL? I assume it's the grit that isn't deep enough (to catch the yarn and not just its pile) to carry it around the beam. I heard that AVL has a sleeve that goes over the beam for chenille. Does anyone have one or have any solutions to the problem? The beam is quite new so it's not worn.

This is an interesting problem of which I have no easy solution. AVL does make a special rubberized beam covering that is supposed to grab the chenille. Let me say, I don't have this covering on my beam and I haven't tried it. On my 40" AVL, I have the heavy sandpaper cloth. Rayon chenille warp will not hold for more than a few yards. You defeat
the purpose of having the elastic tensioning/automatic takeup if you take up directly on the first beam. Even then the woven cloth is so slick it might spin around. The real industrial fix for this (I have been told) is something that looks like cheese grater material. Just don't rest your arms on it! Now what is so peculiar about this problem is that larger AVL looms can often weave the rayon chenille. The advancing beam on those AVLs is larger in diameter. My theory is that they have a larger surface area to grab the woven cloth. I can weave a 1/1 chenille/cotton cloth but not 100% rayon chenille. I can weave *cotton* chenille. I've woven lots of 100% rayon yarn. Rayon chenille is weird stuff!

- Margaret Copeland

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Mon Jan 11 08:32:56 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA23551; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 08:32:56 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA23542; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 08:32:55 -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 KAA22525 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 10:32:59 -0500 (EST)
Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1999 10:32:59 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199901111532.KAA22525@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: FLY SHUTTLE MOTION (long)
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net
Precedence: bulk

TO ALL:

If I may, I would like to add to the discussion on the use and adjustment of the handloom fly shuttle, AVL or otherwise.

While not seem by some as relevant to the handloom venue, the issue of energy is as much a factor on powerloom use as in handloom use since it would be best to obtain the most work for the least energy. When our powerloom picking motions were not properly lubricated and adjusted, they consumed too much energy. This we demonstrated at one point by measuring the amperage peaks at each pick and noted quite clearly higher readings when the system was in need of cleaning and lubricating and adjusting.

First adjustment, this being the more complex. Contrary to what may be assumed, not all parts in the fly shuttle system are supposed to be straight and square.

1. The reed itself must b

ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
TO ALL:

If I may, I would like to add to the discussion on the use and adjustment of the handloom fly shuttle, AVL or otherwise.

While not seen by some as relevant to the handloom venue, the issue of energy is as much a factor on powerloom use as in handloom use since it would be best to obtain the most work for the least energy. When our powerloom picking motions were not properly lubricated and adjusted, they consumed too much energy. This we demonstrated at one point by measuring the amperage peaks at each pick and noted quite clearly higher readings when the system was in need of cleaning and lubricating and adjusting.

First adjustment, this being the more complex. Contrary to what may be assumed, not all parts in the fly shuttle system are supposed to be straight and square.

1. The reed itself must be perfectly straight with no bends or kinks. It is set up vertically square with the race place. However, when in place in the lay, the reed is not straight from end to end. Instead, by virtue of a very slight, adjustable curve in the lay beam reed slot, the reed describes a bow towards the shafts. A straight edge placed flat on the race place should touch the reed at each end but have a space of about 1/8" measured in the center of the reed. This bow causes the backside of the shuttle to remain firmly against the reed during flight yet will not produce bowed filling.

2. The ends of the race plate must be at the same level as or slightly lower than the inside end of each shuttle box floor but never higher since higher will certainly be one of the major causes for out of control shuttles. However, the outside end of each shuttle box floor must be approximately 1/16" - 1/8" higher than the inside. This causes the shuttle to be pitched slightly downward at the start of each pick.

3. The inside end of the back wall of the shuttle box must be perfectly in
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line with the end of the reed in all aspects whereas the outside end of the shuttle box back wall must be about 1/8" forward of the inside end. This causes the shuttle to be thrown towards the reed on each pick rather than tending to fly out of control.

The picker spindle does truely become what in my less civilised moments I call a crap magnet!! However, there is a fair amount of heat generated by the sliding friction of the picker on the spindle and wax is not a good lubricant since it is not meant as a lubricant in the first place because it has no viscosity stability. Grease makes things more attractive to fly waste. On some of our powerlooms, the picker spindle was hollow and had a felt strip in a slot milled the entire length of the spindle through which lubricant from an oil cup on the end of the spindle could flow. For those spindles which were solid, we use a clear, stainless oil which had a very low viscosity, on the order of less than 5. While this had to be replenished periodically, it did not become gummy and retard the picker sliding on the spindle.

This all may seem complex and unnecessary for a handloom, but in fact whenever I have so adjusted any handloom fly shuttle, out of control shuttles are never a problem and the energy required to make each pick is greatly reduced.

Sorry for the long tale, but shorter just wouldn't work.

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

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

> The terms "...doup..." and "...leno..." refer to a common weave structure in
> which pairs, triplets or occasionally more, of warp ends are woven such that
> one end in each group is lifted alternately on the left and then on the
> right on each pick causing a crossing between it and the remaining end(s) in
> the group which usually weave 1/1 plain.

OK, I follow so far. This is where I get bogged down, not so much as to *what*
weaving doup/leno is, but *how* it is accomplished on *our* looms, without some
sort of manual intervention thereby for sure reducing smoothness and speed. I
cannot picture the shafts lifting in such a way as to create the crossover leno
implies--help!

> My apologies for the difficulty in trying to explain this in words without
> being able to show it.

Accepted but not needed. Your explanations are excellent, but this particular
discussion is definitely headed toward the showing!

Margaret

-----------------------------------------
MargeCoe@concentric.net
Tucson, AZ, USA

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

Hi Eliz:

I have used a 4 block profile designed for Overshot. It works great in DPW. It was 50
threading blocks, mirrored and then lift plan with weave as drawn in. We eventually used
this profile as the motif on the Fiberworks T shirts. Then I wove 2 couch throws.

The DPW was woven with rust coloured cotton chenille as pattern ends and very fine pale
grey silk tiedown ends. I wove two of these throws. One with grey cotton chenille as
pattern weft and burgundy silk weft tiedowns. The other was with salmon cotton chenille and purple silk tiedowns.

The colour of the weft tiedowns made a difference, even though the silk was about 1/120's.

I finished these throws with a rolled hem in ultra suede trim and mitered corners on all 4 sides.

The pattern is completely reversible and very dramatic.

Ingrid

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

When You Are Warped, What's Weft

<italic> Ingrid Boesel, the weaving half of Fiberworks PCW

Visit us at: http://www3.sympatico.ca/fiberworks.pcw

To reply privately, send message to Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Mon Jan 11 09:21:26 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA05815; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 09:21:26 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp11.bellglobal.com (smtp11.bellglobal.com [204.101.251.53]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA05798; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 09:21:24 -0700 (MST)
Received: from default (ppp822.on.bellglobal.com [206.172.239.54]) by smtp11.bellglobal.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id LAA25540 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 11:22:48 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.32.19990111112244.0069a760@pop1.sympatico.ca>
X-Sender: b1zzam44@pop1.sympatico.ca
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1999 11:24:03 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>
Subject: velvet
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="us-ascii"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi Betty Lou:

I have a reprint of a book from NC textile College that has about 100 pages on cut fabrics. It is very industrially inclined but the structures used are interesting

E.B. Berry. Textile Designing, Pure and Applied, section D. School of Textiles, University of North Carolina, Ed2 1964. The entire D section is on pile fabrics, about 150 pages (hard to tell because each section and chapter is separately numbered)

The other reference is S.A. Zielinski Master Weaver, Vol 14, Pile weaves, Rugs and Tapestries.
Jan Paul in WA does velvets and probably has a good list of references. She is a member of CW and if you have the directory, you can contact her through that. I don't want to give out her address or phone number without her permission.

I have done a few velvet pieces on my AVL (without special beam). These were all uncut velvet, mostly because I could not figure out a system that would allow me to cut accurately.

I used two warp beams one for ground and one for velvet ends. I did the first piece in 2/24 cotton and it worked well. The second piece was silk and about 15" wide. It was fabulous and I loved it but it was much harder to weave.

The cotton piece was about 10" wide so I used knitting needles (3 mm) as the rods and did not cut them. But the pattern was loom controlled so it was technically uncut voided velvet (I think)

To make sure that the tension was good on all ends with the differing takeup, I weighted each 8 end block with a shower curtain hook and a single 2" washer. There was no tension on the second velvet warp beam other than the inherent friction of an unbraked beam.

I had to use 9 needles before removing the first one, in order that the previous loops did not pull out.

The silk piece (not samples?? crazy eh) used 2.5 mm wires that I scrounged from a friend who worked in a steel manufacturing plant. (got 4 mm ones as well) They were 1" wider than the piece. Here I needed 12 before I could remove the first one.

I found that the wires had to really, really smooth for the uncut velvet, because you pull it out.

You can use a type of strapping wire tape. (flat and thin and flexible and not too broad). If you insert two of them in each shed, you can then cut the pile between the two straps. A friend who did some cut pile used these metal straps that was 1/2 inch wide. This gave 1/2 pile. Long, more like a pile rug than velvet fabric. I think the straps would have to be less than 1/4 inch to give a velvety appearance.

This stuff is not expensive esp if you can rescue it from crates.

Ingrid

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

When You Are Warped, What's Weft

<italic> Ingrid Boesel, the weaving half of Fiberworks PCW
</italic>

Visit us at:  http://www3.sympatico.ca/fiberworks.pcw
At 09:12 AM 1/11/99 -0700, you wrote:

> OK, I follow so far. This is where I get bogged down, not so much as to *what*
> weaving doup/leno is, but *how* it is accomplished on *our* looms,

> MargeCoe@concentric.net
> Tucson, AZ, USA

REPLY:

Leno edges of any kind usually require dedicated shafts separate from those weaving the body of the goods. These shafts have special heddles called doup heddles which cause the one crossing or "doup" end to raise alternately on the left and then right of the "standard" or plain weaving ends. None of this requires any manual intervention and weaves right along with the main body of the goods.

Doup heddles can be installed on any shafts, handloom or otherwise so there is no difference in accomplishing this regardless of the loom. If there is one crossing end and two plain ends in the set, four shafts will be required, two for the doup heddles and two for the plain ends.

At the risk of citing my own HWT book again, this is discussed and illustrated at pp. 107 - 110. However, these illustrations are for the most basic one doup, one standard end type of leno, not always secure enough for seges, but operates on the same principle as the set-up using one doup and two plain weaving ends.

As soon as I retrieve the books with additional reference to leno weaving, I will post the citations.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Mon Jan 11 10:13:33 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA19827; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 10:13:33 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp1.erols.com (smtp1.erols.com [207.172.3.234]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA19817; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 10:13:31 -0700 (MST)
Received: from LOCALNAME (207-172-111-189.s189.tnt1.ann.erols.com [207.172.111.189]) by smtp1.erols.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id MAA03726
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 12:13:27 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <369A5B0F.1A8C@erols.com>
Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1999 12:12:00 -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: MULTIPLE SCARF WIDTHS
References: <199901111637.LAA08578@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

I have a little different question than about how leno works, since I have woven leno and know how to make the doups, and so on (there have been articles about leno in Weavers and also in some older weaver texts and Weavers' Journals). Anyway, yes, the leno will hold the "edges" of the scarves in place, but my question is, once you cut the scarves apart, is one then obliged to sew the leno edges in some way to finish the seam?? I can't see how to avoid this. Perhaps the leno warps are so fine that the overall edge is very fine, and one can sew rolled "side hems" that hardly show, but I can't say that I've ever seen this.

Still confused -
Anne in Annandale
arwells@erols.com

Allen Fannin wrote:
> Leno edges of any kind usually require dedicated shafts separate from those > weaving the body of the goods.

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Mon Jan 11 10:17:53 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA20929; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 10:17:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo28.mx.aol.com (imo28.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.72]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA20924; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 10:17:51 -0700 (MST)
From: Srude@aol.com
Received: from Srude@aol.com (IMOv18.1) id 8EDEPa23173
for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 12:17:12 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <b587d6b2.369a3218@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1999 12:17:12 EST
To: weavetech@list-server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: chenille not advancing
Janice --
You're right, the standard sandpaper beam doesn't "grab" chenille. AVL makes a
textured rubber cover for the sandpaper beam that is specifically designed for
weaving chenille. It's easy to put on, and to be honest, once I put it on,
I've never taken it off, even for non-chenille warps. (I was always getting my
elbows and forearms abraded on the sandpaper.) The folks at AVL said the
textured rubber cover might not work well with very fine threads, but I
haven't had any trouble, and I've gone up to 50 epi with some fine silk.
-- Sandra in San Jose
srude@aol.com

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Mon Jan 11 10:30:16 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id KAA24157; Mon, 11 Jan 1999
10:30:16 -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 MAA22152
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 12:30:20 -0500 (EST)
Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1999 12:30:20 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199901111730.MAA22152@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: MULTIPLE SCARF WIDTHS
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 12:12 PM 1/11/99 -0800, you wrote:
but my question is, once you cut the scarves
>apart, is one then obliged to sew the leno edges in some way to finish
>the seam??
>Anne in Annandale
>arwells@erols.com

REPLY:

It is not necessary to do anything to leno edges once they are cut. If the
edges are properly constructed nothing which would not damage the goods over
will cause them to come undone.

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

> These shafts have special heddles called
doup heddles

Thanks for the concise explanation of weaving doup leno.....would you have a
source for the special doup heddles???
I for one appreciate the references, whether to your book or others
(although I get frustrated when the info is in Watson's as I am not
privileged to own or have access to a copy!). It is helpful to have a place
to start!
Regards,
Su :-)
> The picker spindle does truly become what in my less civilised moments I
call a crap magnet!! However, there is a fair amount of heat generated by
> the sliding friction of the picker on the spindle and wax is not a good
> lubricant since it is not meant as a lubricant in the first place because it
> has no viscosity stability. Grease makes things more attractive to fly
> waste.

    I have *no* idea is this would be good for the picker and the spindle but I use this
assorted mechanical devices when grease and wax won't do. You can buy a tube of teflon
grease "Lube
Gel" (not the oil !) from Radio Shack for a big $3.00. Here is what the back of the tube
says,
"Superior adhesion: Stays where you put it", "Non-toxic and Non-corrosive", "Won't wash
off, disperse,
break down or turn racid", "Does not attract dust or other contaminants", "All tempera-
ture use -65 to
+ 650 degrees". Don't ask me what they use it for on electronic equipment but it cer-
tainly provides a
slick surface that "fly excrement" won't stick to.

    - Margaret Copeland

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

---

Hi:

It's not true that all weavers have bad backs.

The back problems come from the "bending over". Production weaving, as I
wrote about weeks ago, requires full leg maneuverability (sp?) which
automatically throws the shoulders back and allows the torso and arms to turn and swing as well.

Perhaps if you are throwing the shuttle by hand, keep the fell line as close as possible to avoid any unnecessary bending forward. Also, when you do bend forward, keep the neck straight by tucking the chin in rather than throwing it out. I also do this when driving for a long time. Don't slump, always keep the torso straight as possible. Like I said, this automatically happens when the chin is tucked. And most importantly, don't push it. Always take breaks when the slightest fatigue or pain is felt.

Go to another loom that uses different muscles.

Healthy weaving to all,

Yehudit

To reply privately, send message to "Yehudit Abrahams" <gabraham@netvision.net.il>

Allen, We used the metal doup leno heddles at the design studio I worked in, since our mill did quite a lot of leno fabrics. (The production manager loved that we could sell more "air" - due to the openness possible with leno.) We had them on a Macomber, however, and while one shed was good, the other shed was only half the height, and we were told that it was because of the "cobbled up" shaft arrangement we had to use. We had the front part of the frame on shaft 1, the back on shaft 2, then the end that went through the eye of the heddle went through a heddle on shaft 3, which wasn't tied up to anything. The end that went through the slot also went through a heddle on shaft 4, which also wasn't ever raised.

After I left there, they installed another gizmo (jury-rigged again) that would enable them to weave tabby with the ends that were threaded through the leno heddles.

Neither system was fun to weave on, due to the shallowness of one of the sheds. I've got a set of those heddles on 2 of my Macomber harness frames, but rarely use it.

I'm not sure pictures will help others "see" how this system works, even after I'd threaded and wove a couple of sample blankets using the doup leno heddles, it still seemed like magic, that the heddle can make the
end A come up on one side of B one time, and on the other the next. After weaving pick-up leno in production one season (what was I thinking??) I could literally feel my brain twisting to grasp what the secret was.

Should we have gotten your book, to see how to correctly hook up this system?

Bonni in Jersey City, NJ

To reply privately, send message to weevings@juno.com

Bonni -

I'm not sure it's this hard to weave leno. I tried "loom controlled" leno this summer, after previously doing lots of it using pick-up. (Very tedious!) I made the doups myself, and put the leno on shafts 1 and 2, which made attaching the doups not too hard. This setup is described in several places (not to repeat myself, sorry!) including recent WEAVERS magazines. I tied about 100 doups and attached them and threaded them in an evening.

The way I attached the doups and threaded the rest of the warp allowed me a choice of weaving plain weave *or* leno with those threads. I don't know if the industrial, premade doup heddles allow the same flexibility.

Because you are twisting one thread around another, in the leno shed, it's very hard to get as big a shed as usual. When using a pick-up stick to work leno, you can feel the pressure of those threads! So whether industrial or home, I suspect that one must plan on that smaller shed when weaving leno. The other sheds, BTW, are just fine. And the shed while weaving plain weave in the leno areas also is just fine.

Anne in Annandale

arwells@erols.com

To reply privately, send message to Anne Wells <arwells@erols.com>
Hi, I'm Susan Smith, a production weaver who used to weave on an AVL PDL but now has the AVL IDL. I have been following the scarf discussion with great interest as I refused to weave narrow scarf widths. Totally inefficient! I did not know about the douper leno but found my own solution in a serger which would handle a yarn to match the scarves. Now I weave the length I want for the scarves with a fringe filler at each end on my 60" warp. When off loom, I cut to the desired width and serge with sewing thread to secure the edges, then serge again with the matching thread. As long as the ends are finished properly, the edging is very stable. While this requires some additional steps, they are quick and I have the added benefit of being able to weave both yardage for jackets and scarves on the same warp.

Susan
private replies welcome

To reply privately, send message to Susan Smith <sufiber@erols.com>

From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 12 13:23:39 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA21253; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 13:23:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: from post.mail.demon.net (post-20.mail.demon.net [194.217.242.27]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA21247; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 13:23:38 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host post-20.mail.demon.net [194.217.242.27] claimed to be post.mail.demon.net
Received: from [194.222.59.249] (helo=plysplit.demon.co.uk) by post.mail.demon.net with smtp (Exim 2.10 #2)
  id 100ALn-0006gg-00
  for weavetech@List-Server.net; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 20:23:44 +0000
Message-ID: <zdHa2GAg66mZew3c@plysplit.demon.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1999 20:20:48 +0000
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Peter Collingwood <peter@plysplit.demon.co.uk>
Subject: internet articles
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Turnpike (32) Version 4.01 <2FSQ5RrSWjg+AhbEHiAwghBDxk>
WeaveTech Archive 9901

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

The magazine Textileforum, the excellent organ of ETN (European Textile Network), devoted many pages in its September 3/98 number to Textiles on the Internet; and this was followed by another article in the following issue, 4/98. Both gave good sites to visit. Though produced in Germany there is an English language edition. You can find out about this publication and the ETN organisation at http://www.ETN.net.org

Peter Collingwood
<peter@plysplit.demon.co.uk>

To reply privately, send message to Peter Collingwood <peter@plysplit.demon.co.uk>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Tue Jan 12 13:52:46 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA28315; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 13:52:46 -0700 (MST)
Received: from post.mail.demon.net (finch-post-10.mail.demon.net [194.217.242.38]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA28291; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 13:52:45 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host finch-post-10.mail.demon.net [194.217.242.38] claimed to be post.mail.demon.net
Received: from [194.222.59.249] (helo=plysplit.demon.co.uk) by post.mail.demon.net with smtp (Exim 2.10 #1)
   id 100Any-0005jx-00
   for weavetech@List-Server.net; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 20:52:51 +0000
Message-ID: <fsDB6LAzV7m2Ew88@plysplit.demon.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1999 20:49:55 +0000
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Peter Collingwood <peter@plysplit.demon.co.uk>
Subject: web wite for ETN
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Turnpike (32) Version 4.01 <2F$QSRrSWjg+AhbEHIAwghBDxk>
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Sorry, I got that web site address very slightly wrong for the European Textile Network.

It should be http://www.ETN-net.org

Peter Collingwood
<peter@plysplit.demon.co.uk>

To reply privately, send message to Peter Collingwood <peter@plysplit.demon.co.uk>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Tue Jan 12 14:22:48 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA06188; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 14:22:48 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp1.jps.net (smtp1.jps.net [209.63.224.236]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA06183; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 14:22:46 -0700 (MST)
Received: from fjvns (209-239-195-28.oak.jps.net [209.239.195.28])
   by smtp1.jps.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id NAA19330
   for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 13:22:50 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <000201be3e70$bce110bc0$1cc3efd1@fjvns>
WeaveTech Archive 9901

From: "Betty Lou Whaley" <enbwhaley@jps.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Subject: SPECK BOOK
Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1999 12:59:52 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
         boundary="-----=_NextPart_000_0006_01BE3E2B.71FEEEA80"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3155.0
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_0006_01BE3E2B.71FEEEA80
Content-Type: text/plain;
         charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Has anyone tried making drafts and weaving patterns based on The SPECK BOOK, an 18th CENTURY WEAVING MANUSCRIPT by Johann Ludwig Speck, Volume One, Volume Two, Transcribed and Drafted for the Modern Hand Weaver by Rebecca Emily Heil? (Ginkgo Press, Freeland, WA 1994)

I'd be most interested in other weaver's interpretations of these drafts, which I presume were originally for weaving damask. One of my interpretations ( Page 63, vol. 2) in basket weave and half-tone twill for 8 shafts is attached in.WIF format. My draft is not for commercial use but if anyone weaves it, I would love to have a sample.

Don't know how or why but it appears to have been saved by Patternland (for windows) as .pww and not .WIF. If anyone is interested and can't read this, let me know and I'll try again to post it in .WIF.

Betty Lou Whaley

-----=_NextPart_000_0006_01BE3E2B.71FEEEA80
Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
         name="strailc.pww"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64
Content-Disposition: attachment;
         filename="strailc.pww"

aABZAs4AU3BlY2syMigKFNUyW1sIFRyYWlsKS8PCmIwbCBkcmFmdCBpbiBoWYxmlXRvbmUg
dHdpbGwyY3k5IGJhc2tlbC83WFZzSBieSBCZXR0eSESE3uV2hhdGV5Q0U5U3MgU3RyYWls
b20gVGRhaW5lYXRpb24gU3RyYWlsIC0gVGhlc2FyZS4h

Betty Lou Whaley
Good morning all,

My New Years resolution was to delurk in 1999. I tried earlier by was bounced because of an extra period in my reply url (computing develops strange language.) I have been weaving for about 13 years, the last 10 in the Washington DC area where I made many dear friends. My weaving circle has shrunk alarmingly since moving back to Australia which has made the existence of this list important to my sanity. I weave on a 16 shaft, AVL compu-dobby.

The discussion about the size of the shed in doup leno prompted me to try again. When I first got my loom I wove a series of scarves in leno. The shed was narrow but I was keen so wound on another warp. Suddenly the shed was just great. Those scarves were woven off quickly before the bad shed genie returned. It wasn't until I was tying on yet again that I discovered the reason for the change. I had neglected to route the warp over the back beam from the sectional warp beam to the heddles. So the warp slopped up sharply to the heddles instead of going horizontally.

This treatment didn't hurt the loom as far as I can see. Has anybody else stumbled onto this solution?
Yours, Prue Hill in Sydney where it is hot and sunny (again.)

To reply privately, send message to "Jo Martins" <jmartins@tpg.com.au>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 12 17:10:22 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA15933; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 17:10:22 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mtiwmhc01.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc01.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.36]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA15925; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 17:10:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: from default ([12.79.166.165]) by mtiwmhc01.worldnet.att.net
 (InterMail v03.02.05 118 121 101) with SMTP
 id <199901130000959.EFNG16888@default>
 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 13 Jan 1999 00:09:59 +0000
Message-ID: <000a01be3ea2$1144d3e0$a5a64f0c@default>
From: "Jane Nott" <janenott@worldnet.att.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1999 19:08:17 -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 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

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NOMAIL janenott@worldnet.att.net END

To reply privately, send message to "Jane Nott" <janenott@worldnet.att.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 12 18:35:28 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA04366; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 18:35:28 -0700 (MST)
Received: from haliburtonhighlands.com (unix.haliburtonhighlands.com [207.61.107.2]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA04344; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 18:35:24 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host unix.haliburtonhighlands.com [207.61.107.2] claimed to be haliburtonhighlands.com
Received: from bbs.halhinet.on.ca.halhinet.on.ca (ppp62.haliburtonhighlands.com [207.61.107.62])
 by haliburtonhighlands.com (8.9.1/8.8.7) with SMTP id UAA19272
 for <WEAVETECH@LIST-SERVER.NET>; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 20:36:22 GMT
Message-ID: <019f01be3e95$acbefec0$616b3dce@bbs.halhinet.on.ca.halhinet.on.ca>
From: "Judy" <jchapman@halhinet.on.ca>
To: <WEAVETECH@LIST-SERVER.NET>
Subject: New member
Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1999 20:38:07 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----=_NextPart_000_0198_01BE3E6B.764049A0"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net
Hello Everyone,
I have just subscribed to your list and I am delighted to learn about it. I was a member of the 'other' list but could not keep up with it and so did not learn about this new list until recently.

A little about me. I have been a handweaver for 22 years, completed the Ontario Handweavers & Spinners Certificate Course and have been exploring tabletweaving the last two years, particularly the double-faced 3/1 twill designs. I enjoy exploring lace & seersucker, collapse weaves, fashion weaving and have written articles for several textile magazines. I have taught weaving at a local community college in Haliburton and soon one in Belleville. As publications chair for the OHS Bulletin, I write a regular column called "Net News for Fibre Folk" (why did I take so long to find you? ;-) and I am on the Fashion Show committee for the upcoming WEBS '99 Conference at Geneva Park, Orillia = Ontario.

I am looking forward to sharing with you my thoughts and explorations.

Judy

http://www.geocities.com/Paris/Metro/1117
called "Net News for Fibre Folk" (why did I take so long to find you? :-)
and I am on the Fashion Show committee for the upcoming WEBS '99 Conference
at Geneva Park, Orillia Ontario.</DIV>

I am looking forward to sharing with you my thoughts and explorations.

Judy

http://www.geocities.com/Paris/Metro/1117

To reply privately, send message to "Judy" <jchapman@halhinet.on.ca>

Hi Betty,

Fun draft. I like the combination of twill and basket weave. I have not seen this structure before.

This sounds like a fun book. Does it have a lot of Speck designs? Is it still in print?

If you want the file to save as a wif file, then when you are saving the file, after changing to saving in the wif format, you must also type in the .wif extension to the file name. You will then see the wif save screen -- that lets me know that I did save it as a wif file. <gg>

Judie
My New Years resolution was to delurk in 1999.

HI Prue....glad to see you delurking...and glad to know where you are now located!

Su :-)

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

---

I am new to weavetech and very interested in hearing about air assist possibilities and from those who have used it. I was rear-ended by an 18 wheeler in October and am doing all the physical therapy bit and such. The knee is doing better, the shoulder is almost OK, and the neck still knows it suffers from whiplash. Very little weaving is going on at the moment. I discovered that 45 minutes made me sore all over the next day. All ideas and suggestions appreciated.
I've got an AVL 24 shaft with the Compu-dobby 2 and I added the air assist when I went to 24 shafts. I had a badly sprained ankle when I was picking up my extra shafts and that made me decide not to try and lift all those shafts. I think it was a good decision.

I only have the air assist to lift the shafts not on the fly shuttle but I'm really pleased with how it works. I don't think twice about doing a 24 shaft summer and winter or huck lace. I will eventually add air to the fly shuttle but it isn't a major priority to me at this time.

Darlene Mulholland
darmul@netbistro.com
http://www.pgmoneysaver.bc.ca/weaving/
Gy'day,

I have been rewarded for delurking by hearing from friends whose urls were not in the address book. So shall continue my conversation with you'all.

My loom is weaving well but its computer is on its last legs -- a nine year old, 386 probably deserves to be retired. I am in the middle of a warp for the local napkin exchange. Last I heard there were five of us signed up, which will give US listers an appreciation of the size of the pond weavers are in on this side of the Pacific.

The warp is threaded in 2 blocks of 5 shaft satin with a border of straight, 4 shaft twill. I designed it this way because I like my napkins (really called serviettes) to have a proper hemmed edge with a little drawn thread accent to the hem. In order to account for the difference in take up in the satin and twill areas, I "pegged" basket weave on these borders. Looked good on the computer.

And as I wove, like magic, a row of holes, all ready for the drawn thread work, appeared between the border and the body. Imagine how pleased I was to have this unforeseen result. The holes appear because I am unweaving part of some rows, in the basket weave area, so creating an internal selvedge periodically.

Then the computer stalled, had to visit the man, came home no better, and was forced back to work to finish off that warp. I quickly repugged and set to. Imagine my surprise when I got two rows of neat holes at each border (on alternate sides of the outermost block of satin.)

"Pride goes before the fall" -- how many times will I have to prove that to myself! How will I make a design feature out this latest weaving glitch?

Prue Hill where it is finally raining
jmartins@tpg.com.au

To reply privately, send message to "Jo Martins" <jmartins@tpg.com.au>
Darlene,
Do you mind explaining how the air assist works?
Judy

-----Original Message-----
From: Darlene Mulholland <darmul@netbistro.com>
To: weavetech <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Date: Wednesday, January 13, 1999 2:25 PM
Subject: airassist

>I've got an AVL 24 shaft with the Compu-dobby 2 and I added the air assist
>when I went to 24 shafts. I had a badly sprained ankle when I was picking up
>my extra shafts and that made me decide not to try and lift all those
>shafts. I think it was a good decision.
>
>I only have the air assist to lift the shafts not on the fly shuttle but
>I'm really pleased with how it works. I don't think twice about doing a 24
>shaft summer and winter or huck lace. I will eventually add air to the fly
>shuttle but it isn't a major priority to me at this time.
>
>Darlene Mulholland
darmul@netbistro.com
>http://www.pgmoneysaver.bc.ca/weaving/
>
>To reply privately, send message to "Darlene Mulholland"
darmul@netbistro.com
>
To reply privately, send message to "Judy" <jchapman@halhinet.on.ca>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Jan 14 06:32:46 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA07630; Thu, 14 Jan 1999
06:32:46 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo27.mx.aol.com (imo27.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.71]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id GAA07625; Thu, 14 Jan 1999 06:32:45 -0700 (MST)
From: TBeau1930@aol.com
Received: from TBeau1930@aol.com
by imo27.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id UXBBHo6035
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Thu, 14 Jan 1999 08:32:03 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <fa61df93.369df1d3@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 14 Jan 1999 08:32:03 EST
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: Cut and uncut pile
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 205
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net
When the loops are left uncut in warp pile fabrics they are usually referred to as terry, boucle or frise pile.

When the loops are left uncut in filling(weft) pile fabric they are usually referred to as moleskin, beaverteen, swansdown or canton.

The type of fiber(wool, cotton, etc) and the fabric construction and finish usually determined the designation.

Keep those beaters moving, its good for our wellness

Tom Beaudet

To reply privately, send message to TBeau1930@aol.com
aimed for a shed height 1/8" more than the height of the front wall of the
shuttle with the shuttle placed firmly against the reed and down on the race
plate, measured with the lay in the back center position and the fell line
something less than 10" from the reed. I would have to look back into my
old notes to recall exactly the reed/fell distance.

> Should we have gotten your book, to see how to correctly hook up this
> system?

Possibly, but since this information is described in such excellent detail
elsewhere, I only illustratred the function of the douph heddles.

>Bonni in Jersey City, NJ

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

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
I, too, have the air assist, but I put it onto the fly shuttle as that was causing me the most grief. I have two whip lash injuries, scoliosis, TMJ, etc., etc., and some days I could barely weave for the pain.

The air assist has greatly reduced the physical load on my body. Because the treadle air assist was a pittance compared to the fly shuttle, I sprang for both.

You need a fairly large (and noisy) air compressor which supplies air under pressure to the various working parts - the dobby arm or knife, and the fly shuttle pickers. I opted for foot switches for both, so one foot activates the shed, the other the fly shuttle.

The compressor does not run all the time, but often enough that hearing protection is IMHO recommended. But I used hearing protection before that anyway. :)

You can get an auger type compressor, but they are *very* expensive. If the noise factor is a huge problem, it might be the way to go. My studio is in the basement of my house, and really isn't all that noisy upstairs - it doesn't interfere with DH watching tv etc.

Laura Fry

To reply privately, send message to "Laura Fry" <laurafry@netbistro.com>
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17:14:45 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo15.mx.aol.com (imo15.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA03585; Thu, 14 Jan 1999 17:14:43 -0700 (MST)
From: AmyFibre@aol.com
Received: from AmyFibre@aol.com
by imo15.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id PBBVa03539
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Thu, 14 Jan 1999 19:10:55 +1900 (EST)
Message-ID: <fe76f037.369e878f@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 14 Jan 1999 19:10:55 EST
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: ADMIN - Re: digests
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 226
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

> I have read the directions but can't seem to get the digests I missed
> while gone over Christmas, can someone help me please?

I am going to reply to this question to the whole list as there seems to be a flurry of similar questions as people return from the holidays.

First of all, we have very limited free archive space, so a decision was made last fall to not archive the digests, but only to archive monthly. What this means is that you can no longer retrieve archives by digest, but you can get the same information in one larger file that groups all messages chronologically by month.

Here are the commands for majordomo. All of the commands below should be sent to <majordomo@list-server.net>.

To find out what files are available:

INDEX WEAVETECH
END

That will return a reply from majordomo that looks something like this:

>>>> index weavetech
total 796
-rw-r--r-- 1 sellsafe vuser 4288 Jan 14 04:00 CONTENTS
-rw-r--r-- 1 sellsafe vuser 4904 Jan 14 04:00 TOPICS
-rw-rw---- 1 sellsafe vuser 52509 Dec 31 18:28 weavetech.9812
-rw-rw---- 1 sellsafe vuser 329461 Jan 14 16:37 weavetech.9901
>>>> end
END OF COMMANDS

The file names are the last part of each line, ie. "weavetech.9812" is the file that holds all the messages posted to the list in December; "weavetech.9901" is everything so far in January (and more will be added until that file is finished at the end of this month).

To request, for example, the December archives, the command is:

GET WEAVETECH WEAVETECH.9812
END

Note: yes, "weavetech" is repeated twice in the above command. The first designates the name of the list since list-server's majordomo is handling many lists, not just ours. And the 2nd "weavetech" is the first part of the
filename.

Hope this answers all your questions. BTW -- if you subscribed to WeaveTech early on, ie. October/November, you may want to download a new "info" file as there were a few typos in the original. To do so, the command to majordomo is:

INFO WEAVETECH
END

If you have any more questions (any of you! <g>), please e-mail me privately at <amyfibre@aol.com>. I try to keep this admin stuff off the list wherever possible.

Amy
amyfibre@aol.com

Hi there Laura (Atlanta!)

I'm curious if you have the compressor in the basement. I know you are in a fairly cold area, but have you considered putting the compressor outside and running lines in? We have my pretty big compressor (bigger than I need, but we already owned it) outside my studio and we ran lines in and its not bad. We also put a baffling area around the compressor. I guess if you live in town near another house this might be a problem but we are

> You can get an auger type compressor,
> but they are *very* expensive. If the noise
> factor is a huge problem, it might be the
> way to go. My studio is in the basement
> of my house, and really isn't all that noisy
> upstairs - it doesn't interfere with DH watching
> tv etc.
WeaveTech Archive 9901

on 20 acres. Just a thought for others—I’m sure you’ve already considered this.

Diane
---
Diane B. Fields
Designer/colorist/weaver of interior textiles
picnic@twave.net

To reply privately, send message to "Diane B. Fields" <picnic@twave.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Jan 14 18:24:56 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA22188; Thu, 14 Jan 1999 18:24:56 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id SAA22181; Thu, 14 Jan 1999 18:24:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (balto-ts1-port220.x-press.net [209.150.113.220])
   by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id UAA05308
   for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Thu, 14 Jan 1999 20:25:01 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19990114202317.006c7cc4@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Thu, 14 Jan 1999 20:23:17 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Re: ADMIN - Re: digests
In-Reply-To: <fe76f037.369e878f@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

>>>>> index weavetech
>total 796
>drwx------ 2 sellsafe vuser 4288 Jan 14 04:00 CONTENTS
>drwxr-xr-x 2 sellsafe vuser 4904 Jan 14 04:00 TOPICS
>drwx------ 2 sellsafe vuser 52509 Dec 31 18:28 weavetech.9812
>drwx------ 2 sellsafe vuser 329461 Jan 14 16:37 weavetech.9901
>>>>> end

Sorry for all the admin stuff, but let me add one thing to what Amy has said. If what Amy reproduced here is the total of what we have in the archive, this tells me that majordomo has already dumped October & November. We have contracted for only so much archive space, and when it fills up, earlier archives will be dumped.

However, at least for now, I'm running an archive backup system. If you want to read an archive file that has disappeared from majordomo, drop me a line and I'll send it to you. My archive files are the same as majordomo's--a month at a time, so they are very large files.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia USA

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
WeaveTech Archive 9901

I know I was asked a question earlier about archiving info for this digest...
Currently I have each digest by issue (the original form)
If someone were to e-mail me the digest and tell me the issue (number) they were missing
and supplied an e-mail address, I think I could send it out.

I am not sure how much space everyone is looking for...(i have been a trifle busy...
sorry for the lapses.)
Lets discuss your needs?

In the meantime I can answer requests for old digests..
Eliz

To reply privately, send message to "Elizabeth tritthart" <Etritthart@wyellowstone.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Thu Jan 14 19:49:53 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA13625; Thu, 14 Jan 1999
19:49:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA13585; Thu, 14 Jan 1999 19:49:43 -0700 (MST)
Accepted: (qmail 7539 invoked by alias); 15 Jan 1999 02:49:49 -0000
Accepted: (qmail 7526 invoked from network); 15 Jan 1999 02:49:47 -0000
Received: from ip178.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO unknown) (204.239.167.178)
by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 15 Jan 1999 02:49:47 -0000
Message-ID: <MAPI.Id.0016.00617572616672793030303830303038@MAPI.to.RFC822>
In-Reply-To: <1999001150124.SAA22221@salmon.esosoft.net>
References: Conversation <1999001150124.SAA22221@salmon.esosoft.net> with last message
<1999001150124.SAA22221@salmon.esosoft.net>
X-MSPMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
From: "Laura Fry" <laurafry@netbistro.com>
Subject: Re: air compressor
Date: Thu, 14 Jan 99 18:43:54 PST
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"; X-MAPIextension=".TXT"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net
We live in a residential neighbourhood in a town which only recently "allowed" home based business. If the neighbours complain, a home based business can be shut down (noise nuisance factor). The compressor is noisy, but not all that noisy - as I said, it doesn't interfere with DH's tv watching. :)

Laura Fry

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

The book that inspired my draft is: The SPECK BOOK An 18th Century Weaving Manuscript by Johann Ludwig Speck, Volumes One and Two, Transcribed & Drafted for The Modern Hand Weaver by Rebecca Emily Heil, Ginkgo Press, Freeland, WA 1994. It's available from: Rebecca Heil, 5250 Honeymoon Bay Road, Freeland, WA 98249-9712. The original manuscript is owned by the Philadelphia Museum of Art. Rebecca's transcription is beautifully printed, a handsewn labor of love. It has surprised me that no reviews or discussions on it have appeared in print. Some of the drafts have confounded me but it is a lovely puzzle book for those interested in pattern drafting.

My draft (damasce"?) combines half-tone twill with basket weave. In this twill structure each block is written on 4 shafts (A=1,2,3,4; B=3,4,5,6; C=5,6,7,8; D=7,8,1,2) This blurs the edges of the motifs and forms half-tones just like overshot. After much head-scratching, I worked out this method of drafting it because I just couldn't understand how to use Madelyn's system to construct drafts for 24 shafts. (See her article "'Colonial' Double Weave" in Weaver's, Issue 12, 1991 and my article
Combining half-tone twill with basket weave is my idea - a result of looking at the Speck drafts and trying to figure out how he might have woven them. I have woven samples and found this (damasse) structure to be sound. I wove it in 10/2 & 8/2 cotton, 30 epi with various closely beaten wefts of the same grist in wool, silk, rayon. The fabric would be fine for a medium-weight jacket and it has interesting iridescence that is confined to the blocks, rather chameleon-like in blue-greens and gold. It was not more iridescent than plain half-tone twill - it was less iridescent.

For Ruby who is currently without a weaving program - a GIF file of my draft!
WeaveTech Archive 9901

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3155.0
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

Here's a GIF file for Ruby who needs a weaving program that reads WIF! (Sorry I posted this without an attachment) This time I won't forget.

R0lGODhlnhAcAAAAAAAAPAAAAgAAA/wAgAAAgQAAggAAg/wBAAABAQMdBBAgGBBA/gAAgAgAgAgggAg/gABAAABABaBA/gABgAgAgAgggAg/gACAACAAQACAgCCA/yAgACCgCgCCg/yCAAADAAAAgAggAgg/0AABAAEAEAAgEAA/0AgAEAgOEAgEAg /0BBAAEBAAEBE
To reply privately, send message to "Betty Lou Whaley" <enbwhaley@jps.net>

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Jan 15 12:35:11 1999
Received: (salam@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA13258; Fri, 15 Jan 1999 12:35:11 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo18.mx.aol.com (imo18.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.8]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA13251; Fri, 15 Jan 1999 12:35:09 -0700 (MST)
From: WC3424@aol.com
Received: from WC3424@aol.com
by imo18.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id XWFKa2055; Fri, 15 Jan 1999 14:33:01 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <e9d836f4.369f97ed@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 15 Jan 1999 14:33:01 EST
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #164
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 214
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I would love to see the draft, but on my screen there is a continual alphabet
and in the downloaded file, I have the same thing.

Thanks...Charlotte

To reply privately, send message to WC3424@aol.com
Since I posted to the list a day or so ago that I have archives that have been dumped by majordomo, I have rec'd several requests from people for back archives. This is just to let you know that I'll send them over the next couple of days, as I can. We've been hit w/ a wallopings ice storm here in the DC area. Our power was out for 7 hrs, on briefly for an hour, off again, now on again. I don't expect its current "on" state to be permanent. So give me the weekend to get these things out, plz.

Thanks, and sorry for so much admin talk.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia USA

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
I'm really sorry that my GIF file arrived as TEXT! Phooie. Are you PC or MAC? I'm PC running Win98 and the GIF just arrived in my box as a full color picture. Here's something you can try - I have no idea if it will work. Save the file to a diskette. Close mail, open browser, File/Open your disk drive, locate the GIF and open it! Let me know if this works.

~Betty Lou
-----Original Message-----
From: WC3424@aol.com <WC3424@aol.com>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Date: Friday, January 15, 1999 11:37 AM
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #164

<<
> Speck's Snailtrail as .GIF          ["Betty Lou Whaley"
<enbwhaley@jps.net>]
> Speck's Snailtrail                 >>
>
>I would love to see the draft, but on my screen there is a continual alphabet
>and in the downloaded file, I have the same thing.
>
>Thanks...Charlotte
>
>To reply privately, send message to WC3424@aol.com
>

To reply privately, send message to "Betty Lou Whaley" <enbwhaley@jps.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Jan 15 14:49:33 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA11205; Fri, 15 Jan 1999 14:49:33 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mtiwmhc02.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc02.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.37]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id OAA11194; Fri, 15 Jan 1999 14:49:32 -0700 (MST)
Received: from default ([12.69.0.79]) by mtiwmhc02.worldnet.att.net (InterMail v03.02.07 118 124) with SMTP id <19990115144908.BWBJ8733@default>
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 15 Jan 1999 21:49:08 +0000
Message-ID: <000601be40e9$e3dfb880$4f00450c@default>
From: "Jane Nott" <janenott@worldnet.att.net>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Date: Fri, 15 Jan 1999 16:48:02 -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 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

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NOMAIL janenott@worldnet.att.net END

To reply privately, send message to "Jane Nott" <janenott@worldnet.att.net>
What am I supposed to do with the messages that come in as long rectangles in mixed alphabet? I think they are supposed to be drafts. does one need a special program to read them, or are they some kind of code?

thanks much.

Nancy Slutsky

To reply privately, send message to "Nancy T Slutsky" <NSLUTSKY@prodigy.net>

---

At 11:47 AM 1/15/99, you wrote:
> I'm really sorry that my GIF file arrived as TEXT! Phooie. Are you PC or

It is my understanding that this is email discussion list, as such there are few if any list management programs that can handle graphical attachments.

Would the "list-admin" care to let us know if the posting of .gif, .jpg,
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.vcf or for that matter .htm/.html files is appropriate

If not then may I suggest every consider taking advantage of some information that I received from Ron Parker = here is a quote:

"Ron Parker, found and shared the following site that is helpful to those in need of assistance resetting their software options to avoid contributing to the problem.

"Here is a useful website that describes how to turn off HTML and RTF encoding in each of the following programs....

Eudora Pro
Microsoft Exchange
Netscape Communicator
Outlook Express
Outlook Express for Macintosh
Outlook 98
Pegasus Mail 3.01b

If you are interested, take a look at and probably bookmark the following site....


end quote

- Wheat Carr mailto:wheat@craftwolf.com
  http://www.craftwolf.com/

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Fri Jan 15 17:54:19 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA20494; Fri, 15 Jan 1999 17:54:19 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo25.mx.aol.com (imo25.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.69]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id RAA20490; Fri, 15 Jan 1999 17:54:18 -0700 (MST)
From: AmyFibre@aol.com
Received: from AmyFibre@aol.com
  by imo25.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id 8EYa15302
  for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 15 Jan 1999 19:53:55 +1900 (EST)
Message-ID: <9dc9873e.369fe323@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 15 Jan 1999 19:53:55 EST
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: ADMIN - Attachments
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 226
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Hi all --

Although it's a nice thought, this list is not equipped to handle attachments, even our beloved weave drafts.
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The problem is two-fold. First of all, majordomo rejects messages over a certain size, and frequently attachments create messages of enormous size. Secondly, there are almost as many different systems/servers receiving this list as we have members and many of these are ill-equipped to handle attachments. Consequently, these subscribers get computer-ese instead of messages and attachments.

So, please refrain from sending any attachments to the list as a whole.

Instead, if you are willing, let the list know of attachment(s) that you would be willing to send privately, collect their names/e-mail addresses and then send the attachments directly to them (not through the list). Remember you can make it easier on yourself by collecting e-mail addresses for a day or two or even several days before sending one e-mail to all interested parties.

Thanks for understanding -- and please, no attachments to the list.

Amy
amyfibre@aol.com

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

Hi all -

Sorry to bother you one more time with this admin subject, but I just learned that majordomo has a quirk which might be preventing some of you from retrieving the archive files.

*Majordomo is case-sensitive regarding archive file names.*

That means, when you request the archive file, it must be **exactly** as shown in majordomo's index list, ie. no caps in the file name.

So instead of:

GET WEAVETECH WEAVETECH.9812
GET WEAVETECH WEAVETECH.9901
END

use:

GET WEAVETECH weavetech.9812
Sorry for any confusion this might have caused.

Amy
amyfibre@aol.com

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

On Fri, 15 Jan 1999, Betty Lou Whaley wrote:

> I'm really sorry that my GIF file arrived as TEXT! Phooie.
This is probably happening to a bunch of us - me included. My mail program cannot handle graphics or applications. It 1) offers and then refuses to save, 2) freezes up, or 3) regurgitates screen after screen after screen of code (ie solid blocks of characters). I really think that this sort of thing should be sent privately, by request, to those who are set up to handle it, rather than posted to the list where many of us can't.

Anne

Anne Silas
asilas@krl.org
Bainbridge Island, Washington, USA

To reply privately, send message to AE Silas <asilas@linknet.kitsap.lib.wa.us>

The following is one of the references I promised to post dealing with leno weaving in general, which has mention of multiple width. This one is in German but ranks among the two or three best references on the subject anywhere. With some effort it can be found since I hardly doubt I own the only extant copy.

Author: W. Boos

Title: Herstellung von Drehergeweben

Publisher: Konradin - Verlag Robert Kohlhammer
           Stuttgart 1950

The specific mention of leno edges for multiple widths is found on page 12.

This book is part of a larger series of about 14 titles.

When I find the other reference, which I believe is in English, I will post it.

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Sat Jan 16 12:10:44 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA18785; Sat, 16 Jan 1999 12:10:44 -0700 (MST)
Received: from wyellowstone.com (www.wyellowstone.com [206.26.87.34]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA18777; Sat, 16 Jan 1999 12:10:41 -0700 (MST)
Received: by wyellowstone.com from localhost
(router,SLMail V2.6); Sat, 16 Jan 1999 12:15:06 -0700
Received: by wyellowstone.com from wyellowstone.com
(206.26.87.195:mail daemon; unverified,SLMail V2.6); Sat, 16 Jan 1999 12:15:05 -0700
Message-ID: <36A0E47C.C14C3A51@wyellowstone.com>
Date: Sat, 16 Jan 1999 12:11:56 -0700
From: "Elizabeth tritthart" <Etritthart@wyellowstone.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win95; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #165
References: <199901161100.EAA08367@salmon.esosoft.net>
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
   boundary="------------E99A4D224BBD29B6D691210B"
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

--------------E99A4D224BBD29B6D691210B
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Attachments....
There is one more list server out here working but seems to have gone inactive....
it can handle attachments and pictures for those who want to send them. Is any one interested in making use of it?

Regular users can stay on this digest...
But users who can take attachments can join the secondary list and use it to forward attachments to others set up to recieve them..

Let me know....

Eliz

--------------E99A4D224BBD29B6D691210B
Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Attachments....
There is one more list server out here working but seems to have gone inactive....
it can handle attachments and pictures for those who want to send them. Is any one interested in making use of it?
Regular users can stay on this digest...
But users who can take attachments can join the secondary list and use it to forward attachments to others set up to receive them.
Let me know....
<br>&nbsp;
<br>&lt;br&gt;
<br>center
<br>Eliz&lt;/center&gt;

To reply privately, send message to "Elizabeth tritthart" &lt;Etritthart@wyellowstone.com&gt;

I was able to see the Snail Trail draft on my Mac. I will briefly outline how I did this, hoping that something similar can be done by PC users.

1. I copied the encoded document and then pasted it all by itself in a new document.
2. Since it was uuencoded, I dropped the new document on Stuffit Expander to decode it.
3. Since it still did not belong to any application, I opened it in GIF Coverter, and there it was!

Jo Anne

Jo Anne Ryeburn   ryeburn@sfu.ca
Eliz--

My e-mail program (and ISP) can handle most attachments and I do appreciate being able to see what weavers are talking about. The snail's trail came thru very nicely.

BTW, I use Netscape 4.5 (a free download taking about an hour at 56 Kb) and would recommend it to those having sufficient hard disk capacity. It seems to provide decoding service for most attachments. Certainly, I haven't loaded anything special for this purpose.

Michelle in White Rock NM
mailto:rudymm@roadrunner.com

To reply privately, send message to Michelle Rudy <rudymm@roadrunner.com>
A question for Mr. Fannin; I've been reading the books of E.A. Polleslt, of about 1900 or so, and he stated the doup's that were constructed (String doup's) so as to enter the heddle above the eye, and then leave through the eye, were superior then if they were simply entered through a heddle eye. Really, I can't see the advantage, but you have probably seen this type of doup before, so I thought I'd ask if you have an opinion? - Bill Koepp

To reply privately, send message to "Bill Koepp" <bgkoe@netxn.com>

Hi everyone. Just letting you all know that my web-page is now up.

Bonnie Datta (Currently in Murray, Kentucky)
Airdrie, Alberta, Canada
brdatta@vci.net
http://www.vci.net/~brdatta/

To reply privately, send message to Bonnie Datta <brdatta@vci.net>
My solution was simpler. I saved the attachment on disk and then opened Patternland and loaded the pattern. It came out very well. At that time I was taking a workshop from Madelyn, too and showed it to her.
Cynthia Broughton (no longer lurking)

To reply privately, send message to kip broughton <cynthb@uswest.net>
just weave, because there's ALWAYS going to be an open box to throw into.

On a three or four box system, independent control becomes more feasible, of course, but it would require independent controls for each side and a lot of thinking. It might also require fixing the boxes and having only the lay (aka beater) move. In fact we offer such an option on our IDL. It's a four box system that can handle up to 7 shuttles (with prior planning); 6 shuttles are a slam dunk with the same system...the boxes are moved by the computer and pneumatics and it's pretty darn spectacular. No less an authority than the head of production at Burlington's biggest plant said it "is damn near perfect". It is, in fact possible, to outfit YOUR loom with this system or one similar to it, but you might find the price to be a bit high.

Indeed, there are other options for allowing for multiple independent selections on a hand-loom. One idea, that was tried by other handloom companies in the past, is to put only one box on the "receiving" side. Such a system, known popularly as a 3 by one or 4 by one system works very well, except, of course, that using pick and pick, that is alternating yarns, is out of the question, because the minimum selection would be two picks (over AND back).

Since pick and pick is so popular among handweavers, we determined, long ago, that this style would only have limited commercial appeal. Perhaps, that thinking needs to be re-examined.

One more aspect about the counter-balanced boxes system is their relative ease of use...since the one side always balances the other, then it is always relatively easy to go up or down with the boxes. If you had uneven boxes then it might be more of a strain to, for example, lift the full boxes or even more so to lower them to the right height (this can be overcome by a rotary system, of course, but that adds other complexity.)

Sorry, I didn't mean to prattle on here, but I do want you to know that we have indeed, thought long and hard about the issue of multiple boxes on the hand loom and continue to work to bring you and other weavers the most efficient and effective looms on the market.

Last, I want you and all the other weavers out there to know that we really enjoy reading your thoughts and concerns on the Net. It's nice to know that folks still care so passionately about their equipment and serves as a bolster to the re-doubling of our efforts on your behalf.

Sincerely,
Peter Straus
President
AVL Looms
Hello,

For those who are interested in a place where files may be posted and retrieved, the ANWG webmaster has asked that I pass this information on to you.

"In order to have a place where fiber artists can upload files for everyone to download, I am making space available on the ANWG website. The address will be ftp://anwg.org and there is a readme.txt file in the pub/weavers/ folder. Please read this before uploading any files. Files will be uploaded into the incoming/ folder. If you have any questions or suggestions, please contact me.

Thanks,
Jerry Coopmans"

jerry@anwg.org

Yvonne in Bozeman, where our winter is behaving very civilized-like.

To reply privately, send message to "Yvonne Coopmans" <coops@avicom.net>
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mfg sorted out during the design process helps me sort out the features I need/like as I consider the purchase of a loom. I'd like other weaving equipment mfgs to share these ideas (both the discarded ones & the accepted ones) with us.

Tom & Peter: can you also address for us the issue of why the computer controlled AVL must have two treadles? I gather from the discussion on this list that dobby control requires two, but a computer-controlled loom could be handled by one treadle. Perhaps AVL could include a treadle conversion kit with its upgrade for computer-assisted weaving. Or perhaps you could produce two different kinds of treadles--a single & a double. I'm particularly attracted to the idea of a single, wide treadle (you could use either foot) for the computer-assisted loom.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia USA

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

---

Ruth Blau wrote:

> Tom & Peter: can you also address for us the issue of why the computer controlled AVL must have two treadles? I gather from the discussion on this list that dobby control requires two, but a computer-controlled loom could be handled by one treadle.

A thing to ponder while we're waiting to hear from Peter & globetrotting Tom. With the current two treadle system, if the Compu part goes into terminal fits (either AVL's black box, our third party PC, or the electric company) one can remount the chain gizmo, peg the bars, and continue weaving by candlelight. One wouldn't want to, but one can. Single treadle modifications that are readily reversible would be the answer, no?

Margaret
Yet another weaver with a challenged leg.

-----------------------------------------
MargeCoe@concentric.net
Tucson, AZ, USA
-----------------------------------------

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 19 07:22:55 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA00442; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 07:22:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail.twave.net (twave.net [206.100.228.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA00436; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 07:22:54 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host twave.net [206.100.228.5] claimed to be mail.twave.net
Received: from [208.246.1.152] by mail.twave.net (NTMail 3.0.0.17/1.abwg) with ESMTP id da905999 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 09:22:46 -0500
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19990119092213.007c9a10@twave.net>
X-Sender: picnic@twave.net (Unverified)
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Tue, 19 Jan 1999 09:22:13 -0500
To: weavetech@list-server.net
From: "Diane B. Fields" <picnic@twave.net>
Subject: Re: challenged legs/solutions
In-Reply-To: <3GA48F80.4E3E075@concentric.net>
References: <3.0.3.32.19990119065828.006cb3f0@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

> Margaret
> Yet another weaver with a challenged leg.

I know almost all of you are AVLers, but I too have a 'challenged leg'-and use a large Macomber. In fact I had to take most of '98 off because I had developed severe tendenitis in one knee. It was something that I had long wanted to do under other circumstances (a mini sabbatical) to develop ideas related to surface design (which I did develop and they are evolving fairly quickly into my regular work-having long been an ikat/complex weave person). But--the crux of the problem was solving having to lift with that one large Macomber pedal-(computerized 20 shaft). A Swiss engineer friend designed and built a fairly reasonable (price wise) and fairly simple air lift system that works like a charm. I did not want to opt for the relatively expensive air dobby system that Macomber sells and I did not want to switch to another loom. Granted, you have to have a mind like a Swiss engineer (<G>) to do these things RIGHT, but there are always 'ways', as he says. I told him what I needed-and he found all the parts and made them work efficiently after much measuring and thinking. It uses a simple pedal that needs no strength applied to it-can be made to lift faster or slower, can be made to hold shafts up or have the pedal to the floor (which I prefer while I'm threading). After many many years of weaving full time, I was afraid I was going to have to give it up-altho' now I'm healthy again-and back to full time weaving. Approaching 60 next month, I wonder how many MORE years I'll be doing this full time <VBG>?? I guess if everything 'holds', many many more. Hope all of you with 'challenged legs' come up with a good solution also.

---
Diane B. Fields
Designer/colorist/weaver of interior textiles
At 06:58 AM 1/19/99 -0500, you wrote:

> can you also address for us the issue of why the computer
> controlled AVL must have two treadles? I gather from the discussion on
> this list that dobby control requires two, but a computer-controlled loom
> could be handled by one treadle.
> Ruth
> rsblau@cpcug.org
> Arlington, Virginia USA

REPLY:

There is no absolute reason why the AVL must be controlled by two treadles
either as a mechanical dobby or as a computer dobby.

In the case of the mechanical dobby, while AVL has designed it such that one

treadle operated the knife to open the shed and the other treadle moves the
chain to the next pick, there is no reason it absolutely has to be this way.
All our handloom dobbies of the mechanical variety operated from one treadle
and the chain cylinder mechanism is self-acting. At the same time, the

cylinder can be moved ahead or back to return to the correct shed following
a pick-out. Again, this is just a design decision on the part of AVL rather
than some physical absolute.

For the computer dobby, the same is essentially true. There is no
physically absolute reason why two treadles are needed. As presently
designed and manufactured by AVL, one treadle operates the knife as on the
mechanical dobby and the other treadle simple assists the knife to return to
its full up position so as to prevent misselection on the next shed. In
fact, if the main operating treadle is allowed to raise quickly, the knife
will all but return to the uppermost position. The secondary treadle is
needed to effect a more positive return. In the interest of
experimentation, here at SU, I disconnected the cable between the knife and
the secondary treadle and temporarily installed a tension spring on the
outer end of the knife to create a positive return. Once the proper length
and tension of spring was found, the loom operated perfectly with only the
main treadle.
The advantage of operating a dobby equipped handloom with one treadle, aside from the special requirements for those operators who have only one fully functional lower extremity, is ease efficiency. The rhythm of a single treadle is considerably smoother than that with two since the up-down treadle movement coordinates better with the lay movement. Weaving at 60ppm or better with a single treadle would require more effort with two since double the leg movements would be required.

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

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

TO ALL:

Peter Strauss of AVL, in response to a discussion on this topic and in part in response to my comments on same, wrote recently regarding AVL's design thought behind their multi-box fly shuttle:

> if you have, as suggested independently controlled
> boxes then it would require a lot of thought to make sure that the box you
> are throwing to is empty. As Jim Ahrens designed it, however, you have
> counter-balanced boxes so when the ones on the right go down, the ones on
> the left go up and vice versa...there's no thinking...you should be able to
> just weave, because there's ALWAYS going to be an open box to throw into.
> >
> On a three or four box system, independent control becomes more feasible,
> of course, but it would require independent controls for each side and a
> lot of thinking.

This statement find somewhat troubling in that it appears to gainsay the
ability of handloom weavers to figure out, memorise and function with a box change sequence where several fillings are needed so as to always have an empty box on the receiving side. Clearly, not all handloom weavers would want to deal with such a chore. However, as a compromise in loom design, I find it faulty in that the severe loss of weaving flexibility would be, in my way of thinking, not worth the slight gain in not having to think about always having an empty box on the receiving side. Having woven lots with independently controllable boxes on a handloom fly shuttle, I can say that while Peter is correct in that one must think through the shuttle sequence same as on a powerloom, if a mistake is made, the result on a handloom is not nearly as drastic as under power. Thinking, though inconvenient at times, is not known to be fatal and once a sequence is established and memorised, working it actually requires less thinking than Peter's comments would suggest.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562
E-mail: <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Web: 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 Jan 19 11:14:14 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA21734; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 11:14:14 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cpcug.org (cpcug.org [205.197.248.25]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA21719; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 11:14:13 -0700 (MST)
Received: from authoriu (balto-ts1-port173.x-press.net [209.150.113.173])
by cpcug.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id NAA18765
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 13:14:15 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19990119131210.006c2934@cpcug.org>
X-Sender: rsblau@cpcug.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Tue, 19 Jan 1999 13:12:10 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
Subject: Re: computer-driven looms
In-Reply-To: <3.0.5.32.19990119092213.007c9a10@twave.net>
References: <36A48F80.4E3E075@concentric.net> <3.0.3.32.19990119065828.006cb3f0@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

Diane wrote:
> I know almost all of you are AVLers, ... <snip>

Oh, no! Not at all! I (like many others on this list) don't have either a dobby- or computer-driven loom, and sometimes the terminology baffles me. For example, in the context of weaving, what is the "knife"?

I read the computer stuff avidly, however, because I'm in the process of trying to decide (1) *if* I want to move to a computer-driven loom, and (2)
if so, which one.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia USA

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

REPLY:

The "...knife..." is the nomenclature for the arm which actually raises and lowers the shafts on a dobby. This is the common trade term for this part.

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

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
At 12:21 PM 1/17/99 +0000, you wrote:
>A question for Mr. Fannin; I've been reading the books of E.A.Polleslt , of
>about 1900 or so, and he stated the doups that were constructed ( String
>doups ) so as to enter the heddle above the eye, and then leave through
>the eye, were superior then if they  were simply entered through a heddle eye.

>To reply privately, send message to "Bill Koepp" <bgkoe@netxn.com>

REPLY:

The reference cited is probably E.A. Pousselt who early on wrote many very
useful texts on textiles.

Early heddles were made of cord and were often tied directly on the shafts
in a continuous way, one heddle being connected to the other. These were
referred to as knitted heddles. Doups were single loops of cord attached
either to the top or the bottom of a separate doup shaft. The reference to
the doups entering "...heddle above the eye, and then leave through the
eye..." has to with the upper loop of the heddle as it was originally
tied. The doup was passed through the loop in one direction and out
through the heddle eye in the other direction. This was a very akward
system of setting up leno. Later on, while cord doups were still in use,
wire heddles, usually round wire, came into use and special double eyed
heddles were developed for leno wherein the cord loop forming the doup
(how's that for alliteration!!) made a circle into one eye and back out the
other. Still very akward which is why the evolution in heddle design came
to the flat wire doup heddles... all we used at my mill.

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

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
> There is no absolute reason why the AVL must be controlled by two treadles
> either as a mechanical dobby or as a computer dobby.
> >In the case of the mechanical dobby, while AVL has designed it such that one
> treadle operated the knife to open the shed and the other treadle moves the
> chain to the next pick, there is no reason it absolutely has to be this way.
>
> When my 16H AVL started giving me serious tendentious in my hip and sciatica, I
> took advantage of a "free" medical analysis at a local sports medicine clinic. The
> clinician was a bit puzzled why I was there as I wasn't there for shin splints.
> However, I got my "range of motion" evaluated and some specific suggestions to
> improve my posture etc. for weaving. This brought up a couple issues - if assuming
> you have good use of both legs - from a physical standpoint - most motions are
> better performed in a bipolar manner. It would be better to treadle our looms with
> two peddles doing *equal* work so that both left and right leg are in balance. One
> treadle could do it all but it certainly would be a strain on the "working" leg. It
> would be better with the AVL to have each peddle give you a shed and advance the
> chain. With the Compudobby (no chain) I can't imagine why this isn't done. Many
> spinners prefer the peddling action of a double treadle spinning wheel.
>
> The other issue perhaps more easily solved is the *&^! bench. The relationship
> between the bench height, breast beam height, peddle angle and height are all
> integral to having a comfortable weaving position that can be sustained for a long
> time. The peddle angle for the legs is probably the most important. Various weavers
> have put blocks on the peddles, gotten comfortable office chairs (tossed the bench)
> or better padding. I use a backpackers inflatable pillow. It doesn't slip and
> provides for my posterior the best padding against the edge of the bench. I've tried
> tail bone doughnuts and sheepskin - not for me. This is where you need to experience
> but there is no reason to weave in pain. Getting back to a pain free experience took
> me six months of NO weaving. It isn't worth it and it certainly made me wary of long
> weaving projects. I now take frequent breaks - listen to my hip. Serious weight
> training and properly beamed warps help a great deal.
>
> If I were a Compudobby owner and had my Compudobby set up, I doubt I'd want to
> reinstall the chain etc. I'd wait 'till power is restored !
>
> - Margaret Copeland

To reply privately, send message to Margaret Copeland <busys@cdsnet.net>
At 01:12 PM 1/19/99 -0500, you wrote:
> Diane wrote:
>> I know almost all of you are AVLers, ... <snip>
> >Oh, no! Not at all! I (like many others on this list) don't have either a
> >dobby- or computer-driven loom, and sometimes the terminology baffles me.
> >For example, in the context of weaving, what is the "knife"?

I'm contrite :-( However, a lot of the AVL tech stuff baffles me too.

Diane in NC
---
Diane B. Fields
Designer/colorist/weaver of interior textiles
picnic@twave.net

To reply privately, send message to "Diane B. Fields" <picnic@twave.net>

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Tue Jan 19 12:07:46 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA04016; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 12:07:46 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA04010; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 12:07:45 -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 OAA25053
   for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 14:07:50 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 19 Jan 1999 14:07:50 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <19990119160750.OAA25053@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: Double Box Issues, long
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 10:51 AM 1/19/99 -0800, you wrote:

This brought up a couple issues - if assuming
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> you have good use of both legs - from a physical standpoint - most motions
> are better performed in a bipolar manner.

> It would be better with the AVL to have each peddle give you a shed and
> advance the chain.

REPLY:

Absolutely correct. This would be the ideal arrangement whether it were
with a mechanical or a computer controlled handloom dobby.

Since our dobbies were only a single treadle, we solved the bipolar issue by
regularly changing the "working" leg to allow rest time.

Clearly, handloom design needs more ergonomic considerations. In the not
too recent past, handloom weavers didn't weave so much as to cause the
physical strains some are beginning to experience, not to mention the aging
of the handloom weaver population. Someone whose name presently escapes me
once said in the course of a casual conversation that they felt while there
may be fewer handloom weavers those are doing more weaving.

AAF

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

To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Allen,
What is your opinion of looms that are built for weaving while standing? I am thinking of the Rio Grande in particular. I do not have one but found that I can weave longer if I stand; no back and leg aches. Trouble is most looms are not set up for standing unless you can extend and lower the treadles.
Lois

Allen Fannin wrote:

> At 10:51 AM 1/19/99 -0800, you wrote:
> 
> This brought up a couple issues - if assuming
> >you have good use of both legs - from a physical standpoint - most motions
> >are better performed in a bipolar manner.
>>
> >It would be better with the AVL to have each peddle give you a shed and
> >advance the chain .
> 
> >REPLY:
>
> >Absolutely correct. This would be the ideal arrangement whether it were
> >with a mechanical or a computer controlled handloom doby.
> 
> >Since our dobbies were only a single treadle, we solved the bipolar issue by
> >regularly changing the "working" leg to allow rest time.
> 
> >Clearly, handloom design needs more ergonomic considerations. In the not
> >too recent past, handloom weavers didn't weave so much as to cause the
> >physical strains some are beginning to experience, not to mention the aging
> >of the handloom weaver population. Someone whose name presently escapes me
> >once said in the course of a casual conversation that they felt while there
> >may be fewer handloom weavers those are doing more weaving.
> 
> >AAF
>
> >ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
> >ECR Department
> >224 Slocum Hall
> >College for Human Development
> >Syracuse University
> >Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
> >Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
> >FAX: (315) 443-2562
> >E-mail: <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
> >Web: http://syllabus.syr.edu/TEX/aafannin
>>
> >To reply privately, send message to Allen Fannin <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>

--
Lois Mueller
Wooden Porch Books
books@woodenporch.com

To reply privately, send message to Lois <books@woodenporch.com>
WeaveTech Archive 9901

Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA1395Z; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 12:58:10 -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 OAA18222 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 14:58:16 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 19 Jan 1999 14:58:16 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199901191458.0.OAA18222@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: Double Box Issues, long
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 02:32 PM 1/19/99, you wrote:

> Allen,
> What is your opinion of looms that are built for weaving while
> standing?

> Lois Mueller
> Wooden Porch Books
> books@woodenporch.com

REPLY:

Our 32 shaft mechanical dobby sampling looms were build to be operated from
a standing position. This can be difficult for long periods if legs are not
alternated periodically for rest. A full standing position was not
absolutely necessary since with a bench which would allow weight to be taken
somewhat off the legs, the loom could still be operated quite well from a
nearly standing position and yet give the advantage of greater use of the
larger thigh muscles. I have talked to many older production handloom
weavers, expecially European ones who also seem to prefer the advantage of
weaving from a standing or nearly standing position.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
224 Slocum Hall
College for Human Development
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1250
Phone: (315) 443-1256/4635
FAX: (315) 443-2562
E-mail: <aafannin@mailbox.syr.edu>
Web: 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 Jan 19 16:07:40 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA27497; Tue, 19 Jan 1999
16:07:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from arl-img-10.compuserve.com (arl-img-10.compuserve.com [149.174.217.140]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA27493; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 16:07:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: (from mailgate@localhost)
I've enjoyed lurking the last two months and have learned a lot. Thank you all. I have a new-to-me AVL 48" 16S production dobby. To thread it BTF, I'd like to raise all the harnesses to their maximum height. Higher than they would be using the peg to hold the doby arm down. Does anyone have any advice as to how to keep them all up there? Also, upon receipt of the AVL, I find I must part with an almost new Mountain Loom, 12" weaving width, 8S table loom. Foldable with warp on. I'll pay shipping w/in lower 48 states. $375 firm. e-mail me privately at <75061.2042@compuserve.com> =

Julie in Minneapolis.

To reply privately, send message to Zdenek Mestenhauser <75061.2042@compuserve.com>

Hi everyone.

I use a wide single treadle on my other loom and at first both feet had to be used. This put an impossible strain on my lower back. Once I rigged the pedal to allow one footed use, I was again weaving in comfort.

I need a foot on the floor to brace the effort of the other foot. With the wide treadle I can now switch feet and find I still do most of my work on
one. But it changes from session to session.

If you find that you have trouble with your back after switching to a single pedal consider using one foot again.

And I like the idea of the spring return for the arm. As long as the spring did not add to the force needed in the lift. Perhaps a gizmo can be invented that kicks in only on the extreme end of the arm movement.

Ingrid Boesel
Fiberworks is moving to
http://www.fiberworks-pcw.com

To reply privately, send message to Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 19 22:42:32 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id WAA19600; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 22:42:32 -0700 (MST)
Received: from newmail.netbistro.com (newmail.netbistro.com [204.239.167.35]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id WAA19561; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 22:42:27 -0700 (MST)
Received: (qmail 17440 invoked by alias); 20 Jan 1999 05:42:38 -0000
Received: (qmail 17425 invoked from network); 20 Jan 1999 05:42:36 -0000
Received: from ip183.dialup.pgonline.com (HELO unknown) (204.239.167.183) by newmail.netbistro.com with SMTP; 20 Jan 1999 05:42:36 -0000
Message-ID: <MAPI.Id.0016.00617572616672793030303830303038@MAPI.to.RFC822>
In-Reply-To: <199901191931.MAA09142@salmon.esosoft.net>
References: Conversation <199901191931.MAA09142@salmon.esosoft.net> with last message
<199901191931.MAA09142@salmon.esosoft.net>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
MIME-Version: 1.0
From: "Laura Fry" <laurafry@netbistro.com>
Subject: Re: AVL bench
Date: Tue, 19 Jan 99 17:47:46 PST
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"; X-MAPIextension=".TXT"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Like Margaret, I "tossed" my bench. I now use a heavily padded bar stool, cut down to the appropriate height. Unfortunately an attached bench doesn't allow for extreme differences in physical measurements - I'm 5'9" and just could *not* no matter how I tried, adjust the bench so that it felt comfortable to weave on.

The stool is tall enough so that I am nearly standing. This gave better leverage when I had the standard dobby. Now that I have the air assist, I find the stool is still comfortable even tho I don't need the physical leverage to raise the shafts.

Slightly off topic - I met another weaver at a craft fair and noticed she had braces on both wrists. I asked if she was having Carpel Tunnel Syndrom problems, and she said yes, she'd just had the surgery - which was why she had so
little stock in her booth. Then she said she had asked her doctor why so many people were experiencing CTS - what did they do in the "olden" days? My mouth, which seems to have a mind of its own some days said "They died." She gave me a look of stunned amazement - "That's what my doctor said!!"

When you consider the average life span of people in the 1700-1800's most people died in their 40-50's - maybe they just didn't survive long enough to develop the repetitive motion injuries that those of us are experiencing???

Laura Fry
working in panic mode - the weft for part of the mega warp got caught in customs....

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

My mouth, which seems to have a mind of its own some days said "They died." She gave me a look of stunned amazement - "That's what my doctor said!!"

When you consider the average life span of people in the 1700-1800's most people died in their 40-50's - maybe they just didn't survive long enough to develop the repetitive motion injuries that those of us are experiencing???

So, Laura, as they said on another list I'm on, "in dog years I'm dead" --LOL. However, I think you and her doctor are right on the money. Even my grandmother, by my age, certainly wouldn't have even thought of continuing a career, let alone feel she was at her peak-or approaching it. A
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generation before that, they most likely would have been deceased and
wouldn't have had to worry about 'challenged legs', carpal tunnel, and so
on. However, as is said, the alternative is not so great, so I'll settle
for what I have and look for the best way to avoid further problems and
rectify those I can.

Diane

---
Diane B. Fields
Designer/colorist/weaver of interior textiles
picnic@twave.net

To reply privately, send message to "Diane B. Fields" <picnic@twave.net>

Just got my winter Weaver's Magazine and saw an add for this great sounding
course in Mainland China, at the Suzhou Silk Museum. Suzhou has been one of
three main silk production centers in China Since the days of the Silk
Road.

Any weavers out there in Denmark who might be able to get me an e-mail
contact address with the Danish Weaving Center , in Hadderslev, Denmark
which will be running the first ever Chinese silk tapestry weaving course
for foreigners at Suzhou starting in April? Anybody know any more details?
I just visited the museum in November and it is wonderful! A course there
would be great! Thanks for any info.

Kathleen Johnson
Taipei
kjohnson@mail.aiit.org.tw

To reply privately, send message to "Kathleen Johnson" <kjohnson@mail.aiit.org.tw>
A member of this list requested that those of us who had the opportunity to hear Elizabeth Wayland Barber speak at the Smithsonian report back to the list. Dr. Barber is the author of "Prehistoric Textiles," "Women's Work: The First 20,000 Years," and (just out) "The Mummies of Urumchi." If you went to Convergence last summer (and stayed till the very end), you might have heard Dr. Barber's talk at the closing meeting.

Those of us in the Wash, DC, area were actually treated to a double-dose of Dr. Barber yesterday. Thanks to the word being quickly passed among the weaving community, we learned that she was to be interviewed for an hour at noon on one of our public radio stations. What a treat to listen to a talk show/call-in show in which people were asking intelligent questions about weaving (e.g.: "Do you think the work was done on warp-weighted looms?"
Answ: no, probably some kind of ground loom or possibly backstrap).

In her lecture, Dr. Barber traced the presumed origins of the caucasiod people found mumified in the Tamrin Basin in what is now Chinese Turkestan. (Carbon dating has placed the mummies themselves at approximately 2000 before the Christian Era, roughly equivalent to the period of the better-known mummies in Egypt.) Two factors lead the academic community to point to Mesopotamia (what we all learned in 5th grade to call "The Fertile Crescent," she said) as the place of origination for this group: the fact that they had wooly sheep and the fact that they had wheat. Both had been originally domesticated in Mesopotamia.

About the wheat: the mummies were buried w/ small baskets of wheat (just about the only non-textile item found in the graves). Populations further to the north consumed mainly millet, she said, and those to the south rice (I believe this information came during the radio show, not the Smithsonian talk). Aside from these people, wheat, which was well-known in Europe and the Middle East by the presumed time of the death of the mummies, was not known in Asia.

About the sheep: sheep in the wild, Dr. Barber said, were entirely hairy (a coat more like deer, she said), and it took about 1000 years of breeding to bring about wooly sheep. Dr. Barber was brought on the Urumchie team especially for her textile expertise, and she went out there fully expecting to find only vegetable-fiber textiles, she said. Instead, the textiles were exclusively wool. I have not (yet) read her book, but from her talks (both radio & at the Smithsonian), I gathered that at least three different techniques were used in producing textiles: felting, weaving, and braiding. Hats, in particular (Cherchen Man and his family had 10 hats buried in their tomb), seemed to have been felted. Weaving included both plain weave and twill techniques. The braids (about 1" wide bands) were sewn together to make a kind of strip-woven cloth. Dr. Barber said she really puzzled over this aspect of the textiles: why would a group that
clearly had the technology to weave wider pieces of cloth resort to this meticulous braiding & sewing? She theorizes that it was an artifact of being a herding society. Wool could be taken out into the pastures by the herders, spun there, and braided. When the herds were brought into winter pastures and the herders were confined indoors during the harshest times of year, the summer's collection of strips of braids could be sewn together to make cloth.

A listener to the call-in radio show asked Dr. Barber about the relationship of the peoples of the early Urumchie community and the Celts. The nexus between the two is that both left behind plaid twills. Dr. Barber said she went out to the dig persuaded that it was coincidence. She has since come to believe that the two groups of people had a common origin, probably somewhere in the region of present-day Austria (which suggests that the Urumchie people, who originated in Mesopotamia, migrated west before subsequently migrating east). This is not to say, she stressed, that the mummified people "were Celts." They were not, though (she said) this is the most common question she gets from the press. The two peoples simply had a common origin, and had the twill-weaving knowledge and expertise before they split into two groups, one of which migrated east and the other of which migrated west.

A fascinating aspect of the textiles from Urumchie is that they are not all natural wool colored. Many are brightly dyed. A questioner at the Smithsonian asked if Dr. Barber had any information on the plants used for dyeing. Dr. Barber said that this is still under analysis. The only information she has so far is that clearly mordants were used.

Another questioner asked if DNA studies have been done on the mummies. Apparently a *very* small amount of DNA material from the mummies has been analyzed, and this analysis seems to indicate that these people are the forebears of the current tall, light-haired, blue-eyed population in western China known as the Uigars (sp?).

I could go on and on (and I usually do <ggg>), but you no doubt have better things to do w/ your time than read email. Janet also attended the lecture, and perhaps can add to what I've written.

I did buy a copy of the new book, and spent the few minutes waiting for the lecture to start "eating my dessert first," that is, looking at the color plates in the book. They're just wonderful! The book lists at US$35.00, but can be purchased both on-line and a local discounters for less.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia  USA

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

Thinking, though inconvenient
>at
>times, is not known to be fatal and once a sequence is established
>and
>memorised, working it actually requires less thinking than Peter's
>comments
>would suggest.
>
>AAF

Reply:

Our local guild, Syracuse Weaver's Guild, had Allen as a guest speaker on Saturday. Allen brought along a few video clips of students weaving; most of the clips were a wonderful demonstration of some of the warping and weaving techniques in his book and if pictures are worth a thousand words than video clips are worth at least a million.

Allen opened the talk with a clip of a boy (maybe 10 or 11) tying a fly (Allen also teaches fly tying). This boy was concentrating totally on the tying process, all the while chomping nonstop on a wad of gum. Someone in the audience noticed that the boy was chomping and tying in rhythm and I think, since he was doing such a great job on that fly, we're now all considering chewing gum while warping. But I think the point was that skill can be acquired at any age and that attention to rhythm and consistency of motion are important in any repetitive activity, be it fly tying, warping a loom, or weaving.

Above all, Allen challenges us all to THINK about what we're doing and how we're doing it and challenges us to make changes that will ultimately make the warping and weaving process more efficient, more enjoyable, and more productive.

Thanks Allen for a great talk.

Linda Wilson
Syracuse, NY
Hi Margaret, Diane, Laura and all

<< The peddle angle for the legs is probably the most important. Various weavers have put blocks on the peddles, gotten comfortable office chairs (tossed the bench) or better padding. I use a backpackers inflatable pillow. It doesn't slip and provides for my posterior the best padding against the edge of the bench. I've tried tail bone doughnuts and sheepskin - not for me. >>

Some months ago I developed an adjustable Bench for a weaver friend/fellow lister that happens to be vertically challenged<g>. She complained about the blood circulation being cut off as the edge of her bench cut into the backs of her legs and her legs would go numb. She weaves on a Macomber.

The Bench is adjustable in both height and angle swing of the seat. The seat rides on a center support that automatically moves with the body movement as the body moves back and forth.

The seat can be adjusted to swing thru an arc from 14 degrees to 20 degrees at four different heights, or it can be locked stationary level at four different heights.

Leclerc is currently fabricating the Bench to be introduced in the upcoming 99 catalog.

Those interested post me privately and I will send you a picture(attached E-mail) of the prototype and details.

Keep those beaters moving

Tom Beaudet

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

Thanks so much for the info--I found it very interesting. In fact, I was wondering where I could get some classes in the historic textiles so that, after being educated, would also be asked to go on such digs. And also interesting, I didn't know there is currently a group of people in NW China who are tall, blond, blue-eyed. I wonder about that group too. Thanks again.

Cheers,
Kathleen

-----Original Message-----
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Date: Wednesday, January 20, 1999 7:28 AM
Subject: Eliz Wayland Barber (long)

A member of this list requested that those of us who had the opportunity to hear Elizabeth Wayland Barber speak at the Smithsonian report back to the list. Dr. Barber is the author of "Prehistoric Textiles," "Women's Work: The First 20,000 Years," and (just out) "The Mummies of Urumchi." If you went to Convergence last summer (and stayed till the very end), you might have heard Dr. Barber's talk at the closing meeting.

Those of us in the Wash, DC, area were actually treated to a double-dose of Dr. Barber yesterday. Thanks to the word being quickly passed among the weaving community, we learned that she was to be interviewed for an hour at noon on one of our public radio stations. What a treat to listen to a talk show/call-in show in which people were asking intelligent questions about weaving (e.g.: "Do you think the work was done on warp-weighted looms?" Answ: no, probably some kind of ground loom or possibly backstrap).

In her lecture, Dr. Barber traced the presumed origins of the caucasiod people found mumified in the Tamrin Basin in what is now Chinese Turkestan. (Carbon dating has placed the mummies themselves at approximately 2000 before the Christian Era, roughly equivalent to the period of the better-known mummies in Egypt.) Two factors lead the academic community to point to Mesopotamia (what we all learned in 5th grade to call "The Fertile Crescent," she said) as the place of origination for this group: the fact that they had wooly sheep and the fact that they had wheat. Both had been originally domesticated in Mesopotamia.

About the wheat: the mummies were buried w/ small baskets of wheat (just about the only non-textile item found in the graves). Populations further to the north consumed mainly millet, she said, and those to the south rice (I believe this information came during the radio show, not the Smithsonian talk). Aside from these people, wheat, which was well-known in Europe and the Middle East by the presumed time of the death of the mummies, was not known in Asia.

About the sheep: sheep in the wild, Dr. Barber said, were entirely hairy (a coat more like deer, she said), and it took about 1000 years of breeding to
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Dr. Barber was brought on the Urumchie team especially for her textile expertise, and she went out there fully expecting to find only vegetable-fiber textiles, she said. Instead, the textiles were exclusively wool. I have not (yet) read her book, but from her talks (both radio & at the Smithsonian), I gathered that at least three different techniques were used in producing textiles: felting, weaving, and braiding. Hats, in particular (Cherchen Man and his family had 10 hats buried in their tomb), seemed to have been felted. Weaving included both plain weave and twill techniques. The braids (about 1" wide bands) were sewn together to make a kind of strip-woven cloth. Dr. Barber said she really puzzled over this aspect of the textiles: why would a group that clearly had the technology to weave wider pieces of cloth resort to this meticulous braiding & sewing? She theorizes that it was an artifact of being a herding society. Wool could be taken out into the pastures by the herders, spun there, and braided. When the herds were brought into winter pastures and the herders were confined indoors during the harshest times of the year, the summer's collection of strips of braids could be sewn together to make cloth.

A listener to the call-in radio show asked Dr. Barber about the relationship of the peoples of the early Urumchie community and the Celts. The nexus between the two is that both left behind plaid twills. Dr. Barber said she went out to the dig persuaded that it was coincidence. She has since come to believe that the two groups of people had a common origin, probably somewhere in the region of present-day Austria (which suggests that the Urumchie people, who originated in Mesopotamia, migrated west before subsequently migrating east). This is not to say, she stressed, that the mummified people "were Celts." They were not, though she said this is the most common question she gets from the press. The two peoples simply had a common origin, and had the twill-weaving knowledge and expertise before they split into two groups, one of which migrated east and the other of which migrated west.

A fascinating aspect of the textiles from Urumchie is that they are not all natural wool colored. Many are brightly dyed. A questioner at the Smithsonian asked if Dr. Barber had any information on the plants used for dyeing. Dr. Barber said that this is still under analysis. The only information she has so far is that clearly mordants were used.

Another questioner asked if DNA studies have been done on the mummies. Apparently a *very* small amount of DNA material from the mummies has been analyzed, and this analysis seems to indicate that these people are the forebears of the current tall, light-haired, blue-eyed population in western China known as the Uigars (sp?).

I could go on and on (and I usually do <ggg>), but you no doubt have better things to do w/ your time than read email. Janet also attended the lecture, and perhaps can add to what I've written.

I did buy a copy of the new book, and spent the few minutes waiting for the lecture to start "eating my dessert first," that is, looking at the color plates in the book. They're just wonderful! The book lists at US$35.00, but can be purchased both on-line and a local discounters for less.

Ruth
sblau@cpcug.org
>Arlington, Virginia  USA

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
I'm Jessica Speer in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. I weave wool yarn rugs and other fabrics on an 8H 62" Cranbrook and I use PCW Software to work out the weave structures and treadling. I sometimes change weaves within a shot, twill and tabby, for instance in a Rya piece. I sell my work in both "major" national shows and in "minor" more local shows and galleries. I occasionally dye yarns and I save all my thrums for inlay and Rya work.

I'm looking forward to this exchange.

Thanks, Jess

To reply privately, send message to Jessica Speer <speerj@mid-pen.lib.mi.us>
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plates in the book. They're just wonderful! The book lists at US$35.00, but can be purchased both on-line and a local discounters for less.

Ruth

Thanks so much Ruth. I just ordered the book online at Amazon and it is $24.50 plus shipping there. I would probably not have thought about buying it (at least not so soon) without your terrific synopsis of the talk.

Diane

---

Diane B. Fields
Designer/colorist/weaver of interior textiles
picnic@twave.net

To reply privately, send message to "Diane B. Fields" <picnic@twave.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Wed Jan 20 08:57:40 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA17720; Wed, 20 Jan 1999 08:57:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo27.mx.aol.com (imo27.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.71]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA17708; Wed, 20 Jan 1999 08:57:35 -0700 (MST)
From: DrmWver999@aol.com
Received: from DrmWver999@aol.com
by imo27.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id 8UUTa06037
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 20 Jan 1999 10:56:52 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <f89ec2b4.36a5fcc4@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 20 Jan 1999 10:56:52 EST
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Eliz Wayland Barber
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 236
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

In a message dated 1/20/99 7:29:10 AM Central Standard Time, owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net writes:

<< Eliz Wayland Barber >>

For those of you in the Chicago area, Dr. Barber will be presenting that same presentation at the Chicago Botanical Gardens on March 27, 1999. There are two sessions, at 11am and 3pm.

Lynn Smetko

To reply privately, send message to DrmWver999@aol.com

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Wed Jan 20 09:25:19 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA23605; Wed, 20 Jan 1999 09:25:19 -0700 (MST)
Received: from internet.roadrunner.com (root.internet.roadrunner.com [198.59.109.7]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA23594; Wed, 20 Jan 1999 09:25:17 -0700 (MST)
Received: from roadrunner.com (diallv114.roadrunner.com [198.59.109.114]) by internet.roadrunner.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id JAA01686
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Wed, 20 Jan 1999 09:25:20 -0700 (MST)
Message-ID: <36A60367.86ADD33@roadrunner.com>
Date: Wed, 20 Jan 1999 09:25:11 -0700
From: Michelle Rudy <rudymm@roadrunner.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win98; I)
I tried this site this am. No problem getting there, but find that I can't read the wif format. (I can read gif.) What program should I obtain to solve this problem? TIA

Michelle in White Rock NM
mailto:rudymm@roadrunner.com

To reply privately, send message to Michelle Rudy <rudymm@roadrunner.com>

The wif format is a text file (you can load it into any text editor/word processor) that stores weaving information to be read into a weaving program that then produces the weaving draft graphically. You need weaving software that supports the wif format.

Fiberworks, Patternland, WeaveIt, ProWeave are some of the ones that support this format. Some only support a few of the features (threading, treadling, but not color) in the wif format. See http://www.mhsoft.com/ for details.

Judie
Hi Ruth,

Thank you for the post. I thoroughly enjoyed reading it. I wish the National Library Service would select books like this for transcription, but seldom is the case.

When I hear descriptions of textiles that are thousands of years old it always sets me to wondering about present day weaving. It will not matter to me a hundred years from now rather someone is still enjoying a rug or wallhanging that I have woven, but I hate to think that it will be easily tossed into a landfill. Then again, maybe an archeologist will dig it up in a thousand years from now.

In our society today it just seems that most people never really think about textiles.

Thanks again, Ruth.

Crystal
raincrow@vvm.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Date: Wednesday, January 20, 1999 6:20 AM
Subject: Eliz Wayland Barber (long)

A member of this list requested that those of us who had the opportunity to hear Elizabeth Wayland Barber speak at the Smithsonian report back to the list. Dr. Barber is the author of "Prehistoric Textiles," "Women's Work: The First 20,000 Years," and (just out) "The Mummies of Urumchi." If you went to Convergence last summer (and stayed till the very end), you might have heard Dr. Barber's talk at the closing meeting.
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Those of us in the Wash, DC, area were actually treated to a double-dose of the weaving community, we learned that she was to be interviewed for an hour at noon on one of our public radio stations. What a treat to listen to a talk show/call-in show in which people were asking intelligent questions about weaving (e.g.: "Do you think the work was done on warp-weighted looms?"

In her lecture, Dr. Barber traced the presumed origins of the caucasiod people found mummified in the Tamrin Basin in what is now Chinese Turkestan. (Carbon dating has placed the mummies themselves at approximately 2000 before the Christian Era, roughly equivalent to the period of the better-known mummies in Egypt.) Two factors lead the academic community to point to Mesopotamia (what we all learned in 5th grade to call "The Fertile Crescent," she said) as the place of origination for this group: the fact that they had wooly sheep and the fact that they had wheat.

About the wheat: the mummies were buried w/ small baskets of wheat (just about the only non-textile item found in the graves). Populations further to the north consumed mainly millet, she said, and those to the south rice (I believe this information came during the radio show, not the Smithsonian talk). Aside from these people, wheat, which was well-known in Europe and the Middle East by the presumed time of the death of the mummies, was not known in Asia.

About the sheep: sheep in the wild, Dr. Barber said, were entirely hairy (a coat more like deer, she said), and it took about 1000 years of breeding to bring about wooly sheep. Dr. Barber was brought on the Urumchie team especially for her textile expertise, and she went out there fully expecting to find only vegetable-fiber textiles, she said. Instead, the textiles were exclusively wool. I have not (yet) read her book, but from her talks (both radio & at the Smithsonian), I gathered that at least three different techniques were used in producing textiles: felting, weaving, and braiding. Hats, in particular (Cherchen Man and his family had 10 hats buried in their tomb), seemed to have been felted. Weaving included both plain weave and twill techniques. The braids (about 1" wide bands) were sewn together to make a kind of strip-woven cloth. Dr. Barber said she really puzzled over this aspect of the textiles: why would a group that clearly had the technology to weave wider pieces of cloth resort to this meticulous braiding & sewing? She theorizes that it was an artifact of being a herding society. Wool could be taken out into the pastures by the herders, spun there, and braided. When the herds were brought into winter pastures and the herders were confined indoors during the harshest times of year, the summer's collection of strips of braids could be sewn together to make cloth.

A listener to the call-in radio show asked Dr. Barber about the relationship of the peoples of the early Urumchie community and the Celts. The nexus between the two is that both left behind plaid twills. Dr. Barber said she went out to the dig persuaded that it was coincidence. She has since come to believe that the two groups of people had a common origin, probably somewhere in the region of present-day Austria (which suggests that the Urumchie people, who originated in Mesopotamia, migrated west before subsequently migrating east). This is not to say, she stressed, that the mumified people "were Celts." They were not, though (she said) this is the most common question she gets from the press. The two peoples simply had a common origin, and had the twill-weaving knowledge and expertise before they split into two groups, one of which migrated east and the other of which migrated west.

A fascinating aspect of the textiles from Urumchie is that they are not all...
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> natural wool colored. Many are brightly dyed. A questioner at the
> Smithsonian asked if Dr. Barber had any information on the plants used for
> dyeing. Dr. Barber said that this is still under analysis. The only
> information she has so far is that clearly mordants were used.
>
> Another questioner asked if DNA studies have been done on the mummies.
> Apparently a *very* small amount of DNA material from the mummies has been
> analyzed, and this analysis seems to indicate that these people are the
> forebears of the current tall, light-haired, blue-eyed population in
> western China known as the Uigars (sp?).
>
> I could go on and on (and I usually do <ggg>), but you no doubt have better
> things to do w/ your time than read email. Janet also attended the
> lecture, and perhaps can add to what I've written.
>
> I did buy a copy of the new book, and spent the few minutes waiting for the
> lecture to start "eating my dessert first," that is, looking at the color
> plates in the book. They're just wonderful! The book lists at US$35.00,
> but can be purchased both on-line and a local discounters for less.
>
> Ruth

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

To reply privately, send message to "Crystal French" <raincrow@vvm.com>

> And also
> interesting, I didn't know there is currently a group of people in NW China
> who are tall, blond, blue-eyed.

Yes indeed--these are the Uigars. I saw some when I was in Beijing in the
mid-80s. I wouldn't have known that I was seeing a Chinese man (he looked
Western European) had not my daughter (something of a China expert at the
time plus fluent Mandarin speaking) pointed them out to me.
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Dr. Barber told a charming story last night. She & another member of the archeology team (a westerner) were accompanied by a local man from Urumchio on a taxi ride. The three got into the cab speaking English, but then their guide turned to the driver & gave instructions in (??whatever dialect??). The taxi driver was astonished and asked the man where he learned to speak such good (??whatever it was??). The man (tall, medium-to-light hair, round but brown eyes, said Dr. Barber) told the driver, "I was born here & have lived here all my life." She showed a slide of the gentleman with the other archeologist. He looked Swiss, German, Central European, North American--but definitely not Asian.

I believe (like the Ainu in Japan) there is a fair amount of prejudice against these western-looking people in China, but I would be happy to be corrected in that by someone who knows more about it than I do.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia USA

To reply privately, send message to Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
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-----Original Message-----
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Date: Wednesday, January 20, 1999 4:30 AM
Subject: Eliz Wayland Barber (long)

> I did buy a copy of the new book, and spent the few minutes waiting for the
> lecture to start "eating my dessert first," that is, looking at the color
> plates in the book. They're just wonderful! The book lists at US$35.00,
> but can be purchased both on-line and a local discounters for less.

What is the title of this new book?
>
> Betty

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

To reply privately, send message to "Betty Lou Whaley" <enbwhaley@jps.net>
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- 177 -
Ruth Blau wrote:

> A member of this list requested that those of us who had the opportunity to
> hear Elizabeth Wayland Barber speak at the Smithsonian report back to the
> list.

Ruth, thank you for the long wonderful review on Dr. Barber's lecture and
interview. Her books are a must for my library now. I printed your e-mail to
share with my studio partners and fellow teachers.

To Betty and Jessica, Ruth stated that the titles were "Prehistoric Textiles,"
"Women's Work: The First 20,000 Years," and "The Mummies of Urumchi."

Jane Doub

To reply privately, send message to bjdoub@earthlink.net

To reply privately, send message to Jane Doub <bjdoub@earthlink.net>

Hi All,

Jerry and I have been fine-tuning the ANWG FTP site and have come up with a
painless solution to those who would like to share WIF or graphic files.
Simply attach them to an e-mail to me, and I will relay them to Jerry.
Remember, anyone can download the files, we just need contributions at this
point so there will be something to download. Gif, tif, jpeg, etc. will
work, just keep them of a modest size.

A source for an FTP program is as follows: http://www.download.com

type in WS FTP in the Search. You can find others just by doing a web
Can't you imagine how the Communist party could use these people as undercover operatives, fluent and Western looking ------or have I been weaving too long.  Thanks for the info.  Cheers, Kathleen

-----Original Message-----
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Date: Wednesday, January 20, 1999 6:11 PM
Subject: Re: Eliz Wayland Barber (long)

>>And also
>>interesting, I didn't know there is currently a group of people in NW China
>>who are tall, blond, blue-eyed.
>
>Yes indeed--these are the Uigar.  I saw some when I was in Beijing in the mid-80s.  I wouldn't have known that I was seeing a Chinese man (he looked Western European) had not my daughter (something of a China expert at the time plus fluent Mandarin speaking) pointed them out to me.
>
>Dr. Barber told a charming story last night.  She & another member of the archeology team (a westerner) were accompanied by a local man from Urumchue on a taxi ride.  The three got into the cab speaking English, but then their guide turned to the driver & gave instructions in (??whatever dialect??).  The taxi driver was astonished and asked the man where he learned to speak such good (Whatever it was?).  The man (tall, medium-to-light hair, round but brown eyes, said Dr. Barber) told the driver, "I was born here & have lived here all my life." She showed a slide of the gentleman with the other archeologist. He looked Swiss,
German, Central European, North American--but definitely not Asian.

I believe (like the Ainu in Japan) there is a fair amount of prejudice against these western-looking people in China, but I would be happy to be corrected in that by someone who knows more about it than I do.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia USA

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

I've made sporadic (unsuccessful) attempts to find a German tractor-seat factory standing chair for just such a purpose (originally for word processing, now for weaving on a badly-designed table loom). Saw them in a couple of books back when "high-tech" (i.e. industrial) furnishings were all the rage, but the closest I ever came was a tripod with a bicycle seat (IKEA) which tipped over whenever I tried to use it. Kinda like the NordicTrack, only not as funny.

Anyway, the idea is that you lean your backside into the tractor seat while standing at the assembly line. Sounded good to me (still does).

Anne in Bainbridge, a bit blabber-fingered after hauling yarn all day yesterday (oh, my shoulders! Oh, my back!)

Anne Silas
asilas@krl.org
Bainbridge Island, Washington, USA

To reply privately, send message to AE Silas <asilas@linknet.kitsap.lib.wa.us>
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Judy,  
I write a column in the Ontario Handweavers & spinners Bulletin called "Net News". What I do is look for textile information and reprint it with permission. I would like to reprint your explanation of the Wif format as below. Our readers are going on-line at a rapid rate and need this kind of information.

Thanks in advance.

Judy Chapman

-----Original Message-----
From: Judie Eatough <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Date: Wednesday, January 20, 1999 7:08 AM
Subject: Re: Re. File Exchange via the ANWG Website

I tried this site this am. No problem getting there, but find that I can't read the wif format. (I can read gif.) What program should I obtain to solve this problem? TIA

The wif format is a text file (you can load it into any text editor/word processor) that stores weaving information to be read into a weaving program that then produces the weaving draft graphically. You need weaving software that supports the wif format.

Fiberworks, Patternland, WeaveIt, ProWeave are some of the ones that support this format. Some only support a few of the features (threading, treadling, but not color) in the wif format. See http://www.mhsoft.com/ for details.
To reply privately, send message to "Judy" <jchapman@halhinet.on.ca>

From: "Judy" <jchapman@halhinet.on.ca>
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Fw: Re. File Exchange via the ANWG Website
Date: Thu, 21 Jan 1999 09:40:44 -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 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Sorry listers,

I had intended to send this message privately.
Judy

. I would like to reprint your explanation of the Wif format as
below.

To reply privately, send message to "Judy" <jchapman@halhinet.on.ca>
There is a Scandinavian company that makes a chair called something like an ErgoChair. It is mean for those who often work standing. It is very expensive. A friend who prefers to semi-stand when working hot glass and who has to stand for public demos uses one of these for 8-12 hours working stretches.

She does sell them and if anyone where interested I would email her for more details.

Wheat

- Wheat Carr mailto:wheat@craftwolf.com
  http://www.craftwolf.com/

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

I would be interested in that chair.
Elaine Deyo
EVESTUDIO@aol.com

To reply privately, send message to EVESTUDIO@aol.com
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Received: from arl-img-12.compuserve.com (arl-img-12.compuserve.com [149.174.217.142]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA22500; Thu, 21 Jan 1999 11:41:18 -0700 (MST)
Received: (from root@localhost)
    by arl-img-12.compuserve.com (8.8.6/8.8.6/2.17) id MAA14568
    for weavetech@List-Server.net; Thu, 21 Jan 1999 12:59:58 -0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 21 Jan 1999 12:59:45 -0500
From: Sue Hunt <drloom@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: Silk tapestry weaving course in China
To: "INTERNET:weavetech@List-Server.net" <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Message-ID: <199901211259_MC2-677E-96BA@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

Message text written by INTERNET:weavetech@List-Server.net

>Any weavers out there in Denmark who might be able to get me an e-mail contact address with the Danish Weaving Center, in Haderslev, Denmark?

I don't think Turid has e-mail but you can fax: +(45) 74 53 42 22. Address is Turid Uthaug, Director, Danish Weaving Center, Fjelstrupvej 34, 6100 Haderslev, Denmark.

Sue

To reply privately, send message to Sue Hunt <drloom@compuserve.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Thu Jan 21 16:57:45 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA00503; Thu, 21 Jan 1999 16:57:45 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.jjj.net (postmaster@smtp.jjj.net [209.235.31.137]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id QAA00494; Thu, 21 Jan 1999 16:57:44 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cc429928-a.hwrd1.md.home.com (cc429928-a.hwrd1.md.home.com [24.3.63.99]) by smtp.jjj.net (8.9.1/8.9.0) with SMTP id SAA12852;
    Thu, 21 Jan 1999 18:54:51 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.16.19990121185644.31070602@smtp.jjj.com>
X-Sender: wheat@smtp.jjj.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (16)
Date: Thu, 21 Jan 1999 18:56:44 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Wheat Carr <wheat@craftwolf.com>
Subject: RE: Sit Stand & Arm thingys
Cc: DichroicDiva@aol.com
In-Reply-To: <d4bab122.36a7ace1@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

This is the info about the Sit/Stand Chair and another device which supports your arm just in "front of the elbow - Karen is a hot glass worker, but I also use a support for my arm when doing just about any handwork.

Please email her directly for brochures or whatever - I have no interest in her business other than spending entirely too much money buying her wonderful Beads.
Those who attended Convergence may have met Karen there – she was way the one making glass beads in the back corner

>missed you in Clearwater. Thought you were going to be there. Were
>you absent because of illness or ya just dint wanna see us?
>
The Arm Thingys (perfect name for them) are $275 delivered and the
>"Sit Stand" is in the $650 range. I will see if there are any closeouts, etc.
>Yes, it is expensive. I used to have to go to the chiropractor and massage
>therapy 2 - 3 times a week after doing a show. That cost me many times more
>than this equipment. A safety consultant watched me working one day and told
>me I would be undergoing operations fairly soon – AND – have to quit what I
>was doing, if I did not make some changes in how I was working.
>
>In our RV studio, I can't use my chair because of the layout. I really notice
>it everywhere. I have to stand because I am unable to reach the kiln
>otherwise. My feet, knees, hips and lower back hurt. I have to stand with
>legs wide apart or stoop. Less than perfect. I am ecstatic when we can go
>and do a show, I get to sit.
>
>Good to hear from you. Hug yourself tightly and drink lots of colloidal silver.
>Karen - Hot Glass Beads
>
>

Wheat Carr   mailto:wheat@craftwolf.com
http://www.craftwolf.com/

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Fri Jan 22 08:43:16 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA26052; Fri, 22 Jan 1999 08:43:16 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp13.bellglobal.com (smtp13.bellglobal.com [204.101.251.52]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA26040; Fri, 22 Jan 1999 08:43:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from default (ppp955.on.bellglobal.com [206.172.239.187])
by smtp13.bellglobal.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id KAA22149
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Fri, 22 Jan 1999 10:43:31 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.32.19990122104205.006d49ec@pop1.sympatico.ca>
X-Sender: b1zzom44@pop1.sympatico.ca
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Fri, 22 Jan 1999 10:43:03 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>
Subject: tractor seat
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

Hi Anne:

I saw many many moons ago, an article in Interwoven I think (early
WeaveTech Archive 9901

Handwoven). It was about a very tall man who used a tractor seat, not a pretty new age thing, but a tractor seat. Perhaps farm suppliers could give you a line. He fastened it to the bottom cross brace of the loom. It would take a while to hunt this up.

We are changing servers, so please update your address book and bookmark
Ingrid

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Ingrid Boesel, the weaving half of Fiberworks PCW
Fiberworks is moving!
Visit us at: http://www.fiberworks-pcw.com
Email: ingrid@fiberworks-pcw.com or info@fiberworks-pcw.com

To reply privately, send message to Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>

Hello, I am new to weavetech so forgive me if I repeat an old dialog. I came to a University which had already bought solenoid linking boxes for the two 10 harness Macs. These were so old that, although never installed, they were engineered to interface with an ATARI computer.

Through a grant, I upgraded both boxes a year ago. However, nothing I have tried has been successful in getting the interfaces to work. The programs work (and I have tried many,) the computer engineers tell me that the signal is getting from the computer to the box, but no one understands why the solenoids refuse to engage. I am not an engineer and really not very adept at machines. As a result I have sought help from many sources but no one has been able to explain the problem. Does anyone else have this technology who would be willing to try to help me figure it out?

I have heard from more than one instructor that these boxes cannot be made to work. I sincerely hope that is not true.

Thanks,
Laura Strand
Southern Illinois University

To reply privately, send message to laura strand <lstrand@siue.edu>
> From: Jessica Speer <speerj@mid-pen.lib.mi.us>
> Subject: Post to weavetech
>
> From: Jessica Speer <speerj@mid-pen.lib.mi.us>
> Subject: Post to weavetech
>
> Hi Jessica:

> Just read your intro to the weavetech list and I have a couple of questions
> for you. My name is Patt Hanson, I live in Boulder, Colorado. I also
> weave on an 8H, 62" Cranbrook. Have been weaving off and on for about 22
> years. I use the PCW software, and just upgraded to the "Baby Silver" PCW.
> Like it a lot!

> My questions: What kind of a shed do you get when using 4 or more of your
> harnesses on the Cranbrook? And is your loom a new one or an older one, of
> Norwood manufacture? The reason I ask these particular questions: I love
> my Cranbrook, but have trouble getting a proper and even shed. Mine is
> older - manufactured by Norwood, has the metal chain tie-ups and harness
> supports. I've been out to Schacht Co (they now manufacture the Cranbrook)
> and have looked at the changes and adjustments they have made to the loom -
> they are using Texsolv instead of the metal chains in all areas. Any
> little ideas you can pass along to me would be much appreciated. I weave
> blankets and rag rugs on this loom, but not wool yarn rugs.

> My next question: You mention Rya rugs - what do you use for the warp, and
> what yarn are you using for the weft, and where do you get it? I have made
> one Rya, however, I bought the backing from Norway, as well as the wool -
> all different sizes of wool from skinny to fat - wonderful rug, but would
> like to do one on my loom. Haven't been able to find the skinny yarn for
> the weft - I do have the fatter wool.

> I am not posting this to the big list because somehow it doesn't seem
> technical enough. Thanks for any information you might be willing to share!

> Patt Hanson
> waynehanson@worldnet.att.net

>
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To reply privately, send message to Jessica Speer <speerj@mid-pen.lib.mi.us>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Fri Jan 22 13:40:55 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA03528; Fri, 22 Jan 1999
13:40:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail.twave.net (twave.net [206.100.228.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5)
id NAA03522; Fri, 22 Jan 1999 13:40:54 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host twave.net [206.100.228.5] claimed to be mail.twave.net
Received: from [208.219.234.102] by mail.twave.net (NTMail 3.03.0017/1.abwg) with ESMTP
id ha939907 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Fri, 22 Jan 1999 15:40:03 -0500
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19990122154003.007e0100@twave.net>
X-Sender: picnic@twave.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Fri, 22 Jan 1999 15:40:03 -0500
To: weavetech@list-server.net
From: "Diane B. Fields" <picnic@twave.net>
Subject: Re: Macomber Computerized Looms
In-Reply-To: <36A8CBFD.21C1@siue.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 02:06 PM 1/22/99 -0500, you wrote:
> Hello, I am new to weavetech so forgive me if I repeat an old dialog. I
> came to a University which had already bought solenoid linking boxes for
> the two 10 harness Macs. These were so old that, although never
> installed, they were engineered to interface with an ATARI computer.
> 
> Through a grant, I upgraded both boxes a year ago. However, nothing I
> have tried has been successful in getting the interfaces to work. The
> programs work (and I have tried many,) the computer engineers tell me
> that the signal is getting from the computer to the box, but no one
> understands why the solenoids refuse to engage. I am not an engineer and
> really not very adept at machines. As a result I have sought help from
> many sources but no one has been able to explain the problem. Does
> anyone else have this technology who would be willing to try to help me
> figure it out?
> 
> I have heard from more than one other instructor that these boxes cannot
> be made to work. I sincerely hope that is not true.

Well Laura, speaking as someone who has a 20 shaft Macomber that had the
Designers Delight (the big pedal that I'm guessing these have) and the
original 'sort of' computer that used a key to log in programs, etc.--I
have gone through the upgrade process, be it quite a number of years ago.
My loom did have a box that communicated with the loom (solenoids). I
bought my loom from a fabric mill where it had been used as a sample loom
way back when it was about the first computerized handloom and they (the
mill) were not, at that time, running a sample loom in the mill. I called
Macomber and had my box upgraded (basically got new innards for it because
it has to be 32 bit). At that time I used Macomber's weave program-Design
Master, I think--because no one else had created the drivers for their
programs to work with the Mac. That may be what you don't have-a Macomber
specific loom driver. I used Proweave and then had to manually key
everything into DM. I had problems with the box (I weave full time) and
bought Proweave's box (which will only work with Proweave for all the
obvious reasons) and have had absolutely no problems since. I also use
Fiberworks and Patternland but use WIF capabilities (well, can't WIF <out>
yet from Fiberworks silver, Ingrid, <G>) to and from Proweave and use the
Proweave loom control.

My questions to you would be what programs are you using, do they have
Macomber specific drivers, <how> did you have the boxes upgraded? Since my
loom probably predates the ones you are working with, then I know it is
entirely possible to get everything to work—and work well.

Be glad to help in any way I can.

Diane
---
Diane B. Fields
Designer/colorist/weaver of interior textiles
picnic@twave.net
To reply privately, send message to "Diane B. Fields" <picnic@twave.net>

I have an AVL compu-dobby loom with the old dobbysystem and cartridge in
it. I program the cartridge and weave, as the computer needs to reside
most of the time away from my loom. (Or I won't have a phone connection
for one thing.) Anyway, for those of you who have ever used this system
you'll know how frustrating it can be to back up and correct a mistake or
to simply know where you are at in your weaving. Besides which, my
cartridge occasionally experiences random memory problems causing it to
lift all the shafts at once, for instance, when it wasn't supposed to.

So, here's what I need your opinion on...is it better to buy a used
computer to go by my loom or to spring for the new compudobby system with
programable cartridge. I bought the loom used this past summer and want to
use it for years to come. A used computer would be cheaper but is cheaper
necessarily better here? Your opinions please.

Sara
jnordling@exodus.valpo.edu

To reply privately, send message to jnordling@EXODUS.VALPO.EDU (John Nordling)
At 04:47 PM 1/22/99 -0600, Sara wrote:
> So, here's what I need your opinion on...is it better to buy a used 
> computer to go by my loom or to spring for the new compudobby system with 
> programable cartridge. ... A used computer would be cheaper but is cheaper 
> necessarily better here?

I've been questioning along the same lines. Although I have a computer 
dedicated to the loom, it does not run Windows 95 or 98. Do I buy an 
inexpensive, low-end Windows 98 machine or the new Dobby box? At the 
moment my thinking is to get a new computer as it will not only give me 
more flexibility right at the loom and also could be used as a back up for 
my upstairs system, but it would be much less expensive.

Janet (who recently retired the 8088 and is now weaving with a 386)
Sara,

I'm using a compu-dobby 1 without the cartridge. It is reliable and great. I suppose if the box failed, I would upgrade, but until then I'm happy.

One vote cast for a used computer.

Judie

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

---

Here is another vote for a used computer. My loom computer (after several upgrades) failed. We found an inexpensive, reconditioned computer with everything I needed, including Windows 95 and additional ports. In this area (central AZ) many companies upgrade their computers regularly and sell the old ones at auction. Smart people buy these, clean up the hard drives and resell them. My feeling is that it is much better to be able to see what is happening with the pattern while the weaving is in progress.

Cynthia Broughton

John Nordling wrote:

> I have an AVL compu-dobby loom with the old dobby system and cartridge in it. I program the cartridge and weave, as the computer needs to reside most of the time away from my loom.
> So, here's what I need your opinion on...is it better to buy a used computer to go by my loom or to spring for the new compudobby system with programable cartridge.

To reply privately, send message to kip broughton <cynthb@uswest.net>
I have decided that I should introduce myself since I enjoy the list and comments. Also been tempted to jump in but answering a question and introducing myself is to big a hurtle.

My name is Sue Peters and I live in Midland Michigan. We are located about 25 minutes from the Saginaw bay, its the big bay between the thumb and the forefinger.

I am just recently retired and am VP of the Michigan League of Handweavers, also the Workshop Chairman for next Summers Conference and Workshops. I will be president in June. Thus I have not increased my time at the loom as much as I thought I would when I retired. I like to weave best but talking about it is almost as much fun.

I have an 8H Baby Wolf and an AVL. The AVL is a 60 inch, 24H, Compu-Dobby, with and overhead beater, single box, fly shuttle. I also have the Auto Advance and two sectional warp beams. I bought the loom a shortly before I retired and love it. On occasion it is like the little girl who had a little curl .... so I am really enjoying all the AVL'ers who have so kindly taken time from their weaving to answer questions about the AVL.

Plan to contribute as time goes by. Like most weavers, I do have an opinion.

Sue Peters near the Saginaw Bay
<yapeters@concentric.net>

To reply privately, send message to "Sue Peters" <yapeters@concentric.net>
I am enjoying the messages very much, but is it possible to limit the quotes to a few pertinent lines please.

Susan

Chickadee Creek Studios

e-mail: <rbh@bc.sympatico.ca>

---

The authoritative definition and information on the WIF format can be found at http://www.mhsoft.com/wif/wif.html on the Maple Hill Software website.

Michael Slade

To reply privately, send message to "Michael Slade" <mslade1@rochester.rr.com>
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>> So, here's what I need your opinion on...is it better to buy a used
>> computer to go by my loom or to spring for the new compudobby system with
>> programable cartridge.
>
>My computer guru (an electronic (electric?) engineer) told me that
vibrations can damage a computer but if you place your machine on a rubber
or foam pad, that will isolate it from the loom's vibrations and protect it.

Betty Lou

To reply privately, send message to "Betty Lou Whaley" <enbwhaley@jps.net>
One of the looms I have under consideration for when/if I make the leap into computerized weaving is the new (I guess really not yet out) Louet Megado. I had emailed Louet to ask if they were going to be at MAFA and if so would they have a Megado for people to play with. I heard back from Dave, and the answer is yes & yes--they will be at MAFA and they will have a Megado. Thought I'd let everyone know, in case others are also interested in seeing/trying this new loom.

Ruth

rsblau@cpcug.org
Arlington, Virginia USA

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

Ruth Blau wrote:

> One of the looms I have under consideration for when/if I make the leap into computerized weaving is the new (I guess really not yet out) Louet Megado.

Hi Ruth,
I was able to see and weave on the new Louet loom at Convergence last summer. I was impressed with the ease that the harnesses lifted. One of my studio partners has ordered it and expects delivery this summer. If any one is interested in a review when it arrives and is operating, I can let you know the pros and cons.

Jane

To reply privately, send message to Jane Doub <bjdoub@earthlink.net>
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Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA02060; Fri, 22 Jan 1999 21:40:29 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail.twave.net (twave.net [206.100.228.5]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id VAA02055; Fri, 22 Jan 1999 21:40:27 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host twave.net [206.100.228.5] claimed to be mail.twave.net
Received: from [208.246.1.107] by mail.twave.net (NTMail 3.03.0017/1.abwg) with ESMTP id ya945696 for <weavetech@list-server.net>; Fri, 22 Jan 1999 23:40:32 -0500
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19990122233948.007db570@twave.net>
X-Sender: picnic@twave.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Fri, 22 Jan 1999 23:39:48 -0500
To: weavetech@list-server.net
From: "Diane B. Fields" <picnic@twave.net>
Subject: Re: your opinion please
In-Reply-To: <36A8F5F1.BC220A86@uswest.net>
References: <v01510101b2ceaf4f5d15@[152.228.37.113]>
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 03:04 PM 1/22/99 -0700, you wrote:
>Here is another vote for a used computer.  <snip>  My feeling is
>that it is much better to be able to see what is happening with the
>pattern while
>the weaving is in progress.
>Cynthia Broughton
>
I am coming to that situation I think.  I have a quite old 486 for my
dedicated loom computer and I believe my harddrive is failing.  I have
another old 486 that I may use, but more likely will try and find a
reconditioned Pentium.  I don't much worry about losing my harddrive as I
do all my designing on my fast big monitored Gateway.  I then just carry my
'portable' diskette back and forth to the studio.  I definitely want a
computer near my loom at all times-I make changes, change repeats, pull in
different treadlings.  I vote for a computer-new or reconditioned that you
can have as a dedicated loom computer.

Diane in NC

To reply privately, send message to "Diane B. Fields" <picnic@twave.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Jan 23 06:50:57 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA27772; Sat, 23 Jan 1999
06:50:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from green.up.lib.mi.us (root@green.up.lib.mi.us [198.108.240.254]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA27768; Sat, 23 Jan 1999 06:50:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: from pm219-04.dialip.mich.net (pm219-04.dialip.mich.net [198.110.153.14]) by
green.up.lib.mi.us (8.6.12/8.6.9) with SMTP id JAA19064 for <weavetech@list-server.net>;
Sat, 23 Jan 1999 09:02:38 -0600
Date: Sat, 23 Jan 1999 09:02:38 -0600
Message-Id: <199901231502.JAA19064@green.up.lib.mi.us>
X-Sender: speerj@mid-pen.lib.mi.us
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: Jessica Speer <speerj@mid-pen.lib.mi.us>
Subject: Used Computers
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
I don't have a computer-driven, but I do have a used reconditioned computer. For $300 I got an 16 mg hard drive, 16 mg memory, sound board, modem, color monitor and Win 3.1. I'm probably going to upgrade to upgrade to Win 95, but I could have had that, too, for very little more. I ordered it on Friday and it came on Mon. and by Tues afternoon it was up and running, with out the help of any of my computer gurus. Saved a lot of money over buying a new one with much more than I need. Most of us don't really need the super power of the newest and fastest.

Jess

To reply privately, send message to Jessica Speer <speerj@mid-pen.lib.mi.us>

Aside from a dedicated computer offering you a back up, it also offers the advantage of using, AT THE LOOM, other design programs. It is unclear to me if the system offered by the Loom Company will allow or support other design programs you might like.

Assuming that the programs required for your loom now or will soon allow for import of the "WIF" format that the more responsible weaving programmers are incorporating as a standard to import any draft, and, while each of us has a favorite weaving program, there are many who like different features of different programs so may have multiple programs.

Besides, I like equipment that is not loom/manufacturer dependent.

Incidentally, because of our concerns about security of certain business
data, we are moving towards a machine dedicated to email, but which
will also support my loom - something others who "main" machine also
contains confidential data as more of us have some from of direct Internet
connection (Janet, think Cable Modem) this type of security issue can be
a matter for serious concern.

So bottom line, go for the separate machine, make sure it can support
various weaving or design programs and perhaps serve are you email machine
and the only really secure way to protect your other machines is sneaker.net

Wheat

who is learning more about fire walls this month than she cares to think
about.

- 

Wheat Carr mailto:wheat@craftwolf.com
http://www.craftwolf.com/

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Jan 23 08:13:36 1999
Received: (salmon=localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA09092; Sat, 23 Jan 1999
08:13:36 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp3.erols.com (smtp3.erols.com [207.172.3.236]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id IAA09055; Sat, 23 Jan 1999 08:13:34 -0700 (MST)
Received: from erols.com (207-172-145-2.s2.as4.fdk.erols.com [207.172.145.2])
by smtp3.erols.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id KAA23554
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 23 Jan 1999 10:13:35 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <36A9A022.838D8700@erols.com>
Date: Sat, 23 Jan 1999 10:10:42 +0000
From: Susan Smith <sufiber@erols.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: you opinion please
References: <199901222138.0AA15532@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

> > From: jnordling@EXODUS.VALPO.EDU (John Nordling)
> > Subject: your opinion please
> >
> > So, here's what I need your opinion on...is it better to buy a used
> > computer to go by my loom or to spring for the new compudobby system with
> > programable cartridge. I bought the loom used this past summer and want to
> > use it for years to come. A used computer would be cheaper but is cheaper
> > necessarily better here? Your opinions please.
> >
> > Sara
> > jnordling@exodus.valpo.edu
>
Sara and Janet,
I vote for an older computer. I had an 8088 running my loom back when 386's were
the top of the line. Currently, I have a 386 running the IDL and an older(smaller)
486 for my new sample loom. I prefer to design with the latest version of my software and in the relative comfort of my office. I have copies of the latest version of my software, as well as the previous version which I need for the older computer, on the office computer. The new programs all will export in wif. to an older version which I then save to disk and bring to the loom. This sounds more complex than it is.

At the loom, it's easy enough to enter any last minute changes. This way you don't need a computer chair or printer at the loom and only need a surface for the monitor and keyboard/mouse.

As for Janet's comment about backing up the main computer, I think you should get a tape or zip drive for that. If you were to loose all your data due to a power failure or house fire, it would likely happen to both. Recomended procedure is to back up and keep the copy in the glove box of the car. Did I do this yet? ;-)

Here's hoping I sent this post correctly and apologies beforehand if I don't.

Susan Smith

To reply privately, send message to Susan Smith <sufiber@erols.com>

> I am coming to that situation I think. I have a quite old 486 for my
> dedicated loom computer and I believe my harddrive is failing. I have

First, many times folks think it is their hard drive (and get told that by computer sellers) when really all it is a little battery. The exact info escapes my feverish brain at the moment, but there is a battery much like a watch battery that has about a 3 year life span. We have several machines that were discarded because the owner was told the hard drive was bad and all that was needed was a battery that costs under $10 and the knowledge to change it. Even paying some repair place to change the battery has to be much less costly than replacing the machine.

May I suggest that since the machine works, that you might want to consider simply adding a new hard drive and perhaps some ram. Change the Battery an d adding a larger drive/more ram and you will have spent far less.

Far too many machines and drives are ending up in dumps for no real reason.
My plan is to use the Loom Machine as the "back up storage" for drafts and designs.

Wheat
who has zip driven sneakers.

Wheat Carr mailto:wheat@craftwolf.com
http://www.craftwolf.com/

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

Recomended procedure is to back up and keep the copy in the glove box of the car.

Uhh, this would not be recommended as most media (maybe not cd's) are sensitive to temperature change and also to heat.

For the average home owner/home business - we usually suggest weekly back up with three rotating sets one at your home, one in transit and one kept outside the home - your desk or locker at work.

Wheat Carr mailto:wheat@craftwolf.com
http://www.craftwolf.com/

To reply privately, send message to Wheat Carr <wheat@craftwolf.com>
Betty Lou Whaley wrote:

> My computer guru (an electronic (electric?) engineer) told me that
> vibrations can damage a computer but if you place your machine on a rubber
> or foam pad, that will isolate it from the loom's vibrations and protect it.

While certainly not challenging the knowledge of an expert, I think we need to
put this in perspective. Lots of us have been using looms with computers for
many years with and without pads, some even have mounted them on the loom. I've
encountered all sorts of problems but I confess most can be blamed on the
operator/weaver, none of them have been with the hardware of any of the sundry
computers I've used.

Margaret

----------------------------------------
MargeCoe@concentric.net
Tucson, AZ, USA
----------------------------------------

To reply privately, send message to Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>
Hi to All - I'm new to WeaveTech and reading my first digest. I'm a production weaver on the Mendocino Coast of California. Out here on the edge I've been using an AVL Compu-dobby/two beams/4 shuttle boxes and waiting on Air powered shuttle mechanism.

A suggestion for computers to use in the studio away from your main design computer and in place of the cartridge system: I go to the local High School Electronics class and pick up the least expensive computer that will run my software. The students refurbish them and get a few dollars for learning. Personally I use an old MAC Plus and the appropriate software for that generation. It is dedicated to running my compu-dobby in the dusty environment of the studio and when it dies I trade it in for another one. So far I have spent less than $200 over 10 years of weaving.

E-mail <admark@mcn.org>

To reply privately, send message to Adriane Nicolaisen/Mark Safron <admark@mcn.org>
I like having the new laptop for my loom, I don't have to dedicate a whole wall to the loom and the computer. I used to sometimes have the computer on the wrong side of the loom so then the wires were hanging all over the place. With the laptop I can put it on a tv tray stand on either side and the loom can be anywhere I want it in my apartment.

vivian in colorado springs

You don't need to buy Internet access to use free Internet e-mail. Get completely free e-mail from Juno at http://www.juno.com/getjuno.html or call Juno at (800) 654-JUNO [654-5866]

To reply privately, send message to sparrowv@juno.com

> From: Yehudit Abrahams <gabraham@netvision.net.il>  
> To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
> Subject: Re: your opinion please  
> Date: iem x'yeo 24 ipe'x 1999 00:56  
>  
> If I'm not mistaken, it sounds as if the computer you use to program your cartridge is probably old enough. Why not take that one to the loom and buy an upgrade for the telephone. This way, you do not have to feel guilty about anything.  
>  
> I have, I believe, the most incredible amount of equipment that covers 120 sq. meters. I bought nothing new; so when I had to fit a new compudobby to my used AVL, I had a choice, at the same price, and I had to go for the Dobby I....it has to be old to work in my studio. My husband still sniffs around now and then and picks up a screwdriver and I have to prove it's mine.  
>
I'm sorry for sending this whole post, but this is one of several I have never seen on the list (I wanted to include the whole thing so perhaps someone could set me straight). Am I missing some posts or has this been personal emails that have then had selections posted to the list?--which is fine, but I sort of felt that I had missed some posts and then wondered if I was missing even more??
Does anyone out there have any experience or an opinion on the practicality or workability of retrofitting a Glimakra loom with a computerized dobby system?
I'm new to the list and have been lurking for several weeks and am impressed with what I am reading.
I have been weaving for 15 years. My interest in color and texture brought me to weaving but I seem to have developed an addiction for pattern work and at one time was doing reproduction coverlets both full size and miniature
As most weavers do, I have several looms. My first, a 36" 4H Harrisville, a 54" 8H Glimakra, and am about to buy a 12-16H workshop loom, to take to MAFA in July (Karen Selk's silk workshop.)
I recently rescued a 40" 4 H (add a harness) Macomber from a sheltered workshop group that was about to put it in the dumpster.
It needs some minor refurbishing, (a retirement project)
Fran in Delaware
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Date: Sun, 24 Jan 1999 13:36:27 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Fiberworks PCW <ingrid@fiberworks-pcw.com>
Subject: laptops and Looms
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

Date: Sat, 23 Jan 1999 17:16:40 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Fiberworks PCW <ingrid@fiberworks-pcw.com>
Subject: laptops and Looms

Hi Vivian:
Laptop sometimes do not have the power in the ports to interface with a loom.
But is wise to check the specs on your desired or preferred program before committing to any computer.

Ingrid

Please update your address book and bookmark to our NEW address
Ingrid Boesel, the weaving half of Fiberworks PCW
Visit us at:  http://www.fiberworks-pcw.com
Email:  ingrid@fiberworks-pcw.com

To reply privately, send message to Fiberworks PCW <ingrid@fiberworks-pcw.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Sun Jan 24 12:57:07 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA22507; Sun, 24 Jan 1999 12:57:07 -0700 (MST)
Received: from swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net (swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.123]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA22498; Sun, 24 Jan 1999 12:57:05 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cheryl (ip6.an5-new-york4.ny.pub-ip.psi.net [38.26.16.6]) by swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id LA24799 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 24 Jan 1999 11:57:11 -0800 (PST)
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19990124145353.007c47c0@mail.earthlink.net>
X-Sender: fiberart@mail.earthlink.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Sun, 24 Jan 1999 14:53:53 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: "FiberArt@earthlink.net" <fiberart@earthlink.net>
Subject: laptops and Looms
In-Reply-To: <3.0.32.19990124133103.006d3afc@mail.sstsystems.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

>Hi Vivian:
>Laptop sometimes do not have the power in the ports to interface with a loom.
>But is wise to check the specs on your desired or preferred program before committing to any computer.

I have an older Toshiba Protege. It's a 486/33 that wasn't strong enough for many things. But it has Windows 95 & my weaving software. I don't create the drafts on it but use it to power my Schact CompuDobby. It works
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perfectly and I have never had a problem with it. It was good to have a use for the laptop since I couldn't throw away a perfectly good piece of equipment but it wasn't sufficient horsepower for more updated everyday software that I use.

Cheryl
FiberArt@earthlink.net
http://home.earthlink.net/~fiberart/

To reply privately, send message to "FiberArt@earthlink.net" <fiberart@earthlink.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Sun Jan 24 13:24:53 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA27259; Sun, 24 Jan 1999
13:24:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp4.nwnexus.com (smtp4.nwnexus.com [206.63.63.52]) by salmon.esosoft.net
(8.8.5) id NAA27252; Sun, 24 Jan 1999 13:24:51 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [206.63.41.195] (blv-lx105-ip45.nwnexus.net [206.63.41.195])
   by smtp4.nwnexus.com (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id MAA17308
   for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 24 Jan 1999 12:24:57 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: kwarner@mail.halcyon.com
Message-Id: <l03010d00b2d12ec7be5e@[206.63.42.90]>
In-Reply-To: <3.0.5.32.19990124145353.007c47c0@mail.earthlink.net>
References: <3.0.32.19990124133103.006d3afc@mail.sstsystems.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Sun, 24 Jan 1999 12:26:12 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Kathy Warner <kwarner@halcyon.com>
Subject: Re: laptops and Looms
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

I have successfully used two Mac Powerbooks with Weavemaker One and the Macomber "box". The 145 was slow, but not as slow as the door-closer pedal lifter, and the newer one also works fine (it only has one serial port, which it thinks is a modem port in this case.) The problems I've had have been with the box, which may have been assembled by the newest apprentice, and has been back for repair twice in the year I've had it. Maybe this time it's settled down....

It's very handy to have the computer, not taking up acres of space, right next to the loom. Laptops are definitely worth trying.

Kathy Warner (kwarner@halcyon.com)
busily knocking on wood

To reply privately, send message to Kathy Warner <kwarner@halcyon.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Sun Jan 24 15:41:20 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA22220; Sun, 24 Jan 1999
15:41:20 -0700 (MST)
Received: from priv-edtnps04-hme0.telusplanet.net (edtnps04.telusplanet.net
[198.161.157.104]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA22188; Sun, 24 Jan 1999 15:41:13 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host edtnps04.telusplanet.net
[198.161.157.104] claimed to be priv-edtnps04-hme0.telusplanet.net
Hi Gang,

With the use of all these old computers on our weaving equipment, I currently have the old 486/50 earmarked for that chore when I convert, will they be adversely affected by the dreaded "Y2K?"

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>
They be adversely affected by the dreaded "Y2K?"

Pamela

Maybe :-).  What operating system?  You can check with the manufacturer of both to see if you will be OK.

Cheryl
FiberArt@earthlink.net
http://home.earthlink.net/~fiberart/

Y2K for weaving programs is probably a non-issue - or are you weaving dates into the cloth?

Most 486 PC's are Y2K compliant by a manual date reset after the end of the year.  There are loads of programs and diskettes circulating that allow you to check any PC quickly to be sure that the BIOS will handle new dates. Otherwise, there is the suggestion that a German machine tool maker is making seriously - set the system date back 10 or 15 years and NO PROBLEMS.

Sara von Tresckow
sarav@tcccom.net
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin

To reply privately, send message to "SARA VON TRESCKOW" <sarav@tcccom.net>

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Sun Jan 24 19:44:15 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA06507; Sun, 24 Jan 1999 19:44:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo23.mx.aol.com (imo23.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.67]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA06489; Sun, 24 Jan 1999 19:44:11 -0700 (MST)
From: EVESTUDIO@aol.com
Received: from imo23.mx.aol.com (imo23.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.67]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA06489; Sun, 24 Jan 1999 19:44:11 -0700 (MST)
From: EVESTUDIO@aol.com
Received: from imo23.mx.aol.com (imo23.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.67]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id TAA06507; Sun, 24 Jan 1999 19:44:15 -0700 (MST)
If you set your computer to a "former" date; say 10 or 15 years prior to the present, will the dated material - that is, applications which were installed and/or set-up on a certain date -- be nonexistent? They can't be installed "into the future". What could the outcome be? I wrote a letter October 2, 1998, say for instance. I set my computer's date back a ways before the date of my letter which is saved in a file. Will the computer try to make sense of it and do what

To reply privately, send message to EVESTUDIO@aol.com
Setting the date WAY BACK on a computer was not intended for one that you use for dated materials. For business correspondence, etc. most newer computers will take you into 2000 just fine. Microsoft Office 97 is rated compliant as are most other recent office packages.

However, the "junk PC's" used in business and probably weavers studios to run specialty software like compudobby programs won't care. There are thousands of users out there running industrial control programs and weaving drafts who only need the machine to boot properly and run the machine. I'm responsible for the software side of Y2K for a factory of 1500 employees and not nearly as skittish as some folks who just type letters at home. Most of the Y2K issues those home users face are of the inconvenience nature, not "mission critical".

Sara von Tresckow
sarav@tcccom.net
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin

To reply privately, send message to "SARA VON TRESCKOW" <sarav@tcccom.net>

> From: "SARA VON TRESCKOW" <sarav@tcccom.net>
> Subject: Re: used computers
> Date: Sun, 24 Jan 1999 20:56:03 -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 4.72.3110.5
> X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
> Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
> Precedence: bulk
> Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

SARA VON TRESCKOW wrote:

Y2K for weaving programs is probably a non-issue . . . Otherwise, there is the suggestion that a German machine tool maker is making seriously - set the system date back 10 or 15 years and NO PROBLEMS.
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Heard a discussion on radio - 28 years back gives the correct day/date
cycle.

To reply privately, send message to Iris Charmer <icharmer@up.net>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Mon Jan 25 00:36:57 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id AAA26297; Mon, 25 Jan 1999
00:36:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mail10.svr.pol.co.uk (mail10.svr.pol.co.uk [195.92.193.214]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id AAA26292; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 00:36:55 -0700 (MST)
Received: from modem-124.barium.dialup.pol.co.uk ([62.136.27.252] helo=headquarters)
   by mail10.svr.pol.co.uk with smtp (Exim 2.10 #1)
   id 104gZp-0004lo-00
   for weavetech@list-server.net; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 07:36:54 +0000
From: "Ian Bowers" <ian@fibrecrafts.freeserve.co.uk>
To: <weavetech@list-server.net>
Subject: RE: Glimakra Retrofit
Date: Mon, 25 Jan 1999 07:29:05 -0000
Message-ID: <000101be4834$bae93ee0$fc1b883e@headquarters>
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
In-Reply-To: <000701be47a3$5b214160$6739bad1@oemcomputer>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Fitting a computer dobby to a countermarch or counterbalance loom will
require a complete rebuild to strip out all the mechanics, it really is easy
only on a jack loom. So you would have to build the mechanism yourself and
purchase the activators from someone like the Kelly's who work with most of
the craft loom makers on this.

Hope this helps you from doing too much damage to your loom

Ian Bowers
Fibrecrafts; Europe's leading textile crafts supplier
the best products and a better service
phone Ø(+44) 1483 421853
fax Ø(+44) 1483 419960
email ian@fibrecrafts.freeserve.co.uk

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
[mailto:owner-weavetech@List-Server.net]On Behalf Of FAD
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 1999 2:11 PM
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Glimakra Retrofit

Does anyone out there have any experience or an opinion on the practicality
or workability of retrofitting a Glimakra loom with a computerized dobby
system?
I'm new to the list and have been lurking for several weeks and am impressed
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with what I am reading.
I have been weaving for 15 years. My interest in color and texture
brought me to weaving but I seem to have developed an addiction for pattern
work and at one time was doing reproduction coverlets both full size and
miniature)
As most weavers do, I have several looms. My first, a 36" 4H
Harrissville, a 54" 8H Glimakra, and am about to buy a 12-16H workshop loom,
to take to MAFA in July (Karen Selk's silk workshop.)
I recently rescued a 40" 4 H (add a harness) Macomber from a sheltered
workshop group that was about to put it in the dumpster.
It needs some minor refurbishing,(a retirement project)
Fran in
Delaware

To reply privately, send message to "FAD" <fad@delanet.com>

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Mon Jan 25 08:11:12 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA24647; Mon, 25 Jan 1999
08:11:12 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mailbox.syr.edu (root@mailbox.syr.edu [128.230.18.5]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA24639; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 08:11:10 -0700 (MST)
Received: from RoomZ15.syr.edu (syru2-042.syr.edu [128.230.2.42])
   by mailbox.syr.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id KAA09286
   for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 10:11:14 -0500 (EST)
Date: Mon, 25 Jan 1999 10:11:14 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199901251511.KAA09286@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: Glimakra Retrofit
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

At 09:10 AM 1/24/99 -0500, you wrote:
>Does anyone out there have any experience or an opinion on the
>practicality or workability of retrofitting a Glimakra loom with a
>computerized
>dobby system?

REPLY:

The very first loom of any kind which owned was a Bexell, which was nothing
more than a hardwood duplicate of the softwood Glimakra countremarche.
This style loom frame is the most versatile in that the harness motion and
other elements can be removed from the frame and changed without
compromising the structural integrity of the frame. Soon after working with
the loom we installed a 32 shaft mechanical dobbey and never again had a loom
without a dobyy. There is no reason I can see that the retrofit you propose
cannot be accomplished, albeit with some effort, but it can be done
nevertheless.

AAF
ALLEN FANNIN, Adjunct Prof., Textile Science
ECR Department
I have been reading/lurking with interest the discussion of late on CAD/CAM systems on looms. I am on the verge of upgrading my rather dated tech equipment, and would appreciate advice and notes from experienced users.

I am an experienced weaver (30 yrs), and have used the macomber cad/cam old system since it came out in the early 80's. But now my faithful old designer's delight has just about croaked, and I need to upgrade. I used to use the atari system when it was supported by Macomber, and have over the years kept up as best I could with what was technologically current. But now I find that there are so many more choices that I need some advice.

I have a 16H 56" air assist loom, with the power supply box, and the designer's delight. I also have a 32H 72" with the single pedal, no extra power supply or des.del. (this loom was given to me!!). So my question is what programs will drive these looms, and what programs do you who use them find the easiest to use? I am not looking for alot of bells and whistles, just good support, basic design capabilities, and the ability to interface with my existing loom equipt.

I realize that I will have to upgrade my power supply box (I have spoken with the guys at Macomber), but beyond that any wisdom would be appreciated.

Thanks....Sarah Haskell

York, Maine
Probably and all your weaving will unravel. Seriously the date may be a bit wonky, but the computer can still be made to work.

Ian Bowers
Fibrecrafts; Europe's leading textile crafts supplier
the best products and a better service
phone 0(+44) 1483 421853
fax 0(+44) 1483 419960
email ian@fibrecrafts.freeserve.co.uk

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
[mailto:owner-weavetech@List-Server.net]On Behalf Of FiberArt@earthlink.net
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 1999 10:56 PM
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: used computers

At 03:43 PM 1/24/99 -0700, you wrote:
>Hi Gang,
>With the use of all these old computers on our weaving equipment, I
currently have the old 486/50 earmarked for that chore when I convert, will
they be adversely affected by the dreaded "Y2K?"
>Pamela

Maybe :-). What operating system? You can check with the manufacturer of
both to see if you will be OK.

Cheryl
FiberArt@earthlink.net
http://home.earthlink.net/~fiberart/

To reply privately, send message to "FiberArt@earthlink.net"
<fiberart@earthlink.net>
Sarah,

I'm using the single pedal Designers Delight with the upgraded power supply box but did have my problems with the box fairly repeatedly-thus ended up with a Proweave supply box also (will only interface with Proweave for all obvious reasons-it was just their answer to helping people using Proweave who were having problems with their power supply box). I originally had the old 'key slot mini computer thing' that came with my used Macomber 48" 20 shaft loom. I upgraded my box and moved on to other software. (I just reread your post and realize you are referring to "Designers Delight" meaning the whole system with the little box and key and single large pedal-I'm using it strictly as the single pedal with solenoid hookups and cable connections to my PC at this point after upgrading).

My understanding is that a great deal of weaving software now have Macomber drivers. I use Proweave for all my designing and use the loom control on Proweave with my Proweave power supply box to control the loom. I also have Fiberworks and Patternland but do not have Macomber drivers on these as I use the Proweave box and just keep the Macomber power supply box as a backup (which I haven't needed). However I do know the drivers are available. I generally WIF my Proweave design over to Fiberworks and play with color there, maybe do some quick playing with other possibilities. I use Patternland (WIF) primarily for fancy printouts (you can actually make the draft look very much like your cloth with all its adjustments and it provides for wonderful printing possibilities). Proweave and Fiberworks are fairly different in their approach to design so I would suggest that you obtain demo copies of both and try them out.
There are also other programs that have Macomber drivers but I have just played with them in demo programs and never bought them. Perhaps others have suggestions.

If I can help any further, please contact me off list and I'll be glad to give you my opinions. I, too, am a full time weaver (and dyer).

Diane
---
Diane B. Fields
Designer/colorist/weaver of interior textiles
picnic@twave.net

Hi Fran:
Does anyone out there have any experience or an opinion on the practicality
or workability of retrofitting a Glimakra loom with a computerized dobb
system?
Cyrefco looms does a Compu-Marche conversion for the Glimakra.
It is an excellent computer assist system. It is a true rising and sinking
shed mechanism and the action remains as light as that on the original.
The Compu Marche replaces the pedals, the lams, the shafts. The new ones
just get placed into the castle and the Compu Marche hangs on the right of
the loom. The retro fit is easy.

I have worked on it for several days at Jeff and Cyrena's studio and quite
liked it. It was different from my AVL but the light action sure is
attractive.

It is not such a workhorse as the AVL, so is not as suitable as the AVL for
production or student situation.
They advertise in the major magazines and on the back cover of the CW
newsletter.
Ingrid Boesel
ingrid@fiberworks-pcw.com
Fiberworks website has moved to
http://www.fiberworks-pcw.com

To reply privately, send message to Fiberworks PCW <ingrid@fiberworks-pcw.com>

Hi Pamela:
If the software does not have a date function, those programs will not be
affected. Clear any of the doubtful ones off that computer. Like
spreadsheets which depend on dates. And payroll.
If you just add a date to notes as text rather than as a date function, no
sweat.
To test if your computer is able to handle 4 digit dates, you go in and
look at the date in the DOS part of the program. I don't know how to do it,
but Bob does and did all out machines including the ancient 386 running the
loom.

If it shows 4 digits then it won't have the Y2K problem.

Ingrid

Please update your address book and bookmark to our NEW address
Ingrid Boesel, the weaving half of Fiberworks PCW
To reply privately, send message to Wheat Carr <wheat@craftwolf.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Mon Jan 25 12:29:45 1999
Received: (salmon=localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA27543; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 12:29:45 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp.jjj.net (postmaster@smtp.jjj.net [209.235.31.137]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id MAA27530; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 12:29:43 -0700 (MST)
Received: from cc429928-a.hwrd1.md.home.com (cc429928-a.hwrd1.md.home.com [24.3.63.99]) by smtp.jjj.net (8.9.1/8.9.0) with SMTP id OAA07218 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 14:26:12 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.16.19990125140019.369fee44@smtp.jjj.com>
X-Sender: wheat@smtp.jjj.com (Unverified)
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (16)
Date: Mon, 25 Jan 1999 14:00:19 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Wheat Carr <wheat@craftwolf.com>
Subject: Re: Y2K
In-Reply-To: <3.0.32.19990125112726.006d7c34@mail.sstsystems.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 test if your computer is able to handle 4 digit dates, you go in and
> look at the date in the DOS part of the program. I don't know how to do it,
> but Bob does and did all out machines including the ancient 386 running the
> loom.
>
> If it shows 4 digits then it won't have the Y2K problem.
>
> While there is every possibility this is just one of those little programs
running to "Wheat-proof" our shared machine, typing date at the C:\ prompt
usually brings up the dos utility for setting the date, and time works for
time.

Wheat

- 

Wheat Carr mailto:wheat@craftwolf.com
CraftWolf.Com PO Box 417 Savage MD 20763
Fax: 888.232.3329 http://www.craftwolf.com

To reply privately, send message to Wheat Carr <wheat@craftwolf.com>
Erica de Ruiter writes:

I lost a dear weaving book: 'Latin American Brocading', by Susanne Baizerman and Karin Searle, printed somewhere in the 80-ies. It is since long out of sale as far as I know. [Does] anyone have a spare issue and want to sell/give to me?

Please contact her directly at: <ederuiter@hetnet.nl>

Thanks,
Amy
amyfibre@aol.com

To reply privately, send message to AmyFibre@aol.com
Regarding dates on files, it doesn't make any difference. If you have ever had your battery go down, programs (1990's) read files (1980's) that are older than they are. And I got several emails dated in 2036 not long ago (I wondered if it was a virus, since they came from 3 very different places in the same week) They seemed to work ok too.

The only problem with bad dates -- it makes it harder to find files. But you can lie to your computer and tell it whatever date you want. It doesn't care.

You could stay 29 forever.

Judie
Unfortunately Y2K is more than a four/two display digit date issue.

There are three points to check on the hardware:

- Will it handle the concept of a specific year called 2000, it may go back to 80 (ie 1980) rather than hold 00, 01 etc.
- Will it go over from midnight 31/12/99 to 01/01/00 smoothly. This is really only a problem for computers which are mission critical over the blessed midnight. Otherwise see above for the problem when you first start the machine in the new millennium.
- And does it know that there will be a 29th February 2000, and not skip straight to 1st March?

These are the basic hardware problems. The software problems are much more complex and start on 9/9/99.

---

Ian Bowers
Fibrecrafts; Europe's leading textile crafts supplier
the best products and a better service
phone 0(+44) 1483 421853
fax 0(+44) 1483 419960
email ian@fibrecrafts.freeserve.co.uk

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
[mailto:owner-weavetech@List-Server.net]On Behalf Of Wheat Carr
Sent: Monday, January 25, 1999 7:00 PM
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: Y2K

>To test if your computer is able to handle 4 digit dates, you go in and
>look at the date in the DOS part of the program. I don't know how to do it,
>but Bob does and did all out machines including the ancient 386 running the
>loom.
>
>If it shows 4 digits then it wont have the Y2K problem.
>
While there is every possibility this is just one of those little programs
running to "Wheat-proof" our shared machine, typing date at the C:\ prompt
usually brings up the dos utility for setting the date, and time works for

time.

Wheat
I've read many different definitions, woven dukagang style on a number of different weave structures. I've figured out several ways to get a dukagang-effect but would like to know more about "real" dukagang definitions. For example, I can make columns of pattern area akin to full dukagang in several ways:

1) P, Po
2) a, P, Po, b, P, Po
3) a, P, b, Po

and half dukagang: a, P, b, P

where a and b are tabby sheds, P is a pattern shed, and Po is the pattern shed on opposite to P. Are all of these valid ways to do dukagang or half dukagang? Is a tabby required in full dukagang for it to be dukagang rather than dukagang-style? Is there a true dukagang threading or is dukagang just a way of treadling?

Laurie Autio
WeaveTech Archive 9901

Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA06537; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 06:14:12 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo25.mx.aol.com (imo25.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.69]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA06532; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 06:14:10 -0700 (MST)
From: JNBJ@aol.com
Received: from JNBJ@aol.com
by imo25.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id 2JPEa15290
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 08:13:02 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <5c0b447b.36adbf5e@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 08:13:02 EST
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: lost book
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL for Macintosh sub 50
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

Amy,

Try biblioind.com or alibris.com, if you haven’t already. I’ve found copies of a few out of print books through biblioind. The prices seemed fair to me and the books arrived in great condition.

Good luck

Janice Jones

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

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 26 06:45:39 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA10976; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 06:45:39 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo29.mx.aol.com (imo29.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.73]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA10972; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 06:45:38 -0700 (MST)
From: Grimi@aol.com
Received: from Grimi@aol.com
by imo29.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id GFUFa01223
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 08:44:57 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <253ff1c5.36adc6d9@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 08:44:57 EST
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: chenille slipping
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0.1 for Macintosh sub 82
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

There are a couple of things you can do on an AVL to REDUCE the slipping of rayon chenille on the cloth beam.
Putting on a new beam cover is probably the most effective solution. We are currently recommending a Soft Grip cover that is just that. A very soft rubber cover that grips almost everything very well. We’ve had reports of it not working well with fine silk because it spreads the weft after it's woven, but no other problems reported at this time. It also reportedly works well with wire weaving!
We have also found that it works much better and is more reliable than the "cheese grater" cover we used to offer. We still have some by the way just
in case someone would like it.
The other end of this solution is adding a second weight to the cloth storage system. That also helps to pull the woven chenille through the loom.
Hope this helps.
Tom @ AVL
grimi@aol.com
info@avlusa.com

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 26 06:46:51 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA11224; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 06:46:51 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (imo12.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.2]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id GAA11217; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 06:46:50 -0700 (MST)
From: Grimi@aol.com
Received: from Grimi@aol.com
by imo12.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id QOCSa04795
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 08:45:48 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <99d80fc5.36adc70c@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 08:45:48 EST
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: AVL treadling
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

Switching the lifting treadle from the right leg to the left is a pretty easy conversion, depending on how new the loom is.
You'll need new left and right treadle cables (left is shorter and right is longer) and then all you need do is switch the treadles.
On the newer looms the cables are replaceable with no crimping tool necessary. Older AVL's require a crimping tools to put the new cables on.
We'll gladly send out a loaner tool if necessary.
Please let me know if there are any additional questions.
Tom @ AVL
grimi@aol.com
info@avlusa.com

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Tue Jan 26 07:03:03 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA13420; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 07:03:03 -0700 (MST)
Received: from smtp4.erols.com (smtp4.erols.com [207.172.3.237]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id HAA13415; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 07:03:01 -0700 (MST)
Received: from LOCALNAME (207-172-111-1.s1.tnt1.ann.erols.com [207.172.111.1])
    by smtp4.erols.com (8.8.8/smtp-v1) with SMTP id JAA08308
    for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 09:03:00 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <36ADF438.EAA@erols.com>
Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 08:58:32 -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: Dukagang definition
References: <4.1.199901262072658.0093b430@mailsrv-unix.oit.umass.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
WeaveTech Archive 9901

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

Autio wrote:
>> I've read many different definitions, woven dukagang style on a number of
>> different weave structures.

Laurie -

The Dukagang that I've been taught goes back to the one defined and
described by Mary Black in her _New Key to Weaving_, pages 120 - 126 in
my 1957 edition. In fact, the illustration for the book is a wall
hanging done in half-dukagang. It's very impressive! In summary, she
says that in half dukagang, threads which form the pattern lie on the
surface of a plain weave background, and are tied down by every fourth
warp thread. In whole dukagang, the background areas, as well as the
pattern areas, are filled in. The easiest way I've woven dukagang is on
a twill threading -- much less counting to get the pattern areas
properly tied down! But of course, one could use just two shafts and do
more counting. So, the threading and treadling can be whatever, but one
must tie down pattern with every fourth thread.

A literal translation of the word dukagang (the word is Swedish,
and is supposed to have a ".." over the second a, but I can't type
that!) is "straight little paths in the cloth" per Mary Black. She is
quoting a Swedish weaving teacher.

Anne in Annandale
arwells@erols.com

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

According to my Swedish/English dictionary, dukagang is defined as "a laid in Swedish technique; vertical stripes done with a weaving sword on tabby background; brocaded on the counted thread." Doesn't this definition make it a supplementary weft technique, regardless of structure??
Su :-)
WeaveTech Archive 9901

I lost a dear weaving book: 'Latin American Brocading', by Susanne Baizerman and Karin Searle, printed somewhere in the 80-ies. It is since long out of sale as far as I know. [Does] anyone have a spare issue and want to sell/give to me?

Please contact her directly at: <ederuiter@hetnet.nl>

Thanks,
Amy
amyfibre@aol.com

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

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

> I lost a dear weaving book: 'Latin American Brocading', by Susanne Baizerman and Karin Searle, printed somewhere in the 80-ies. I know this is an off-the-wall suggestion, but as no responder has a spare copy thus far, here goes.

Karen is alive and well (as is Sue) in St. Paul. When the press (Dos Tejedoros) was disbanded there was all sorts of stock left over, and it's possible that not all of it went to Interweave--maybe Karen has a couple of copies she'd be willing to part with!

I don't have anyway of contacting her directly, but perhaps the Weavers Guild of Minnesota would forward a letter? I have a very indirect way, that if nothing else works I'd be willing to try.

Margaret

To reply privately, send message to Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>
I've woven lots of chenille yardage by adding extra weights to my cloth-take-up. I used fishing weights and found that as the diameter of the cloth beam grew I needed to add more weight to the take-up. I found I could produce 10 to 12 yards before I had to cut the cloth off and start a new roll. Sometimes I added as much as 10 lbs to the take-up weight. The great thing about fishing weights is they are a specified weight ie: 1/4 lb, 1/2 lb etc.

To reply privately, send message to Adriane Nicolaisen/Mark Safron <admark@mcn.org>
Hello again,

Tom has prevailed on me to pick up this thread at least one more time, so here goes...but please folks, getting too involved in this discussion starts to tread dangerously close to some commercial considerations, trade secrets if you will. We don't necessarily care to share all of our internal considerations with the world, until, of course, we are ready to make them available to all. So please excuse us if our business concerns get in the way of our sharing of information. That being said, here goes.

1.) Two treadles versus one. Jim Ahrens has always believed that two treadles, much like two heads, are better than one. It clearly is more balanced or at least it should be. There is no doubt however that the right treadle on an AVL does more work than the left. That's why, of course, we added the Dobby Cam Cylinder that provides an additional mechanical advantage to the right treadle. And our Spring Lever System, which allows the user to set how much pressure is on the individual harnesses, also mitigates the amount of force necessary to lift the shafts.

Indeed, an AVL loom equipped with polyester heddles is really easy to lift. The right treadle is truly easy to depress...problems emerged when we started offering metal heddles. But when the treadle cables are adjusted correctly and the spring levers are tensioned appropriately, then you should be able to keep 6, 8, 10 even 12 60" harnesses lifted with your baby toe - literally! I do it all the time at Conferences...it's part of my standard AVL demonstration.

2.) Adding a Spring to the Dobby Arm -- to eliminate the need for a second
treadle. Allen Fannin tried this on his Studio Dobby Loom and has told us that after a little experimentation, he found the perfect balance. It's funny because we did the same thing over ten years ago (!) for Margaret Windeknecht (on an AVL 40" Small Frame Dobby) just after she suffered a stroke that left one side of her body all but useless. Funny because I, much like Ingrid Boesel in her recent post, always pooh-poohed this solution as silly. Why put a spring on the loom that you have to work against? Funny because Margaret has always LOVED her loom! Loved the spring; loved the single treadle; and to this day continues to love her AVL loom. And we, for all intents and purposes, ignored her success and pleasure and continued with the two treadle system, until we discovered....

3.) Air Systems. Really folks, there's no need to get a Swiss Engineer to design an air lift for your dobby. We have it...it's right there in our Price List, item #520. It's simple and very elegant. All we do is control the raising and lowering of the dobbý arm (knife) with a small air cylinder that's mounted on the end of the arm. It eliminates the treadles and takes all the strain off your legs....requires absolutely no effort at all, in fact it can be set up as a series of push buttons as found on our Industrial Dobby Loom. The aforementioned Margaret Windeknecht is changing over to this system on her new Studio Dobby Loom, because, well, I convinced her that it's superior to her spring system.

4. The future. Well here's where we start to tread right up to the edge of our corporate secrets (maybe "corporate planning" is a better description). Jim Ahrens has been working on what I call (with a tip of the hat to Einstein) on a "Unified Theory of Treadling" for many, many years now. The purpose of said Unified Theory is to have a TWO TREADLE SYSTEM, where each movement of a treadle will raise the shafts. Think of it as Allen Fannin's one treadle system squared. Jim even has a nice little loom in his shop in Salt Lake City that works on this principle. We have experimented with it ourselves for years now...only trouble is, it only works on narrow looms. Doesn't pass muster on the more popular wider looms. Sorry, that's all I'm going to say about the subject.

5.) Summary. Our feeling is, despite our lack of the perfect solution (still working on it!) that we do offer a pretty good variety. You have:  
1.) Traditional AVL two treadle system - thousands of weavers around the world can't ALL be wrong, can they?  
2.) One treadle (mechanical) with spring - which we are in the midst of re-examining, with a tip of the hat to Allen Fannin - and -  
3.) an AVL Air Dobby System - takes ALL the effort out of the lifting.  

Not bad, we think.

I guess I ran on a bit long again, so thanks for indulging us at least one more time.

Sincerely,

Peter Straus
info@avlusa.com
800-626-9615

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

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Wed Jan 27 08:51:01 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA15002; Wed, 27 Jan 1999 08:51:01 -0700 (MST)
Received: from netexpress.net (root@shamu.netexpress.net [206.65.64.2]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id IAA14994; Wed, 27 Jan 1999 08:50:59 -0700 (MST)
X-Authentication-Warning: salmon.esosoft.net: Host root@shamu.netexpress.net
> Autio <autio@pssci.umass.edu> wrote:
> Is there a true dukagang threading or is dukagang just a way of treadling?

Dukag=E5ng as I know it is a very specific supplementary weft technique of covering a fixed number of ends. (i.e. 3) followed by a 4 end for tiedown. This creates columns of pattern on the surface. It is definitely a one sided fabric. Half Dukag=E5ng has pattern only with the background in plain weave. Full Dukag=E5ng covers the background also. The traditional threading is a straight draw. Treadling is plain weave. How you treadle to get the tiedown ends up is at your discretion. There is always a plain weave shot - then pattern is laid in.

I suppose that one could make longer floats (tie down less often) but, as I know Dukag=E5ng, the pattern floats are always the same length (4 ends, 5 ends, 6 ends .......) else it is not Dukag=E5ng.

I have a piece woven by my aunt form Sweden over 60 years ago. I have done some Dukag=E5ng my self for liturgical stoles. It is great for that purpose. Not as dramatic as Moorman but quite striking.

Dick Lindell, Weaver
Check out Dick's Die-Cut cards at<http://www.angelfire.com/il/dickshome>

One who elevates their profession iz the best mechanic, whether preaching the gospel, peddling phisic, or skinning eels for a living.
- Josh Billings

To reply privately, send message to Dick Lindell <hataori@writeme.com>
Thanks for the information Peter. I don't have an AVL, but am always interested in information about looms. I have talked to Jim about his looms and have read all the comments on the list. There is never the "perfect" loom, but it is interesting to see how you are coming close.

Deanna

To reply privately, send message to Num1weaver@aol.com
WeaveTech Archive 9901

Thanks to all for the information on Dukagang. Yes, I had read Mary Black, but had seen a variety of other definitions where dukagang and dukagang-style were used fairly freely. It sounds like I definitely need the tabby in full dukagang, but that it could come either after every pattern shot or every pair of pattern shots and still fit the definition of a supplementary weft structure.

happy weaving,

Laurie Autio

To reply privately, send message to Autio <autio@pssci.umass.edu>

Dick Lindell, Weaver
Check out Dick's Die-Cut cards at<http://www.angelfire.com/il/dickshome>
One who elevates their profession is the best mechanic, whether preaching the gospel, peddling physic, or skinning eels for a living.
- Josh Billings

To reply privately, send message to Dick Lindell <hataori@writeme.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Thu Jan 28 09:33:13 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA25098; Thu, 28 Jan 1999 09:33:13 -0700 (MST)
Received: from ada.sstsystems.net (ada.sstsystems.net [207.164.1.21]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id JAA25063; Thu, 28 Jan 1999 09:33:10 -0700 (MST)
Received: from default ([207.164.1.41]) by ada.sstsystems.net (8.7.5/8.6.9) with SMTP id LAA10349 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Thu, 28 Jan 1999 11:21:23 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.32.19990128112013.00696ad4@mail.sstsystems.net>
X-Sender: ingrid@mail.sstsystems.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1999 11:26:20 -0500
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Fiberworks PCW <ingrid@fiberworks-pcw.com>
Subject: Dukagang
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

Hi Dick:

I have done dukagang and half dukagang on Summer and Winter to get the 3 end float and control of the pattern by block structure.
I use the supplementary weft pattern either over ends P1P or P2P but should be consistent. The P is the pattern shaft anything between 3 and 24 in my case. This gives the floats over 3 ends with a one thread tie down between adjacent blocks of floats.
In half dukagang the background is summer and winter ground structure, not plain weave. To do the full dukagang, two colors of pattern are used in "On Opposites" manner. No ground structure is then visible. Both are reversible, but negative images.

Pattern blocks can be shaft controlled or picked up. It is really easy to do pick up on Summer and Winter, since the tie downs can be lifted easily and are easy to see. I did the method where you change shed in mid shot and that worked well too, if you have to use pickup techniques.

Ingrid

Please update your address book and bookmark to our NEW address
Ingrid Boesel, the weaving half of Fiberworks PCW
  Visit us at: http://www.fiberworks-pcw.com
    Email: ingrid@fiberworks-pcw.com

To reply privately, send message to Fiberworks PCW <ingrid@fiberworks-pcw.com>
I looked up Karen on the Internet, and you can write to her at this address:

Karen Searle
1742 Portland Ave
St Paul, MN 55104
612-642-9897

She is a wonderful person and may have some good ideas.

Judith

Judith Favia, Minneapolis, MN
cronenorth@earthlink.net

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

> I lost a dear weaving book: 'Latin American Brocading', by Susanne Baizerman
> and Karin Searle, printed somewhere in the 80-ies.

I know this is an off-the-wall suggestion, but as no responder has a spare copy thus far, here goes.

Karen is alive and well (as is Sue) in St. Paul. When the press (Dos Tejedoros) was disbanded there was all sorts of stock left over, and it's possible that not all of it went to Interweave--maybe Karen has a couple of copies she'd be willing to part with!

To reply privately, send message to "Judith Favia" <cronenorth@earthlink.net>
On my question if somebody could help me to find a book that has been out of print for many years I got many useful suggestions and answers. Mrs. Deanna Baugh found a spare issue for me. Thank you all for your kind help.

Erica de Ruiter, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

Several people have been asking which vendors would be at MAFA, so thought I would post the list to everyone.

Alexandria Textiles
Beady-Eyed Women
Bobbins by Van-Dieren
Carodan Farm Wool Shop
The Clearing (Corriedale Sheep and Wool)
Cloverleaf Farms
Cochenille Design Studio
Colores de Pueblo
I am considering putting my handwoven rugs/saddleblankets in a new co-op
WeaveTech Archive 9901

Weave Tech Archive 9901

gallery. Is there anyone on this list who belongs to such? What I need to
know is what rules/regulations your co-op has for a jury to follow.
Vernice vmyers@wavecom.net

To reply privately, send message to "Vernice Myers" <vmyers@wavecom.net>

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Jan 30 11:30:53 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA04702; Sat, 30 Jan 1999
11:30:53 -0700 (MST)
Received: from harrier.prod.itd.earthlink.net (harrier.prod.itd.earthlink.net
[207.217.120.12]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id LAA04697; Sat, 30 Jan 1999 11:30:52 -
0700 (MST)
Received: from 1Cust171.tnt4.santa-barbara.ca.da.uu.net [208.251.97.171]
by harrier.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id KAA24398
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 30 Jan 1999 10:30:57 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <36B34F3B.6804@earthlink.net>
Date: Sat, 30 Jan 1999 10:28:11 -0800
From: robin lewis <robinlewis@earthlink.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0C-NSCP (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Subject: Re: CASCH conference
References: <36A8CBFD.21C1@siue.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

I just wanted to send a little reminder to those who are thinking of
registering for the Conference of the Association of Southern California
Handweavers in Santa Barbara this March--the workshops are filling up.
For more info http://www.casch.org

Thanks, Robin Lewis

To reply privately, send message to robin lewis <robinlewis@earthlink.net>

> From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Jan 30 13:17:47 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA23335; Sat, 30 Jan 1999
13:17:47 -0700 (MST)
Received: from enaila.nidlink.com (root@enaila.nidlink.com [216.18.128.8]) by
salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id NAA23328; Sat, 30 Jan 1999 13:17:46 -0700 (MST)
Received: from elizabeth.nidlink.com (pm9-40.nidlink.com [216.18.141.95])
by enaila.nidlink.com (8.9.0/8.9.0) with ESMTP id MAA02610
for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 30 Jan 1999 12:17:49 -0800 (PST)
Message-Id: <199901302017.MAA02610@enaila.nidlink.com>
From: "Elizabeth Merrill" <elizabeth@nidlink.com>
To: <weavetech@List-Server.net>
Date: Sat, 30 Jan 1999 09:09:44 -0800
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1161
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

> GET WEAVETECH weavetech.9812
To reply privately, send message to "Elizabeth Merrill" <elizabeth@nidlink.com>

>b From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net Sat Jan 30 20:58:23 1999
Received: (salmon@Localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA16109; Sat, 30 Jan 1999 20:58:23 -0700 (MST)
Received: from camel7.mindspring.com (camel7.mindspring.com [207.69.200.57]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id UAA16105; Sat, 30 Jan 1999 20:58:21 -0700 (MST)
Received: from ibm-customer (user-381dh1o.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.196.56]) by camel7.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id WAA22806 for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sat, 30 Jan 1999 22:58:31 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19990130195939.00696810@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: bnathans@pop.mindspring.com
Date: Sat, 30 Jan 1999 19:59:39 -0800
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
From: Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #181
In-Reply-To: <199901250737.AAA26317@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

>Laptop sometimes do not have the power in the ports to interface with a >loom.
>But is wise to check the specs on your desired or preferred program before >committing to any computer.
>
>Ingrid

I don't know how to go about checking the compatibility of older computers and newer software, but I sure had such a problem, trying to get an older IBM thinkpad to work with the fine knitting program "Designaknit". It never did. When I tried the program with a newer computer, I had no problem. The company was actually aware of the problem.....

So if I were buying a used computer, especially a lap-top to run a weaving program/loom interface, I would call the software writer and run the purchase past him/her for possible problems.

As I remember, the number pad on some laptops don't register with Fiberworks PCW (dos) and I used a feature dependent on the numberpad a lot.... I would not have been happy to lose that feature.

Barbara Nathans   Bellport, Long Island, NY
(and warm and sunny San Diego, Ca for January, February and March)

To reply privately, send message to Barbara Nathans <bnathans@mindspring.com>
Hi Vernice:
I have belonged to a co-op (loved it) and did consignment (hated it) for a few years.

I have one very strict rule. No pottery may be placed on the weaving.
(Except as a occasional short term Window display, and never without protection on the bottom of the pot) "If you want to use my weaving as a prop or a background to enhance the pottery, I would be pleased to sell you a placemat to do it."

No weaving in windows not protected by UV screen and no weavings in south or west windows at all. (Had a silk purse ruined by fading in one week in winter!)

The jury at the co-op consisted of a member at large, one of the executives members and a rotating member. This rotating member would have an area of expertise. So if weaving came in, then a textile person would be on the jury. Needless to say, if it was woven clothing, then a member who also
wove clothing may have a conflict, so a silk painter, or quilter or rug weaver could be asked. Usually the other two members would have marketing knowhow or display experience to judge the "sell-ability" of the work. If there was any doubt as to the prospective member or the jury could not decide, then we took it to the next members meeting. We had meetings once a month. No members were accepted after Oct 15, because we found that these usually joined just for Christmas and pulled out in Jan, never doing any work. New members worked twice with experienced members and on the second work day, were assigned a space, and shown how and where the display equipment was, and then allowed to place items for sale in their area. The second work day was scheduled to be Monday, or if not possible, to start before opening time or after closing time. A new member was featured in the newsletter that went to our mailing list, so that new work was always stressed. We had monthly "shows" in the window and in one area in the store. These shows had specific themes. Like On the Beach for a summer show, Wood and wool, Partners for a show featuring collaborations. This was a good incentive to members. Individuals were also featured every month. We had both working and non working memberships, with two different membership fees and different percentages kept by the co-op. I no longer belong because I do not produce to sell. But I loved the control I had over my work in the co-op, vs the consignment route.

Ingrid

Please update your address book and bookmark to our NEW address
Ingrid Boesel, the weaving half of Fiberworks PCW
Visit us at: http://www.fiberworks-pcw.com
Email: ingrid@fiberworks-pcw.com

To reply privately, send message to Fiberworks PCW <ingrid@fiberworks-pcw.com>

>From owner-weavetech@List-Server.net  Sun Jan 31 15:19:13 1999
Received: (salmon@localhost) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA17986; Sun, 31 Jan 1999 15:19:13 -0700 (MST)
Received: from imo25.mx.aol.com (imo25.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.69]) by salmon.esosoft.net (8.8.5) id PAA17980; Sun, 31 Jan 1999 15:19:12 -0700 (MST)
From: EVESTUDIO@aol.com
Received: from EVESTUDIO@aol.com
    by imo25.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id 8HLRa20271
    for <weavetech@List-Server.net>; Sun, 31 Jan 1999 17:18:14 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <8000cc5a.36b4d6a6@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 31 Jan 1999 17:18:14 EST
To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: Rayon
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 214
Sender: owner-weavetech@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: weavetech@list-server.net

To anyone on the Weavetech list: The discussion of rayon raises some questions for me. 1) Can anyone tell me the shrinkage rate expected when weaving yardage using rayon yarn? 2) What if using rayon/cotton blend as in a fancy rayon slub wrapped with cotton as weft and cotton as warp?

Thanks for any information.
Elaine Deyo
Answer privately to: EVESTUDIO@aol.com

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