



The Idaho Observer

"Bag Light" Makes CFL and LED Lights Obsolete



By: Donald "Pogo" Meserlian, PE
National Leader: Patriot's Citizens Campaigns
www.voicesofsafety.com/pcc/
dcmeserlian@voicesofsafety.com
(973) 228-2258

In colonial times candles were used to provide light when either reading or walking through a home. Light was not required to illuminate either the walls or ceilings. These surfaces were not illuminated until the advent of the incandescent electric light bulb. This light bulb provides a warm soft yellow light as contrasted with the harsh white light of fluorescent light. The long life LED light bulbs provide a similar light as the incandescent light bulb.

The brightness of light bulbs is rated in lumens. A lumen is defined as the amount of illumination, in footcandles, that falls on the surface of a sphere with a one-foot radius; 12.56 square feet. A 43-watt high efficiency light bulb is equivalent to a 60-watt light bulb with both bulbs rated at 750 lumens. Therefore, the lumens per square foot, footcandles is 750/12.56 or approximately 60 footcandles at one foot from the light bulb's filament. The amount of illumination on a surface is equal to the footcandles one foot from the filament divided by the square of the distance from the filament. An average distance of three feet from a 60-watt bulb would therefore provide 60/9 or 6.7 footcandles for reading.

The Illumination Engineering Society has published illuminance recommendations since 1958. An average illumination of three footcandles is required "for public spaces with dark surroundings"; this is the same value required in building codes. When "performing visual tasks" (i.e. reading) at "high", "medium" and "low" contrast the average required footcandles are 30, 75 and 150 footcandles respectively. The dark walls and ceilings during colonial times provide a "high" contrast such that much less illumination was required for reading compared with today's brightly lit rooms. The eye's pupil automatically adjusts to provide more or less light on the retina based on the amount of contrast with surrounding surfaces.



Last month's IO article was the basis for my inventing the "bag light" (see pg. 16 for pictures and information) whereby either a four or 7.5 watt "night light", used with a plastic bottle spray painted chrome reflector, uses 115 V, 60 hz rather than batteries to provide low power for visual tasks. The power required for a 900 lumen Compact Fluorescent Light (CFL) and a 800 lumen Light Emitting Diode (LED) light bulb is 14 and twelve watts respectively, therefore the four watt "bag light" only requires one third the power of a high priced LED light.

The life of the 43 watt high efficiency incandescent CFL and LED light bulbs are 1000, 10,000 and 25,000 hours respectively. Based on an average usage of three hours per day the life of the three bulbs are approximately one year, ten years and 23 years respectively. The four and 7.5 watt "night lights"

have a life of 3000 and 1400 hours respectively. The 7.5 watt "bag light" with dimmer switch, when used at half power, extends the bulb life 20 times or 28,999 hours which is a greater life than the approximately \$30 LED light bulb.

The CFL bulbs contain mercury, a neurotoxin that is contaminating our underground aquifers. In addition the 60 hz. flicker causes health hazards such as headaches and fatigue.

Based on this scientific study, the "bag light" has made the 43-watt high efficiency CFL and LED lights obsolete! I have replaced my 60-watt table lamp light bulbs with either the 7.5-watt nightlight or 25-watt clear tubular light. The 25-watt clear tubular light is more easily screwed into outside house light fixture compared with the larger diameter incandescent 40-watt light bulbs I previously used. See pg. 16 to order the "bag light" and light bulbs instead of the CFL or LED lights.

Western States Demand GMO Labeling

By: Anne Wilder Chamberlain, Idaho-Observer.com

A resolution regarding the labeling of genetically modified food barely passed the Bonner County Republican Central Committee. This resolution follows in the footsteps of the California "Right to Know" initiative and the Washington State House and Senate GMO labeling bills, (attached) which are supported by 1200 Washington farmers, fearful of Monsanto going after their wheat. These bills have many exemptions for small producers who do not use the ingredients on the USDA GMO list. They are not about more regulations for small farmers, but about beginning to balance the playing field between those who want to provide healthy food for this nation's people, and Monsanto, which wants to control ALL the food we eat.

I was astonished at the number of precinct committeemen who, despite seeing all the illness in adults and children in this nation – first in the world in breast cancer, diabetes, and heart disease – do not want to acknowledge its ties to the food we eat.

Their main objection to the resolution was a fair one – that as Republicans we should be against more regulations on businesses. However, there is a difference between the FDA and the USDA regulating small family businesses out of existence, and that of requiring transparency from the largest and – on record – most corrupt corporations in the world. Monsanto, which, on its website states that its genetically engineered products are safe, also told us that dioxins, DDT, and agent orange were safe. It took 30 years for the government to admit that agent orange caused permanent debilitating physical damage to our Viet Nam veterans, and most of them are still awaiting compensation. Where is the Republican stand on that?

These giant corporations are already required to put ingredient labels on their products. It will not cost them any more to add "may contain genetically modified ingredients". On the other hand, organic producers, who offer us excellent nutritional food, are required – justifiably – to jump through a multitude of hoops in order to label their products "organic". Why should those companies offering us nutritionless food products not be expected to do the same?

One person said that GMO labeling would cause the cost of food to go up. The cost of food will continue to go up, but not because of labeling. It will be because our corrupt federal government continues to allow the corrupt "federal" reserve bankers to print money with no backing, and that causes the cost of everything to rise. This same government uses our tax dollars ev-

