

# Re: Strange problem with low energy light bulb

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.repair/2007-06/msg01436.html>

---

- *From:* Seán O'Leathlóbhair <jwlawler@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Tue, 26 Jun 2007 08:52:38 -0700
- 

On 26 Jun, 14:17, "Arfa Daily" <arfa.da...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"JANA" <j...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

[news:1381vgd8ur9p10e@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:1381vgd8ur9p10e@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

If the switch that is series with the light bulb has a night light in it, the current pass of the night light will cause the CFL to flicker.

If the CFL is connected to a switch that is electronic, the small leakage of the electronics will cause the CFL to flicker or in some cases to not turn off.

Regular CFL's cannot be used on standard light dimmers and many of the electronic timers. This is a big inconvenience for many people.

When regular lamps become unavailable, I can see a lot of problems with these new types of lamps. The biggest one will be the pollution from their disposal. They use mercury, phosphors, and many types of materials that are very harmful for the environment. There is also the electronics circuit board, which contain components that have the same recycling problem as used in most electronics. Even though they last longer, when they are eventually put out in to the garbage, they will eventually end up in the land fills.

## Re: Strange problem with low energy light bulb

They are going to be a very big problem compared to the simple light bulb that was made of simple glass and metals.

Regular light bulb materials are about 85% recyclable. There are almost no materials in these that are bad for the environment. Most CFL's materials are not recyclable, and their materials are very polluting.

It looks very strong that the government is pushing the CFL's to save some electricity to sell to large industry. This is the only answer that is logical. There are NO green house gasses from using regular light bulbs. When more electricity is sold to industry, the pollution problems from its generation will actually increase, unless the generation is from water power, or nuclear power.

---

JANA

---

These are my (well known) views also, but I fear we are squeaking like little lost mice in the dark ...

The general public are not told – and would not understand anyway – the wider implications of these knee-jerk government interventions in our lives. All too often, they are poorly thought through, and are dreamed up as a response to the latest bit of pseudo science to hit the news stands. At the moment, anything with the words 'green' or 'eco' or 'environment' or 'global warming' are fair game for this sort of nonsense, and to add to its 'validity' in the public's eyes, they've already started inventing new bits of techno-babble like 'carbon footprint' and 'carbon offsetting' to justify what amounts to little more than opinions by a vociferous band of scientists getting paid large amounts of money and credibility ratings, to promote the government line. As you say, these CFLs are just trading one form of alleged pollution, for another definite one ...

I also have qualms about the overall value of these bulbs. They are complex devices and I have not heard of any schemes for recycling or safe disposal. It is very hard, as an end user, to judge the pros and cons. From a selfish point of view, I can look at the cost to me. The low energy bulbs cost considerably more. The hope is that the

## Re: Strange problem with low energy light bulb

longer lifetime and lower energy use compensate for this. The longer lifetime seems to be linked to the physical size. The larger ones do indeed seem to have a long life. The first ever ones I bought, about 15 years ago, are still working but they are huge by modern standards. The larger of the newer ones have a good life time but I have had a few failures. The small new ones, which are required for some applications, seem to have a noticeably shorter life time. In this case, is not so obvious that I am spending less on the bulbs than on incandescent ones. Also, I find the energy saving not as great as claimed. I usually don't find them as bright as the claimed equivalents. I guess that the equivalence claims are true in some sense but not in my subjective judgment. If I replace an incandescent bulb with a low energy with the same claimed equivalent power, it usually looks dimmer. I often have to buy one step up from the claimed equivalent power and hence make a smaller saving. An exception to this last point is the one that inspired this thread. It actually seems brighter than the incandescent that it replaced despite having the same claimed equivalent power. Of course, I have no idea of the life time yet.

On the heating point that same raise. I am aware that the heat from the incandescent bulbs will be slightly reducing the heat required from other sources. However, even here in the UK, I am not running the heating all the time, and electricity costs me more per joule than gas. Even when using the heating, I like the cooler running of the low energy bulbs, I hope that it reduces the fire risk in some of the cramped places that bulbs are used. I have seen lamp shades scorched quite worryingly by incandescent bulbs (even when within the stated limits of the shade). I have never seen this with a low energy bulb. Finally, not everyone lives in a cold country. I have a house in the Philippines, there heating is unknown but air conditioning is desirable. The stray heat from incandescent bulbs is a double waste since it is increasing the load on the air conditioning.

I have dropped the long list of apparently irrelevant groups.

—

Seán Ó Leathlóbhair

.