

Re: Lightning – funny how we're not seeing him any more

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.hardware/2005-05/msg00086.html>

- *From:* w_tom <w_tom1@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 02 May 2005 06:25:11 -0400
-

'UPS connected' devices were protected just like the "missing UPS" devices were protected. What protected Leythos' smoke detector, bathroom and kitchen GFCIs, clock radio, and dishwasher. Clearly Leythos forgot to mention he also installed "missing UPS" protectors. How else can Leythos explain those other undamaged electronics not connected to a UPS?

This was explained previously in that discussion entitled "Lightning and computer?". Back then, I was replying to someone who claimed to have an EE degree. Now that we know Leythos lied about the EE degree, well then of course he doesn't understand why some things were damaged and others were not. Of course he never understood the answer. The technical education he claimed did not exist.

In the meantime, a "missing UPS" protected the TV while an adjacent VCR was damaged. That example also answered Leythos question a second time. A more technical answer was posted in "Lightning and computer?". But that means Leythos must learn some basic electrical concepts. Clearly, Leythos wants to argue rather than learn.

Leythos again misrepresents what was posted only to keep arguing. He again posts:

> ... as tom does, that a UPS provides no surge protection, ...

When Leythos misrepresented what I posted above on 28 April 2005, the reply (that Leythos still does not comprehend) was:

- > Leythos should read with care. The UPS claims to protect
- > from types of transients that are typically not destructive.
- > UPS does claim to protect from something. But anything
- > effective inside that UPS is already accomplished inside the
- > adjacent appliance. Somehow, Leythos dumbs this down and
- > distorts reality into "a UPS does NOT protect anything."

Again Leythos. Remember those numerical specification you

Re: Lightning – funny how we're not seeing him any more

could not provide after how many requests? Fifteen? The UPS does claim protection from transients. Provide the numbers. It does not claim to protect from the type of transient that typically damages electronics. Again, I am only reposting what you intentionally distort to keep arguing.

So for the sixteenth time, Leythos: post the manufacturer's spec for that protection you claim is provided by an APC UPS. You cannot? Why? Numbers are what junk scientists fear. But prove me wrong. Show me. Show me this manufacturer spec that even claims to protect from each type of transient. Show me where the manufacture even claims to do as you claim – in that same post where you also claim an EE degree. Show me the numbers – rather than repeatedly misrepresent what I have posted and misrepresent what a UPS manufacturer claims.

Leythos – where are your numbers? Or do you just know these things.

Leythos wrote:

- > I didn't really see it as an argument, I asked him to explain how the
- > UPS devices remained undamaged while the non-UPS devices were damaged
- > when both were connected to the same outlet.
- >
- > It's not about being blow-away or anecdotal, it's just about a simple
- > observation that I've seen first hand. Since there is no logical
- > explanation for "something else" protecting the devices it seemed
- > reasonable to determine that the UPS did indeed protect the devices.
- >
- > If one is to suggest, as tom does, that a UPS provides no surge
- > protection, then the devices should not have been undamaged.
- >
- > I've still not seen an explanation of why devices connected to a
- > UPS remained undamaged and those not connected (to the same
- > electrical outlet as the UPS supply) were damaged – and from the
- > looks of it, Tom's not going to answer it, just keep ignoring it.
- >
- > I've always come out and admitted when I was wrong, as I know I
- > can be wrong, but, unless he can clearly explain what I've seen
- > several times with my own eyes, I'm going to keep believing in
- > the ability of a properly connected UPS to provide at least some
- > protection against surges.
- >
- > Now, for any lurkers benefit, I do not disagree that whole-house
- > protection is good, in fact, I think it's a great thing. I
- > completely disagree with the assumption that UPS's don't protect
- > devices from surges.

.

Re: Lightning – funny how we're not seeing him any more

- **References:**

- ◆ **Re: Lightning – funny how we're not seeing him any more**

- ◆ *From:* NobodyMan

- Prev by Date: **Re: Internal Microphone Problems**

- Next by Date: **Toshiba Satellite P10-804 and wireless NETGEAR DG834GT**

- Previous by thread: **Re: Lightning – funny how we're not seeing him any more**

- Next by thread: **Re: Lightning – funny how we're not seeing him any more**

- Index(es):

- ◆ **Date**

- ◆ **Thread**