

Jerry Coonen

This is for your information.

I do not plan to make the letter to Bell known more widely unless I am compelled by his inaction to place this letter into the subcommittee's minutes and burn the last of my bridges.

Velvet Kahan

for J. Coonen

June 79

Prof W. Kahan
University of Calif.
E.E.&Comp.Science Dept
Berkeley, CA
94720

I am dismayed by the childish & irresponsible attitudes betrayed in the rationalizations expressed by several of those who voted against gentle underflow as a default. "I'm against it because I heard that it was slower, though I can't say by how much nor why" is an obvious cop-out. "We can't figure out how to build it" really meant "We don't want to figure it out because we could easily make just as much money selling what we already know how to do". And the other two instances of crass corporate mentality are too transparent to need explanation. What does need explanation is why the excuse "I haven't yet had time to analyze those codes and provide others that do equally well when underflows flush to zero instead" should continue to be respected for half a year when the codes in question merely do what is needed in an obvious way whereas their replacements proffered so far do what is not needed in an unobvious way. And to crown this fatuity, I overheard "I can't say how my proposal will hurt or benefit numerical programs because I don't produce numerical programs; nor can I estimate what my proposal will cost in hardware because I don't build hardware".

Name withheld by request.