

## Re: PROFESSIONAL floating-point algorithms.

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.programming/2004-01/0387.html>

---

*From:* Willem (*willem\_at\_stack.nl*)

*Date:* 01/05/04

Date: Mon, 5 Jan 2004 09:43:10 +0000 (UTC)

Edward wrote:

- )> Didn't I just explain this to you elsethread ?
- )> You used the exact same fallacious logic to attack my point of view.
- )> Please pay attention, you're really making a fool of yourself here.
- )
- ) We'll see about that, dear chap.

There's nothing to 'see about'. This statement is about your attack on \*me\*, in another post. \*You\* used the fallacious logic. That makes you stupid.

- ) I quote: "that does not mean we are obliged to ignore all we know
- ) about good programming practice when writing the initial code."
- ) <bla, bla>

You may want to take some lectures on writing style as well, if you interpret that as a genuine reverse generalization.

- ) You might improve your technical communication style to my level. For
- ) example, note in the above how I always keep the discussion moving
- ) forward by tight coupling of humor with instruction. I learned this as

Making yourself ridiculous is not humour, nor is attacking and insulting others. If you see your constant ad hominem attacks as a form of humour, you are a sad little person.

- ) I SAID, idiota, that the CPU changes variables by executing IO
- ) instructions to refresh the memory which is "read mostly". At the
- ) level of the instruction to "scan for Nul" the search instruction
- ) accesses RAM but by hardware or firmware which cannot be used by the
- ) program.

You only have to write the value \*once\*, then you can read it from memory in \*exactly\* the same manner as when you're reading the string itself.

- ) I SAID, idiota, that you cannot alter the read mostly memory save by
- ) executing IO commands which are time-consuming.

comp.programming: Re: PROFESSIONAL floating-point algorithms.

You *\*don't\** have to alter the memory in every loop.

) People are claiming in this newsgroup to have actual experience with  
) small memories but I don't see it in your comments.

I have worked with small memory models. Although it may be preferable to recalculate something inside a loop because of memory constraints, it is *\*never\** faster. It is a size/speed tradeoff.

) Do your own homework. Furthermore, I've described the CPU such that it  
) could be simulated.

I did my homework, and I claim that no such CPU exists. Describing a CPU so that it can be simulated does not make it an existing CPU.

SaSW, Willem

--

Disclaimer: I am in no way responsible for any of the statements  
made in the above text. For all I know I might be  
drugged or something..

No I'm not paranoid. You all think I'm paranoid, don't you !

#EOT