

HP Forum Archive 13

[[Return to Index](#) | [Top of Index](#)]

I email HP about need a 41CX...

Message #1 Posted by [Michel Beaulieu](#) on 4 June 2003, 3:40 p.m.

I email HP (my email is lower this post) and they send me this answer. I think they have some good stuff coming soon they still "Invent"!

Subj: Re: FW: [USCN EDU WEB FEEDBACK Rv3.0] Date: Wed, 04 Jun 2003 12:07:55 -0600 From: HP Calculator E-mail Support Graphing <calculatorgrph_support@am.exch.hp.com> ----- Dear Valued Customer

We received your mail over the past few days. First of all, let me extend a warm "thank you" for your very loyal and unwavering support for HP calculators and in particular, our RPN technology.

Secondly, it is very important that we reassure you that HP will continue to offer a full line of both RPN and Algebraic calculators. We have currently, under development, an enhanced, new range of financial, scientific and graphing calculators to replace the following: HP17BII, HP32SII, HP19BII, HP38G, HP39G, HP40G, HP48G, HP48GX and the HP49G. Many of you have expressed a strong preference for some of the above products and it is important that you receive this reassurance. Please note, however, that some of these products have been discontinued but will be replaced over the next 6 -12 months, a few as soon as this summer and fall. You should be also made aware that you might encounter difficulty with buying products being replaced, depending on your geographic region.

Sincerely, HP Consumer e-Support

Our advice is strictly limited to the question(s) asked and is based on the information provided to us. HP does not assume any responsibility or liability for the advice given and shall not be liable for any direct, indirect, special, incidental or consequential damages in connection with the use of this information. Always back up your data. For more information, including technical information updates, please visit our Web site at <http://www.hp.com/go/support>.

Original Message Follows: -----

This message has been rerouted to you by the HP.COM email router. If this message has been sent to you in error, please forward back to the email router mailbox at REROUTER,HPCOM per HP email directory or HPCOM REROUTER per CPQ email directory. Original message follows: -----

-----Original Message----- From: geologie@hotmail.com [mailto:geologie@hotmail.com] Sent: Saturday, May 31, 2003 6:29 PM To: educationweb@hp.com Subject: [USCN EDU WEB FEEDBACK Rv3.0]

Formname: Feedback

your_name: Michel Beaulieu company: Rivers School job_title: Teacher city: Forestville state: Quebec country: Canada phone: fax: 418-587-2697 email: geologie@hotmail.com question_1: Hi, i'm a math and sciences teacher. I know that you were doing some really good RPN calculators in the 70 and 80. I still use my HP-41CX on a daily base but it is slowly going... Will you release for person like me and possibly for students a RPN SCIENTIFIC calculator NON GRAPHING calculator that have the equivalent of keystroke programmability with comm ports (like my HP-41). I know that some of my coworker spend hundreds of\$ for a used HP-32SII and even more for a HP-42S of a HP-41CX like mine. I read about your HP-30S and some of my students have one. I think these calculators are good but are not quality that we are use to with HP; don't you agree? I also see a HP-49G but i don't like the keyboard feeling; what happened to the legendary engineering behind the HP-41 series? I have a lot of HP products at home (computers, printer, drive, oscilloscope) and beleive that i can change my HP-41CX with a new release calculator that fits the place left by it without any pretendent for over 15 years; don't you remember these line found in a HP calculator user's manual written by your own father?

"The success and prosperity of our compagny will be assued only if we offer our customers superior products that fill real needs and provide lasting value, and that are supported by a wide variety of useful services, both before and after sale."

Thanks for an answer! Michel Beaulieu Math ans sciences teacher question_2: C question_3: C question_4: B question_5: A question_6: Hi, i'm a math and sciences teacher. I know that you were doing some really good RPN calculators in the 70 and 80. I still use my HP-41CX on a daily base but it is slowly going... Will you release for person like me and possibly for students a RPN SCIENTIFIC calculator NON GRAPHING calculator that have the equivalent of keystroke programmability with comm ports (like my HP-41). I know that some of my coworker spend hundreds of\$ for a used HP-32SII and even more for a HP-42S of a HP-41CX like mine. I read about your HP-30S and some of my students have one. I think these calculators are good but are not quality that we are use to with HP; don't you agree? I also see a HP-49G but i don't like the keyboard feeling; what happened to the legendary engineering behind the HP-41 series? I have a lot of HP products at home (computers, printer, drive, oscilloscope) and beleive that i can change my HP-41CX with a new release calculator that fits the place left by it without any pretendent for over 15 years; don't you remember these line found in a HP calculator user's manual written by your own father?

"The success and prosperity of our compagny will be assued only if we offer our customers superior products that fill real needs and provide lasting value, and that are supported by a wide variety of useful services, both before and after sale."

Thanks for an answer! Michel Beaulieu Math ans sciences teacher Referrer: -- SysDate: Sun Jun 1 1:29:16 GMT 2003 Submit Domain: unknown

Re: I email HP about need a 41CX...

Message #2 Posted by [Michel Beaulieu](#) on 4 June 2003, 8:30 p.m.,
in response to message #1 by Michel Beaulieu

HP send me another message telling me the HP-32SII will be remanufactured in about 8 months and all the calculators they wrote me in their previous email!

Re: I email HP about need a 41CX...

Message #3 Posted by [Erik Ehrling \(Sweden\)](#) on 5 June 2003, 2:24 a.m.,
in response to message #2 by Michel Beaulieu

It's scary to see that the HP-42S is not mentioned at all in their email..

Re: I email HP about need a 41CX...

Message #4 Posted by [HrastProgrammer](#) on 5 June 2003, 2:29 a.m.,
in response to message #3 by Erik Ehrling (Sweden)

Well, they haven't mentioned HP-41C/CV/CX, HP-42S and HP-71B :(

Re: I email HP about need a 41CX...

Message #5 Posted by [J.Manrique Lopez de la Fuente](#) on 5 June 2003, 4:45 a.m.,
in response to message #4 by HrastProgrammer

Should they?

It seems that hp41 had been updated by hp42 and this, had been updated by hp48, but last maybe it is not true, because hp42 is not "as graphic" calculator as hp48.

But hp32sii hasn't been updated by a new model, so, yes, if HP is redoing all its calculator lines, hp32sii will be updated. I hope this update will be a more like a hp42sii than hp32, but who knows. Seeing new hp12c platinum I have started to think that maybe, they will do a mix between hp32sii and hp20s (rpn/alg mode on a scientific calc).

We should have patience... next course seems to be "intense"...

Best regards,
J.Manrique López de la Fuente
Users Club from Gijón
1077 [HPCC](#) Member
AsturLiNUX & HispaLiNUX Member

Re: I email HP about need a 41CX...

Message #6 Posted by [Håkan Thörngren](#) on 5 June 2003, 5:10 a.m.,
in response to message #5 by J.Manrique Lopez de la Fuente

A HP42 is not a replacement for a HP41, it lacks I/O. HP48 is not a replacement for either, it uses RPL, not RPN.

I refused to get a HP42 when they existed on the market due to the lack of reasonable I/O.

Recently I have obtained two spare HP41CXs, one spare HP48GX (all new) and a couple of used Voyagers. I think I will manage for a long time without having to buy any more calculators. But, should HP start producing a new high end RPN/RPL calculator that interests me, I will probably find it hard to resist it..

Håkan

Re: I email HP about need a 41CX...

Message #7 Posted by [Erik Ehrling \(Sweden\)](#) on 6 June 2003, 3:00 a.m.,
in response to message #6 by Håkan Thörngren

> A HP42 is not a replacement for a HP41, it lacks I/O. HP48 is not a replacement for either, it uses RPL, not RPN.

That is exactly my point!

Keep the HP-42S the way it is but add serial I/O and increase the RAM size to 32K... What they definitely *not* should do, however, is to start adding an algebraic mode etc!

I have previously thought that another drawback of the HP-42S is that you cannot call MCODE programs (well, except from entering the debugger) - but I am now seeing it rather as an advantage: as HP is migrating to another CPU platform it is actually still possible to create a 100% compatible version using the new CPU.

Best regards, Erik Ehrling (Sweden)

Re: I email HP about need a 41CX...

*Message #8 Posted by **Robert** on 6 June 2003, 9:24 a.m.,
in response to message #7 by Erik Ehrling (Sweden)*

Guy's It's my opinion that the 42S was more than a replacement for the 41C, at the time of production. Do I like the 41C?.....yes, love it, at it's time the 41 was a lab engineer's dream. It has a good feel and is strait forward to use. Something important happened around the time of the 42S, PC's! It became easy to bring a PC to the problem. This limited the use of all those peripherals.

The 42S had to be smaller, lighter and more powerful than it's replacement. It is. I do not agree with all this IO business for non-graphics, it complicates the machine, and adds cost. Real world users would not use it, in my opinion.

Don't get me wrong, the 41 deserves a place in history. I love mine. The 42S was a perfect replacement. That 42 chewed up matrix based orbital dynamics problems easily, that much I know.

Re: "42s was replacement for 15C"

*Message #9 Posted by **Ron Ross** on 6 June 2003, 9:47 a.m.,
in response to message #8 by Robert*

The 42s was a replacement for the 15c. Hp said so in their advertisements, often. The 42s was supposed to have an sx version, that is why 32K can be addressed. I/O was also going to be available, but was never finished. The reason none of this happened, "It would rob sales from the Hp48 line and be an extra support item." Marketing made the call, as usual.

Re: I email HP about need a 41CX...

*Message #10 Posted by **Johnny Billquist** on 7 June 2003, 5:51 a.m.,
in response to message #8 by Robert*

The lack of I/O in the 42 is a serious drawback. Saving and transferring programs, as well as doing backups is not possible in the 42, and I'm sure everyone would agree that this is important.

Also, functional expansion is rather important too. The 41 had modules. The 48 was functionally expandable by downloading libraries.

Either way is acceptable, but the 48 solution can gobble up lots of user memory.

The 42 is useful in lots of ways, but I do miss time functions, and you could always come onto a problem where a few new functions would be wonderful.

The 41 is a totally wonderful machine, but I doubt they'd make a similar machine again. (But I would buy it)

Time fuctions in the 42S

*Message #11 Posted by **R Lion** on 7 June 2003, 6:46 a.m.,
in response to message #10 by Johnny Billquist*

Quote:

The 42 is useful in lots of ways, but I do miss time functions

I succesfully ported [this program](#) to the 42S. It was not very difficult.

Unfortunately I never wrote the 42S version in paper and the calc, w/o batteries!!, is crossing the Atlantic in these days...

If I could, anyone can do it.

Raul

Re: Time fuctions in the 42S

*Message #12 Posted by **Erik Ehrling (Sweden)** on 7 June 2003, 12:21 p.m.,
in response to message #11 by R Lion*

> If I could, anyone can do it.

You are being modest! But the simplicity of RPN programming is in my opinion a very good argument for a high-end RPN programmable calculator. If in addition to this would be backwards compatible to the HP41/HP42S then, bingo!

I am not stating that the HP41/HP42S could not be improved upon, but these high-end RPN programmables do still today represent a state of the art that has not been improved much upon since they went out of production - so using them as a starting point would seem very logical to me. And would probably also make business sense as well!

It could be brought to market relatively quickly and without much design work - as the HP42S is already designed! (Just add memory and I/O). It **must** be much cheaper to migrate a winning concept than starting it all over again!

Best regards, Erik Ehrling

RPL after RPN; what comes next?

*Message #13 Posted by **Vieira, Luiz C. (Brazil)** on 7 June 2003, 1:30 p.m.,
in response to message #12 by Erik Ehrling (Sweden)*

Hello, Erik;

I think I got your point here, but I wonder about RPL and RPN. When I got into contact with an HP28 for the first time, I found everything I wish to find in an advanced scientific calculator plus a lot more. I know many RPN-addicted will disagree with me, but I found RPN to RPL transition as a painless process. I still keep programming both styles. I have not yet delve into SYS-RPL and HPCALC Machine code, but I intend to.

Again, I wonder what comes next. If, despite flames and blames, RPL is an RPN evolution form (Pokemon's?), what should we expect if HP and ACO have gone further and further?

Hard to guess, I think.

Luiz C. Vieira - Brazil

Re: RPL after RPN; what comes next? (O.T.?)

*Message #14 Posted by **R Lion** on 7 June 2003, 3:18 p.m.,
in response to message #13 by Vieira, Luiz C. (Brazil)*

Quote:

but I found RPN to RPL transition as a painless process

Certainly RPL is not as intuitive as RPN but I've ever thought that the RPL is not as difficult as many says.

I have the Manual and the AUR to hand when programming my 48 and this is not necessary to me when programming in RPN, but this is not a big problem.

I use them both as well...

*Message #15 Posted by **Vieira, Luiz C. (Brazil)** on 7 June 2003, 4:26 p.m.,
in response to message #14 by R Lion*

Hi, Raúl;

I use them both as well, mostly to enhance and optimize HP48 programs. I think the highest level the language is, the bigger is its documentation. I started to use CLEAN and

ML about four years ago for post-graduation purposes and I missed C/C++ straight directives. I do not even remember how CLEAN structures are defined, but I can write a C/C++ program without using a programming guide or a C/C++ related book.

I wrote some user RPL programs last year, my own and someone else's use, and it took me more time to refine them than to write them. And I want my programs to be as small and efficient as possible, so I go for it fiercely. And I use manuals all time. I have more calculator related documentation, original press, than calculators themselves, maybe more than 50 publications amongst books and manuals. Once, when I was translating a big HP41 program to an HP48, I counted more than eight books and manuals opened.

And I felt amused!

I thought about posting a message with the title: "Now that your calculator is working fine..." to propose programming techniques to be posted, then I remembered that there is already a Software Library and a Programming-dedicated page.

Best regards, my friend.

Luiz C. Vieira - Brazil

Re: I use them both as well...

*Message #16 Posted by **Richard Garner** on 8 June 2003, 4:57 a.m., in response to message #15 by Vieira, Luiz C. (Brazil)*

"Once, when I was translating a big HP41 program to an HP48, I counted more than eight books and manuals opened."

This is exactly the point those of us that would prefer RPN calculators are trying to make. RPL may be a much more advanced and powerful OS for calculators, but if you have to have 8, 10, 15 different manuals open to just write a simple program, it does not find itself to being something that can be done on the fly out in the woods where you need to have a quick answer to a problem. You can't pull it out at a board meeting and in 5 minutes have a quick program that shows what the change in cost for a project is if your client decides they want to play the what if game. RPN calculators are much better at these sort of things because the programming is much simpler and more intuitive. I have a 41CX, 42S & 48GX, and if I have to do something fast on the fly, I always go for the 41 or 42. The 48 just takes too much time and is too awkward to do what needs to be done a hurry in terms of programming.

Re: I use them both as well...

*Message #17 Posted by **Erik Ehrling (Sweden)** on 8 June 2003, 8:34 a.m., in response to message #16 by Richard Garner*

> This is exactly the point those of us that would prefer RPN calculators are trying to make. RPL may be a much more advanced and powerful OS for calculators

That is in my opinion exactly where UserRPN excels over UserRPL - when writing small programs to solve a problem in the field! And this is bearing on a philosophical question, but isn't the "field" (i.e. any place where you don't have immediate access to a computer) the real home for a calculator?

Note that I am not mentioning systems development (e.g. all larger projects aiming at extending the functionality of the calculator) which would probably benefit from a more structured language. It might just as well be that the best solution would be to use UserRPN for user programs and SysRPL for the development of libs?! (i.e. the right tools for the right task)

Best regards, Erik Ehrling (Sweden)

RPN or RPL?

*Message #18 Posted by **R Lion** on 8 June 2003, 9:11 a.m., in response to message #17 by Erik Ehrling (Sweden)*

Quote:

UserRPN for user programs and SysRPL for the development of libs

Perhaps you are right.. but I repeat because I'm convinced: I think that to write *small programs* on the fly in the 48 is easy (although RPN is easier)

Raul

Clearing facts and a challenge (long)

Message #19 Posted by [Vieira, Luiz C. \(Brazil\)](#) on 8 June 2003, 1:05 p.m., in response to message #15 by [Vieira, Luiz C. \(Brazil\)](#)

Hi, folks; let's go again.

It's a "big guy" and I'd ask you please: read it all before getting to a conclusion, O.K.?

Focussing over a particular problem sometimes leads to a leak of specific information that may be interpreted as general case.

I mentioned: *a big HP41 program*. There are programs written for the HP41 that take lots and lots of memory and are many steps long. A few days ago, Valentin mentioned Othello, a 1,000 steps long program for the HP41... It is RPN. I do not know what Othello does, but porting it to an HP48 might reduce part of its structure in order to use enhanced HP48 features, although enhancing functionality might also cause it's RPL version to be a lot longer than the original RPN one.

Not to extend the subject any farther than it should go, in my case I had to identify what was going on the HP41 program so I could reproduce the same thing in the HP48. And I believe a single translation is sometimes trivial, so I decided to do what is supposed to do: enhance functionality. I rebuilt all loops, I used HP SOLVE instead of custom RPN loop control (by far, the worst part of all), I created a new, friendly in/out interface that used the LCD to show the complete (six values) answer at once, impossible to be done in a single-line LCD. And I did not mention it, but the about eight books were three manuals (HP41CX, HP48 UG and AUG) plus four or five specific books, subject related (surveying).

What for? I'm a teacher, if I can't do the thing or if I don't understand the thing I cannot explain how to do the thing. The only book I wrote (at least so far) and published is titled "From the HP41 to the HP48" (Da HP41 para a HP48), and I wrote because I think if I can do the thing, I can explain how to do the thing and go further: allow others to be able to do the thing, too. That's what teachers are primarily for.

I explain to my students that programming and using a program language are related tasks, instead different ones. You first learn how to program, like communicate, and improve your own programming skills and methodology and this goes with you forever. Some languages come and go, learning them is up to each one of us and the task we're performing. There are some situations where RPN programs need specific structures to be created, while RPL *may* already have them. And this eases the job.

We're dealing with calculators, but we can extend this "analysis" to computers and their O.S. Let's be honest and think both as users and programmers: whom of us would gladly and spontaneously migrate "back" to plain, old text interface instead of graphical one? Some "classical" programmers would gladly accept the task of getting back to their own roots and do magic with assembly language, plain C/C++ and Pascal. I would (I still have two 586 desktops and one 386 laptop to cry over when I'm nostalgic). But as a user I would not like to get rid of high-quality graphics environment, and I have already seen "today's" programmers that are not even aware of what's going on inside their boxes for as long as they command and the box obey.

C'mon, let's face it: there was a time when first computers and handheld calculators were "cool". Many of us lived those days, some did not. I read here that, in some cases, calculators do not even call for curiosity anymore, and we come from a "time" (twenty, twenty five years ago?) when RPN users and programmers were revered. Today, youngsters do not have the feeling for it anymore. Calculators are no longer

"cool", being able to understand problems and solve them is not "cool", survive against tech challenges is neither "cool"...

The HP41 series showed a drastic claim for their own "cool" inner parts when HP decided to call them computers instead of calculators. Coconuts and Voyagers were the last Hewlett-Packard "calculators" made by human hands; Clamshells, Pioneers and 48/49 series were CAD/CAE assisted, they have no "soul" to be maintained. I think Xpanders had passion in their design, and their disastrous hammered finale could not be avoided: they were not part of HP's plans for "the future", whatever it is. In time: I have a feeling that Xpanders would not find their place amongst RPN/RPL addicted, I don't know.

I wrote too much.

My challenge is: write the smallest program in any RPN/RPL calculator that computes interception coordinate $P(x,y)$ of two lines $L1$ and $L2$ given line's angles θ_1 and θ_2 , both related to the same reference (bearing, trigonometric, clockwise, whatever) and coordinates of two points $P1(x_1,y_1)$ and $P2(x_2,y_2)$ belonging to each line, respectively. I found my own solution in an HP48 using matrices and linear system solution, but the program has to handle original values a bit before "building" final matrices. When I tried direct values manipulation I found some "gaps" when lines were parallel to each other and when angles were closed to 90 or 270 degrees ($\pi/4$ or $3\pi/4$), so my program does not use any conditional structures. If you already have your own solution let me know it, I'd like to see what others are doing.

Finally, when I pointed out that I used eight books I intended to show that using books is always a good practice. I also want Richard Garner, Erik Ehrling, Raúl Lion and anyone else reading not to take this post as anything but a clearer exposition of the same thoughts expressed in [this post](#). I agree with all views based on personal, particular, professional experiences and analysis. I just thought I should improve the way I expressed my own.

Thank you and forgive me writing too much. I'll accept and read all comments, suggestions, flames, blames without complaining... too much. d;^)

Luiz C. Vieira - Brazil

Edited: 8 June 2003, 4:14 p.m.

Othello

Message #20 Posted by [Ellis Easley](#) on 10 June 2003, 11:49 a.m., in response to message #19 by Vieira, Luiz C. (Brazil)

I'll bet that program was an implementation of the board game "Othello". It is played on a board about the size of a chessboard with black and white discs. You flip lines of discs over by playing a disc at the end of the line ... I forget all the rules. In the 1980's I worked with someone from France who told me many people there competed to write programs to play the game.

Re: Othello

Message #21 Posted by [Valentin Albillo](#) on 10 June 2003, 1:25 p.m., in response to message #20 by Ellis Easley

Hi, Ellis:

You're right, Othello is just the game you described, but the name 'Othello' is a modern trademark. The real name of this ancient game is 'Reversi' (as in 'reverse', 'flip', I guess), and it's quite challenging to play. It's very near to be completely solved by computers, if not already so.

As for Luiz's comments, my Othello program, in its RPN incarnation, was far from 1,000 lines long. I can't check it out now but I'd say it was some 300-350 lines long at most.

I don't know how many 'lines' it would take if written in RPL, but I can say that its conversion to HP-71B's BASIC takes just 10-15 lines of quite simple code.

Best regards.

Re: Othello [OT]

*Message #22 Posted by [R Lion](#) on 10 June 2003, 2:11 p.m.,
in response to message #21 by Valentin Albillo*

I used to play Othello with my brother or my father in the last 70's and first 80's. Now I play with my 7 y.o. son.

I enjoyed playing "Reversi" in my Spectrum in 1984. Actually it was almost the only game I played.

Finally, Quick Reversi (Leon Paulov 1992) is installed in my 48 (although is difficult to find time to play now).

Great game, isn't it?

Raul.

Edited: 10 June 2003, 2:35 p.m.

Re: Othello

*Message #23 Posted by [Valentin Albillo](#) on 11 June 2003, 4:46 a.m.,
in response to message #22 by R Lion*

Raul posted:

"Great game, isn't it?"

Indeed ! I've always liked it very much since I read an article by Martin Gardner in Scientific American, and then another one in Byte magazine, circa 1980.

That article inspired me to write a version of Othello for the then new HP-41C, as I felt it had the necessary RAM and peripherals (i.e: card reader, printert) to even attempt it. Afterwards I wrote versions of it for the HP-85 and other Series 80 computers, the HP-71B, and further ones for the wonderful SHARP PC-1211 Pocket Computer (known is the US as TRS-80 PC-1) and other newer SHARP pocket computers.

I still play against those programs occasionally. The one I play the most is my version for the Sharp PC-1350, because due to its large graphic screen (150x32) the program can show the whole 8x8 board at all times (no printer needed) while displaying piece counts, prompts and messages in several fonts. It even allows the user to input moves using either algebraic coordinates or better still, moving a graphic cursor on the screen. It can also play for you, suggest a move, and will recognize draws automatically, among other features. Besides, you can select several strategies to play against, including a randomized one which ensures no two games are alike.

Should HP ever come with a new calculator with enough RAM and a suitably large graphic screen, I would definitely write a version for it as well, it's become my standard test for testing a new machine's capabilities, ergonomics, and ease of programming.

Best regards.

Valentín, please:

*Message #24 Posted by [R Lion](#) on 11 June 2003, 12:36 p.m.,
in response to message #23 by Valentin Albillo*

could you want send me that Sharp PC 1350 version?

Look [here](#) and guess why I want it...(and with a RAM card of 16Kb!)

Quote:

Should HP ever come with a new calculator with enough RAM and a suitably large graphic screen, I would definitely write a version for it as well, it's become my standard test for testing a new machine's capabilities, ergonomics, and ease of programming

Not in the 48? :-)

Raul

Re: Othello vs. Reversi

Message #25 Posted by [Ellis Easley](#) on 18 June 2003, 4:19 p.m., in response to message #21 by Valentin Albillo

I remembered the name "Reversi" but I thought it might be a modern trademark! I think I saw it on a game cartridge for a home computer. I'm sure my first experience of the game was the ~1970's set with plastic discs, probably made by Parker Brothers, and called "Othello".

Valentin, your HP-41 Othello program is here!

Message #26 Posted by [Gene](#) on 18 June 2003, 4:49 p.m., in response to message #21 by Valentin Albillo

<http://www.rskey.org/gene/calcgene/othello.htm>

This is your "Othello2" program from the PPC Journal with the only changes that I made all the data storage internal to the program (to remove the need for a data card).

I really love playing this game on my 2X speed HP-42S. Moves by the 42s at that speed dont' take too long!

Re: Valentin, your HP-41 Othello program is here!

Message #27 Posted by [Valentin Albillo](#) on 19 June 2003, 6:08 a.m., in response to message #26 by Gene

Gene posted:

"This is your "Othello2" program from the PPC Journal with the only changes that I made all the data storage internal to the program (to remove the need for a data card). I really love playing this game on my 2X speed HP-42S. Moves by the 42s at that speed dont' take too long!"

Thanks for your interest and for hosting it. I'm glad you still like it and play it. The original "Othello" (version 1, say) was quite a sensation when it was published in the legendary Australian magazine "PPC Technical Notes" an eternity ago. I had previously sent it to Richard Nelson's PPC, but he never published it, actually.

Eventually, copies of the program reached australian HP's people, who were equally amazed that it could be done in an HP-41C at all and used it a lot for demo purposes (demonstrating everything: the 41C itself, Memory modules, card reader, and most specially, the printer, with that neat, likeable 'graphic' board output !) with very good results (sales).

They promptly sent copies to HP's headquarters at Corvallis, who were equally amazed, to the point that some person in charge sent me a letter telling me the whole story, and asking for my permission to use it for a number of purposes, which I gladly conceded for free. Nevertheless, they later sent me a prize for 'my efforts', which made me feel great indeed ! :-)

So you see, quite a story behind that "Othello" program ... By the way, though "Othello 2" features two levels of play and is a much more complex program, I actually prefer "Othello 1", which is much shorter and neater, and thus more 'elegant' from a programming point of view, IMO.

Best regards.

Edited: 19 June 2003, 6:09 a.m.

Imagine that!

Message #28 Posted by [Paul Brogger](#) on 19 June 2003, 9:26 a.m.,

in response to message #27 by [Valentin Albillo](#)

... a company that paid attention to what its customers were doing with its products;

a company that showcased customers' best efforts to increase sales;

and *further*, a company that recognized and rewarded customers for their contribution!

I wonder which management theory book that came out of?

(By the way, are Reversi and Othello related at all to "Go"?)

Re: Imagine that!

Message #29 Posted by [Eduardo](#) on 19 June 2003, 11:06 a.m.,

in response to message #28 by [Paul Brogger](#)

I doubt there's any connection between Othello and Go. Go is a millennia-old Chinese game (though it's Japan's national game nowadays). I think I read somewhere that Reversi is European dating back only a few centuries. Other than that the two games are very very different.

Eduardo

Re: Imagine that!

Message #30 Posted by [Valentin Albillo](#) on 19 June 2003, 11:06 a.m.,

in response to message #28 by [Paul Brogger](#)

Paul posted:

"Imagine a company that paid attention to what its customers were doing with its products; a company that showcased customers' best efforts to increase sales; and further, a company that recognized and rewarded customers for their contribution!"

The HP I admired and loved was exactly that way. That's why it made of me a die-hard customer, who bought many, many products from them, who would recommend their products to everyone, and who placed much larger orders for much costlier items later on life, at the corporate level. And it all began with a tiny, premium-quality calculator.

Their tiny calculators, service, and philosophy of superb, state-of-the-art quality and commitment really amounted to many, many thousands of dollars earned from me, my friends, and my corporations.

Needless to say, that old, beloved HP is a thing of the past and I'll never ever buy another item from HP again, and will discourage anyone asking me from doing so, as long as it maintains the abysmal levels of quality and service they boast today. I'm too grown-up and knowledgeable to let those wimps take my hard-earned money in exchange for some crap korean or taiwanese piece of junk just because it carries their formerly prestigious badge, now reduced to a dangling carrot in front of the donkey.

"(By the way, are Reversi and Othello related at all to "Go"?)"

Not at all. "Go" is a much more complicated game, I know of no satisfactory program to play against, even for large computers.

Best regards.

Re: Clearing facts and a challenge (long)

Message #31 Posted by [bonnie](#) on 13 June 2003, 10:24 p.m., in response to message #19 by [Vieira, Luiz C.](#) (Brazil)

Hi, folks; let's go again.

It's a "big guy" and I'd ask you please: read it all before getting to a conclusion, O.K.?

Focussing over a particular problem sometimes leads to a leak of specific information that may be interpreted as general case.

I mentioned: a big HP41 program. There are programs written for the HP41 that take lots and lots of memory and are many steps long. A few days ago, Valentin mentioned Othello, a 1,000 steps long program for the HP41... It is RPN. I do not know what Othello does, but porting it to an HP48 might reduce part of its structure in order to use enhanced HP48 features, although enhancing functionality might also cause it's RPL version to be a lot longer than the original RPN one.

Not to extend the subject any farther than it should go, in my case I had to identify what was going on the HP41 program so I could reproduce the same thing in the HP48. And I believe a single translation is sometimes trivial, so I decided to do what is supposed to do: enhance functionality. I rebuilt all loops, I used HP SOLVE instead of custom RPN loop control (by far, the worst part of all), I created a new, friendly in/out interface that used the LCD to show the complete (six values) answer at once, impossible to be done in a single-line LCD. And I did not mention it, but the about eight books were three manuals (HP41CX, HP48 UG and AUG) plus four or five specific books, subject related (surveying).

What for? I'm a teacher, if I can't do the thing or if I don't understand the thing I cannot explain how to do the thing. The only book I wrote (at least so far) and published is titled "From the HP41 to the HP48" (Da HP41 para a HP48), and I wrote because I think if I can do the thing, I can explain how to do the thing and go further: allow others to be able to do the thing, too. That's what teachers are primarily for.

I explain to my students that programming and using a program language are related tasks, instead different ones. You first learn how to program, like communicate, and improve your own programming skills and methodology and this goes with you forever. Some languages come and go, learning them is up to each one of us and the task we're performing. There are some situations where RPN programs need specific structures to be created, while RPL may already have them. And this eases the job.

We're dealing with calculators, but we can extend this "analysis" to computers and their O.S. Let's be honest and think both as users and programmers: whom of us would gladly and spontaneously migrate "back" to plain, old text interface instead of graphical one? Some "classical" programmers would gladly accept the task of

getting back to their own roots and do magic with assembly language, plain C/C++ and Pascal. I would (I still have two 586 desktops and one 386 laptop to cry over when I'm nostalgic). But as a user I would not like to get rid of high-quality graphics environment, and I have already seen "today's" programmers that are not even aware of what's going on inside their boxes for as long as they command and the box obey.

C'mon, let's face it: there was a time when first computers and handheld calculators were "cool". Many of us lived those days, some did not. I read here that, in some cases, calculators do not even call for curiosity anymore, and we come from a "time" (twenty, twenty five years ago?) when RPN users and programmers were revered. Today, youngsters do not have the feeling for it anymore. Calculators are no longer "cool", being able to understand problems and solve them is not "cool", survive against tech challenges is neither "cool"...

The HP41 series showed a drastic claim for their own "cool" inner parts when HP decided to call them computers instead of calculators. Coconuts and Voyagers were the last Hewlett-Packard "calculators" made by human hands; Clamshells, Pioneers and 48/49 series were CAD/CAE assisted, they have no "soul" to be maintained. I think Xpanders had passion in their design, and their disastrous hammered finale could not be avoided: they were not part of HP's plans for "the future", whatever it is. In time: I have a feeling that Xpanders would not find their place amongst RPN/RPL addicted, I don't know.

I wrote too much.

My challenge is: write the smallest program in any RPN/RPL calculator that computes interception coordinate $P(x,y)$ of two lines $L1$ and $L2$ given line's angles $\emptyset1$ and $\emptyset2$, both related to the same reference (bearing, trigonometric, clockwise, whatever) and coordinates of two points $P1(x1,y1)$ and $P2(x2,y2)$ belonging to each line, respectively. I found my own solution in an HP48 using matrices and linear system solution, but the program has to handle original values a bit before "building" final matrices. When I tried direct values manipulation I found some "gaps" when lines were parallel to each other and when angles were closed to 90 or 270 degrees ($\pi/4$ or $3*\pi/4$), so my program does not use any conditional structures. If you already have your own solution let me know it, I'd like to see what others are doing.

Finally, when I pointed out that I used eight books I intended to show that using books is always a good practice. I also want Richard Garner, Erik Ehrling, Raúl Lion and anyone else reading not to take this post as anything but a clearer exposition of the same thoughts expressed in this post. I agree with all views based on personal, particular, professional experiences and analysis. I just thought I should improve the way I expressed my own.

Thank you and forgive me writing too much. I'll accept and read all comments, suggestions, flames, blames without complaining... too much. d;^)

Re: RPL after RPN; what comes next?

*Message #32 Posted by [Ernie Malaga](#) on 7 June 2003, 7:02 p.m.,
in response to message #13 by [Vieira, Luiz C.](#) (Brazil)*

Luiz:

I must be one of those who found the transition from RPN to RPL painful and difficult; I haven't completed the transition yet (16 years, off and on), and I don't feel inclined to while I have two RPN calculators that still work perfectly well.

Still, HP may come up with a Forth calculator/computer for its next generation. That certainly would be the "next step" in a logical "let's get everything backwards" trend.

Unless, of course, they put the LCDs upside-down on all future machines...? 8^)

-Einre Agalam

Yours is a "must read" post... <8^D

Message #33 Posted by **Vieira, Luiz C. (Brazil)** on 7 June 2003, 7:43 p.m.,
in response to message #32 by Ernie Malaga

Hey, Ernie;

I'm still laughing at you upside-down LCD.

And I'm the one to be called crazy by my pupils...

Best regards!

Luiz C. Vieira - Brazil

Edited: 8 June 2003, 2:04 p.m.

Re: RPL after RPN; what comes next?

Message #34 Posted by **Les Bell [Sydney]** on 7 June 2003, 11:57 p.m.,
in response to message #32 by Ernie Malaga

And of course, for hard copy printout, an infra-red Postscript printer.

The existence of HP PCL laser printers is a slap in the face to all RPN purists. <g>

Best,

--- Les [<http://www.lesbell.com.au>]

Re: RPL after RPN; what comes next?

Message #35 Posted by **Erik Ehrling (Sweden)** on 8 June 2003, 8:41 a.m.,
in response to message #32 by Ernie Malaga

> That certainly would be the "next step" in a logical "let's get everything backwards" trend.

:-)

I just hoped that they would use a "zero development, take anything we've already got" approach - and in that case I could not really see why they should make a "HP32SII Platinum" instead of a "HP42S Platinum"!?

Current state of the matters: Let's hope for status quo :-)

Best regards, Erik Ehrling (Sweden)

Re: RPL after RPN; what comes next?

Message #36 Posted by **Mark Ordal** on 13 June 2003, 2:44 p.m.,
in response to message #32 by Ernie Malaga

[quote]Still, HP may come up with a Forth calculator/computer for its next generation....
[/quote]

If I recall correctly, HP made a Forth module for the HP-71B.

Re: RPL after RPN; what comes next?

Message #37 Posted by **Paul Brogger** on 8 June 2003, 5:53 p.m.,
in response to message #13 by Vieira, Luiz C. (Brazil)

I found the 28s and RPL to be a logical extension of RPN, and had a lot of fun with it.

Now that I do only the simplest programming on any calculator (and infrequently at that), I find RPN with clear mnemonics (rather than key coordinates) to be most accessible. Hence my appreciation for the 32s and 42s. IMO, they just can't be beat for simple, on-the-fly programming. (I suppose the 41 should be mentioned here as well, but I've never used one of those.)

In a calculator designed for ready accessibility, but with gobs of memory for programs of greater complexity, I wonder whether the 32s/42s-style of keystroke programming should be extended by some sort of machine language capability and a PC connection. That way, the larger, more complex applications could be written & tested on a PC with an emulator, then downloaded for final testing & use. (There again, I'm probably talking about a 41!)

Re: RPL after RPN; what comes next?

*Message #38 Posted by **Johnny Billquist** on 8 June 2003, 8:49 p.m.,
in response to message #37 by Paul Brogger*

Yes, you're talking about the 41. The whole thing was invented back in '79 already. Nothing new and better under the sun since then. :-)

Keep smiling.

And for those that complain about RPL. It's not hard. You just have to understand functional programming instead of imperative. That's the big leap. I actually much prefer Lisp (and similar languages) over C, but I can understand that it takes some getting used to.

Get some good book on functional programming, and learn that first, and *then* go for RPL. You'll be amazed how much easier it will be.

Re: Time fuctions in the 42S

*Message #39 Posted by **Johnny Billquist** on 8 June 2003, 8:51 p.m.,
in response to message #11 by R Lion*

That's a nice and neat program. On my 41 I have DATE+ and DDAYS already, so I don't need it. :-)

But if I want to time something, start something at a specific time, or play around in other ways, it will become more difficult with the 42.

Which 41 is yours?

*Message #40 Posted by **Vieira, Luiz C. (Brazil)** on 8 June 2003, 9:11 p.m.,
in response to message #39 by Johnny Billquist*

Hi, Johnny;

Just curiosity: a CX or a C/CV with time module?

For the records, only...

Thanks.

Luiz C. Vieira - Brazil

Re: Which 41 is yours?

*Message #41 Posted by **Johnny Billquist** on 9 June 2003, 6:44 p.m.,
in response to message #40 by Vieira, Luiz C. (Brazil)*

It's a CX. I first bought a CV a long time ago. When the CX came out I lusted for it for over a year before I bought one. Sold my CV at the same time.

S/N: 2519S40501

I've built in my two X-MEM modules as well as my ZENROM. I have the magnetic card reader, Advantage, HP-IL, video interface, cassette recorder, extended I/O and an MLDL. Just about the only thing I really still miss is an RS-232 interface...

I haven't bought a thing except for batteries for a long time. Perhaps I should spend some money on it... :-)

Hmm, I think I'm about my 20th anniversary with a 41... :-)

Re: Which 41 is yours?

*Message #42 Posted by **Johnny Billquist** on 9 June 2003, 6:48 p.m.,*

in response to message #41 by Johnny Billquist

Oh, and I can't help being a bit proud of the old bugger. Everything on it still works fine.

One other modification I have been tempted at times is to speed it up. But I haven't, yet...

And I own a 48SX as well. Not as fun at all, now that the initial fascination have passed. (I've owned that one slightly over 10 years now).

I have Coconut and P41 on my Palm as well. :-)

New 32-SII's

*Message #43 Posted by [Michael Meyer](#) on 7 June 2003, 2:37 a.m.,
in response to message #2 by Michel Beaulieu*

If so, I'd better sell mine now! <grin>

If not.... I'd better keep mine now!

Michael

Re: I email HP about need a 41CX...

*Message #44 Posted by [James M. Prange](#) on 5 June 2003, 9:16 p.m.,
in response to message #1 by Michel Beaulieu*

I'm glad to see that they mentioned the 48G and 48GX and not just the 49G for RPL models.

I wonder whether the replacement for the 32SII will be suitable for carrying in a shirt pocket.

Regards,
James

[[Return to Index](#) | [Top of Index](#)]



[Go back to the main exhibit hall](#)