Editor’s note: This issue is especially large because all items received by press time have been included. The Editor believes that information should be relayed to the TUG membership as soon as possible, so nothing is being held over for another issue.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * 

General Delivery

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

SITE COORDINATORS
Robert Welland

The following people, who are bringing up TeX on machines at their institutions, have agreed to be site coordinators. Their primary responsibility is to get TeX running and when this is done to write up a report for TUGboat. They have also agreed to answer a limited number of questions; they offer this help for free and the time to do so comes from very busy schedules. If you are not involved with bringing up TeX, please wait for the site reports to appear in TUGboat. Hopefully, they will answer most questions and make manageable the burden the site coordinators will have to bear.

If you are bringing up TeX on one of the following machines please inform the appropriate person; otherwise send the information to the TUGboat editor, Robert Welland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Machine</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burroughs B8000</td>
<td>Scott McCourt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burroughs Corp., B.C.S. Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Drive, Commerce Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Danbury, CT 06810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203-794-0191 ext 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC Cyber</td>
<td>Thad Hodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Computing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>205 Union St. S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minneapolis MN 55455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>612-372-4599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC10 running under TOPS-10</td>
<td>Phil Sherrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Box 1577 Station B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nashville, TN 37235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>615-322-7311 ext 2951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC20 running under TOPS-20</td>
<td>Patrick Milligan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bell Northern Research Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>885 A Middlefield Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain View, CA 94043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>415-960-0170 ext 2387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM 370</td>
<td>Eagle Burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poly 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanford Center for Information Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanford, CA 94305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>415-422-8700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univac 1100/62</td>
<td>Ralph Stromquist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Computing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1210 W. Dayton St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison, WI 53706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>608-262-8821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VAX

Monte Nichols
Sandia National Laboratories
Livermore, CA 94550
415-422-2706

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

CHAIRMAN’S REPORT
Richard S. Palais

The Steering Committee of TUG met for most of the day on January 9 at the San Francisco Hilton. Much of what transpired at that meeting is reported on elsewhere in this newsletter. I would like to concentrate here on two aspects of the discussions. The first of these is a continuing strong division of opinion on the question of TeX “maintenance”, a matter that many will remember already evoked considerable debate at the first TUG meeting. The disagreement is over which of two goals, both obviously desirable, should take precedence. One goal is that TeX should remain as “free” as possible and the other is that TeX should be as carefully and professionally maintained as possible. At one extreme are the large “production” users who would like rapid and dependable advice and help with all their software problems. For them TeX will be one module in a complex system. They have deadlines to meet that require that all these modules work, and they are used to, willing, and able to pay up to several thousand dollars per year to have real or imagined bugs exorcised on the spot and have their software tailored, tuned, and customized for them. At the other extreme is the single, small user with little or no money to spend but competent, willing and able to invest his time and effort in “hacking TeX” for himself. Complicating matters is a third and perhaps over-riding goal, the need to assure that there remains a single, standard “TeX”, compatible across many machine architectures and output devices. Fortunately these goals and the constituencies supporting them are not really conflicting, but rather orthogonal. With care and compromise there does not seem to me to be any serious reason why the various categories of TeX users cannot all have their needs met. But it is clear that to avoid nonproductive conflicts and polarizations everyone in TUG will have to keep in mind that the TUG membership is anything but homogeneous and several different options will frequently have to be provided to satisfy all the different classes of TeX users.

The second matter I would like to discuss is the Steering Committee’s decision to call for a TeX Implementation Workshop at Stanford in the middle
of May. This will be a two day meeting. One day will be a \TeX demonstration day, open to all present and prospective TUG members. This is meant to give an opportunity to become familiar with the various components of the \TeX system, and in particular with the different output device options. (At present at Stanford it is possible to have a \TeX-produced DVI file output on any one of a Xerox XGP or a Versatec electrostatic printer/plotter, an Alphatype CRS typesetter, or a Canon or Xerox (Dover) laser printer.) The other day is aimed primarily at those actively or prospectively engaged in the implementation of \TeX systems and the goal is to maximize the amount of help and information these people can exchange with each other and with the central \TeX team at Stanford. The ultimate goal of this implementation project is to be able to supply “off the shelf” to anyone desiring it all the components of a completely working \TeX system. Let us consider for the moment what these components are:

(A) \TeX-in-Pascal.

1. System independent part.
2. System dependent part.

(B) Font files.

1. Font information files (device independent).
2. “Character shape” files.

(C) DVI-to-hardcopy back end.

1. Output device hardware interfaces.
2. Software for output device interfaces.
3. Queuers, spoolers, device drivers for output devices.
4. Character shape file “pipeline” from host disk system.

Part (A) (together with B1) is what is necessary to produce DVI output files from a valid \TeX input file. Now A1 has long been complete, and A2 is either completed or nearing completion for a wide spectrum of host machines of different manufacture, architecture and operating systems (DEC TOPS-10, TOPS-20, VAX VMS, VAX UNIX; IBM 360/370; CDC Cyber; Univac 1100). I think that we can look forward with some confidence to the May meeting as marking the virtual completion of this first phase of \TeX implementation. Now as for part B, the creation of a basic font library, that too is essentially complete. The whole family of CM fonts (and others besides) now exist as \METAFONT programs. Recall from this column in the first number of the TUG newsletter that \METAFONT not only creates the device independent font information file (containing the size, spacing, kerning, and ligature information needed by \TeX to create a DVI file), but also, once a simple interface program is written for a given output device, \METAFONT will create the character shape files, in the form of raster patterns stored as, say, matrices of zeros and ones. Such \METAFONT interfaces have now been written for over a half dozen output devices, running from the super high resolution (5300 dot/inch) Alphatype CRS to the low resolution (128 dot/inch) Florida Data impact printer.

So what is rapidly approaching is the final phase of the \TeX implementation program, the creation of the back-end systems which for a given host mainframe and output device will, from the DVI file and character shape files, produce the hardcopy output. Now as David Fuchs has remarked, life would be quite easy if output devices had built into them enough disk-type storage to handle all the character shape files for sixty-four fonts of 128 characters each and enough logic to process the DVI files into raster scan lines. One would still have the (rather trivial) job of writing for each operating system spoolers and queuing programs to send DVI files over a serial line to this ideal output device in an orderly fashion, but one would be able to avoid a host of other small headaches that real world output devices force one to deal with. Since, in fact, output devices usually have no usable general purpose microcomputer built in, one must interface the host computer to the output device via a microcomputer able to speak to both. Also, since all the character shape files that must be accessible to process a complex DVI file can in principle run in the megabyte range, economic considerations mandate that with current technology these files must be kept on the host computer disk memory, and then downloaded as necessary to a small floppy disk system associated to the microcomputer interface over the (for simplicity) serial line joining it to the host computer. Now, designing the hardware interface from off the shelf items and writing the software to make it all go is not a major project for an expert systems program who understands the format of DVI files and character shape files and knows how to communicate scan lines to the output device. Perhaps a month or two of hard work will suffice. What is frustrating is that these systems are extremely sensitive to small differences in the various protocols of operating systems and output devices, so if there are m of the former and n of the latter one could easily end up doing this same work mn times. Of course common sense tells us that good planning should be able to reduce this to more like m + n times. (For example, David Fuchs could probably interface one more output device to TOPS-20 in under a week.)
A major reason for the May meeting is to reduce as much as possible unnecessary duplication of effort in this final part of the program to make \TeX\ generally available.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

REPORT ON THE TUG STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

The TUG Steering Committee and several observers met at the San Francisco Hilton on January 9, 1980. Below is reported the gist of that meeting as recovered from tape recordings and my notes. Since several topics re-emerged throughout the meeting, I have not reported in any order related to that of the meeting.

Robert Morris

ATTENDANCE

The following attended:
Barbara Beeton, AMS Providence
Max Dias, Stanford
Barry Doherty, AMS Providence
David Fuchs, Stanford
Ellen Heiser, AMS Providence
Don Knuth, Stanford
Leslie Lamport, SRI
William LeVeque, AMS Providence
Patrick Milligan, Bell Northern Research
Robert Morris, UMASS/Boston
Evon Motiska, Stanford
Monte Nichols, Sandia Labs
Richard Palais, Brandeis
Lynne Price, Bell Northern Research
David Rogers, University of Michigan
J. L. Selfridge, Math Reviews
Phil Sherrod, Vanderbilt
Michael Spivak, Decatur, Ga.
Rilla Thedford, Math Reviews
Luis Trabb-Pardo, Stanford
Bob Welland, Northwestern
Sam Whidden, AMS Providence
W. B. Woolf, Math Reviews
Ignacio Zabala, Stanford

Treasurer's Report

Sam Whidden gave the treasurer's report, attached. The cost of producing the first newsletter exceeded the treasury by $419. It is estimated that an additional $3600 is needed for two issues in 1981.

AMS-\TeX

Mike Spivak reported that version -1 works as indicated in The Joy of \TeX, where not-yet-implemented features are indicated in handwritten marginalia. The Joy was not processed by \AMS-\TeX, which will now enter its field testing phase as people begin to use it. An order form for a tape is included with the manual, for sale at AMS headquarters. The first finder of each manual misprint will receive a $1 bounty, and the first finder of each \AMS-\TeX bug a $5 bounty. Bounty may be claimed by writing Mike at the address in The Joy of \TeX. The Joy was produced on the Providence Alphatype, which is exhibiting some backlash problems resulting in distortion of some vertical lines.

\AMS-\TeX has too many macros for easy use in the SAIL \TeX running now at Providence. The Pascal version is not expected to have the size limitations which caused the problems, which in any case can be changed by recompiling \TeX with bigger values of \verb|hashsize|. The Pascal version will provide 3 bits more address space for internal memory than the SAIL version and such problems will not be serious. A similar problem with memsize appears when setting multi-column output. These should also disappear in the Pascal version. Making \AMS-\TeX macros more efficient will help, which Mike will do this week.

MAINTENANCE

The administrative burden of maintaining \TeX has become too large for Stanford to support on the informal basis they do. Throughout the meeting at various times debate raged on the appropriate mechanism for maintenance. Since this is inextricable from membership fees, a Finance Committee was formed to recommend a maintenance policy, to recommend a membership fee policy, and to explore sources of support, e.g. foundations. This consists of Sam Whidden, Luis Trabb-Pardo, chairman, Bob Morris, Pat Milligan and Monte Nichols. It seemed that everyone agreed that TUG would run a \TeX switchboard whereby someone would be paid to tell callers who can answer their questions. Luis and the Stanford people are spending too much time doing this and answering the questions. The switchboard could also refer people to an up-to-date list of consultants for hire.

The (unsettled) argument about maintenance varied between two positions: (a) Some organisation with either an explicit financial interest or an in-house \TeX support facility should maintain \TeX at TUG's expense. (b) There should be no financial burden whatsoever on the membership and no particular \TeX maintenance should be endorsed by the
Users Group (see separate articles in this newsletter). Knuth’s intention is that the released Pascal TeX will be a single stable core (aside from the system dependent module) which can be uniformly maintained for all versions and should not have any supported enhancements.

**TUG Meeting**

No general TUG meeting will be called until the Pascal TeX is released. However, an Implementor’s Workshop has been called for May 14-15 at Stanford. This will be coupled with a TeX open house comprising demonstrations for people who don’t know what TeX is. Details are elsewhere in this issue.

**Pascal TeX**

A detailed report of each architecture appears elsewhere in this issue. Knuth expects to read the Pascal version’s code this spring very carefully before its public release. When released, it will be frozen with no enhancements or changes perhaps aside from bug fixes. At present, the only fully operational Pascal version is the TOPS-20 implementation. One problem is that implementors have also to get their output hardware working in order to see output. In general interfacing output devices is proving a greater share of the implementation efforts than people imagined, but has nothing directly to do with bringing up Pascal versions.

**Education**

Knuth is making a video tape to teach TeX to users. He intends for this tape ultimately to be available through TUG.

**Output Devices**

Phil Sherrod: It took a week to get the SAIL version working on TOPS-10, but nearly a year to get all the output device interfaces conveniently working (e.g. spoolers) although only a month to get something up. Finding the right hardware interfacing was lengthy and mysterious. TUG should maintain descriptions of what kind of hardware to buy and what the software interfaces involve.

Phil will write an article describing the tribulations of output device implementors.

There was a belief expressed that the output device vendors would have to be involved in output interfaces. Cooperation greater than that already provided by manufacturers of existing devices will be needed for wide applicability. Luis Trabb-Pardo expressed the belief that more intelligence needs to be provided in devices in order to relieve burden on the host, which will allow less system dependent software. The problem is that Xerographic printers are or soon will be selling for about $3000 for the printing engine. The interface will cost about the same, bringing the OEM cost to about $6-7,000. The end-user prices will be around $20,000 for complete printing systems. These will have sufficient intelligence to take DVI files more or less directly. A similar arrangement based on electrostatic printers should sell for around $10,000 end-user system price.

**Math. Reviews** has interfaced a Florida Data dot matrix printer with the same mechanism (a $3500 one-board Z80 system) to drive it in graphics mode. The device has 128 dots/inch and might be suitable for very rough copy. It is doing TeX output at about 30 seconds per page, which is a little slower than the electrostatic devices.

Varian, Versatec, Dover, and Alphatypers are working at several sites. The Dover does not accept DVI files and is in any case not commercially available.

---

**1980 TUG Treasurer’s Report**

Samuel B. Whidden

During 1980 the first issue of TUGboat appeared. The costs associated with its printing and distribution amounted to $1,719. (Not included in this figure are costs for services provided by AMS professional staff.) As of December 31, 1980, 130 membership applications have been received for a total income of $1,300.

**Income:**

- Membership: $1,300

**Expenses:**

- Printing: $1,232
- Postage: 371
- Mailing/Labor: 116

**Balance (as of 12/31/80)**: $1,719

Based on the costs for 1980, it is anticipated that direct costs associated with the production and distribution of two issues of TUGboat during 1981 will be approximately $3,600, with the AMS continuing to contribute the services of its professional staff.

Respectfully submitted,

Samuel B. Whidden, Treasurer
January 5, 1981

(Note: As of 2/6/81 a total of 258 paid membership applications had been received.)

---

**Informal TUG Session**

Robert A. Morris

On the afternoon of January 9, various TUG Steering Committee members and other interested
people met at the Hilton for informal discussion. Among the people I can remember were there were: Lynne Price and Pat Milligan (Bell Northern Research), Leslie Lamport (SRI), Luis Trabb-Pardo (Stanford), Rilla Thedford (Math Reviews), Arnie Piser (Rochester). Possibly I have missed some. I have reported below some of the wishes, rumors, and reports from this meeting and other sources. Nothing is guaranteed accurate!

Lynne and Pat have extensive macro experience and have made slides, Hebrew, and are advocating TeX as a standard for in-house technical documentation in their organization.

Some desires: improved user interfaces. Lynne will start collecting complaints and suggestions. AMS-TeX is an example.

Many people want a TeX preprocessor which can run on small machines with which people can test the syntax of their TeX input. (But Unidot has its C version running on an Onyx UNIX system with a Versatec printer and hopes for release soon. This could presumably be used even without an output device. It apparently is based on the SAIL version of TeX. Will it be released with all the changes which end up in the Pascal version? It will be for sale.)

Luis: In principle, all that is needed for the use of an arbitrary printing engine is cooperation from the vendor in providing (a) Font Metrics for each font; (b) If the galley proof cost is high, will they provide proof mode encodings (e.g. at 200 dots/inch), not only thereby protecting their own font investment but allowing users to run proof mode versions of their fonts on a proof device? (c) Is the typesetter language available to people to write DVI-to-device drivers? (d) Is the manufacturer willing to include math fonts made by METAFONT?

A trick if your macros are too big to fit (which shouldn't happen very much in the Pascal versions): redefine as null macros which will not be used again. This will return the space to the memory manager.

Leslie Lamport: A trick to avoid un-matched brace syntax errors: When using a screen editor like EMACS, use a macro which creates matching braces with nothing between them except the cursor. The closing brace is then automatically there after the text entry is finished.

Editor's note: The following two articles give divergent views on the subject of how the TeX program is to be maintained in the future. Readers are invited to comment, and to make known their own views on the subject before the next meeting of the TUG Steering Committee in May.

* * * * * * * * * *

A POSITION ON TeX MAINTENANCE
Robert Morris, UMASS/Boston

There are at least two diametrically opposed maintenance/distribution models we can consider. The production user, like AMS or a commercial user, wants something like a fully supported TeX. Such a user has a calculable, or at least identifiable, financial penalty which it incurs when the software it is using does not work. On the other hand is the university user facing little or no budget resources which it can devote to buying support, but also having no particular time constraints and having a pool of talent—its students—which can tweak non-working software. Since I am in the second community, I would like to argue in favor of TUG's involvement being closer to the second model, while facilitating the other class of users solving their support needs at their own expense.

I believe that few universities would benefit by paying $1,000/year membership fee to TUG. Indeed, $200 seems too much to me for an organisation which can wait weeks to get sick software fixed. Instead of contributing to extensive TeX support, I suggest that there be designated distribution sites for each architecture, selected from some organisations heavily using TeX on that architecture. These sites would make standard release tapes at cost and would incorporate bug fixes at designated intervals (quarterly?). Their interest would lie principally in being the funnel for proposed bug fixes (which would often be proposed by the discoverer of the problem) and thereby having the first and widest perspective on maintenance. Presumably these would be organisations which are already maintaining TeX in-house and thus have sufficient expertise to recognise whether a bug report is in fact a TeX problem or a user problem.

The other side of this essentially un-supported TeX is that users can tinker with TeX and circulate their own "enhancements". On the one hand, this is contrary to desires that Knuth has expressed. On the other hand, it is bound to happen when sources are distributed, and I am not convinced it is bad. The most successful model of this kind of un-supported source distribution is the UNIX operating system. UNIX is distributed free to educational users with source licenses. Tapes are made at cost by the licensor, Bell Laboratories. Often, these
releases do not work on the precise configuration
the licensee has and varying degrees of work are
required to bring up the system. Alternatively,
users often get copies of the system not from Bell
Laboratories but from another site with the same
or similar configurations. Many users modify their
systems and/or install major modifications made by
other sites. This process continued for 6-7 years
throughout the life of "version 6 UNIX", the first
version in wide circulation. All this experimentation
led to two things: a bizarre proliferation of
somewhat incompatible versions of UNIX and a sub-
stantial base of expertise about the system coupled
with a great deal of experimentation toward modern-
izing the operating system. The result of the
former was that UNIX came to be regarded as needing
substantial systems programming expertise to keep
it running (a false belief which did not take into
account the simplicity of the operating system
and the ease of dealing with code written in a high-
level language). The result of the latter was that
version 7 UNIX and that for the VAX have incor-
porated the results of these experiments and ap-
parently produced a very contemporary and useful
operating system which internally looks little like
version 6, but to users is very similar. After all this
tinkering, the resulting product seems to be useful
not only in universities, but at high prices in com-
mercial environments.

On the one hand, such a model seems incom-
patible with Knuth's position that TeX will be
released in such a way that tinkering is un-needed.
He prefers that people think of TeX as something
which will not need enhancement, but rather will be
the foundation of similar future developments which
are not TeX but (hopefully) something better. On
the other hand, it suggests that the way to find what
the something better might be is actually by the
kind of refinement which took place in UNIX with
wide circulation (among licensees in that case, but
presumably among everyone in the TeX case).

It strikes me that any form of TeX support will
have its cost underwritten either by an organiza-
tion seeking to profit from it or by the Users Group
seeking to keep to Knuth's idea of a single uniform
TeX. My feeling is that the cost, especially to
academic users, of the latter is prohibitive (one es-
timate mentioned at the TUG Steering Committee
meeting was $25,000-50,000/year total distributed
among 50-100 institutional members).

My guess is that the costs of making fixes to all
releases, i.e. all architectures, could climb above this
just because most sites will not have expertise in all
systems.

I am afraid that any commercial organisation
which assumed "official" responsibility for repairing
TeX would insist on reasonable assurances that no
one would compete with them, for example that I
would not give away bug fixes the way UNIX sites
do. Since no such assurance is possible because the
software is in the public domain, it seems that the
alternative is to have the entire TUG membership
pay for the support by membership fees.

I would propose that as a group TUG provide
no services other than the dissemination of informa-
tion about TeX, including the Pascal release. Any
bug fixes would be reported but not endorsed by
TUG perhaps except at stated intervals when new
releases would incorporate them. Production users
of TeX would be entirely on their own in finding
support at the level they need. I am inclined to
argue that there should be several distribution sites,
one for each architecture and that they should not be
sites which have a commercial interest in selling
supported TeX. They should be reimbursed for their
direct expenses by each recipient in the form of a
nominal ($50-200) fee for providing the release tape
and documents, and some attempt should be made
to ascertain a reasonable level at which TUG will
annually reimburse them for less tangible related ex-
penses, e.g. time spent consulting with people having
difficulty installing the release, time spent evaluat-
ing bug reports, etc. The balance of TUG's budget
should be spent for the "switchboard", the newslet-
ter, and the expense surrounding incorporating bug
fixes at the stated (infrequent) intervals.

Ordinary TUG membership meetings should be
financed largely out of meeting fees which should be
appreciably smaller for educational users than for
production users.

There will be two classes of institutional mem-
berships: educational users and production users.
An educational user is a non-profit educational site
which is using TeX only for instruction or for the
production of publicly accessible research or instruc-
tional documents. A production site is a site which
is using TeX principally for the production of ad-
ministrative, clerical, or commercial or published
documents. A production site is using TeX because
it expects to save or make money by doing so,
whether directly or indirectly. Such sites include not
only commercial enterprises, but also the AMS, the
publications departments of universities, and the in-
house document preparation centers of not-for-profit
research organisations.

* * * * * * * * * *