



Imperial
Chemical
Industries
Limited

Organics
Division

makers of dyestuffs,
pigments, industrial
and polyurethane
chemicals

Mr.R.Kuehni,
Mobay Chemical Corporation,
P.O.Box 385,
Union Metropolitan Park,
Union, N.J.07083,
USA.

Your ref

Our ref

Date

AR.TS/T/KMcL/BS

26 May, 1976.

Dear Mr.Kuehni,

We obviously haven't yet reached the end of our exchange of letters because one or two entirely new points have been raised in your letter dated 11 May.

Objective Choice

You say that "nobody with authority to speak for the CIE has ever said that the objective for the choice were the MMB data". I do not think I am being unduly immodest if I claim to be speaking with authority because I received a letter dated 18 June, 1975, from Wyszecki which contains the following statement:-

"I have completed editing your paper. Only very minor editorial changes have been made."

Wyszecki specifically referred to this paper in all subsequent versions of the Recommendation and no single criticism emerged either when I presented it in London or in subsequent comments concerning the Recommendation.

Lumping

I still cannot understand why you say that the Hatra and D-F data are not compatible. The observers in both cases were textile colourists making acceptability decisions and their degree of severity was so close as to make it unnecessary to use a scaling factor. Although the failure of the Kuehni/McDonald chroma factor is still puzzling I cannot see how this makes the two data sets incompatible.

Ignoring

I ignored the K and M data solely because much data processing would have been necessary to have included it in my sole objective which was to identify the established colour difference equation which correlated best with acceptability decisions and to a degree which was statistically significant. So much of your papers seem to have been concerned with developing yet another equation as was your September 1974 report. I believed at that time and of course still do that industry will be best served by having a single equation which everybody can use until something demonstrably better comes along.



Hatchet Job

If you didn't intend your equation to be adopted by the CIE then you have only yourself to blame if everybody thought that you did because the Recommendation on page 9 clearly suggests that it should be adopted instead of CIELAB. Incidentally the copy of your report which you sent me did not include correlation data though I very much doubt if your equation could have been statistically significantly better than CIELAB.

You must not be surprised if I speculate on the American situation because you do not give me a complete story. This is also true concerning your September 1974 paper. I seem to be getting all the blame for it being ignored but presumably it is the US Committee who are to blame because they neither submitted it as an official document nor did any member of the American delegation ever refer to it as far as I know - don't forget I was not present at any of the London sessions except the last formal meeting.

The most intriguing comment in your letter concerns the reference to me ramming CIELAB through some organisations. I certainly haven't rammed it through the CIE as the first person to suggest that "the CIE recommend the Adams-Nickerson formula with a cube root expression" was MacAdam not McLaren - on 9 July 1973. Since then the progress of the CIELAB equation within CIE has been completely free from official opposition apart from that of Friele who subsequently voted in favour of it. The only other committee involved is ISO and here again no ramming was required. When the UK first submitted this to ISO we never intended it to be adopted and I was astonished to find that every country represented was in favour of adopting it. Again there has been no opposition: Brockes and I disagreed over the symbol to be used for clockwise and anti-clockwise hue changes but this has now been taken out of our hands as the CIE has made its pronouncement. So you see I am completely puzzled by any reference to strong arm tactics on my part.

I hope you will have no objection to me referring your comment concerning the delay in publication of the Hatra data to Jaekel because I think it is only right that he should have the opportunity of refuting your somewhat serious allegation.

Yours sincerely,


K. McLaren