

Re: mutex overkill ?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Development/microsoft.public.win32.programmer.kernel/2006-10/msg00054.htm>

- *From:* "anton bassov" <soviet_bloke@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 30 Sep 2006 20:54:13 -0700
-

Lesbee,

The book is described as valuable to those wanting to understand how Windows runs "applications", not device drivers.

Are you sure you know which particular book we discuss, in the first place????

Your above statement is just incredible "masterpiece". "Windows Internals" is all about kernel mechanics, rather than about actual programming – it is not a book about writing drivers, and it is ***DEFINITELY*** not a book about running user-mode applications

you may appeal to the authors — we can wait and see if they join the discussion.

This is ***EXACTLY*** what you do when you quote their book – you appeal for their expertise.

Therefore, in order to demonstrate their expertise, they don't need to participate in a discussion. I am afraid you understand things too literally

WDM received only 1 chapter in the book

As well as Memory Manager, Cache Manager, kernel dispatcher, etc. Do you want to say that we cannot quote this book when we speak about these issues either?????

In any case, I am out of this discussion – it seems to be just a waste of time

Re: mutex overkill ?

Anton Bassov

Lesbee Honest wrote:

So we see that the book is disqualified as having "authority", because no decisions based on it set precedent, because it is more a collection of observations than a list of citations, because it is not the source of those citations, and because it is not a conclusive set of statements wrt WDM. .

According to this definition, the DDK header files have "authority" (decisions based on them set precedent), as do the executables themselves (the source of citations), and MSDN (a list of citations).

You mention 1 c TESTIMONY — you may appeal to the authors — we can wait and see if they join the discussion. But, WDM received only 1 chapter in the book, and is not listed on the back cover. The book is described as valuable to those wanting to understand how Windows runs "applications", not device drivers.

"anton bassov" <soviet_bloke@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:1159427853.778175.309910@xx
Hi mate

Anton – find a dictionary and lookup authoritative!

Here we are – this is how Merriam–Webster Online Dictionary defines it

Main Entry: au·thor·i·ta·tive
Pronunciation: &–'thär–&–'tA–tiv, o–, –'thor–
Function: adjective
1 a : having or proceeding from authority : OFFICIAL <authoritative church doctrines> b : showing evident authority : DEFINITIVE <a most authoritative literary critique>
2 : DICTATORIAL 2
– au·thor·i·ta·tive·ly adverb
– au·thor·i·ta·tive·ness noun

Please look at (b) – "showing evident authority"

Now let's look at "authority" in the same source dictionary:

Main Entry: au·thor·i·ty
Pronunciation: &–'thär–&–tE, o–, –'thor–
Function: noun
Inflected Form(s): plural –ties

Re: mutex overkill ?

Etymology: Middle English auctorite, from Anglo-French auctorité, from Latin auctoritat-, auctoritas opinion, decision, power, from auctor

1 a (1) : a citation (as from a book or file) used in defense or support (2) : the source from which the citation is drawn b (1) : a conclusive statement or set of statements (as an official decision of a court) (2) : a decision taken as a precedent (3) : TESTIMONY c : an individual cited or appealed to as an expert

2 a : power to influence or command thought, opinion, or behavior b : freedom granted by one in authority : RIGHT

3 a : persons in command; specifically : GOVERNMENT b : a governmental agency or corporation to administer a revenue-producing public enterprise <the transit authority>

4 a : GROUNDS, WARRANT <had excellent authority for believing the claim> b : convincing force <lent authority to the performance>

Look at 1c – it is "authority " may be "an individual cited or appealed to as an expert", i.e. *EXACTLY* what Russinovich and Solomon are – no matter what they write about, they demonstrate in-depth knowledge of a subject

Concerning WDM, "Windows Internals" speaks about it in Chapter 9 (it is called I/O System) and explains what types of WDM drivers are defined (i.e. bus-function-filter) – whatever it says, it demonstrates in-depth knowledge of a subject.

This is why I quoted it as an authoritative source

.

Anton Bassov

m wrote:

Anton – find a dictionary and lookup authoritative!

"anton bassov" <soviet_bloke@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:1159298808.753937.204580@xx

Lesbee,

I am afraid you really have no clue what the "discussion" is all about.....

Someone said that "Windows Internals" is not authoritative source on WDM. This is wrong, because, in order to qualify for being "not

Re: mutex overkill ?

authoritative source", the book has to make some wrong statements on the subject it speaks about. Although "Windows Internals" is not focused on WDM, it makes few statements that are WDM-related. Once these statements are perfectly correct, they can be quoted and used in technical discussions as a reference whenever it applies – even if the book is not focused on WDM. Taking into consideration the fact that this book has been written by widely respected and recognized Windows experts, making such statements about it is really stupid things to do.

Therefore, I questioned the "expertize" of someone who made the above stupid statement about the book, and it turned out that this person claims to be an "expert". Therefore, I asked him to present the source of any description that confirms his recognition by other people. Taking into consideration the fact that this person actively participates in MSFT newgroups, his "recognized expertize" is more than likely would have gained him MVP status. This is the only reason why the issue of MVP has arised, in the first place.

Now, it seems you claim that R&S is NOT an authoritative source.....

In fact, I claim*EXACTLY* the opposite

but because they are NOT MVP, and extended this claim to all persons who are NOT MVP.

The above statement demonstrates your profound misunderstanding of the

Re: mutex overkill ?

whole discussion – I think it is a good idea to learn what the discussion is all about before trying to participate in it

FYI, Russinovich and Solomon are both MVPs – the only reason why you did not find them on the list is because this is the list of those who gained their nomination via participation on MSFT newsgroups, and this is not the only possible way to get a nomination. I tried to explain it to you already, but it looks like I just wasted my time – you came to totally different conclusions that are , in fact, *EXACTLY* the opposite of what I am saying

I take issue with your claims because I represent myself as an authoritative source, but I am not an MVP.

Unless you happen to be writing books and/or articles, you cannot qualify for *ANY* source – either authoritative or non–authoritative one. Therefore, I really have no idea why you decided that this "discussion" may be somehow related to you

Anton Bassov

Lesbee Honset wrote:

"anton bassov"
<soviet_bloke@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1159114958.695346.55800@xx

Lesbee,

The
discussion
is not "what

Re: mutex overkill ?

constitutes
an MVP", it
is "what is
an
authoritative
source".

I am afraid you missed the
point – this is *NOT* what
the discussion
is
all about.

The original statement with which you took
issue was this: "the R&S
book
Windows Internals is not an authoritative
source on WDM". This is a
TRUE
statement, because the book is NOT about
programming device drivers
using
the Windows Driver Model (WDM).

Now, it seems you claim that R&S is NOT
an authoritative source, but
because
they are NOT MVP, and extended this claim
to all persons who are NOT
MVP.
This is NOT correct. Being an MVP is not
pre-requisite to being an
authoritative source.

You should agree that the book is not an
authoritative source on WDM
because
it is not about WDM.

And, you should agree that it is possible to
be an authoritative source
without being an MVP.

Why is this so difficult for you to
understand? Are you really just
pretending to not understand this? Is this
some sort of joke?

I take issue with your claims because I

Re: mutex overkill ?

represent myself as an
authoritative
source, but I am not an MVP.

If people with whom I do business happen to
read your postings, they
may
get
it in their minds that because I am not an
MVP, then I am not an
authoritative source, and I may suffer
economically due to your wild
statements.

If that does happen, I can now reference my
previous posting wherein it
is
proved that your statements are false.
Because, really, it is simple.
The
book is not about programming WDM, so
obviously, it is not an
authoritative
source on WDM. And, R&S are
authoritative sources, but not MVPs, like
me.