

Re: How printf() works???????

## Re: How printf() works???????

---

*Source:* [http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/C\\_CPP/comp.lang.c/2008-03/msg01001.html](http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/C_CPP/comp.lang.c/2008-03/msg01001.html)

---

- *From:* Richard Heathfield <[rjh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rjh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 07 Mar 2008 13:44:05 +0000
- 

[Well, what an eye-opener. On the basis of his previous, helpful, reply, I unplonked "Just Richard" on a whim, and look what I found...]

Richard said:

santosh writes:

<snip>

The expression  $x < 30$  will evaluate to 1 if  $x$  is less than 30 and zero otherwise. Richard said the reverse, by mistake I'm sure.

Getting something totally backwards is, of course, a mistake.

Yes.

There is no evil intent in my correction.

Believe it or not, I believe you. It was an honest correction to an honest mistake.

Why you feel the need to confirm his "mistake" is very strange. Possibly you should inform Robbie to be less quick to tell people their compilers are broken and that they should get a new one?

And here you make a very reasonable point. It's better not to be hostile (not something I always manage), but if you're determined to be hostile, you'd better be very, very sure that you're right! It's a lot costlier (blushes, etc) to apologise for an incorrect correction if that

Re: How printf() works???????

## Re: How printf() works???????

"correction" was aggressive. (I am well aware of this from personal experience, alas.)

Which leads to the question "Why didn't you explain why Heathfield was wrong". And the answer is simple : I don't believe in treating people like idiots. Let them look and think the problem over themselves. They can always come back and say "you have me stumped", what is the issue?".

I kind of agree with this. When someone who I \*know\* ought to know better misinterprets a statement and issues a misguided rejoinder (and if there are no other responses in the feed that have caught the misguidedness), I will generally say something like "how sure are you about that?" or "read it again, <name>", or whatever. If it's someone I don't recognise, or whom I think is unlikely to spot on re-reading the reason that their "correction" is wrong, I am more likely to give a detailed explanation.

A good C programmer and "team player" thinks for themselves. RH had said enough about the comparison expression for anyone with half a clue to see why he had made a mistake in his final analysis.

Yes. In fact, this was particularly unfortunate, because I was rather pleased with my answer – not because it was difficult to write (it wasn't, except for the getting-it-right part!), but because after posting it I downloaded another bunch of articles, and all the other replies I saw were, I felt, leaning (and in some cases positively \*bending\*) in the direction of unfriendliness and unhelpfulness. I think that's a shame.

But of course, giving credence and credit to other posters is becoming a rarer and rarer thing these days with posters like CBF riding in on their chargers at a moments notice.

Again, I am struggling to disagree with you here, and failing.

People in clc are far too eager to see other people wrong so that they can score some clique points by being rude and obnoxious at the first possible point. See the races to post OT rejoinders for a good example – when they KNOW that Default User or CBF have already beaten them to it.

Well, I'm less sure about this. I think the first sentence is, alas, correct. The second, I'm less sure about. Newsfeeds are of course asynchronous, and we don't actually know what kinds of delays are involved in other people's feeds, except when it's mind-numbingly obvious (eg Shaggy or Chuck). In fact, Chuck's is a curious case – he seems to manage

Re: How printf() works???????

Re: How printf() works???????

to get the wrong end of the stick several hours or even days after everyone else considers the thread to be played out.

It's why I come here to be honest.

And this is the sad part. I know that you and I don't particularly see eye to eye, but it strikes me that you could get a lot more out of clc if you put a bit more /into/ it. If you could just increase the number of articles you post where you actually contribute useful technical information to those who seek it, I think it would make for a more pleasant group for everyone. I am not so naive as to believe that this would reduce the level of your "reg-baiting", which you seem to enjoy so much, but it would increase the overall signal-noise ratio here, and that can only be a good thing for everyone.

It's fun to watch and relieves the boredom of a typical C programming day. And one learns something here – not always standard C related either. Fortunately there are more posters willing to "break topicality" and, err, talk about real C.

I know you might not believe this, but I'd actually like the group as a whole to relax its topicality restrictions somewhat. Not \*too\* much – that way lies chaos – but if we just dropped the bar a /little/, we would perhaps be able to benefit from each other's platform-based experience. Unfortunately, there is little sign of a shift in the group attitude towards topicality – and I accept that (reluctantly, which is why I sometimes cheat).

Bottom line: yes, this group /is/ too mean-spirited. Let's \*all\* try to change that. Please?

—

Richard Heathfield <<http://www.cpax.org.uk>>

Email: [-http://www.+rjh@](mailto:-http://www.+rjh@)

Google users: <<http://www.cpax.org.uk/prg/writings/googly.php>>

"Usenet is a strange place" – dmr 29 July 1999

.

Re: How printf() works???????