

Re: notifying particular thread to wake up.

Re: notifying particular thread to wake up.

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Java/comp.lang.java.programmer/2007-10/msg02793.html>

- *From:* nebulous99@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Wed, 24 Oct 2007 09:55:40 -0000
-

On Oct 21, 9:06 pm, Arne Vajhøj <a...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

So spamming is okay, as long as it's somewhat targeted?

No.

But that is irrelevant since the message was not spam.

As defined by you, arbitrarily (since clearly you consider some targeted, commercial-content-only messages to qualify and others not to seemingly at random).

And that making an entire post solely to refer someone to a commercial site, providing nothing else in the way of relevant information other than some site offering to sell that information, is suspicious behavior, though maybe not ipso facto evil.

No. That is common usenet practice.

No, disliking that sort of behavior is the common usenet practice. Or perhaps you spent the last decade or two using a different usenet than I did? If so, I suggest you go back to that other usenet; you'll like it better than this one. :P

I think you have a serious problem.

I do, and its name is Arne Vajhøj (disclaimer: looks correct as pasted, but GG may mangle it horribly). I'm still trying to think up a solution to that problem. I'm beginning to suspect that it involves emailing staff@xxxxxxxxxx (If I weren't using GG, and the problem weren't spreading lies about me in earshot of third parties, a killfile would solve it.)

Re: notifying particular thread to wake up.

Re: notifying particular thread to wake up.

A question: do you believe the Java tutorial has as good information about multithreading as the recommended book ?

I don't know, because I've only read one of the two, but it has information that's frequently "good enough" for many purposes, and therefore is likely to have satisfied at least the OP's short-term needs. Indeed, may have actually done so, for all we know -- he hasn't weighed in lately with any new comments so who knows what he's done? Maybe he bought that book. Maybe not. If he did he's probably still waiting for delivery, but already out the price tag, whereas the Java Tutorial section on concurrency is available almost instantly with one click of the mouse from a link I provided, and without costing a dime over whatever his normal internet usage fees are, too.

The Java Tutorial is certainly no-risk to try: if you read it and apply it, but it's not enough or you find it outright bad or whatever, well you didn't spend any money at least, and you're free to go book shopping. If you bought the book and the same thing happens, though, you're going to have to eat the cost.

In other words, I present a cogent and unassailable argument that you cannot defeat by specifically addressing particular points with cogent objections, so you resort to generally insulting it and engaging in / ad hominem/ attacks.

???

There were plenty of specific points.

Not in the area where I responded with that paragraph. There was a chunk of quoted material by me, a blank line, and a general-purpose insult by you. Probably all that someone of your IQ is capable of coming up with; it would explain why you do it so often.

That's for the original poster to decide, using other relevant information as well that only he knows, such as what his budget is. For the OP to make this decision in a way that is self-maximizing, he needs all of the relevant facts. The existence of a free source of relevant information is certainly one of those facts.

So is the book !!

Re: notifying particular thread to wake up.

Re: notifying particular thread to wake up.

It's not symmetrical. If the prices were equal it would be, but they're not.

OP knows of neither -> asks, perhaps here.

OP knows of both -> informed choice between them.

OP knows of tutorial, but not book -> uses tutorial. If adequate, good! If not, comes back looking for more, or searches the net, finds book.

OP knows of book, but not tutorial -> pays for book. If tutorial would have been adequate, outcome is not Pareto-optimal.

Only the fourth situation risks a substantially sub-optimal outcome for the OP, unnecessary expenditure of money.

Have you tried counting how many people here that consider it common sense and how many that does not consider it common sense ?

The silent majority is rather hard to count on usenet because being silent makes you invisible here.

Then try count the non silent !

A small sample size, and by the very nature of their being vocal on the issue, likely a biased sample too.

Small, self-selecting samples are doubly bad statistics and you fucking know it.

No no no - you were never able to produce anything backing your claims.

Yeah, go ahead, keep telling yourself that, even though a quick google search quickly reveals the post where I cited no fewer than three sources to back them up. If you close your eyes the monster can't see you to eat you. I suppose I shouldn't expect reasoning of a higher caliber from someone of your apparent age and IQ.

[lying insult deleted]

Fuck off.

Re: notifying particular thread to wake up.

Re: notifying particular thread to wake up.

I again ask you: What is your objection to

- a) Disclosure when a link is not to the information requested directly, whether because it "requires registration", or requires you to buy access to the information, or whatever;
- b) Disclosure when any such link will benefit you financially;
- c) Disclosure of any cheaper and especially free alternatives you know of for getting information that may satisfy the OP; and
- d) Directly answering the OP's immediate question while you're at it.

re a)

Rather unnecessary since the reader will find out.

Rather necessary (note spelling) since the reader won't like being conned into clicking a trick link. Why do you think I rarely follow links in usenet posts? Because so damn many of them are useless, moneygrubbing, or even outright dangerous (malware, fraud/phishing, etc.)

And the link may immediately give an undeserved financial benefit to someone, due to ad impressions, or being treated as an ad click-through even, even assuming the victim isn't tricked into paying through the nose for information they might have found elsewhere for free had they not been led down the garden path.

If you feel the author of this book is especially deserving of money, make that decision with your own money and buy extra copies or donate money to him or something rather than trying to cause other people to do so (perhaps unnecessarily, as they might later judge things when they have all the facts) by withholding information from them (or granting information to them selectively).

You can even be doubly charitable by buying extra copies and then donating them to educational institutions and libraries in your area!

Let other people make their own informed choice, and that means they should know of the cheapest variation of what they want at a bare minimum.

But as has been proven

Nothing of the sort has been proven. I'd need to see detailed financials for all of that guy's accounts to determine with certainty whether or not he got some sort of kickback.

It's also true that it has not been proven that he *did* receive anything of the sort.

Re: notifying particular thread to wake up.

Re: notifying particular thread to wake up.

It's a complete unknown at this point.

People post what they think is the best answer.

People post for all kinds of reasons, and cannot always be trusted. For example, you don't post insulting twaddle like this, implying that I'm an idiot simply by posting to disagree vocally with everything I say instead of quietly nodding your head, explicitly calling me an idiot in two separate places, and making other insulting insinuations, because it's the best answer (and besides -- best answer to what?), but because you're an asshole and you hate me and you want everyone else to feel the same way you do.

People certainly don't post the various spams nobody is disputing were spams because they think those are the best answers, but rather because they make money from people that get suckered.

People post all kinds of things with motivations other than to inform honestly (including without lies of omission) and that has to be taken into account.

If somebody think they have a better answer they must post it.

And they do. But I don't like seeing posts that, were I the OP, would leave me feeling tricked and cheated. A link promising the answers to my questions that goes to some page saying "Please insert a coin to continue" or "Please login" or an ad for a commercial product or whatever would have exactly that effect. I hoped the OP would make a genuine effort to inform me, and succeed in that effort, and instead all I found was a waste of my time. Either the OP had another motivation than to inform me, or they did intend to inform me but did not succeed because they assumed that I was an affluent American with a credit card and no problems with making \$40–50 purchases at the drop of the proverbial hat. 99+% of the people in the world don't meet such a description, and the bulk of the people posting questions here will be students, the bulk of whom do not fit any of that except perhaps "American", typically being anti-affluent, in too much debt to even contemplate charging anything else to credit, and seriously debating \$4–5 purchases such as whether to skip lunch, nevermind ones ten times that size.

re d)

If possible and optimal.

Re: notifying particular thread to wake up.

Re: notifying particular thread to wake up.

If you know the answer it's possible. If you don't know the answer, you're not qualified to decide if book XYZ or site JKL is appropriate to suggest. If you know the answer it's also certainly optimal, since it likely requires about the same amount of typing on your part and certainly requires less mouse clicks (and perhaps less money!) on the OP's part.

.