Re: Disobeying jet engines − why?

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008−01/msg04816.html

- *From*: John Larkin <jjlarkin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Wed, 30 Jan 2008 07:08:01 −0800

On Tue, 29 Jan 2008 10:12:21 +0000, Martin Brown
<|||newspam|||@nezumi.demon.co.uk> wrote:

> In message <9nlsp35asmtgjb00l601qnrgr6at66tnhg@xxxxxxx>, John Larkin
> <jjlarkin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes
>
> > On Mon, 28 Jan 2008 13:55:38 −0800, "Joel Koltner"
> > <zapwireDASHgroups@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> >
> > > "John Larkin"
> > > <jjlarkin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote
> > > in message
> > > news:2dhpp3p0ahl3qm4co9ms0jgiqak12vp7tq@xxxxxxxxxx
> > >
> > > > So it dawned on me
> > > > that he didn't ever give a damn about my
> > > > problem, he just wanted to
> > > > fiddle with databases. Similarly, there are
> > > > lots of programmers who
> > > > aren't interested in your dinky buttons and
> > > > LCD's, they really want to
> > > > get into context switching and schedulers
> > > > and dynamic memory
> > > > assignment algorithms.
> >
> > I wish I could say it wasn't true. Although if you are doing genuine RT
> > work you do need an engineer who understands what semaphores are for and
> > how to design a things to prevent deadlocks occurring.

If you use state machines, and don't multitask, you don't need
semaphores. If you don't allocate resources, you can't have deadlocks.

It's simple.