
Subject: Re: "Alternative Multithreading" revisited
Posted by [mirek](#) on Mon, 29 Jun 2009 20:15:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Mindtraveller wrote on Mon, 29 June 2009 15:00

That is why you don't need synchronization objects. Threads interact with some public member functions (delegates/messages) only and they "know" nothing more about each other. So, thread's private functions are executed (handled) in it's own thread and don't need to do anything with synchronization.

Well, I have some experiences now (did project based on queues, now planning to rewrite it to plain old locking) and I have something to say about the topic (IMO!):

Synchronization objects are simple to manage as compared to often complex race condition relations in queued systems.

IMO, this is the exactly same problem that seems to have killed microkernels.

Mirek
