

Alex Martelli with ideas from: Just van Rossum, Guido van Rossum, ...

© 2003 AB Strakt



don't use them!

- 90% of the time you think you need multiple threads, you're better off with alternatives:
 - async (event-driven) programming
 - multiple processes
- but, if you must... (10%)...

Threads in Python

- Queue-based architecture
 - 90% of the 10% (9% net) you're best off with Queues
- RLock, Condition, Lock,
 Semaphore, Event

cover 90% of the rest (0.9% net)

...what about the other 0.1%?

thread.interrupt_main()

- it's in 2.3 since Beta 2
- it comes from ex-IDLEfork (now IDLE)
- it's limited:
 - can't interrupt blocking system calls
 - could cause deadlocks (less likely now!)
- ...but it can still be useful (for 90% of the 0.1%...!-)



lock.acquire()
#interrupts now masked here...!
try:

finally: lock.release()

How is interrupt_main useful

fundamental known use case:

- make new "monitor" thread
- run user script in main
- and now, monitor can interrupt a "runaway" (buggy) user script

```
(...in most cases...)
```



- main thread may be otherwise taken
- e.g., may have to control event-loop
- so -- could we interrupt *other* threads?
- ...pretty please...?-)
 - it covers a whopping 0.009%...:-)
 - we don't want newbies messing with it
 - so: accessible as a **C-API** *only* ("ordeal")

Interrupting other threads

if(!PyArg_ParseTuple(args, "i0", &threadid, &exceptionClass)) return 0; count = PyThreadState_SetAsyncExc(threadid, exceptionClass); if(count > 1) /*we're in trouble!*/ PyThreadState_SetAsyncExc(threadid, NULL);

return Py_BuildValue("i", count);

PS: why not multi-process?

- when Python is the embedded scripting language, forking may be impractical
- in some Windows versions making a new process takes "forever" and interprocess control can be hairy and buggy (while threads do work fine there)