"H. Peter Anvin" <hpa@zytor.com> writes:

> Eric W. Biederman wrote:
>>>>
>>> With "architectural" I mean "guaranteed to be stable" (as opposed to
>>> "incidental"). Sorry for the confusion.
>>
>> Ok. Then largely we are in agreement. To implement that the rule is simple.
>> If it isn't CTL_UNNUMBERED and the number is in Linus's tree, it is
>> our responsibility to never change the meaning of that number.
>>
>> If a new sysctl entry is introduced it should be CTL_UNNUMBERED until
>> it reaches Linus's tree to avoid conflicts.
>>
>> There is simply no point in having any kind of support for numbers
>> whose meanings can change.
>>
>> Which is why I removed the few cases of binary number duplication I
>> found.
>>
>
> Agreed. *Furthermore*, if the number isn't in <linux/sysctl.h> it shouldn't
> exist anywhere else, either.

That would be a good habit. Feel free to send the patches to ensure that
is so.

I'm a practical fix it when it is in my way kind of guy ;)

Eric

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers