Subject: Re: Screamm.. commit f400e198b2ed26ce55b22a1412ded0896e7516ac
Posted by serue on Thu, 29 Mar 2007 13:18:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quoting Serge E. Hallyn (serue@us.ibm.com):
> Quoting Eric W. Biederman (ebiederm@xmission.com):
> >
> > This is just to vent.
> >
> > I was clearly not auditing patches well enough earlier and the above
> > patch got modified since the version I wrote initially. Adding a
> > few addition is_init calls where what we care about test is not
> > is the real init process of the system (so we should treat it with
> > care) but is this the pid == 1 in my pid namespace.
> >
> > So now we (or maybe me) are going to have to through all of those
> > is_init references and undo the changes for the ones that don't
> > apply to the global init.
> >
> > Guys, please, please be more careful.
> >
> > The one that set me off is the one in will_become_orphaned_pgrp.
> >
> > Eric

By the way thanks for catching this. Clearly it slipped right past
the rest of us!

-serge

> Yup. Looks like ambiguous naming once again hid some real (future)
> bugs. This is of course safe so far in mainline, but needs to be split
> into
>
> static inline int is_global_init(struct task_struct *tsk)
> {
> return (tsk == &init_task);
> }
>
> and
>
> static inline int
> is_container_init(struct task_struct *task, struct pid_namespace *ns)
> {
> return (__pid_nr(task, ns) == 1);
> }
>
> Where the latter is needed in, for instance, kernel/capability.c.

>
> -serge

_____

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org
https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers