Subject: Re: [PATCH 4/5] Move the user namespace under the option
Posted by rpjday on Mon, 01 Oct 2007 08:42:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Mon, 1 Oct 2007, Pavel Emelyanov wrote:

> Robert P. J. Day wrote:
> > On Thu, 27 Sep 2007, Cedric Le Goater wrote:
> >
> >>> diff --git a/include/linux/user_namespace.h b/include/linux/user_namespace.h
> >>> index b5f41d4..dda160c 100644
> >>> --- a/include/linux/user_namespace.h
> >>> +++ b/include/linux/user_namespace.h
> >>> @@ -17,7 +17,7 @@ struct user_namespace {
> >>>
> >>> extern struct user_namespace init_user_ns;
> >>>
> >>> -#ifdef CONFIG_USER_NS
> >>> +#ifdef CONFIG_NAMESPACES_EXPERIMENTAL
> >
> > is it really a good precedent to introduce Kconfig variables that
> > literally include the word "EXPERIMENTAL"?
>
> How else can we call it? I proposed one config option for each
> namespace with "depends on EXPERIMENTAL" dependency, but everyone
> else said that two options are much better.

i don't know -- perhaps something as trivially obvious as
NAMESPACES_V2 or something. i just think it's awkward to take a word
like "EXPERIMENTAL" that already has a long and established history,
and start jamming it into config variable names. but it's just an
observation.

rday
--
==
Robert P. J. Day
Linux Consulting, Training and Annoying Kernel Pedantry
Waterloo, Ontario, CANADA

http://crashcourse.ca
==

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