

---

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](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)  
<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---