

Hi!

> > ...this will break with FUSE enabled, right? (Minor security hole by
> > allowing users to stop c-a-delete, where none existed before?)
>
> Yup (or I don't know, I'm sure there was or is some problem with
> ptrace, that could be used to create unkillable processes).
>
> Fuse could actually be fixed to exit reliably for 'killall5 -9' (it
> used to), but that has other problems, and it doesn't seem very
> important to me. But this can be discussed.

I think it is better to fix fuse than to rewrite all the shutdown scripts.

> What cannot be fixed is if one process is inside an fs operation
> (e.g. unlink), holding a VFS lock (i_mutex) and another process goes
> to uninterruptible sleep on that lock. There's no way (other than
> rewriting the VFS) in which that second process could be killed unless
> you kill the first one or the fuse server.

I believe VFS should be rewritten here. Perhaps new "TASK_KILLABLE"
state can help?

> > I really believe FUSE vs. signals needs fixing. Either that, or
> > updating all the manpages
> >
> > man 1 kill:
> > - KILL 9 exit this signal may not be blocked
> > + KILL 9 exit this signal may not be blocked, except by FUSE user mount
>
> Heh, there are all very interesting, but most of these issues are not
> even on my todo list (which has grown into quite a big pile over the
> years), which means, that they don't seem to matter to people in
> practice.
>
> You seem to be implying that fuse is worthless if these issues are not
> fixed, but that is very far from the truth, I think.

I'm not saying fuse is worthless. It is a nice toy for single-user
systems. But I do not think we should be merging "allow ordinary users
to mount their own fuse's" before issues above are fixed.

Pavel

--

(english) <http://www.livejournal.com/~pavelmachek>

(cesky, pictures) <http://atrey.karlin.mff.cuni.cz/~pavel/picture/horses/blog.html>

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
