
Subject: Re: Namespaces exhausted CLONE_XXX bits problem
Posted by [Cedric Le Goater](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 15:51:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Serge E. Hallyn wrote:

> Quoting Pavel Emelyanov (xemul@openvz.org):

>> Dave Hansen wrote:

>>> On Tue, 2008-01-15 at 11:25 +0300, Pavel Emelyanov wrote:

>>>> Hmm. I have an idea how to make this w/o a new system call. This might
>>>> look wierd, but. Why not stopple the last bit with a CLONE_NEWCLONE and
>>>> consider the parent_tidptr/child_tidptr in this case as the pointer to
>>>> an array of extra arguments/flargs?

>>> I guess that does keep us from having to add an _actual_ system call.

>> Exactly!

>

> I'll be honest, while it's a really neat idea, in terms of code actually
> going into tree I far far prefer a real new syscall.

well, hijacking child_tidptr and adding a new syscall will probably look
the same internally. so if it ends up that hijacking child_tidptr is not
acceptable, we won't have much work to plug it in a new syscall.

> But it sounds like I'm the only one so I'll just mention it once and
> then bite my tongue :)

hold on. this patch has not been sent on lkml@ but it's worth a try :)

C.

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

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