
Subject: Re: [patch 9/9] unprivileged mounts: add "no submounts" flag

Posted by [Miklos Szeredi](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 09:43:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> > > Why not "nosubmnt"?

> >

> > Why not indeed. Maybe I should try to use my brain sometime.

>

> Well it really should have 'user' or 'unpriv' in the name

> somewhere. 'nosubmnt' is more confusing than 'nomnt' because

> it no submounts really sounds like a reasonable thing in

> itself...

I slept on it, and I still think 'nosubmnt' might be the best compromise. Obviously the superuser has privileges, that override what is normally allowed, and we don't find it strange when a read-only file is happily being written by root.

It may feel wrong in the context of mounts, because we are so used to mounts being privileged-only.

Objections? Once this goes in, it will stay the same forever, so now is the time to express any doubts...

Thanks,
Miklos

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

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