
Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/3] change clone_flags type to u64
Posted by [Kirill Korotaev](#) on Thu, 10 Apr 2008 13:11:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The was no real rationale except for some people seeing "clone" functionality as the match and the fact that FS_NAMESCAPE was done so made them believe it is a good way to go.

And I warned about flags limitation at the beginning.

Both OpenVZ/vserver suggested to use a special syscall for handling this.

Maybe it is a good point to switch to it now finally and stop worrying about all this?

Andi Kleen wrote:

>> I guess that was a development rationale.

>

> But what rationale? It just doesn't make much sense to me.

>

>> Most of the namespaces are in

>> use in the container projects like openvz, vserver and probably others

>> and we needed a way to activate the code.

>

> You could just have added it to feature groups over time.

>

>> Not perfect I agree.

>>

>>> With your current strategy are you sure that even 64bit will

>>> be enough in the end? For me it rather looks like you'll

>>> go through those quickly too as more and more of the kernel

>>> is namespaced.

>> well, we're reaching the end. I hope ! devpts is in progress and

>> mq is just waiting for a clone flag.

>

> Are you sure?

>

>>

>>> Also I think the user interface is very unfriendly. How

>>> is a non kernel hacker supposed to make sense of these

>>> myriads of flags? You'll be creating another

>>> CreateProcess123_extra_args_extended()

>>> in the end I fear.

>> well, the clone interface is a not friendly interface anyway. glibc wraps

>> it

>

> But only for the stack setup which is just a minor detail.

>

> The basic clone() flags interface used to be pretty sane and usable

> before it could overloaded with so many tiny features.

>

> I especially worry on how user land should keep track of changing kernel

> here. If you add new feature flag for lots of kernel features it is
> reasonable to expect that in the future there will be often new features.
>
> Does this mean user land needs to be updated all the time? Will this
> end up like another udev?
>
>> We will need a user library, like we have a libpthread or a libaio, to
>
> That doesn't make sense. The basic kernel syscalls should be usable,
> not require some magic library that would likely need intimate
> knowledge of specific kernel versions to do any good.
>
>> but we still need a way to extend the clone flags because none are left.
>
> Can we just take out some again that were added in the .25 cycle and
> readd them once there is a properly thought out interface? That would
> leave at least one.
>
> -Andi

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

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