

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 0/3] clone64() and unshare64() system calls  
Posted by [Sukadev Bhattiprolu](#) on Thu, 10 Apr 2008 18:26:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Paul Menage [menage@google.com] wrote:

| On Wed, Apr 9, 2008 at 7:38 PM, <sukadev@us.ibm.com> wrote:

| >

| > But as Jon Corbet pointed out in the the thread above, it looked like  
| > adding a new system call has been the "traditional" way of solving this  
| > in Linux so far and there has been no consensus on a newer approach.

| >

| I thought that the consensus was that adding a new system call was  
| better than trying to force extensibility on to the existing  
| non-extensible system call.

There were couple of objections to extensible system calls like  
sys\_indirect() and to Pavel's approach.

|

| But if we are adding a new system call, why not make the new one  
| extensible to reduce the need for yet another new call in the future?

hypothetically, can we make a variant of clone() extensible to the point  
of requiring a copy\_from\_user() ?

|

| Paul

---

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

---