

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 12/15] driver core: Implement tagged directory support for device classes.

Posted by [Tejun Heo](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 13:57:15 GMT

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

---

Hello, Eric.

Eric W. Biederman wrote:

> Thank you for your opinion.

>

> Incremental patches to make things more beautiful are welcome.

>

> Please remember we are not building lisp. The goal is code that works today.

>

> Since we are not talking about correctness of the code. Since we are not

> talking about interfaces with user space. Since we are talking something

> that is currently about 100 lines of code, and so will be easy to change

> even after it is merged. I don't understand how discussing this further

> is useful. Especially when I get a NAK based on the feel that the code

> is ugly.

I'm sorry if I gave you the impression of being draconian. Explanations below.

> As for your main objection. Adding a accessor method to an object versus

> adding a data field that contain the same thing. The two are effectively

> identical. With the practical difference in my eyes that an accessor method

> prevents data duplication which reduces maintenance and reduces skew problems,

> and it keeps the size of struct kobject small. Since you think methods are

> horrible I must respectfully disagree with you.

Yeah, it seems we should agree to disagree here. I think using callback for static values is a really bad idea. It obfuscates the code and opens up a big hole for awful misuses. Greg, what do you think?

As we're very close to rc1 window, I think we can work out a solution here. The reason why I nacked was because the change wouldn't take too much effort and I thought it could be done before -rc1. Unless you disagree with making tags static values, I'll try to write up a patch to do so. If you (and Greg) think the callback interface is better, we can merge the code as-is and update (or not) later.

Thanks.

--

tejun

---

Containers mailing list

