Subject: Re: [PATCH 12/15] driver core: Implement tagged directory support for device classes.
Posted by gregkh on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 16:12:00 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Fri, Jul 04, 2008 at 10:57:15PM +0900, Tejun Heo wrote:
> 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?

Sorry, Greg is walking out the door in 30 minutes for a much needed week
long vacation and can't look into this right now :(

I'll be able to review it next weekend, sorry for the delay.

greg k-h

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