On 02/21, Daniel Lezcano wrote:
>
> On 02/21/2011 05:01 AM, Serge E. Hallyn wrote:
>> To do so we need to pass in the task_struct who'll get the utsname,
>> so we can get its user_ns.
>>
>> -extern struct uts_namespace *copy_utsname(unsigned long flags,
>> -   struct uts_namespace *ns);
>> +extern struct uts_namespace *copy_utsname(struct task_struct *tsk,
>> +   unsigned long flags,
>> +   struct uts_namespace *ns);
>
> Why don't we pass 'user_ns' instead of 'tsk' ? that will look
> semantically clearer for the caller no ?
> (example below).
> ...
>
> new_nsp->uts_ns = copy_utsname(flags, tsk->nsproxy->uts_ns, task_cred_xxx(tsk,
user)->user_ns);

To me tsk looks more readable, I mean

 new_nsp->uts_ns = copy_utsname(flags, tsk);

copy_utsname() can find both uts_ns and user_ns looking at task_strcut.

But this is cosmetic and up to you and Serge.

But. I think it makes sense to pass "tsk" argument to copy_pid_ns() as well.
This way we can remove some CLONE_PIDNS code in copy_process(), and this
looks like a nice cleanaup (even if minor) to me.

Oleg.

_____