
Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/4] userns: let clone_uts_ns() handle setting uts->user_ns
Posted by [Daniel Lezcano](#) on Mon, 21 Feb 2011 14:23:30 GMT

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

On 02/21/2011 02:58 PM, Serge E. Hallyn wrote:
> Quoting Oleg Nesterov (oleg@redhat.com):
>> 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_struct.
> Uh, yeah. I should remove the 'ns' argument there shouldn't I.
>
> Daniel, does that sway your opinion then?

Well, I prefer to pass the needed parameters to a function. AFAICS,
'tsk' is not really needed but 'user_ns'.
But it is a detail, so if passing the tsk parameter in the other copy_*
functions helps to cleanup, that will be consistent.
So I am fine with that.

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