

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/4] userns: let clone\_uts\_ns() handle setting uts-&gt;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->nsp->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>

---