

---

Subject: Re: User namespaces and keys

Posted by [Casey Schaufler](#) on Wed, 23 Feb 2011 21:37:16 GMT

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

---

On 2/23/2011 12:55 PM, Eric W. Biederman wrote:

> Casey Schaufler <casey@schaufler-ca.com> writes:

>

>> I confess that I remain less well educated on namespaces than

>> I probably should be, but with what I do know it seems that the

>> relationships between user namespaces and LSMs are bound to be

>> strained from the beginning. Some LSMs (SELinux and Smack) are

>> providing similar sandbox capabilities to what you get from user

>> namespaces, but from different directions and with different

>> use cases.

> Casey I won't argue about the possibility of things being strained, but

> I think if we focus on the semantics and not on the end goal of exactly

> how the pieces are to be used there can be some reasonable dialog.

I'm sure that there will be cases where they will work together like horses in a troika. Making sensible semantics for the interactions is key, and it is entirely possible that in some cases a comparison of semantics and behaviors will lead an end user to chose either an LSM or namespaces over the combination. Just like I expect that even when we allow multiple LSMs the SELinux and Smack combination will be rare among the sane.

---

Containers mailing list

[Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---