
Subject: Re: User namespaces and keys
Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Thu, 24 Feb 2011 06:56:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

> 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.

That sounds about right.

Eric

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