
Subject: Re: Re: [RFC][PATCH 1/2] add user namespace [try #2]
Posted by [Cedric Le Goater](#) on Tue, 12 Sep 2006 15:16:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Herbert Poetzl wrote:

[...]

> as I said, I'd opt for having a new clone() syscall in
> addition to the existing one, with a separate 64bit
> set of flags to decide what namespaces should be created
> or cloned. there is no problem with putting 'important'
> or generally 'useful' flags (like for example for pid,
> uts or lightweight network isolation) into the existing
> clone call (will require a simple mapping if done properly)
> so that they can be used with 'older' libc interfaces too
>
> I know, it would be 'nice' to keep the existing clone()
> interface, but I think it already has become a complication
> we should avoid (and we have not even used up all the
> available flags :)

agree and so does Kirill.

> are there any strong arguments against having a new
> clone() syscall, which I was missing so far?

I don't see any.

I'm going to revive execns() syscall into a clone_ns() syscall as suggested
by Kirill and you. Then, others will be free to nack ;)

Thanks,

C.
