Subject: Re: Re: [patch -mm 10/17] nsproxy: add unshare_ns and bind_ns syscalls
Posted by Cedric Le Goater on Mon, 11 Dec 2006 16:44:53 GMT

Eric W. Biederman wrote:

>> because if not, then why not simply extend that one
>> to 64bit and be done, we probably won't need a clone64()
>> but if we find we do (at some point) adding that with
>> the new flags would be trivial ...
>>
>> OTOH, we could also just add an unshare64() too
>>
>> anyway, we _will_ run out of flags in the near future
>
> Agreed. Please let's cross that bridge when we come to it.

How many are left right now ? isn't it 4 ?

```
#define CLONE_CHILD_SETTID 0x01000000 /* set the TID in the child */
#define CLONE_STOPPED  0x02000000 /* Start in stopped state */
#define CLONE_NEWUTS  0x04000000 /* New utsname group? */
#define CLONE_NEWIPC  0x08000000 /* New ipcs */

#define CLONE_NEWPID  0x10000000
#define CLONE_NEWUSER  0x20000000
#define CLONE_NEWNET  0x40000000
   0x80000000
```

I think the bridge is crossed. Leaving one available clone
flag is not an option to me.

C.