Subject: Re: Screamm.. commit f400e198b2ed26ce55b22a1412ded0896e7516ac
Posted by ebiederm on Thu, 29 Mar 2007 14:44:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Serge E. Hallyn" <serue@us.ibm.com> writes:

>> > Where the latter is needed in, for instance, kernel/capability.c.
>>
>> Yes.
>>
>> I think more clear cut examples could be made. It isn't clear to me
>> why we skip pid == 1 in kernel/capability.c
>
> Because the capset(2) manpage says:
>
> For capset(), pid can also be: -1, meaning
>   perform the change on all threads except the caller and
>   init(8);

Which they copied from the kill(2) manpage. So they are just preserving
the existing definition of which processes -1 applies to.

The single unix/posix standard says:

> If pid is -1, sig shall be sent to all processes (excluding an
> unspecified set of system processes) for which the process has
> permission to send that signal.

So I'm still curious why we decided not to send to pid == 1. But
that is clearly the way things are defined to work in linux.

So I guess that makes the capsetall case a good example after all.
It is skipping pid == 1 because that is what it means. And in that
context I suspect makes a great deal of sense to perform the skip
by testing for pid == 1. Because that is what we really mean.

Eric

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