
Subject: Re: [PATCH 4/5] Move the user namespace under the option

Posted by [rpjday](#) on Mon, 01 Oct 2007 08:42:18 GMT

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

On Mon, 1 Oct 2007, Pavel Emelyanov wrote:

> Robert P. J. Day wrote:

> > On Thu, 27 Sep 2007, Cedric Le Goater wrote:

> >

> >>> diff --git a/include/linux/user_namespace.h b/include/linux/user_namespace.h

> >>> index b5f41d4..dda160c 100644

> >>> --- a/include/linux/user_namespace.h

> >>> +++ b/include/linux/user_namespace.h

> >>> @@ -17,7 +17,7 @@ struct user_namespace {

> >>>

> >>> extern struct user_namespace init_user_ns;

> >>>

> >>> -#ifdef CONFIG_USER_NS

> >>> +#ifdef CONFIG_NAMESPACES_EXPERIMENTAL

> >

> > is it really a good precedent to introduce Kconfig variables that

> > literally include the word "EXPERIMENTAL"?

>

> How else can we call it? I proposed one config option for each

> namespace with "depends on EXPERIMENTAL" dependency, but everyone

> else said that two options are much better.

i don't know -- perhaps something as trivially obvious as

NAMESPACES_V2 or something. i just think it's awkward to take a word

like "EXPERIMENTAL" that already has a long and established history,

and start jamming it into config variable names. but it's just an
observation.

rday

--

=====

Robert P. J. Day

Linux Consulting, Training and Annoying Kernel Pedantry

Waterloo, Ontario, CANADA

<http://crashcourse.ca>

=====

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

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