

Re: top delay value

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/hackers/2007-01/msg00389.html>

- *From:* "Coleman Kane" <zombyfork@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 31 Jan 2007 14:30:05 -0700
-

On 1/31/07, Mike Meyer <mwm-keyword-freebsdhackers2.e313df@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In <20070131170241.230960@xxxxxxxxx>, Dr. Markus Waldeck <waldeck@xxxxxxxxx> typed:

```
>>> typing "while ;; do ;; done". There are a thousand ways
>
>> No. What I write above is not a "fork bomb", it's a single
>> process which is wasting CPU in a busy loop. It's exactly
>> equivalent to top(1) with zero delay, except that top
>> produces some output, while a busy loop does nothing useful
>> at all.
>
> I tested different shells and I found out that an explicit sub shell
> is required to let the shell fork:
>
> while ;; do (:); done
```

That's still not a fork bomb. While it creates a process every time through the loop, the process exits before the loop continues, so you've still got just a few processes. Basically, it's still a busy loop.

A true fork bomb creates an ever-increasing number of processes, typically by forking copies of itself (which led to them being called "rabbit jobs" when I first ran into one).

<mike

--

Mike Meyer <mwm@xxxxxxxxx>

<http://www.mired.org/consulting.html>

Independent Network/Unix/Perforce consultant, email for more information.

Don't forget that a real fork bomb would fork forking forkers thereby growing the process overhead and time exponentially!

e.g:

Re: top delay value

```
perl -e 'while(1) { fork; };'
```

--

Coleman Kane

freebsd-hackers@xxxxxxxxxxx mailing list

<http://lists.freebsd.org/mailman/listinfo/freebsd-hackers>

To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-hackers-unsubscribe@xxxxxxxxxxx"