

## Re: ten thousand small processes

**Source:** <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/performance/2003-06/0114.html>

---

**From:** Jon Mini ([mini\\_at\\_freebsd.org](mailto:mini_at_freebsd.org))

**Date:** 06/27/03

Date: Thu, 26 Jun 2003 20:51:32 -0700

To: "D. J. Bernstein" <[djb@cr.yp.to](mailto:djb@cr.yp.to)>

D. J. Bernstein [[djb@cr.yp.to](mailto:djb@cr.yp.to)] wrote :

> *I want separate processes for the memory protection. Each process is  
> chrooted under its own uid, so it can't write to disk except through  
> supplied file descriptors, and it can't hit other processes. (If I had a  
> portable way to cut off other communication channels, such as creating  
> new sockets, I'd do that too.)*

Have you looked into our jail(8) mechanism?

Consider your resource consumption needs, it is also too heavy-weight.

> *protection; I realize that it's hard to do better than that. But I'm not  
> willing to casually piss away large fractions of a gigabyte of RAM. Not  
> this decade, anyway.*

Unfortunately, FreeBSD is the wrong operating system for you.

> *I'm willing to sacrifice one page per process for the sake of memory  
> The lack of memory protection is exactly why I can't use threads. It's  
> also why I'm not surprised to hear that processes are slightly less  
> efficient than threads. But something is seriously wrong if processes  
> are much less efficient than threads.*

There are many other contributing factors that have been mentioned, but you are choosing to ignore. I'm afraid I can't communicate with you effectively if you are going to ignore the facts.

My sincerest apologies,

--

Jonathan Mini <[mini@freebsd.org](mailto:mini@freebsd.org)>

<http://www.freebsd.org/>

---

freebsd-performance@freebsd.org mailing list

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

To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-performance-unsubscribe@freebsd.org"