

## Re: ten thousand small processes

**Source:** <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/performance/2003-06/0119.html>

---

**From:** Bakul Shah ([bakul\\_at\\_bitblocks.com](mailto:bakul_at_bitblocks.com))

**Date:** 06/27/03

To: "D. J. Bernstein" <[djb@cr.yp.to](mailto:djb@cr.yp.to)>  
Date: Fri, 27 Jun 2003 09:12:17 -0700

> > *Instead of complaining about wasting 78 megabytes and arguing  
> > about why various proposed solutions fall short and why your  
> > way is the best, why don't you come up with a patch that  
> > saves space for small programs?*  
>  
> *Funny. Seems to me that I keep making concrete suggestions---including a  
> detailed proposal for giving more space to malloc()---and the answer is  
> consistently ``We really don't care about per-process overhead." What's  
> the benefit of a patch for people who don't even see the problem?*

If after repeated suggestions people are not "getting it", the reason is usually *\*not\** apathy. Either you are not explaining well or your starting assumptions are different. But show me the code! If I like it I'll use it. "Build it and they will come" -- you should be familiar with that! If enough people like it, may be it will get incorporated in some form. May be.

---

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"