SoylentNews

SoylentNews is people

(KillUserProcesses=yes).

posted by cmn32480 on Monday May 30, @02:44AM

from the fed-up-with-the-UNIX-take-over dept. An Anonymous Coward writes: The spreading of systemd continues, now actively <u>pushed by themselves unto other projects</u>, <u>like tmux</u>:

"With systemd 230 we switched to a default in which user processes started as part of a login session are terminated when the session exists

It seems methods already in use (daemon, nohup) are not good for them, so handling of processes after logout has to change at their request and as how they say. They don't even engange into a discussion about the general issue, but just pop up with the "solution". And what's the "reason" all this started

SoylentNews is powered by your submissions, so send in your scoop. Only 8 submissions in the queue.

Unfortunately this means starting tmux in the usual way is not effective, because it will be killed upon logout."

rolling? dbus & GNOME coders can't do a clean logout so it must be handled for them.

tmux Coders Asked to Add Special Code for Systemd

et al, wake up before RH signed RPMs become a hard dependency.

Just a "concidence" systemd came to the rescue and every other project like screen or wget will require changes too, or new shims like a nohup will need to be coded just in case you want to use with a non changed program. Users can probably burn all the now obsolete UNIX books. The systemd configuration becomes more like a fake option, as if you don't use it you run into the poorly programmed apps for the time being, and if they ever get fixed, the new policy has been forced into more targets. Seen at lobsters 1 & 2 where some BSD people look pissed at best. Red Hat, please, just fork and do you own thing, leaving the rest of us in peace. Debian

Original Submission • 🖃 📇 🖸 just fork it (Score:3, Touché)

by Anonymous Coward on Monday May 30, @02:49AM (#352523)

Just fork the forking thing and shut the fork up about it already.

way things happen with Linux crap.

SystemD can have its own fork of tmux, what's the problem? Everybody loves forks. Top coders all have GitHub profiles full of completely unmodified forks of trendy repos just to make themselves look like they contribute when they don't. Tapping that fork button is the most important skill of coding. **Reply to This**

Right, so then you have a tmux-systemd package and it depends on systemd and tmux conflicts with it, what's the forking problem? This is the normal □ Re:just fork it (Score:5, Insightful)

by MadTinfoilHatter (4635) on Monday May 30, @04:24AM (#352552) Just fork the forking thing and shut the fork up about it already. They don't want to - that would mean extra work. Why would you do that when you can just tell the developers:

and add some code that... streamlines it with ours, you know, so nobody has to get hurt... Seriously, systemd is a cancer that grows uncontrollably and infects everything it touches.

Nice software you got there... It would be a shame if it stopped working due to something we did in our "init-system". So you'd better bend over **Reply to This Parent**

□ □□□□ Re:just fork it (Score:4, Funny)

by zeigerpuppy (1298) on Monday May 30, @04:43AM (#352561) I prefer to spoon my code

Reply to This Parent ■ Enterprise Process
■ Re:just fork it by Anonymous Coward (Score:0) Monday May 30, @08:15AM

• Exercise Feering Free Property of the Register of the Regist • Example 1 Remember when LINUX forced LIBC to change? by Anonymous Coward (Score:0) Monday May 30, @02:57AM ■ 🖃 🔄 🖸 Re:Remember when LINUX forced LIBC to change? (Score:4, Interesting) by Anonymous Coward on Monday May 30, @03:02AM (#352526)

Quote copied from Wikipedia because fucking asshole hypocrite dumbshits can't be expected to follow a link. Fork "Linux libc" In the early 1990s, the developers of the Linux kernel forked glibc. Their fork, called "Linux libc", was maintained separately for years and released versions 2 through 5.

When FSF released glibc 2.0 in January 1997, it had much more complete POSIX standards compliance, better internationalisation and multilingual function, IPv6 capability, 64-bit data access, facilities for multithreaded applications, future version compatibility, and the code was more portable. At this point, the Linux kernel developers discontinued their fork and returned to using FSF's glibc. The last used version of Linux libc used the internal name (soname) libc.so.5. Following on from this, glibc 2.x on Linux uses the soname libc.so.6 (Alpha and IA64 architectures now use libc.so.6.1, instead). The *.so file name is often abbreviated as libc6 (for example in the package name in Debian) following the normal conventions for libraries. According to Richard Stallman, the changes that had been made in Linux libc could not be merged back into glibc because the authorship status of that code was unclear and the GNU project is quite strict about recording copyright and authors. **Reply to This Parent**

■ E Re:Remember when LINUX forced LIBC to change? (Score:5, Insightful) by jimshatt (978) on Monday May 30, @06:36AM (#352588) Journal Your quote doesn't seem to establish what you claim. Namely that GNU libc was forced to change because of Linux. It seems to me that the Linux forked libc because they thought they needed it, then later realized that was a mistake and returned to the better unforked version. This is how it should work. If the changes you (think you) need are not generic enough to be in the upstream version, you fork the code. If that turns out to be a mistake, at least you haven't polluted upstream. And this is EXACTLY why the systemd integration into tmux should be in a fork. So that when the nightmare is over (if ever) we can kill the fork and enjoy the purity of upstream tmux.

Reply to This Parent • E Re:just fork it by Anonymous Coward (Score:0) Monday May 30, @04:00AM • 1 reply beneath your current threshold.

Don't worry, it's just part of RedHat's gentle push [freedesktop.org] to make all distributions uniform by making it as hard as possible to not do things

3) Some distros still allow the use of alternate init systems. Debian still has sysvinit-core, for example, along with openrc, minit, upstart, runit, and

the right way instead of trying to push tmux into doing things the systemd way. I'm not against alternate inits, but they should at least attempt to work with the existing infrastructure (SIGHUP exists for a reason, for example) instead of demanding every process be modified to accommodate.

Why not fix what is broken? dbus and Gnome? I usually am called a troll here for my opinions on linux. But that just seems backwards. Why fix

Because that would be the sane way of doing things, and if they where sane they would also start splitting systemd into a herd of systemd

something that is not broken, break a bunch of other stuff. Why not go after the real bug? Am I missing something?

probably more. I think Ubuntu users are screwed, though, because Canonical purged sysv init and most (all?) other init systems years ago to

1) Your distro of choice may decide it's a stupid fucking default (because it is) and change it back to KillUserProcesses=no

by canopic jug (3949) on Monday May 30, @03:26AM (#352534) Debian et al, wake up before RH signed RPMs become a hard dependency. Three points on that:

Too late for Debian. Nearly all the Developers that know what's going on have left. Many ended up at <u>Devuan</u> [devuan.org] which just released a <u>beta</u> [devuan.org]. The combined torrent for Devuan-beta is huge, but just select pieces can be downloaded instead of the whole thing.

• 🖃 🛨 🖸 Debian et al, wake up (Score:5, Insightful)

The Developers at Devuan are making very good progress, but have a very tough row to hoe. As you can see from the links in the summary, systemd is working its hooks in all over the place. tmux probably won't bend over, but many other packages have. So far it's been two steps forward and one step back as Devuan straightens out one package only to find a new one infected. However, they are making headway. Perhaps by then, many of the

Debian derivatives will have seen through Poettering and Red Hat.

Red Hat likes and aims for the complexity [blogspot.ru]. Their more extreme ideas won't work if they go it alone, so they infect as many other distros as they can. More complexity means fewer can support their own work environments and more will have to sign contracts with Red Hat. Also, some of Red Hat's major customers benefit from the bugs that come with the added complexity.

Money is not free speech. Elections should not be auctions. **Reply to This**

○ E Re:Debian et al, wake up (Score:5, Informative)

by coolgopher (1157) on Monday May 30, @04:20AM (#352550) The combined torrent for Devuan-beta is huge, but just select pieces can be downloaded instead of the whole thing.

You can also download the ~200MB netinst ISO, dd it to a USB stick, boot off that and install directly from the net, downloading only what packages you need as you go along. Did that over the weekend, worked well.

Reply to This Parent

• 🖃 🖅 🖸 Gentle push. (Score:5, Informative)

The bad news:

Reply to This

Reply to This

Reply to This

(or are still migrating).

Kill systemd with fire.

think so.

I have no desire to run Potterix.

Reply to This

Parent

• E = Re:Debian et al, wake up by RamiK (Score:2) Monday May 30, @04:23AM ■ ☐ E:Debian et al, wake up by zeigerpuppy (Score:2) Monday May 30, @07:50AM

by Marand (1081) on Monday May 30, @03:42AM (#352537) Journal

2) If they don't, you can still set it yourself in logind.conf

Especially when it's a dumb fucking hack job "fix" like this.

by chromas (34) * on Monday May 30, @03:54AM (#352540)

■ End Re: Debian et al, wake up by Unixnut (Score:2) Monday May 30, @08:51AM ■ Re:Debian et al, wake up by cubancigar11 (Score:3) Monday May 30, @09:44AM • Example 20 Property Re:Debian et al, wake up by fnj (Score:2) Monday May 30, @06:39AM

their way. Why not just roll over and let them do what's best for you? The good news:

"encourage" upstart adoption. Sucks for Ubuntu users I guess, but that's what they get.

This will probably bite you on the ass eventually. If not now, then later, because it's another "gentle push" to make everyone do things their way or gtfo. If not this, then something else will. At least the tmux dev didn't roll over and accept the idea of adding libsystemd and/or pam as a hard dependency, and politely told them to go do shit

• Et= Re:Gentle push. by canopic jug (Score:2) Monday May 30, @03:54AM ■ E:Gentle push. by Marand (Score:2) Monday May 30, @04:28AM • \square blerg (Score:2)

Wouldn't this be the perfect use case for systemd's socket activation buttmagic?

• 🖃 🖅 🖸 fix whats broken? (Score:5, Insightful) by Anonymous Coward on Monday May 30, @04:06AM (#352544)

Reply to This ∘ ☐ Re:fix whats broken? (Score:4, Insightful)

by Aiwendil (531) on Monday May 30, @05:05AM (#352573) Journal

deamons that could easily be interchanged with other software of similar capabilities.. Akin to the old way of "do one thing but do it well"... Or put another way - once you start doing stuff the easy way it is hard to let go of that habit.

• Energy Weight Street, what street, by Anonymous Coward (Score:0) Monday May 30, @05:29AM • 🖃 🖽 🖸 Windows 7 (Score:0)

If you're going to use stupid crap like that you might as well get the industry standard crap. And at the rate things are going it might actually run better and be more stable/reliable than this rube goldberg stuff. Windows 7 isn't going to get phased out anytime soon, the Large Enterprises aren't switching to Windows 10. They only just switched to Windows 7

That way you can spend more time and resources using your apps rather than dicking about with your OS. Which is supposed to be the whole frigging point of having an OS.

by Anonymous Coward on Monday May 30, @04:09AM (#352545)

How about format and install Windows 7?

• 🖃 🖅 🖸 Simple solution (Score:5, Insightful) by sjames (2882) on Monday May 30, @04:32AM (#352557) Journal

• E:Windows 7 by Scruffy Beard 2 (Score:1) Monday May 30, @05:02AM

Reply to This • E Re:Simple solution by Anonymous Coward (Score:1) Monday May 30, @04:56AM • Ending the End of th

■ 🛨 🔄 • Re:Simple solution by Scruffy Beard 2 (Score:2) Monday May 30, @05:08AM

■ ☐ ☐ ☐ Re:Simple solution (Score:4, Informative)

by <u>linuxrocks123 (2557)</u> on Monday May 30, @06:29AM (#352586) <u>Journal</u> "WHY!": Because BlueZ doesn't support ALSA for Bluetooth audio anymore.

"NO!": I wrote the "Removing PulseAudio Completely" section of this wiki page which details how to remove it without getting dynamic loader errors when running anything that uses audio: http://docs.slackware.com/howtos:multimedia:pulseaudio non-

default [slackware.com] You're welcome:)

The software is "apulse", which I didn't write, and the nice thing about the approach I document there is that, in theory, you

should still be able to use software that requires PulseAudio, maybe even including BlueZ, but apulse was written just to make Skype work and so any other PulseAudio software might or might not actually work with apulse. The concept is really

nice, though: apulse provides a fake "libpulse.so" that exactly mimics the PulseAudio API but just translates the API calls to ALSA instead of spawning a daemon and throwing shit everywhere like the real PulseAudio library does.

Reply to This Parent

■ 🛨 🛨 🖸 Re:Simple solution - apulse by bitstream (Score:2) Monday May 30, @08:57AM ■ Example solution - apulse by Anonymous Coward (Score:0) Monday May 30, @09:26AM ■ E:Simple solution - apulse by bitstream (Score:2) Monday May 30, @09:42AM • \(\subseteq \) Lack of knowledge (Score:4, Insightful)

by jimshatt (978) on Monday May 30, @06:46AM (#352590) Journal Poettering is implementing things his own way because of sheer lack of knowledge. I doubt he even knows about SIGHUP. And like every beginning developer, when you don't know what the tools in your toolbox are for, you reinvent them, badly. **Reply to This**

• $\square \stackrel{\longleftarrow}{=} \square$ Why so Serious? (Score:2, Disagree) by <u>SemperOSS (5072)</u> on Monday May 30, @06:48AM (#352592) As much as I'd love to hate systemd, I find it difficult when actually looking into the matters discussed ... much to my surprise. Personally, I would not take it as an affront if somebody pointed out to me that by changing my code a little it would be able to support some systemd

If systemd did not give you a choice, I could understand the sentiment, but it does. You can disable it at compile time (not an option for most, I know) or by making one little change of your setup. So, why so serious? Think about the early cars: No locks, you just opened the door and jumped in. Then suddenly somebody had the gall to put a lock on your car. I mean, what a pretentious idiot could come up with such an idea? Make a fuzz, shout from the top of the roofs, call on divine intervention ...

... Or just don't lock your door. The choice is yours — and you actually *have* a choice!

All the same, I'm still going to hold on to Sys V init for as long as I can, systemd or not! **Reply to This**

• Ere: Why so Serious? by bitstream (Score:2) Monday May 30, @09:01AM • E Re: Why so Serious? by Anonymous Coward (Score:0) Monday May 30, @10:08AM • \square Linux + SystemD, the new MS Windows (Score:0)

feature. I would mull it over, talk to my peers and make a decision whether to ignore it or not ... but causing an outbreak of systemd-bashing, I don't

by Anonymous Coward on Monday May 30, @09:12AM (#352613) We do not care what you want to do.
We do not care how yo want to work.
We do not care about your prior choices.

We a MicroS... strike that... We are Linux with SystemD That is with "D", as in "We are DEVIL in the details or the lack of)"

• 🖃 LIke a disease (Score:0)

SysD is one.

by Anonymous Coward on Monday May 30, @09:53AM (#352624)

Reply to This

Reply to This • <u>1 reply</u> beneath your current threshold.

Reply

Drop in any mailbox.