

Re: RE:[fw-wiz] Vulnerability Scanners (was: concerning ~el8 / project mayhem)

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Firewall-Wizards/2002-08/0491.html>

From: B. Scott Harroff (Scott.Harroff@att.net)

Date: 08/26/02

From: "B. Scott Harroff" <Scott.Harroff@att.net>

To: "Paul D. Robertson" <proberts@patriot.net>

Date: Mon Aug 26 11:14:25 2002

- > *Actually, I think it's not necessarily good to stop "folks like Jim—" the*
- > *"bad apple" defense means you *must* stop Jim once he's reported.*
- > *However, if you put in a mechanism and it has flaws, you could be more*
- > *liable for the things that get through than you are if you don't try.*
- > *Suddenly you've placed yourself in the position of an editor, and legally,*
- > *not trying and not failing is different than trying and failing.*

Your opinion is its better to do nothing and let 100% get though then though a combination of technology / process / policy that stops 95%?

I think one would be better of showing "intent to protect and missing one instance or two" than "doing nothing about a known problem".