

Re: grc.com news server down?

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.security.firewalls/2003-01/2870.html>

From: Art Kopp (artnpeg@claymania.com)

Date: 01/27/03

From: artnpeg@claymania.com (Art Kopp)

Date: Mon, 27 Jan 2003 20:01:41 GMT

On Mon, 27 Jan 2003 18:11:44 GMT, "Alexander Delarge"

<alex@nowhere.com> wrote:

> "Hank Arnold" <rasilon@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:8c8Z9.403856\$FT6.79099977@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> Gibson is one of those guys who started out as almost a lone voice in the
>> wilderness pushing an issue that others thought wasn't that big a deal.
>> Turns out he was right and he became a "visionary". However, as time went
>> on, he went overboard and started a feud with Microsoft (and others) and,
>> IMHO, started believing the all the hype about himself. Now, he's getting
>> the image of an opinionated "guru" who just won't listen to anyone who
>> disagrees with him and, in fact, seems to attack them. It's damaged his
>> reputation to the point that a lot of us just don't listen any more. Too
>> bad, because he's a very smart guy who has a lot of good things he could
>be
>> doing for all of us.
>
>Oh PLUUUULEEEEEASE.
>
>There is nothing even remotely "visionary" about his work. Steve has
>consistently "re-invented" things that were designed and tested many years
>before him. Like his phenominally stupid "GENISIS" or whatever that
>re-invention of syn cookies was. He designed this anti DoS technology that
>was AN EXACT COPY of a technology designed many years before he got there.
>But because he wrote it in assembly code, he fancies himself some genius and
>mindless twerps follow him.
>
>The problem with Steve is very simple. He is about 40% accurate and 60% hype
>and self-promotion. He makes ludacrious claims about technology that are
>only partially accurate. Hence, the people who believe him and "learn" from
>him are learning a small fraction of the truth. Like his laughable crusade
>against Windows XP. "It will destroy the Internet!" What a total boob. A
>prime example of how Steve took a relatively small issue and exaggerated it
>into a maasive conspiracy.
>
>Also, no serious security professional has a shred of respect for him. Steve
>once posted to SecurityFocus and was promptly beaten into submission by

comp.security.firewalls: Re: grc.com news server down?

>people considerably more intelligent than him.

>

>I personally enjoy reading his newsgroups, however. He will make these

>tremendously self-congratulating posts about how he is working hard on SUPER

>SECRET PROJECT X-68 and that it will REVOLUTIONIZE THE ENTIRE UNIVERSE AS WE

>KNOW IT. And without fail there is always a chorus of morons who post

>gushing praise of his tender genius. Its so pathetic. It makes me wonder,

>what kind of low-rent retard must you be to worship Steve Gibson.

>

>Nevertheless, in the land of the blind, the one-eyed man will be king.

>

>Steve is a huckster, a fraud, and a phoney. Like the saying goes, pay no

>attention to the man behind the curtain.

No attention? Are you saying his unbinding procedure for Win 98 is worthless?

I'd still like to know the benefits, if any, of using a firewall. I've posed the question in this newsgroup more than once, trying to get answers from experts. As a home user with DSL on all day (dynamic IP) I've taken the approach of running without a firewall as a sort of long term experiment. After at least a year with DSL and several years with dialup I've never had a problem. I've checked many test sites and I once used a port scanner. All 64K of my ports are normally closed.

I suppose a hacker would first have to have some interest in making a dedicated prolonged attempt of some sort? I suppose some method might be used to find an opening whereby a stab at some buffer overrun vulnerability might allow root access? I guess "stealth" ports cuts down on his chances a bit? I suppose rules blocking a bunch of ports using a firewall cuts his chances down even more? Is it a matter of cutting down a small probability of a hacker gaining root access to some smaller amount? Is that it? Or exactly what? :)

I'll tell ya, I've seached high and low and to put it bluntly I've never seen so much confusion and downright BS and paranoia and self serving interests as I've seen on the subject of firewalls. I'm a engineer with much programming experience and now quite a bit of knowledge concerning virus/Trojan prevention. But I'm having a helluva time with the internet security/firewall question. I really feel sorry for users who don't even have a good tech background in computers to start with. Who are the "disinterested" real experts in this area who aren't just trying to sell you something or other or BS you in one way or another?

Art

<http://www.epix.net/~artnpeg>

artnpeg@claymania.com