

Re: netstat makes a Firewall redundant?

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.security.misc/2002-12/0476.html>

From: Leythos (void@nowhere.com)

Date: 12/27/02

From: Leythos <void@nowhere.com>

Date: Fri, 27 Dec 2002 15:53:27 GMT

In article <3E0C6B47.4F2420A1@dbc.dbc>, dbc@dbc.dbc says...

- > *Windows95A, 56K modem, single standalone home use.*
- >
- > *When I connect to the net via dial-up modem and do "netstat -a" in DOS*
- > *I see no output (other than 2 lines of 127.0.0 which is safe). If I*
- > *connect to www.microsoft.com I EXPECT to see that line appearing. So if*
- > *all connections are "as expected" I'm safe? Doing netstat regularly is*
- > *a firewall still then necessary? "netstat [interval]" executes it so*
- > *many seconds.*
- >
- > *If the IP address under "Local Address" is my ISP then I'm not being*
- > *hacked?*
- >
- > *PS The fact I only see 2 lines when I connect is proof I have ALL ports*
- > *closed (via following instructions at www.grc.com) or just removed the*
- > *NetBIOS/NetBEUI thingy?*

I hate to say this, but I almost laughed when I read your posting. I get calls from people running laptops with modems that though they were safe – it only takes about 5 seconds for someone to find you, it doesn't matter how you connect, they will find you. We get calls about once a month with someone saying they were hacked, but since they were on dial-up they thought they were safe :)

A modem doesn't look any different than any other connection to the internet, it's just slower, and people target slower connections less than they do faster ones.

--

--

Leythos999@columbus.rr.com

(Remove 999 to reply to me)