

## Re: Putty: Release 0.54 does not work with SOCKS5 server

*Source:* <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.security.ssh/2004-02/0325.html>

---

*From:* Jacob Nevins ([jacobn\\_at\\_chiark.greenend.org.uk](mailto:jacobn_at_chiark.greenend.org.uk))

*Date:* 02/25/04

Date: 25 Feb 2004 10:29:21 +0000 (GMT)

Mariusz Lisowski <[sqlbvn@wp.pl](mailto:sqlbvn@wp.pl)> writes:

>I have got little Linux server with work services: SSH, SOCKS5,  
>Samba, FTP and SMTP gate. I'm interested in lately added last support  
>SOCKS5 connections in putty.  
>I try to run it, but putty returns me message: "Proxy error: SOCKS  
>password subnegotiation contained wrong version number." and that is  
>all.

Taking the message at face value, this means that PuTTY is seeing a version number in the subnegotiation that is not specified in RFC1929 (which specifies SOCKS5 password auth with a version number of 1). In which case,

It's possible that PuTTY is mistaken, however. I haven't looked into this possibility.

I'm not sure how we can distinguish these, unless you can get a tcpdump of the relevant bit of proxy negotiation to us.

What is your SOCKS5 server?

>I checked SOCKS5 server with Total Commander release 5.51 and it  
>works correctly. In this one was implemented SOCKS5 support for FTP  
>connections and it works without any problems.  
>  
>SSH clients which are installed in local Linux system connect with it  
>too.

These clients are all using SOCKS5 with password authentication?

Are any of them things that we can look at the source for? (We'd need to know which version.)

>Second question,  
>are you interested in internationalization of putty ?

comp.security.ssh: Re: Putty: Release 0.54 does not work with SOCKS5 server

In principle, but some design & infrastructure work has to be done before we can accept translations.

<<http://www.chiark.greenend.org.uk/~sgtatham/putty/wishlist/i18n.html>>

>*Third question,*

>*Do you think of adding to putty support X clients, eg. KDE ?*

We already support X11 forwarding. If you are asking us to implement an X\_server\_, then emphatically no.

>*Now cygwin project does it, but it is very big application*

>*and installation and this is very complicated for users.*

>

>*In practice simple X-server application will be good*

>*in local network. It will be easy in configuration and easy*

>*in using and stable in work – as putty.*

Erm, X servers are big and complicated because the X protocol is big and complicated. (IMO)