



[Home](#) | [Features](#) | [News](#) | [Advisories](#) | [Resources](#) | [Contributors](#) | [Forums](#)

#### Top Stories

[Why We Don't  
Need Perfectly  
Secure  
Systems](#)

Oct 4

[Secure SHell  
now in  
NetBSD  
mainline](#)

Oct 4

[FBI releases  
first Carnivore  
data](#)

Oct 4

[.comment: Are  
We Asking for  
It?](#)

Oct 4

[Do you know  
if your data is  
safe?](#)

Oct 4

[Issues: The  
medias guide  
to talking to  
hackers](#)

Oct 4

## Paul Vixie and David Conrad on BINDv9 and Internet Security

There is a fine line to be drawn between usability and security. I personally feel that Linux (or rather, the popular distributions) may err on the side of allowing too many applications and services to exist and/or default to on. From my experience, it is difficult to fully audit contributed code (the BIND v8.2 & v8.2.1 NXT bug that has caused such difficulties was a result of a bug in code donated to us, ironically enough, from a large firm

The Linux  
Community's  
Center for  
Security

10/3/2000 7:54

Page [\[1\]](#) [\[2\]](#) [\[3\]](#) [\[4\]](#) [\[5\]](#)

No comment comes to mind.

\_\_\_\_\_ : A increases the potential for bugs (security related or otherwise). Standards bloat, in combination with feeping  
*checksum* creaturism demanded of us by our funders or users, results in software bloat which is probably our most  
*that is*  
*computed for*  
*a data object*  
*by means that*  
*protect*  
*against active*  
*attacks that*  
*would attempt*  
*to change the*  
*checksum to*  
*make it match*  
*changes*  
*made ...*

[Return to LinuxSecurity.com](http://www.linuxsecurity.com)

\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_  
[© Guardian Digital, Inc., 2000](#)

## Today's Tip

[Using PAM:](#)  
Pluggable  
Authentication

 ***Contribute!***