

Re: Purpose of a hypervisor (was Re: rock solid)

## Re: Purpose of a hypervisor (was Re: rock solid)

---

*Source:* <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Debian/2007-07/msg00383.html>

---

- *From:* Douglas Allan Tutty <[dtutty@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dtutty@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 5 Jul 2007 19:25:15 -0400
- 

On Thu, Jul 05, 2007 at 08:43:34AM -0700, Andrew Sackville-West wrote:

On Tue, Jul 03, 2007 at 10:00:35PM -0400, Douglas Allan Tutty wrote:

On Tue, Jul 03, 2007 at 06:22:46PM -0500, Ron Johnson wrote:

On 07/03/07 13:25, Andrew Sackville-West wrote:

>

Dom0: local file server (video, music, local backups)  
DomU1: firewall

I understand the need for a small, "separate" firewall.

Does this really give any more security than running the firewall as a regular part of the main box? Is it as secure as a separate old computer? These three (plus I suppose a commercial hardware firewall) seem to be the choices. How do they compare for security?

I don't think there is anything wrong with a debian machine on the net with its local firewall as the only thing protecting it. But I think if you want anything more sophisticated, some sort of seperate device is the way to go.

So what about a virtual box as a firewall? That virtual box may have less on it but it exists in the same physical box as everything else. Doesn't the virtualization mean that there is one more thing that could have a vulnerability?

In general, I agree with you and with old boxes being free it makes

Re: Purpose of a hypervisor (was Re: rock solid)

Re: Purpose of a hypervisor (was Re: rock solid)

sense that once one has more than a couple of boxes to have a spare box  
as a firewall.

Doug.

--

To UNSUBSCRIBE, email to [debian-user-REQUEST@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:debian-user-REQUEST@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
with a subject of "unsubscribe". Trouble? Contact [listmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:listmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)