

Re: [2.4 PATCH] bugfix: ARP respond on all devices

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Kernel/2003-08/5603.html>

From: Stephan von Krawczynski (skraw_at_ithnet.com)

Date: 08/20/03

Date: Wed, 20 Aug 2003 17:41:33 +0200
To: "David S. Miller" <davem@redhat.com>

On Tue, 19 Aug 2003 12:28:47 -0700

"David S. Miller" <davem@redhat.com> wrote:

> On 19 Aug 2003 21:32:35 +0200

> Andi Kleen <ak@colin2.muc.de> wrote:

>

>> *What happens on outgoing active ARPs is a different thing. Reasonable*

>> *choices would be either the preferred source address of the route or*

>> *the local interface's address. I must admit I don't have a strong*

>> *opinion on what the better behaviour of those is, but neither of them would*

>> *seem particularly wrong to me.*

>

> *Andi, we take the source address from the packet we are*

> *trying to send out that interface.*

>

> *Just as it is going to be legal to send out a packet from*

> *that interface using that source address, it is legal to*

> *send out an ARP request from that interface using that source*

> *address.*

Aehm, sorry but the logic is bogus. A routed packet will be sent out this interface with a foreign IP as source, too. Though nobody will want to send an arp request with a foreign ip as source.

But you say here: Just as I can send out a packet with IP X from that interface I can send out ARP request with same source.

Obviously you don't want that.

So you cannot step from A to B in your logical chain here.

Again. I'd like to stress I don't want to insult you or anything. The simple thing is this: there are a lot setups out there that could benefit from your tolerance in this issue. Can't we simply take the issue to the point: "you are right, but you show tolerance for boxes that are not completely wrong" ? I mean the world is full of people that are right and intolerant, so that in fact doesn't really make them special ...

Linux-Kernel: Re: [2.4 PATCH] bugfix: ARP respond on all devices

Please let us keep in mind that joe-average-user cannot handle complex setups with arpfiler, arp_filter or anything the like. But he can right away enter IT-superstore XYZ and buy a brand new router box for 20 bucks. If he is unlucky (and you stay intolerant) he will for sure _not_ blame this box but his desktop linux if things don't work out as expected.

I think we should at least make a minimum effort to keep things simple (and explainable to joe-average-user), even if the background is complex. Everywhere we have a solution for a problem that is overly complex, we will fail to gain a broad market share, because there may very likely be easier solutions under <name-some-os> _and_ we attract support problems for all distributors.

Regards,
Stephan

-

To unsubscribe from this list: send the line "unsubscribe linux-kernel" in the body of a message to majordomo@vger.kernel.org

More majordomo info at <http://vger.kernel.org/majordomo-info.html>

Please read the FAQ at <http://www.tux.org/lkml/>