

Re: web server + router on the same box

Re: web server + router on the same box

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/alt.os.linux/2007-03/msg00772.html>

- *From:* ibuprofin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Moe Trin)
 - *Date:* Sun, 25 Mar 2007 17:49:44 -0500
-

On 24 Mar 2007, in the Usenet newsgroup alt.os.linux, in article <1174752206.861923.256060@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, scottnews@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

I've started playing around with Linux and Apache lately

Inferred: not experienced

and am wondering if it would be secure to put a web server and wireless router on the same box. Are there security risks?

Yes. How much depends on the amount of work you want to put in to secure things.

Is it more conventional to put the router and server on their own boxes?

It's hardly uncommon – many users put everything (router, firewall, server, workstation, and the kitchen sink) on the same box, often because it's the only box they have or are willing to use. That doesn't make it a good idea, but it's also not instantly fatal.

Would I recommend it? No. Anyone gaining access to even the tiniest crack has access to everything. The more things you have running, the more `_potential_` exploits. That's why separate boxes are better.

I'll probably use Fedora Core and Apache. I'm not sure what router application to use.

```
echo 1 > /proc/sys/net/ipv4/ip_forward
```

Boom – you got a router. Or with Fedora, in `/etc/sysconfig/network` you

Re: web server + router on the same box

Re: web server + router on the same box

set 'FORWARD_IPV4=' to 'true'. What you're really thinking of is a _firewall_ and that's a different ball of wax. Again, the firewall is built in to the kernel, and your choice is which of the many firewall configuration tools you want to use. Literally, there are hundreds, ranging from powdered plastic puppy poop up to tools adequate for a commercial installation that worries about Sarbanes–Oxley Act level controls, and everything in-between.

Would you recommend the one that comes with Fedora?

If you keep it up to date – sure, why not?

I'll be using an old 500 MHz Dell Inspiron. I'll have to buy a wireless NIC for the the router side. Any recommendation for a NIC that has an antenna on a cable?

[news://alt.internet.wireless](#)

Antenna on a cable is often bad news. Cable loss at 2.4 GHz is pretty substantial, and you want to minimize that if at all possible. A far better solution is a standalone access point that can be optimally located, and connect that to your local box/LAN with UTP Cat5 cable.

Just pay attention to the security aspects. The vast majority of wireless installations are wide open for anyone to exploit. They are left in the default configuration with all security disabled because it takes too much effort (a minute maximum for someone experienced, a half hour for the mouth–breathers) to properly secure them.

Old guy

.