

## Re: confused routes with multiple nics

---

*Source:* <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.networking/2007-08/msg00111.html>

---

- *From:* [ibuprofin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ibuprofin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Moe Trin)
  - *Date:* Tue, 07 Aug 2007 14:58:36 -0500
- 

On Tue, 07 Aug 2007, in the Usenet newsgroup comp.os.linux.networking, in article <1186447768.117715.35420@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, kevincw01 wrote:

(Moe Trin) wrote:

What you have done is mis-use the word "gateway". While the more simple meaning of the word is "that host that leads elsewhere" – virtually all Linux distributions (and the crappy "helper" tools provided by the various distributions) make the assumption that if you declare a gateway, it MUST lead to the world which is not always the case, and pretty uncommon when there are multiple ways off of the local wire.

You sir, are awesome. Your explanation was eloquent and descriptive and I got the point immediately. I have also fixed the problem based on your feedback. I now understand the meaning of a gateway in this context.

Glad to hear it! This problem is seen a few times a month, fostered by the misunderstanding caused by the way windoze shows routing tables with the 'route print' command (which shows a "gateway" for every route including the loopback), and an overly helpful Linux routing setup that accepts a second (or more) default route, and replaces the function of the existing route (under the impression that you changed your mind).

The 10.x.x.x gateway did not lead to the internet and really, i had no use for it since all the hosts on that network are on the same switch as eth1.

Sounds like a helpful tool that was overly helpful. Glad it's working

Old guy

Re: confused routes with multiple nics