

Re: Current status?

Re: Current status?

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.vms/2008-09/msg00572.html>

- *From:* david20@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Fri, 12 Sep 2008 17:59:56 +0000 (UTC)
-

In article <6iv84fFma4eU1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, billg999@xxxxxxxxxxx (Bill Gunshannon) writes:

In article <gad5rp\$25e\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Johnny Billquist <bqt@xxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:

Bill Gunshannon skrev:

In article <hPXxk.13\$ia.10@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, John Santos <john@xxxxxxx> writes:

Bill Gunshannon wrote:
I'm on Verizon FIOS at home and I know the FIOS converter box is a router and does NAT and some level of filtering, so inbound port 25 traffic wouldn't make it to my LAN (or single computer if that was all I had) unless I actively reconfigure it to pass port 25 to a designated host (the default is "block"), but I don't know if the same applies to Comcast cable modems. (FIOS is point-to-point to the central office, like DSL, so local "LAN" traffic isn't a separate issue like it would be with Comcast.) In other words, blocking at the upstream router or at my home would be equally effective with FIOS or DSL, but for Comcast, only blocking at the home would catch everything.

Inbound port 25 to your machine is not the source of SPAM, outbound from your machine, which has no business sending email to anyone but

Re: Current status?

your local MTA for relaying, to the INTERNET in general is. It doesn't require blocking at the user level, just at the border of the email domain which is your ISP.

Just thought I'd throw in a torch here, and then I'll be quiet again.

I just totally hate ISPs that block port 25. The less I have to deal with an ISP, the better my life works. They are *clowns* and I for one am not interested in letting them handling my mail traffic if I can avoid it.

If you are a residential customer:

1. You probably don't have a clue what any of this means.
2. You have no need to run your own mail server.
3. Your AUP (at least for every ISP in the US who's AUP I am familiar with) prohibits you from running servers.

You also are probably being provided with a dynamic address by your ISP and hence if sending mail out directly risk having your mail blocked because your recipient's mailhub is using one of the many DUL lists (SORBS DUHL, SpamHaus PBL etc).

To ensure your mail is not blocked by such a list you should be sending through a mailhub with a fixed IP address – for most people the simplest to use is the ISP's mailhub. This is irrespective of whether or not the ISP blocks outbound port 25 connections.

The only time that the ISP blocking outbound port 25 connections is a real problem is if you want to send mail out through another fixed ip address mailhub eg your employer's mailhub. Which is where having your employer setup their mailhub to support authenticated connections on the submission port comes in.

David Webb
Security team leader
CCSS
Middlesex University

So why would you need access to port 25? If you have commercial network service, nothing should be blocked, but you should be held to a much higher standard of maintenance.

Re: Current status?

Spam is definitely a scourge, but letting the ISPs get monopoly on mail is not the solution.

It's not giving them a monopoly. Anyone who wants to run servers merely needs a commercial and not a residential service agreement.

And as others have pointed out, the fact that a whole bunch of ISPs now block port 25 haven't reduced spam one bit.

Actually, the number who do is insignificant. Most of the major ISP's in the US do not. And probably don't even know what we are talking about.

Don't kill the messenger when the message is junk. Find the originator instead. That's where your problem is, and that is where you need to apply the fix. Otherwise the spammer will just continue, finding new ways of spreading their junk.

I can virtually eliminate SPAM. All I need is to get people to expend what will turn out to be considerably less effort in the long run than what they are expending now on the problem.

Jail them. Confiscate their money and their business. That would stop spam. Not much else will.

That comes back to my statement that we need a social solution and not a technological solution. Under the way the INTERNET is currently run, this can not be done. Under my plan, it most certainly could.

People who think that blocking ports is a solution to the spam problem are just plain ignorant.

Blocking port 25 is just a bandaid, but the only one we have available right now. It would have an immediate effect, if it were truly universal. But the solution needs to be social and that solution exists today and could easily be improved upon once people actually looked at the problem

Re: Current status?

Re: Current status?

and the solution with un-biased eyes.

Thank you for your time. I now let you go back to your spamming. :-)

Always good to hear from you.

bill

--

Bill Gunshannon | de-moc-ra-cy (di mok' ra see) n. Three wolves
billg999@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx | and a sheep voting on what's for dinner.
University of Scranton |
Scranton, Pennsylvania | #include <std disclaimer.h>