7.1 Introduction

At this point, having seen both the threads that perform computations and the virtual memory spaces in which those computations take place, you are finally prepared to synthesize the notion of process. Processes play a central role in the view of an operating system as experienced by most system administrators, application programmers, and other moderately sophisticated computer users. In particular, the technical concept of process comes the closest to the informal idea of a running program.

The concept of process is not entirely standardized across different operating systems. Not only do some systems use a different word (such as “task”), but also the details of the definition vary. Nonetheless, most mainstream systems are based on definitions that include the following:

**One or more threads** Because a process embodies a running program, often the process will be closely associated with a single thread. However, some programs are designed to divide work among multiple threads, even if the program is run only once. (For example, a web browser might use one thread to download a web page while another thread continues to respond to the user interface.)

**Virtual memory accessible to those threads** The word “accessible” implies that some sort of protection scheme ensures that the threads within a process access
only the memory for which that process has legitimate access rights. As you will see, the mainstream protection approach is for each process to have its own virtual memory address space, shared by the threads within that process. However, I will also present an alternative, in which all processes share a single address space, but with varying access rights to individual objects within that address space. In any case, the access rights are assigned to the process, not to the individual threads.

**Other access rights**  A process may also hold the rights to resources other than memory. For example, it may have the right to update a particular file on disk or to service requests arriving over a particular network communication channel. I will address these issues in Chapters 8 and 9. For now, I will sketch two general approaches by which a process can hold access rights. Either the process can hold a specific *capability*, such as the capability to write a particular file, or it can hold a general *credential*, such as the identification of the user for whom the process is running. In the latter case, the credential indirectly implies access rights, by way of a separate mechanism, such as *access control lists*.

**Resource allocation context**  Limited resources (such as space in memory or on disk) are generally associated with a process for two reasons. First, the process’s termination may serve to implicitly release some of the resources it is holding, so that they may be reallocated. Operating systems generally handle memory in this way. Second, the process may be associated with a limited resource quota or with a billing account for resource consumption charges. For simplicity, I will not comment on these issues any further.

**Miscellaneous context**  Operating systems often associate other aspects of a running program’s state with the process. For example, systems such as Linux and UNIX (conforming to the POSIX standard) keep track of each process’s current working directory. That is, when any thread in the process accesses a file by name without explicitly indicating the directory containing the file, the operating system looks for the file starting from the process’s current working directory. For historical reasons, the operating system tracks a single current working directory per process, rather than one per thread. Yet this state might have been better associated with the individual threads, as it is hard to see why a change-directory operation in one thread should upset file operations underway in another concurrently running thread. Because there is no big master narrative to these items of miscellaneous context, I won’t consider them further in this chapter.

From this list, you can see that many of the key aspects of processes concern protection, and these are the aspects on which I will focus. Before diving into a consideration of various approaches to protection, however, I will devote Section 7.2 to the basics of how the POSIX process management API can be used, such as how a thread running in
one process creates another process and how a process exits. This section should serve
to make the use of processes more concrete. Studying this API will also allow you to
understand how the shell (command interpreter) executes user commands.

After studying the basics of POSIX process management, you will spend the remain-
ing sections of the chapter learning various aspects of protection. Keep in mind that
protection is a large and diverse area; although I will introduce several different pro-
tection mechanisms in this chapter, I will leave many topics for later chapters. I post-
pone some protection questions specific to file systems to Chapter 8. Also, protection
is intimately related to security, which I cover in Chapter 11. In particular, my empha-
sis here will be on basic mechanisms. I will defer to Chapter 11 all questions of how
those mechanisms are deployed to enforce chosen security policies.

I will divide this current chapter’s treatment of protection among three sections.
Section 7.3 addresses the fundamental question of limiting each process’s access to
memory. After showing how processors provide two distinct execution modes to serve
as the foundation for any protection system, I will present two approaches to mem-
ory protection: one with a separate address space for each process, and one with a
single address space. Moving beyond memory protection, Section 7.4 first presents
the fundamentals of access rights, then examines the two approaches I mentioned for
representing access rights: capabilities and the combination of credentials with access
control lists. The assumption throughout these two sections is that protection oper-
ates at the granularity of processes. Section 7.5 examines two alternatives, of finer and
carser granularity. The finer-grained protection approach protects parts of processes
from each other. The coarser-grained approach, on the other hand, protects entire
simulated machines from one another, with each simulated machine running its own
operating system.

In Section 7.6, the chapter concludes with an examination of some of the security
issues most directly raised by material in the earlier sections.

7.2 POSIX Process Management API

All operating systems provide mechanisms for creating new processes, terminating
existing processes, and performing related actions. The details vary from system to
system. To provide a concrete example, I will present relevant features of the POSIX
API, which is used by Linux and UNIX, including by Mac OS X.

In the POSIX approach, each process is identified by a process ID number, which is a
positive integer. Each process (with one exception) comes into existence through the
forking of a parent process. The exception is the first process created when the operating
system starts running. A process forks off a new process whenever one of the threads
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running in the parent process calls the `fork` procedure. In the parent process, the call to `fork` returns the process ID number of the new child process. (If an error occurs, the procedure instead returns a negative number.) The process ID number may be important to the parent later, if it wants to exert some control over the child or find out when the child terminates.

Meanwhile, the child process can start running. The child process is in many regards a copy of the parent process. For protection purposes, it has the same credentials as the parent and the same capabilities for such purposes as access to files that have been opened for reading or writing. In addition, the child contains a copy of the parent’s address space. That is, it has available to it all the same executable program code as the parent, and all of the same variables, which initially have the same values as in the parent. However, because the address space is copied instead of shared, the variables will start having different values in the two processes as soon as either performs any instructions that store into memory. (Special facilities do exist for sharing some memory; I am speaking here of the normal case.) Of course, the operating system doesn’t need to actually copy each page of the address space. It can use copy on write (COW) to avoid (or at least postpone) most of the copying.

Because the child process is nearly identical to the parent, it starts off by performing the same action as the parent; the `fork` procedure returns to whatever code called it. However, application programmers generally don’t want the child to continue executing all the same steps as the parent; there wouldn’t be much point in having two processes if they behaved identically. Therefore, the `fork` procedure gives the child process an indication that it is the child so that it can behave differently. Namely, `fork` returns a value of 0 in the child. This contrasts with the return value in the parent process, which is the child’s process ID number, as mentioned earlier.

The normal programming pattern is for any `fork` operation to be immediately followed by an `if` statement that checks the return value from `fork`. That way, the same program code can wind up following two different courses of action, one in the parent and one in the child, and can also handle the possibility of failure, which is signaled by a negative return value. The C++ program in Figure 7.1 shows an example of this; the parent and child processes are similar (both loop five times, printing five messages at one-second intervals), but they are different enough to print different messages, as shown in the sample output in Figure 7.2. Keep in mind that this output is only one possibility; not only can the ID number be different, but the interleaving of output from the parent and child can also vary from run to run. This example program also illustrates that the processes each get their own copy of the `loopCount` variable. Both start with the initial value, 5, which was established before the fork. However, when each process decrements the counter, only its own copy is affected. In Programming Projects 7.1 and 7.2, you can write variants of this program.


Figure 7.1  This C++ program, forker.cpp, demonstrates process creation using fork. The program prints eleven lines of output, including five each from the parent and child process after the call to fork.

In early versions of UNIX, only one thread ever ran in each process. As such, programs that involved concurrency needed to create multiple processes using fork. In situations such as that, it would be normal to see a program like the one in Figure 7.1, which includes the full code for both parent and child. Today, however, concurrency within a program is normally done using a multi-threaded process. This leaves only the other big use of fork: creating a child process to run an entirely different program. In this case, the child code in the forking program is only long enough to load in the
I am still only one process.
I am the child process.
I am the parent process; my child’s ID is 23307.
I am the parent process; my child’s ID is 23307.
I am the child process.
I am the parent process; my child’s ID is 23307.
I am the child process.
I am the parent process; my child’s ID is 23307.
I am the child process.
I am the parent process; my child’s ID is 23307.
I am the child process.

Figure 7.2  This sample output from the forker program of Figure 7.1 shows just one possible sequence of events.

new program and start it running. This happens, for example, every time you type a program’s name at a shell prompt; the shell forks off a child process in which it runs the program. Although the program execution is distinct from the process forking, the two are used in combination. Therefore, I will turn next to how a thread running in a process can load a new program and start that program running.

The POSIX standard includes six different procedures, any one of which can be used to load in a new program and start it running. The six are all variants on a theme; because they have names starting with exec, they are commonly called the exec family. Each member of the exec family must be given enough information to find the new program stored in a file and to provide the program with any arguments and environment variables it needs. The family members differ in exactly how the calling program provides this information. Because the family members are so closely related, most systems define only the execve procedure in the kernel of the operating system itself; the others are library procedures written in terms of execve.

Because exec1 is one of the simpler members of the family, I will use it for an example. The program in Figure 7.3 prints out a line identifying itself, including its own process ID number, which it gets using the getpid procedure. Then it uses exec1 to run a program, named ps, which prints out information about running processes. After the call to exec1 comes a line that prints out an error message, saying that the execution failed. You may find it surprising that the error message seems to be issued unconditionally, without an if statement testing whether an error in fact occurred. The reason for this surprising situation is that members of the exec family return only if an error occurs; if all is well, the new program has started running, replacing the old program within the process, and so there is no possibility of returning in the old program.

#include <unistd.h>
#include <stdio.h>
#include <iostream>
using namespace std;

int main()
{
    cout << "This is the process with ID " << getpid()
    << ", before the exec. " << endl;
    execl("/bin/ps", "ps", "axl", NULL);
    perror("error execing ps");
    return -1;
}

Figure 7.3 This C++ program, execer.cpp, illustrates how the procedure execl (a member of the exec family) can be used to change which program the current process is running. The same process ID that this program reports as its own is later shown by the ps program as being its own, because the same process starts running the ps program. Note also the unconditional error message after the call to execl; only if execl fails does the calling program continue to run.

Looking in more detail at the example program’s use of exec1, you can see that it takes several arguments that are strings, followed by the special NULL pointer. The reason for the NULL is to mark the end of the list of strings; although this example had three strings, other uses of execl might have fewer or more. The first string specifies which file contains the program to run; here it is /bin/ps, that is, the ps program in the /bin directory, which generally contains fundamental programs. The remaining strings are the so-called "command-line arguments," which are made available to the program to control its behavior. Of these, the first is conventionally a repeat of the command’s name; here, that is ps. The remaining argument, axl, contains both the letters ax indicating that all processes should be listed and the letter l indicating that more complete information should be listed for each process. As you can see from the sample output in Figure 7.4, the exact same process ID that is mentioned in the initial message shows up again as the ID of the process running the ps axl command. The process ID remains the same because execl has changed what program the process is running without changing the process itself.

One inconvenience about exec1 is that to use it, you need to know the directory in which the program file is located. For example, the previous program will not work if ps happens to be installed somewhere other than /bin on your system. To avoid this problem, you can use execlp. You can give this variant a filename that does not include a directory, and it will search through a list of directories looking for the file, just like the shell does when you type in a command. This can be illustrated with an example program that combines fork with execlp, as shown in Figure 7.5.
This is the process with ID 3849, before the exec.

```
UID    PID ... COMMAND
...
0 3849 ... ps axl
```

Figure 7.4 This sample output from the `execer` program in Figure 7.3 was made narrower and shorter by omitting many of the columns of output produced by the `ps axl` command as well as many of its lines of output. The remaining output suffices to show that the process had process ID (PID) 3849 before it executed `ps axl`, and that the same process became the process running the `ps axl` command.

```
#include <unistd.h>
#include <stdio.h>

int main(){
    pid_t returnedValue = fork();
    if(returnedValue < 0){
        perror("error forking");
        return -1;
    } else if (returnedValue == 0){
        execlp("xclock", "xclock", NULL);
        perror("error execing xclock");
        return -1;
    } else {
        return 0;
    }
}
```

Figure 7.5 This C program, `launcher.c`, runs `xclock` without waiting for it. The program does so by forking off a child process and executing `xclock` in that child process. The result is that `xclock` continues to run in its own window while the parent process exits, allowing the shell from which this program was run to prompt for another command.

This example program assumes you are running the X Window System, as on most Linux or UNIX systems. It runs `xclock`, a program that displays a clock in a separate window. If you run this program from a shell, you will see the clock window appear, and your shell will prompt you for the next command to execute while the clock keeps running. This is different than what happens if you type `xclock` directly to the
shell. In that case, the shell waits for the `xclock` program to exit before prompting for another command. Instead, the example program is more similar to typing `xclock &` to the shell. The `&` character tells the shell not to wait for the program to exit; the program is said to run “in the background.” The way the shell does this is exactly the same as the sample program: it forks off a child process, executes the program in the child process, and allows the parent process to go on its way. In the shell, the parent loops back around to prompt for another command.

When the shell is not given the `&` character, it still forks off a child process and runs the requested command in the child process, but now the parent does not continue to execute concurrently. Instead, the parent waits for the child process to terminate before the parent continues. The same pattern of fork, execute, and wait would apply in any case where the forking of a child process is not to enable concurrency, but rather to provide a separate process context in which to run another program.

In order to wait for a child process, the parent process can invoke the `waitpid` procedure. This procedure takes three arguments; the first is the process ID of the child for which the parent should wait, and the other two can be zero if all you want the parent to do is to wait for termination. As an example of a process that waits for each of its child processes, Figure 7.6 shows a very stripped-down shell. This shell can be used to run the user’s choice of commands, such as `date`, `ls`, and `ps`, as illustrated in Figure 7.7. A real shell would allow command line arguments, offer background execution as an option, and provide many other features. Nonetheless, you now understand the basics of how a shell runs programs. In Programming Projects 7.3 and 7.4, you can add some of the missing features.

The exec family of procedures interacts in an interesting fashion with protection mechanisms. When a process executes a program file, there is ordinarily almost no impact on the process’s protection context. Any capabilities (for reading and writing files, for example) remain intact, and the process continues to operate with the same user identification credentials. This means that when you run a program, generally it is acting on your behalf, with the access rights that correspond to your user identification. However, there is one important exception. A program file can have a special set user ID (setuid) bit set on it, in which case, a process that executes the program acquires the credential of the file’s owner.

Because a setuid program can check which user ran it, and can check all sorts of other data (the time of day, for example), the setuid mechanism provides an extremely general mechanism for granting access rights. You can grant any subset of your rights to any other users you choose, under any conditions that you can program, by writing a setuid program that tests for the conditions and then performs the controlled access. As a mundane example, you can create a game program that has the ability to write into a file of high scores, no matter who is running it, even though other users...
#include <unistd.h>
#include <stdio.h>
#include <sys/wait.h>
#include <string>
#include <iostream>
using namespace std;

int main()
{
    while(1)
    {
        cout << "Command (one word only)> " << flush;
        string command;
        cin >> command;
        if(command == "exit")
        {
            return 0;
        }
        else
        {
            pid_t returnedValue = fork();
            if(returnedValue < 0)
            {
                perror("error forking");
                return -1;
            }
            else if (returnedValue == 0)
            {
                execlp(command.c_str(), command.c_str(), NULL);
                perror(command.c_str());
                return -1;
            }
            else
            {
                if(waitpid(returnedValue, 0, 0) < 0)
                {
                    perror("error waiting for child");
                    return -1;
                }
            }
        }
    }
    return 0;
}

Figure 7.6  This C++ program, microshell.cpp, is a stripped-down shell that waits for each child process.

are forbidden from directly writing into the file. A similar program you have likely encountered is the one you use to change your password. That program can update a password database that you do not have permission to directly modify. As I will discuss in Section 7.6, the setuid mechanism’s flexibility makes it useful for enforcing security policies; however, I will also point out in Section 7.6 that the same mechanism is the source of many security pitfalls. (Even ordinary program execution, with credentials left unchanged, can be a security problem, as I will discuss.)
This sample interaction shows the **date**, **ls**, and **ps** commands being run within the **microshell** from Figure 7.6.

At this point, you have seen many of the key elements of the process life cycle. Perhaps the most important omission is that I haven’t shown how processes can terminate, other than by returning from the main procedure. A process can terminate itself by using the **exit** procedure (in Java, `System.exit`), or it can terminate another process using the **kill** procedure (see the documentation for details). Rather than exploring process programming further here, I will move on to the mechanisms that operating systems use to protect the memory occupied by processes. If you want to pursue application programming further, the notes section at the end of the chapter suggests additional reading.

### 7.3 Protecting Memory

Memory protection is the most fundamental barrier between processes, as well as between each process and the operating system. If a process could freely write into the operating system’s data structures, the operating system would be unable to enforce any other kind of protection. Moreover, if processes could freely write into each other’s memory, a process without ability to write a file (for example) could manipulate another into doing so for it. Thus, to understand any other kind of protection, you need to first understand how memory is protected.

Section 7.3.1 explains the foundation of this protection, which is the processor’s ability to switch between a restricted and an unrestricted mode of operation. Sections 7.3.2 and 7.3.3 explain how memory protection can be built on that foundation in either of two ways: by giving each process its own virtual memory address space or by giving the processes differing access rights within a single address space.
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7.3.1 The Foundation of Protection: Two Processor Modes

Whether the operating system gives each process its own address space, or instead gives each process its own access rights to portions of a shared address space, the operating system needs to be privileged relative to the processes. That is, the operating system must be able to carry out actions, such as changing address spaces or access rights, that the processes themselves cannot perform. Otherwise, the processes wouldn’t be truly contained; they could get access to each other’s memory the same way the operating system does.

For this reason, every modern processor can run in two different modes, one for the operating system and one for the application processes. The names of these modes vary from system to system. The more privileged mode is sometimes called kernel mode, system mode, or supervisor mode. Of these, kernel mode seems to be in most common use, so I will use it. The less privileged mode is often called user mode.

When the processor is in kernel mode, it can execute any instructions it encounters, including ones to change memory accessibility, ones to directly interact with I/O devices, and ones to switch to user mode and jump to an instruction address that is accessible in user mode. This last kind of instruction is used when the operating system is ready to give a user process some time to run.

When the processor is in user mode, it will execute normal instructions, such as add, load, or store. However, any attempt to perform hardware-level I/O or change memory accessibility interrupts the process’s execution and jumps to a handler in the operating system, an occurrence known as a trap. The same sort of transfer to the operating system occurs for a page fault or any interrupt, such as a timer going off or an I/O device requesting attention. Additionally, the process may directly execute an instruction to call an operating system procedure, which is known as a system call. For example, the process could use system calls to ask the operating system to perform the fork and execve operations that I described in Section 7.2. System calls can also request I/O, because the process doesn’t have unmediated access to the I/O devices. Any transfer to an operating system routine changes the operating mode and jumps to the starting address of the routine. Only designated entry points may be jumped to in this way; the process can’t just jump into the middle of the operating system at an arbitrary address.

The operating system needs to have access to its own portion of memory, as well as the memory used by processes. The processes, however, must not have access to the operating system’s private memory. Thus, switching operating modes must also entail a change in memory protection. How this is done varies between architectures.

Some architectures require the operating system to use one address space for its own access, as well as one for each process. For example, if a special register points
at the base of the page table, this register may need to be changed every time the operating mode changes. The page table for the operating system can provide access to pages that are unavailable to any of the processes.

Many other architectures allow each page table entry to contain two different protection settings, one for each operating mode. For example, a page can be marked as readable, writable, and executable when in kernel mode, but totally inaccessible when in user mode. In this case, the page table need not be changed when switching operating modes. If the kernel uses the same page table as the user-mode process, then the range of addresses occupied by the kernel will be off limits to the process. The IA-32 architecture fits this pattern. For example, the Linux operating system on the IA-32 allows each user-mode process to access up to 3 GB of its 4-GB address space, while reserving 1 GB for access by the kernel only.

In this latter sort of architecture, the address space doesn’t change when switching from a user process to a simple operating system routine and back to the same user process. However, the operating system may still need to switch address spaces before returning to user mode if its scheduler decides the time has come to run a thread belonging to a different user-mode process. Whether this change of address spaces is necessary depends on the overall system design: one address space per process or a single shared address space. Sections 7.3.2 and 7.3.3 address these alternatives.

Having described the distinction between kernel mode and user mode, I am also now in a position to explain the three ways in which threads can be implemented using those modes. Figure 7.8 shows the three options in schematic form; I explain them in the following paragraphs.

As described in Chapters 2 and 6, operating system kernels use threads for their own internal purposes, such as zeroing out unused page frames or flushing dirty pages

![Figure 7.8](image) Three relationships are possible between threads, the scheduling and dispatching code that switches threads, and the operating modes: (a) the threads can be part of the kernel, along with the kernel’s scheduler and dispatcher; (b) the threads can run mostly in user mode, but be scheduled and dispatched in the kernel; (c) the threads can run in user mode along with a user-level scheduler and dispatcher.
out to disk. In these circumstances, the threads may execute entirely within kernel mode; they are called *kernel threads*. As shown in Figure 7.8(a), the processor can run a first kernel thread, the kernel’s scheduling and thread dispatching code, and then a second kernel thread, all without leaving kernel mode.

An operating system kernel’s scheduler may also choose to run a thread that is part of a user-mode process. As shown in Figure 7.8(b), switching between user threads requires two mode switches, even if the threads are in the same process. First, a switch from user mode to kernel mode is needed when moving from one user thread to the scheduler. Second, a switch from kernel mode back to user mode is needed when the kernel dispatches the next user thread. Nomenclature for these kernel-supported user threads is not standardized; the most common term seems to be *native threads*, or simply *threads* when the context is clear.

To avoid mode-switching costs when switching threads within a process, some middleware systems provide scheduling and dispatching mechanisms analogous to the kernel’s but residing within the user-level code, that is, the code running in user mode. As shown in Figure 7.8(c), this allows the outgoing thread, the scheduler, and the incoming thread to all execute in user mode with no mode switch—provided the two threads are in the same process. These threads are commonly called *user-level threads*, but I prefer Microsoft’s name, *fibers*. This name makes clear that I am not talking about Figure 7.8(b)’s threads, which also contain user-level code. Moreover, the name provides a nice metaphor, suggesting that multiple fibers exist within one native, kernel-supported thread. As shown in Figure 7.9, the kernel’s scheduler divides the processor between threads, but within each thread, there can also be a user-level scheduler switching between fibers.

Although you needed to understand the two processor modes in order to appreciate the preceding three kinds of threads, you should keep in mind that I introduced

---

**Figure 7.9** Multiple user-level threads can be enclosed in each kernel-supported native thread. The kernel’s scheduler switches between the enclosing native threads. Within each of them, user-level dispatching also occurs. This creates what Microsoft calls fibers within the threads.
you to the processor modes for a different reason. Namely, the processor modes pro-
vide the foundation for the protection of processes. For example, the processor modes
allow each process to be confined within its own address space in a multiple address
space system.

7.3.2 The Mainstream: Multiple Address Space Systems
Most operating systems (including Linux, Microsoft Windows, and Mac OS X) pro-
vide memory protection by giving each process its own virtual memory address space.
Unless the application programmer makes special arrangements, these address spaces
are completely disjoint. However, the programmer can explicitly ask the operating
system to map the same file, or the same block of shared memory space, into several
processes’ address spaces.

The multiple address space design is particularly appropriate on architectures with
comparatively narrow addresses. For example, a 32-bit address can reference only a
4-GB address space. If a 32-bit system is going to run several processes, each of which
has a couple gigabytes of data to access, the only way to obtain enough space is by
using multiple address spaces. This motivation for multiple address spaces goes away
(for present practical purposes) on 64-bit systems.

Regardless of address size, the multiple address space design confers other advan-
tages, which I mentioned in Section 6.1, where I provided a rationale for virtual mem-
ory. Each process can allocate virtual addresses independently from the others. This
means that a compiler can build addresses into a program, even though several con-
current processes may be running the same program; each will be able to use the pre-
determined addresses for its own copy of data. Moreover, procedures to dynamically
allocate memory (for example, when creating objects) can work independently in the
different processes. Even shared memory can independently appear at the most con-
vienient virtual address for each process. For example, several processes running the
same program can all consistently use one virtual address for their input channels,
and all consistently use a second virtual address for their output channels, even if one
process’s output channel is another’s input channel.

However, independent address spaces can also confer disadvantages. I briefly men-
tioned one in Section 6.2.2: inconsistent virtual addresses for shared memory means
pointer-based structures can’t be shared. At the level of abstraction provided by pro-
grammimg languages, objects are linked together by pointers (as in C++) or references
(as in Java). At the lower level of abstraction executed by the computer, these language
constructs generally are represented by virtual addresses; one object contains the vir-
tual address of another. With separate address spaces, virtual addresses are meaningful
only within one process. Thus, while a shared memory region can contain a simple data structure, such as a contiguous array of characters, it cannot contain anything complex enough to need pointers, such as a linked list or tree. Strictly speaking, pointers can be used as long as they are represented other than as virtual addresses (which most compilers won’t do) or the processes take care to map the shared memory into the same locations (which is difficult to square with their independent allocation of other memory). Pointer-based data structures that span multiple shared-memory regions are even more problematic.

You can see one important variant of the pointer problem if you recognize that memory holds code as well as data. Instructions sometimes include virtual addresses: either the virtual address of another instruction to jump to or the virtual address of a data location to load or store. The virtual addresses included within instructions suffer the same fate as pointers: either they need to be kept local to one process or the processes need to coordinate their assignments of virtual addresses. However, if the processes need to coordinate address allocation, you have already traded away one of the advantages of separate address spaces.

Another disadvantage to separate address spaces is that addresses cannot be used as the ultimate system-wide name for objects. For example, suppose two processes are communicating, and one of them wants to suggest to the other that it map some new object into its address space. The sending process can’t specify the object in question by address (even though it may have an address for the object), because the receiving process doesn’t yet have an address for the object. Instead, the communication needs to be in terms of some other, address-neutral nomenclature, such as filenames. Similarly, virtual addresses can’t play any role in persistent storage of objects, because their validity is confined to a single executing process.

None of these disadvantages has been sufficiently severe as to displace multiple address space systems from the mainstream. However, the disadvantages have been sufficient to cause system designers to explore the alternative, which is for all processes to share a single address space. Single address space systems have even been commercially deployed—in one case with considerable success. Therefore, I will move next to a consideration of such systems.

7.3.3 An Alternative: Single Address Space Systems

There is no need to consider in detail the advantages and disadvantages of a single address space; they are the exact opposite of those for multiple address spaces. Processes can share and store addresses freely but need to coordinate on their allocation. Instead of rehearsing the case for and against a single address space system, I will consider how one could still protect memory with such a system.
Beyond questions of security, memory protection is critical because programs contain bugs. Debugging is challenging enough even if the result of a bug in one process always manifests itself as a symptom in that same process. However, without memory protection, a bug in one process can cause a symptom in another process, because the bug can take the form of writing into memory being used by the other process. This situation, in which a process’s data seems to spontaneously change as a result of a bug in an unrelated process, is a debugging nightmare. Thus, even in a single address space system, processes must have varying access rights to memory. The goal in moving to a single address space is simply to decouple the question of accessibility from that of addressability. The latter concerns whether a memory location can be named, whereas the former concerns whether the location can be read and written.

In a multiple address space system, the processes are protected from one another through addressability; each process will typically have no ability to name the memory locations being used by the others. Even when two address spaces share a particular region of memory, the accessibility of that region is seldom modulated independently for the individual processes. For example, it would be rare for a shared-memory region to be marked read-only for one process but not another. By contrast, the processes in a single address space system are not separated at all by addressability; they can all name any memory location. Instead, the processes differ with regard to the memory regions they have permission to read and write.

Intel’s Itanium architecture contains a representative mechanism for supporting protection in a shared address space. Each page table entry (in a hashed page table) contains a protection key, which is a number. The idea is that all pages that are to be protected in the same way have the same key. In particular, if a data structure spans several pages, all the pages would have the same key. Giving a process the right to read pages with that key would give that process the right to read the whole structure. A collection of at least sixteen special registers holds protection keys possessed by the currently executing process. Every memory access is checked: does the process have a key that matches the accessed page? If not, the hardware traps to an operating system handler, much like for a page fault.

Processes may need access to more independently protected memory regions than the number of protection key registers. Therefore, the operating system will normally use those registers as only a cache of recently accessed structures’ keys, much like a TLB. When a protection key miss fault occurs, the operating system will not immediately assume the access was illegal. Instead, it will first search a comprehensive list of the process’s keys. If the missing key is found there, the operating system will load it into one of the key registers and resume execution. Only if the process truly doesn’t have the key does the operating system cope with the illegal access, such as by terminating the process.
Each protection key register contains not only a key number, but also a set of access control bits for read, write, and execute permissions. Recall that each page table entry also has access control bits. A process can access a page only if it has the appropriate permission in its key register and the page table entry also allows the access. Thus, the page table entry can specify the maximum access for any process, whereas the protection key registers can provide modulated access for individual processes. For example, a process may only be able to read a group of pages that some other process can write.

Although single address space systems remain outside the mainstream, at least one has proved to be commercially viable. In the 1970s, IBM chose the single address space design for an innovative product line, the System/38, aimed at small businesses. In 1988, they issued a revised version of the same basic design, the AS/400, and in 2000 they renamed the AS/400 the iSeries. Whatever it may be called, the design has proved successful; as of June 2005, IBM reports that more than 400,000 iSeries servers are installed worldwide.

7.4 Representing Access Rights

In Sections 7.4.2 and 7.4.3, I will present the two principle approaches to representing access rights. First, though, I will use Section 7.4.1 to clarify the vocabulary used for discussing protection systems.

7.4.1 Fundamentals of Access Rights

A protection system controls access to objects by subjects. An object is whatever kind of entity needs protection: a region of memory, a file, a service that translates names to addresses, or anything else. A subject is the active entity attempting to make use of an object; I will generally assume that it is a process, because each thread within the process has the same access rights. Each kind of object has its own repertory of operations that a subject can perform on it, if the protection system permits: for example, a memory region may have read and write operations, whereas a naming service may have lookup, insert, and modify operations. Each subject is also an object, because operations can be performed on subjects, such as the operation of terminating a process.

Although protection mechanisms normally operate in terms of access rights given to subjects (that is, processes within the computer), those access rights ultimately should reflect the external authority of human users. To capture this notion, I will say that each subject is acting on behalf of a principal. For most purposes, you can equate the word “principal” with “user.”
I use the technical word “principal” because occasionally the principal will be an organization rather than an individual, and because a server process may treat client processes as principals, for its purposes, even though the client processes are really only intermediaries, themselves operated by users. The distinguishing feature of a principal is that its rights are completely a question of policy, not of technical mechanism. If organizational policy directs a web server to grant some rights to particular client web browsers (such as those at on-campus addresses), then it is treating those browsers as principals. If, on the other hand, the organizational policy directs the web server to attempt to identify the human sitting at the web browser and grant access rights on that basis, then the human is the principal and the web browser is just an intermediary subject.

As my example of a web server indicates, a subject may operate on behalf of one principal at one time and a different principal at a different time. One common, but unsatisfactory, design is for the operating system’s protection mechanism to give the subject the union of all the access rights it needs for all the principals. The subject then has the responsibility to enforce more specific protections. A better design would be for the operating system’s protection mechanism to allow the server to switch from one set of access rights to another. In this case, the subject is said to move from one protection domain to another; a protection domain is simply the set of access rights possessed by a subject.

Some subjects may also need to switch domains in order to obtain extra access rights that would not normally be available to the principal. I have already mentioned one form this can take. In systems such as Linux and UNIX, when a process executes a program that has the setuid bit set, the process switches protection domains by taking on the identity of the program file’s owner, with all the corresponding access rights.

At any one time, you can look at one subject (call it S) and one object (call it O) and say that S is allowed to perform some particular set of operations on O. To generalize this to the whole system, one can picture the instantaneous state of a protection system as an access matrix, with one row for each subject and one column for each object. The entry in row S and column O of the matrix is the set of operations that S can perform on O, as shown in Figure 7.10. Any attempt by a subject to perform an operation can be checked for legality by reference to the matrix.

The access matrix in most systems is very dynamic; it gains and loses columns and rows, and the operations listed in individual cells of the matrix change over time. For example, forking off a new process would add a row and a column to the matrix, because the new process is both a subject and an object. If the process executes a setuid program, many of the entries in that process’s row of the matrix would change, because the new user identity conveys different access rights to many objects.
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### Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Operations S can perform on O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7.10** An access matrix has one row for each subject, one column for each object, and entries showing which operations each subject can perform on each object.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>P₁</th>
<th>P₂</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>change accessibility</td>
<td>transfer rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7.11** An access matrix can contain rights that control changes to the matrix itself. In this example, the processes P₁ and P₂ have the right to change the accessibility of file F, that is, to change entries in F’s column of the access matrix. Process P₁ also has the right to transfer rights to process P₂, that is, to copy any access right from the P₁ row of the matrix to the corresponding entry in the P₂ row. Notice that the representation of the right to transfer rights relies upon that fact that each subject is also an object.

Some changes to the access matrix also reflect explicit protection operations, such as making a formerly private file readable by everyone or passing an access right held by one process to another process. These protection operations can themselves be regulated by access rights listed in the access matrix, as illustrated in Figure 7.11. Changing a file’s accessibility would be an operation on that file, contained in some entries within that file’s column of the matrix. Normally, this operation would not appear in every entry of the column, because only some processes should be able to change the file’s accessibility. If only processes P₁ and P₂ have the right to change file F’s accessibility, then the corresponding change-accessibility access right would show up in the matrix in two spots, exactly where rows P₁ and P₂ intersect with column F. Similarly, if process P₁ can pass an access right along to process P₂, there might be an entry in row P₁ and column P₂ conferring that transfer-rights permission. (Recall that subjects, such as P₂, are also objects, and hence have columns as well as rows.)
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(a) | $F_1$ | $F_2$ | $J\text{Doe}$ | $P_1$ | ...  
---|---|---|---|---|---
$J\text{Doe}$ | read | write |  |  |  
$P_1$ | read | write |  |  |  
... |  |  |  |  |  

(b) | $F_1$ | $F_2$ | $J\text{Doe}$ | $P_1$ | ...  
---|---|---|---|---|---
$J\text{Doe}$ | read | write |  |  |  
$P_1$ |  |  | use the rights of |  |  
... |  |  |  |  |  

Figure 7.12 If access rights are initially granted to a principal, such as $J\text{Doe}$, then there are two options for how those rights can be conveyed to a process, such as $P_1$, operating on behalf of that principal. In option (a), when the process $P_1$ is created, all of $J\text{Doe}$’s rights are copied to $P_1$’s row of the matrix; in this example, the rights are to read file $F_1$ and write file $F_2$. In option (b), $P_1$ is given just a special right to indirectly use the rights of $J\text{Doe}$.

In order to fit common protection mechanisms into the access matrix model, some slight contortions are necessary. For example, many mechanisms include access rights granted to principals (users), independent of whether they are running any computations at the time. Thus, it becomes necessary to add the principals themselves as subjects, in addition to their processes. Access rights can then go in both the row for the principal and the rows (if any) for the processes running on behalf of the principal. When a principal starts running a new process, the protection system can initialize the newly added row with rights taken from the principal’s row. Alternatively, the process can just have rights to a special operation on the principal object, allowing it to indirectly use the principal’s rights. Figure 7.12 illustrates both alternatives.

The access matrix model is very general: protections are established by sets of operations contained in an access matrix, which include operations to change the matrix itself. This generality suggests that one could construct an elegant mathematical theory of protection systems, which would work independently from the specifics of concrete systems. Unfortunately, the model’s generality itself limits the results such a mathematical theory can provide. Harrison, Ruzzo, and Ullman showed that under very basic assumptions, the general access matrix model can simulate a Turing machine, with the matrix playing the role of the Turing machine’s tape. Fundamental questions, such as whether a particular access right leaks out, turn out to be equivalent to the halting problem and, as such, are undecidable. Even restricting the problems enough to render them decidable may not make them practically solvable; for example, some fall into the class of PSPACE-complete problems. As explained
in the end-of-chapter notes, this classification from computational complexity theory contains only very hard problems for which efficient solution algorithms are unlikely to exist. Thus, concrete protection systems need to be analyzed individually, rather than by reference to general results about the access matrix model.

Access matrices can represent very different security policies, depending on their contents. If you focus on the operations that allow modification of the matrix, you can distinguish two broad categories of policies: Discretionary Access Control (DAC) and Mandatory Access Control (MAC).

Most mainstream systems (such as Linux, Microsoft Windows, and Mac OS X) are usually configured to use DAC, so you are probably familiar with that class of policies, even if you are not familiar with the name. In a DAC system, each object is considered to be owned by a principal; when one of your processes creates an object (such as a file), you become its owner. The owner has broad rights to control the object’s accessibility. As the owner of a file, you can choose whether to let other users read or write the file. In some DAC systems, you can go even further than giving away arbitrary access rights to your files; you can give away transferable rights, allowing other users to further propagate access to your files.

By contrast, an object’s creator in a MAC system does not obtain control over access rights to the object. Instead, the access rights are determined by an explicit security policy and can be changed only within the parameters of that policy, often only by a designated security officer, rather than by an ordinary user. For example, consider a MAC system that enforces the military policy with regard to classified documents. If you are using such a system and have created a classified document, the fact that you are the creator does not give you any special control. You cannot choose to give access to users who are not cleared for the document’s classification level. The only way the document can be made readable to those users is by declassifying it, an operation that only security officers can perform.

I will postpone further comparison between DAC and MAC systems until Section 7.6. Even there, I will include only the basics, leaving more detailed treatment for Chapter 11. For now, I will explain the two techniques that are used to keep track of access rights, independent of what sort of policy those rights are enforcing. The first technique is the use of capabilities, which I explain in Section 7.4.2. The second technique is the use of access control lists and credentials, which I explain in Section 7.4.3.

### 7.4.2 Capabilities

A *capability* is an indirect reference to an object, much like a pointer. The key distinction is that a capability includes not only the information needed to locate the object,
but also a set of access rights. For example, two processes could possess capabilities for the same file, but one of them might have a read-only capability to the file, whereas the other might have a capability that permitted both reading and writing. A process that possesses capabilities has a tangible representation of entries from its row of the access matrix.

Nomenclature, as always, is not standardized. Although the word “capability” dates back to the mid-1960s and is popular in the academic literature, other names are used by today’s mainstream operating systems. Microsoft Windows refers to capabilities as handles, and POSIX systems such as Linux and UNIX refer to them as descriptors. Continuing with the example of files, a Windows process could have a file handle that permitted reading only, and a Linux process could have a file descriptor that permitted reading only. (As you will see shortly, the handles and descriptors are actually even more indirect than capabilities; however, for everyday purposes, programmers can and do think about them in the same way as capabilities.)

To further confuse matters, the designers of Linux and UNIX systems have recently started using the word “capability” in a somewhat different sense. A capability in this new sense of the word confers rights, but does not refer to a specific object. For example, a process might hold a capability that allows it to access any file, or one that allows it to kill any process. To distinguish the two senses, these new object-independent capabilities are sometimes called “POSIX capabilities,” even though the draft standard that would have made them part of POSIX was in fact abandoned. I will not use the word “capability” in this sense.

A process can store its capabilities in either of two ways, depending on the design of the operating system. Most systems give each process a special storage area just for capabilities, independent of the normal virtual memory address space of the process. Microsoft Windows and the POSIX systems take this approach. The alternative approach, taken by the iSeries, is for a process’s capabilities to be stored in normal memory, just like any other data.

A separate storage area for capabilities is called a C-list, which is short for capability list. You will also frequently see C-lists called by system-specific names, such as handle tables in Microsoft Windows and descriptor tables in POSIX systems. Systems with C-lists provide special system calls to put entries into the C-list or otherwise operate on it, because normal load and store operations are not applicable. Entries in the C-list are referred to by their integer positions within the list. For example, an operation to read from a file takes an integer argument, which must be the position within the C-list of a file capability that includes the read permission. An operation to open a file for reading adds an entry to the C-list and returns the integer index of that entry.

It is these integer indices into the C-list that serve as handles in Microsoft Windows or as descriptors in POSIX. The integers can be stored anywhere in the process’s
memory; however, they do not have any significance outside the process, and so cannot be used for interprocess communication or for persistent storage. In order to pass a capability from one process to another, you need to use a special system call. The sending process specifies the capability to send by its integer index, and the receiving process is notified of its newly acquired capability as an integer index. However, the receiving process will in general be given a different integer than the sending process sent, because the two processes each have their own C-lists. In POSIX systems, descriptors are sent using `sendmsg` and received using `recvmsg`.

The capability model is incomplete as an explanation of POSIX file descriptors. As I will explain in Chapter 8, to fully understand file descriptors, you need to consider not only their capability-like properties, but also how the operating system keeps track of other information associated with each open file, especially the current position within the file for reading or writing. For the present chapter, however, I prefer to continue with the topic of capabilities, explaining another option for how they can be stored.

Instead of segregating the capabilities into a C-list for each process and forcing each process to use positions within its C-list as surrogates for the capabilities, an operating system can give the processes direct possession of the capabilities. In particular, IBM chose this approach for the System/38 and carried it forward into the AS/400 and iSeries. I call these nonsegregated capabilities addressable capabilities, because they are stored within the address space.

Capabilities that are addressable values are considerably more flexible than the C-list variety. By storing addressable capabilities within objects, software can use them to link several independently protected objects together into a larger structure, just as pointers would be used to make a more traditional structure of linked objects. This flexibility is particularly valuable in the iSeries, because (as I mentioned in Section 7.3.3) it is a single address space system.

The major difficulty with addressable capabilities is how to prevent an application program from forging them. (Recall that in the C-list approach, the operating system stores capabilities in memory inaccessible to the process, so forgery is a nonissue.) Normally, the capabilities should come from trusted system calls. However, if the capabilities are stored in ordinary memory locations, what is to stop a program from writing the appropriate set of bits to look like a capability and then using that forged capability to perform a protected operation?

Three basic approaches exist to prevent capability forgery. The approach used by the iSeries relies on special hardware features. Each memory word is supplemented by a tag bit indicating whether the word contains part of a capability. All normal instructions set the bit to 0, whereas capability operations set it to 1. Only words with their tag bits set to 1 can be used as a capability.
An alternative approach uses cryptographic techniques to achieve a high probability that forgeries will be detected, without needing special hardware. If each capability is represented by a large string of essentially random bits, and the operating system can check whether a given string of bits is valid, the only way to forge a capability would be by an incredibly lucky guess.

The third approach to preventing capability forgery forces all user programs to be processed by a trusted translator that enforces a strong type system. The type system prevents capability forgery the same way as any other type error. Interestingly, the iSeries does put all user programs through a trusted translator; apparently its type system is simply too weak to function without special tagging hardware. You will see an example of a stronger type system providing protection in Section 7.5.1, where I discuss the use of the Java Virtual Machine to provide protection at a finer granularity than operating system processes.

With the iSeries’s combination of a single address space and addressable capabilities, determining the set of all capabilities available to a given process is not an easy job. They are not all in one place, unlike with a C-list. Nor can one just scan the process’s address space looking for capabilities, because the process does not have an individual address space. Instead, it has access to those portions of the shared address space that are reachable through its capabilities. That is, each capability the process has available leads to an object, which can in turn contain more capabilities, leading to more objects. Some capabilities might lead back to already discovered objects. Thus, to find all the capabilities would require a general directed graph traversal algorithm, similar to what is needed for a garbage collector.

Regardless of how easy- or hard-to-find a process’s capabilities are, one can recognize this set of capabilities as being the link to the abstract model of protection systems, which is the access matrix. Each process’s set of capabilities corresponds with one row of the access matrix, because it records one subject’s rights to objects. For a hypothetical system that provided protection purely through capabilities, the correspondence between access matrix rows and capability sets would be exact. The correspondence is less direct in real systems, which blend capability-based protection with access control lists, a topic I consider in Section 7.4.3. Because of this hybridization of protection representations, a process’s set of capabilities holds only a portion of the contents of an access matrix row.

In all common operating systems, capabilities can be selectively granted but not selectively revoked. As an example of the selective granting of capabilities, an operating system will not allow just any process to open up a file of private information and obtain the corresponding capability. (You will see in Section 7.4.3 how the system achieves this.) However, once a process has the capability—whether by
successfully opening the file or by being passed the capability by another, more privileged, process—it can continue to operate on the file. The file's owner cannot revoke the capability, short of destroying the file itself. (In POSIX systems, the owner can’t even destroy the open file, but just its contents and any names it has.)

Several systems (such as Multics and various research systems) have supported selective revocation, in which some capabilities to an object can be revoked, while others remain valid. One approach is to keep track of the location of all copies of a capability; they can be invalidated by overwriting them. Another approach is to check whether a capability is still valid each time it is used to request an operation. For example, if capabilities are large random strings of bits, each object can contain a list of the valid capabilities.

Irrevocable capabilities are difficult to reconcile with system security. For this reason, the architects of the AS/400 made a change (relative to the original design taken from System/38) and eliminated all use of capabilities except within the operating system itself.

The POSIX systems take a more pragmatic approach to the problem of irrevocable capabilities. These systems use capabilities only for short-term storage of access rights while a process is running. As such, any excess access rights caused by the irrevocable capabilities will go away when the system is rebooted, in the worst case. Long-term storage of access rights is provided by access control lists, which are the next topic of this chapter.

### 7.4.3 Access Control Lists and Credentials

As you have seen, a capability list collects together the access rights held by a process. This row-wise slice of the access matrix is natural when considering the instantaneous rights of a process as it executes. However, it is much less natural when setting down (or auditing) longer-term policy regarding access rights. For those purposes, most systems use a mechanism based on user credentials and access control lists.

An *access control list (ACL)* is essentially a column-wise slice of the access matrix, listing for one object what subjects may access the object, and in what manner. Rather than listing the subjects at the fine granularity of individual processes, an ACL specifies rights for users (that is, principals) or for named groups of users.

I can show you an example of an ACL on a Microsoft Windows system by pulling up the Properties dialog box for a folder and selecting the Security tab on that dialog box. The visual form of the dialog boxes is dependent on the particular version of Windows, but the principles apply to all modern versions. As shown in Figure 7.13, the folder named “max” has an ACL with three entries: two for groups of users
(Administrators and SYSTEM) and one for an individual user (myself). In the bottom part of the dialog box, you can see that any process running with a credential from the Administrators group is allowed Full Control over this folder. The permissions (such as Full Control) listed here are actually abbreviations for sets of permissions; to see the individual permissions, one needs to click the Advanced button (which gives the dialog box in Figure 7.14) and then the View/Edit button, producing the result shown in Figure 7.15. As you can see, Full Control actually is a set of thirteen different permissions. Some of these permissions (those with slashes in their names) have different interpretations when applied to folders than when applied to files.

One subtlety in Figures 7.13 and 7.15 concerns the presence of the Deny column of check boxes; this column is to the right of the Allow column. You might suspect that this is redundant, with the Deny box checked whenever the Allow box is unchecked. Although that is a reasonable suspicion, it is wrong. You can see in Figure 7.16 that the Users group has been neither allowed nor denied the ability to create files in the Program Files folder. To understand ACLs, you need to understand the difference between denying a permission and not allowing it.

As you have seen, an ACL entry can allow a permission, deny it, or neither. (Although the graphical user interface looks as though an entry could both allow and
Figure 7.14  Clicking the Advanced button on the dialog box shown in Figure 7.13 produces this
dialog box, which in turn gives you the opportunity to click the View/Edit button to obtain the detailed
view shown in Figure 7.15.

Figure 7.15  This detailed view of a Microsoft Windows ACL entry allows you to see that Full Control
really is a summary name for thirteen different permissions.
In the Microsoft Windows ACL entry shown in this detailed view, some permissions are neither allowed nor denied. In this circumstance, other ACL entries are allowed to control access.

deny the same permission, in fact this is not possible. Checking one box unchecks the other.) Keep in mind that your rights as a user derive both from ACL entries specifically for your user identity and from other ACL entries for groups to which you belong. In combining together these various ACL entries, having three options makes sense for the same reason as in parliamentary procedure one can vote yes, no, or abstain. An ACL entry that abstains (neither allows nor denies a permission) is permitting the other ACL entries to decide the question. In Figure 7.16, simply being a member of the Users group is not determinative one way or the other with regard to creating files. A member of the Users group may be able to create files in this folder, depending on what the other ACL entries say and depending on what other groups the user belongs to. This is the meaning of having neither the Allow box nor the Deny box checked. If all applicable ACL entries abstain, then access is denied.

What if one ACL entry that applies to a user specifies that a permission should be allowed, while another ACL entry that also applies to the same user specifies that the permission should be denied? In this case, a key difference arises between ACLs
and parliamentary procedure: the majority of the non-abstaining votes does not win with ACLs. Instead, a single vote to deny access will overrule any number of votes to allow access, much like the veto power possessed by permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. This allows an ACL to include exceptions; for example, all members of some group can be given access (without listing them individually), except one specific user who is denied access. Figure 7.17 summarizes the rule for combining ACL entries.

Within the Windows kernel, ACL entries are actually combined according to a different rule. If one ACL entry that applies to a user specifies that a permission should be allowed, while another ACL entry that also applies to the same user specifies that the permission should be denied, the kernel obeys whichever ACL entry is listed first. However, the API procedures that are generally used to maintain ACLs take care that all Deny entries precede any Allow entries. This effectively results in the rule shown in Figure 7.17, that a Deny entry always overrides an Allow entry. In particular, the graphical user interface shown in the preceding figures makes use of the API that gives precedence to Deny entries. In Exercise 7.8, you can analyze the relative merits of the two rules for combining ACL entries.

Although details vary from operating system to operating system, the Microsoft Windows version of ACLs is typical of all systems with full-fledged ACLs, dating back at least to Multics in the 1960s. Rather than looking at any other examples with full ACLs, I will consider a popular alternative, which is to use a highly restricted form of ACL. In particular, I will explain the file permissions portion of the POSIX specification, implemented by Linux, Mac OS X, and other versions of UNIX. (Some POSIX systems also offer the option of full ACLs; I will focus here on the traditional, required permission system.)

In common with Microsoft Windows, POSIX has a concept of user groups. Each file is owned by a particular user (usually its creator) and also has an owning group.

---

**Figure 7.17** This table shows the rule for combining two Microsoft Windows ACL entries. The same rule is used repeatedly to combine any number of ACL entries. However, if the final result of combining all applicable entries is Neither, it is treated as Deny. (As the text explains, a different rule is used at a lower level. This figure explains the usual interface.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Allow</th>
<th>Deny</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>Deny</td>
<td>Allow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deny</td>
<td>Deny</td>
<td>Deny</td>
<td>Deny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>Deny</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The ACL for any file always has exactly three entries:

- One entry specifies the permissions for the user who owns the file.
- The second entry specifies the permissions for all users who are members of the owning group, except for the owning user.
- The third entry specifies the permissions for all other users, who are neither the owner nor members of the owning group.

Note that unlike Windows, where several ACL entries may contribute to a single user's permissions, only one of these three will apply to any user. Thus, each permission can be treated in a binary fashion (granted or not granted), without need for the three-way distinction of allow/deny/neither. (Because of the way the three ACL entries are defined, you can perform odd stunts like giving everyone but yourself permission to access one of your files.)

Each of the three entries in a POSIX ACL can specify only three permissions: read, write, and “execute,” which as you’ll see can also mean “traverse directory.” These three permissions are abbreviated by the single letters r, w, and x. A file has a total of nine permission bits: r, w, and x for the owner; r, w, and x for the rest of the owning group; and r, w, and x for everyone else. You can see these nine bits in the output from the ls directory listing program, when given the -l option (the letter l indicates you want a long-format listing, with lots of information). For example, in listing my home directory, I see a line that starts with

```
drwxr-x--- 4 max mc27fac
```

followed by the size, date, time, and name of the directory entry. The letter d at the beginning indicates that this is an entry for a subdirectory. The next nine characters are the permissions; I have full rwx permission, the other members of group mc27fac have only r and x (but not w), and other users have no permissions at all.

For an ordinary file, the rwx permissions are relatively self-explanatory. However, many people are confused as to what they mean for directories. For a directory:

- The r permission allows its possessor to find out what names are listed in the directory. This permission is neither necessary nor sufficient to get access to one of those named files. With only the r permission on one of your directories, another user would just be able to observe your taste in filenames.
- The w permission allows its possessor to create, delete, or rename files in the directory. Note, in particular, that a user who doesn’t have permission to write into one of your files may still have permission to delete the file and create a new one with the same name.
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- The *x* permission allows its possessor to use a filename in the directory as part of getting access to a file, subject to that file's own permissions. The *x* permission allows a user to *traverse* a directory, that is, to look up a given name in the directory and determine what it is a name for. Even without the *r* permission, a user can access one of the files in the directory if the user already knows (or can guess) its name, has the appropriate permission to the file itself, and has the *x* permission.

As a simple rule, you should always use the *r* and *x* permissions together on directories, unless you really know what you are doing. Giving *x* permission without *r* can be very frustrating, because it will break many modern programs with graphical user interfaces. These interfaces present users with a list of files to pick from, rather than making the user type the filename in. The only value of *x* without *r* is for security, but a security design that relies on other users not knowing your obscure choices of filenames is probably not very wise. On the other hand, *x* without *r* is at least more useful than *r* without *x*. You would need to think quite creatively to find value in letting people see your filenames but not make any use of them. (In Exercise 7.10, you have the opportunity to be that creative.) For most normal purposes, directory permissions should be *rw* (for yourself, and sometimes for a group you really trust a lot), *r-x* (for others you want to use the directory), or *---* (for others you want to keep out).

As described in the preceding bulleted list, having *w* permission on a directory is quite powerful, in that it allows you to delete and replace an existing file within that directory, even if you couldn’t overwrite the file. However, this power can be kept in check. Each directory has a bit, alongside the nine *rwx* permission bits constituting the ACL, which can be used to limit the power of the *w* permission. If this so-called *sticky bit* is set, then a file may be deleted from the directory only by the owner of the file, the owner of the directory, or the system administrator. The same limitation applies to renaming files.

Access control lists, of either the full variety or the simplified owner-group-other kind, are generally used in conjunction with capabilities. When a POSIX process wants to read or write a file, for example, it starts by using the `open` procedure to translate the filename into a file descriptor, which refers to a capability.

The `open` procedure takes as arguments both the filename (a string) and an integer encoding a set of flags. That set of flags contains information as to whether the process intends to read the file, write the file, or both. For example, `open("alpha/beta", O_RDONLY)` would attempt to obtain a read-only capability for the file named `beta` in the directory named `alpha` in the current directory.
The \texttt{open} procedure uses the process’s user and group credentials to check whether the process has the necessary permissions: \texttt{x} permission on the current directory and the subdirectory named \texttt{alpha}, and \texttt{r} permission on the file named \texttt{beta} within \texttt{alpha}. If the process has executed a setuid program, these permission checks are done using the effective user ID, adopted from the program’s ownership information. Similarly, the permission checks take the effective group ID from the program’s owning group if an analogous \texttt{set group ID} (\texttt{setgid}) feature is used. Assuming the permissions are granted, the \texttt{open} procedure creates a read-only capability for the file and returns an integer file descriptor providing access to that capability. From this point on, the ACLs cease to be relevant. The \texttt{x} bit could be removed from \texttt{alpha} or the \texttt{r} bit from \texttt{beta}, and the open file descriptor would continue to function. That is, an open file descriptor is an irrevocable capability, as described in Section 7.4.2.

7.5 Alternative Granularities of Protection

Sections 7.3 and 7.4 showed how an operating system can protect processes from unwanted interaction with one another. Section 7.5.1 considers the possibility of providing analogous control over interaction even for objects within a single process, and Section 7.5.2 considers protecting entire operating system environments from one another, within a single computer.

7.5.1 Protection Within a Process

When I described what a process is, I indicated that it is the unit of granularity for protection provided by the operating system. That is, operating systems protect processes from each other, but generally do not protect components within a process from each other. This does not mean that protection within a process isn’t important or can’t be achieved. Instead, such protection is normally a job for middleware, rather than for the operating system.

Consider, for example, the Java objects that are used in application servers. Because a large number of objects collaborate within web-based applications, you wouldn’t want to pay the overhead cost of an operating system process per object. Instead, application servers allow numerous objects to exist within a single operating system process. On the other hand, an application server may contain objects assembled together from many different sources. If they were not protected from one another, you would have the same sort of debugging and security nightmares that you would have if processes were unprotected.

In order to protect objects from one another, even if they coexist within a single process, the process runs the \textit{Java Virtual Machine (JVM)}, which provides protection
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and other basic support for Java objects. Thus, the JVM provides a good example of how middleware can provide protection for components within a process.

To protect Java objects from one another, the JVM makes sure that the Java code it is executing obeys certain restrictions. A typical restriction is that no method may ever read from an uninitialized local variable, that is, one into which it has not previously written. This prevents the method from picking up some value left in memory by a previously executed method, which might have been in an object from a different source.

In principle, the JVM could enforce its restrictions by carefully monitoring each step of the Java program as it is executing. For example, the JVM could maintain a set of initialized local variables as the program runs. Any assignment to a local variable would add it to the set. Any use of a local variable would be preceded by a check whether the variable is in the set.

The problem with this approach is that it would make all Java code run like molasses in winter. Each instruction in the program would be preceded by hundreds of other instructions checking whether various restrictions were satisfied. As such, the program would be running hundreds of times more slowly.

Therefore, real JVMs take a smarter approach. As each class is loaded, a JVM component called the verifier mathematically proves that everywhere along all paths through the code, no uninitialized variable is ever read. The verifier also checks other restrictions similarly. Having proved that all paths are safe (in the checked senses), the JVM can then run the code full speed ahead.

The verifier cannot check potential paths through the code one by one, because there may be a great number of paths, or even infinitely many. (Consider, for example, a method with a while loop in the middle. There is one path from the beginning of the method to the end that goes around the loop zero times, one that goes around the loop one time, and so forth.) Therefore, the verifier constructs its safety proofs using the same sort of dataflow analysis that compilers have traditionally used for optimization. This analysis involves finding the greatest fixed-point solution of a system of simultaneous equations. An important general theorem regarding dataflow analysis shows that the greatest fixed-point solution gives a set of security guarantees that can be counted on to hold at a point, independent of which path is taken to that point. Therefore, the verifier can check all paths for safety at once. In Exercise 7.13, you will prove this theorem.

7.5.2 Protection of Entire Simulated Machines

You have seen that the JVM allows you to zoom in and create a whole collection of protected domains within a single operating system process. Similarly, you can zoom
out and treat a whole operating system, complete with all its processes, as just one protected domain among many within a larger Virtual Machine Monitor (VMM). A VMM uses the computer it runs on to simulate the execution of several similar computers, each of which can then run its own operating system with its own processes.

Two commercially significant VMMs are VMware’s ESX Server and IBM’s z/VM. ESX Server uses IA-32 hardware to simulate multiple IA-32 servers; for example, a single four-way multiprocessor server might simulate six uniprocessor servers, each with its own operating system, such as Microsoft Windows or Linux. The six simulated processors take turns executing on the four real processors, under control of the VMM. Similarly, z/VM uses IBM’s mainframe zSeries to simulate multiple zSeries machines, each of which could be running one of IBM’s legacy mainframe operating systems or could be running Linux.

To see how a VMM can be used, you can look at the example in Figure 7.18. Each box indicates a hardware or software component. At the bottom is the Xeon hardware, a member of the Pentium family, which supplies the IA-32 interface upward to the next layer. That next layer is a VMM (specifically the ESX Server), which simulates three virtual machines, each also providing the IA-32 interface. The leftmost virtual machine is running Linux 2.6, the middle one is running Windows 2003, and the rightmost one is running an older version of Linux, 2.4. The presence of Microsoft Windows and Linux on the same hardware may have come about through server consolidation; perhaps two different groups within the enterprise had settled on different software environments but now are being hosted on common hardware to reduce total cost of ownership. The two versions of Linux may reflect a similar story, or may be a case where a new version is being tested while an older version continues to be in production use. In the particular case shown in the figure, the Linux 2.6 virtual

![Figure 7.18](http://example.com/image.png)  
**Figure 7.18** This example shows a VMM, the VMware ESX Server, supporting multiple operating systems. The label within each box identifies a component, whereas the label on each horizontal dividing line identifies an interface. Unlike the operating systems, the VMM provides upward the same IA-32 interface that it relies upon from below.
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Machine is running a single process (the Apache web server), whereas the other two virtual machines are running two processes apiece (in each case, a database server and a web server).

Notice that processes can benefit from two levels of protection, one provided by the operating system and another by the VMM. For example, Windows 2003 is responsible for isolating the SQL Server process from the IIS process. If someone finds a way to subvert Windows's protection mechanism, this isolation may fail. However, the processes running on the other two virtual machines will remain isolated, so long as the ESX Server software continues to do its job. Consider another explanation for why two versions of Linux are running on the same machine: one group, with a lot at stake, might choose to run the latest version with all available security patches, while another group, with less at stake, might choose to stick with an older, less secure version so as to avoid the disruption of an upgrade. The high-stakes group need not fear consequences from an attacker breaking into the low-stakes group’s system any more than if the two were on different hardware machines. The VMM provides that assurance.

The operation of a VMM is similar to that of an operating system. Like an operating system, it uses scheduling to divide processing time and uses page mapping to divide memory. The key difference is that it doesn’t support any higher-level APIs, such as the file operations found in POSIX or Win32. Instead, the VMM supports an interface similar to a real machine’s, complete with I/O devices.

Because the virtual machines use the same instruction set architecture as the real hardware, the VMM does not need to simulate their execution on an instruction-by-instruction basis. Most instructions can be directly executed by the real hardware. The only issue is with privileged instructions, of the kind used by operating systems for such tasks as managing I/O hardware or changing page tables.

Recall that processors generally have two operating modes, a kernel mode in which all instructions are legal, and a user mode, in which dangerous instructions trap to an operating system handler. I need to explain how these two modes can be used to support three levels of execution: the VMM, the operating system, and the application processes.

The VMM runs in kernel mode. When the underlying processor executes instructions from one of the virtual machines, on the other hand, it does so in user mode. That way, the VMM is in complete control and can protect the virtual machines from one another. However, the virtual machines still need to support a simulated kernel mode so that they can run operating systems. Therefore, the VMM keeps track of each virtual machine’s simulated mode, that is, whether the virtual machine is in simulated kernel mode or simulated user mode.

If a virtual machine executes a privileged instruction (for example, to manage I/O hardware), a trap to the VMM occurs, as shown in Figure 7.19. The VMM then
Figure 7.19  When an attempt is made to execute a privileged instruction within a virtual machine, a trap to the VMM occurs, whether the virtual machine is executing operating system code or application code, because the hardware is in user mode in either case. However, the VMM knows whether the virtual machine is in simulated kernel mode or simulated user mode and responds accordingly. In (a), the virtual machine is in simulated kernel mode, so the VMM simulates the privileged instruction and then returns from the trap. In (b), the virtual machine is in simulated user mode, so the VMM simulates the trap that would have occurred on a real machine: it switches to simulated kernel mode and jumps to the operating system trap handler within the virtual machine.

checks whether the virtual machine was in simulated kernel mode. If so, the privileged instruction was attempted by the virtual machine’s operating system, and the VMM carries out the intent of the instruction, for example, by doing the requested I/O. If, on the other hand, the virtual machine was in simulated user mode, then the VMM simulates a trap within the virtual machine by switching it to simulated kernel mode and jumping to the trap handler within the virtual machine’s operating system. In Exercise 7.14, you can consider how the trap handler within the virtual machine’s operating system can later return control to the application program.

One particularly interesting design question is how virtual memory is handled. The operating system running within a virtual machine sets up a page table mapping virtual page numbers into what it thinks of as physical page frame numbers. However, the VMM does another level of mapping, translating the virtual machine’s “physical” page frames into the truly physical page frames of the hardware. That way, the VMM can allocate the hardware’s memory among the virtual machines and can do tricks like using copy on write (COW) to transparently share memory across the virtual machines.
In order to efficiently support this double translation of addresses, the VMM computes the functional composition of the two address translations and provides that composition to the hardware’s MMU. That is, if the virtual machine’s simulated page table would map $A$ into $B$, and the VMM wants to map $B$ into $C$, then the VMM puts a translation directly from $A$ to $C$ into the real page table used by the hardware MMU.

7.6 Security and Protection

Protection plays an essential role in security. If I were to take the title of this section literally, it could be a very long section. Instead, I will simply highlight a few key security issues directly raised by the material in this chapter.

Perhaps the most important take-home message is that although protection is essential to security, it is not the same as security. The two are easily confused. For example, security includes maintaining confidentiality, and protection includes the use of access control lists to limit read access permissions. Surely these are the same, right? Wrong. If the data in question is on a disk drive that is in an unlocked room, then all the access control lists in the world won’t keep it confidential. An adversary simply needs to steal the drive and read it on his own machine, which is programmed to ignore ACLs. In Chapter 11, I will address some of the broader security picture.

Many nasty security pitfalls arise from the distinction between a principal and a subject, or in simplified terms, between a user and a process. A process that is operating with the credentials of a user may carry out actions that the user would not approve of. One way this could happen is if the user authentication system is weak enough for someone else to log in as you. I will not consider that topic further here, instead concentrating on the problems that remain even if the system knows which human is behind each keyboard.

In discussing POSIX processes, I mentioned that user credentials are retained when a process forks and also when it executes a program. Thus, any program you run will be acting with your credentials. (The same is true in other systems, such as Microsoft Windows.) This immediately raises the possibility of a Trojan horse, a program that has some apparent benign purpose but that also has a hidden nefarious intent. Suppose someone gives you a program and tells you it shows a really funny animation of Bart Simpson impersonating Bill Gates. You run it, enjoy the animation, and chuckle merrily. Unfortunately, you aren’t the only one laughing; so is the programmer who knows what else the program does other than showing the animation. Remember: whatever the program does, “you” are doing, because the process is acting with your user credentials. If you have the ability to send all your private data over the network (which you probably do), then so does the Trojan horse.
One variant of the general Trojan horse theme is the *email worm*. Suppose you receive an email with an attached program. When you run the program, it can do anything it wants with your credentials. Suppose what it does is send new email to everyone in your address book, with the same attachment. (After all, the protection system thinks you have every right to read your address book and to send email with your return address.) In this way, the same malicious program can be spread to many computers all over the world. Of course, the worm can perform other actions as well.

Suppose you never knowingly run gift programs. Does that make you safe from Trojan horses? Not necessarily. Recall my discussion of `execlp`. I mentioned that it looks through a sequence of directories until it finds the program file, just as the shell does. This search means that even when you type in as simple a command as `ps` (to list your processes), you don’t necessarily know what program is being run; it might not be `/bin/ps`, if some other program named `ps` is in one of the other directories that comes before `/bin` in the search path. In particular, it was once common for UNIX users to have search paths that started with the current directory (named `.`, before any system-wide directories. That has ceased to be popular, because it is an open invitation to Trojan horses planted by adversaries who don’t have write access to any of the system-wide directories. Even putting the current directory last in the search path (as many users still do) is not completely safe; a clever adversary could plant a Trojan horse named with a common misspelling or with a program name that is installed on some systems, but not the one under attack. The only really safe alternative is to leave the current directory out of your search path. When you want to run a program in your current directory, you will need to specify an explicit pathname. For example, to run the `microshell` program from Figure 7.6, you might compile it in your current directory and then run `./microshell`.

An attacker who wants to plant a Trojan horse for you to run may not even need to take advantage of search paths, if one of the programs you run has file access permissions set so that other people can overwrite the file with a modified version. Similarly, if the directory containing the program is writable, the program can be deleted and replaced. Setting programs (or the containing directories) to be writable seems like such an obvious invitation for Trojan horses that you might find it difficult to imagine such situations arise. Yet I have repeatedly encountered installer programs for commercial application software that set the installed programs or directories to be writable by all users of the system. In the face of such installers, a system administrator needs to be vigilant and manually change the permissions.

The Trojan horse problem is far more dangerous in a system with Discretionary Access Control (DAC) than one with Mandatory Access Control (MAC), because there is far more that “you” (actually, the Trojan horse) can do in a DAC system. For example, in a MAC system that enforces military classification levels, no Trojan horse can
possibly read from a top secret file and then write a copy into an unclassified file; the operating system forbids any process from reading and writing in this way. Notice that using MAC rather than DAC is only partially intended to guard against computer users making unwise decisions. Far more, MAC is guarding against the organization needing to trust all programs’ authors. (Trust in the people running the programs can come from nontechnical sources, like keeping an eye out for employees who seem to have too much money. For external program authors, this would be more difficult.)

Another security pitfall comes from the ability of a setuid program to propagate its owner’s credentials. Suppose that an adversary briefly has the ability to act with your credentials, using some means other than setuid. (This could be through a Trojan horse, but alternatively the adversary might simply use your keyboard while you are getting coffee.) You cannot assume that the adversary’s ability to do damage is over when the initial access method is removed (when you return from getting coffee). A smart adversary will use the brief access to create a setuid shell, owned by you and executable by the adversary. Then, at any convenient later time, the adversary can run any programs whatsoever with your credentials. A real-world analogy would be if leaving your door unlocked made it easy for a burglar to retrofit a secret entrance into your house.

System administrators fight back against unwanted setuid programs with measures such as turning the setuid feature off for file systems that normal users can write into, as well as regularly scanning the file systems looking for setuid files. These measures are valuable but are treating a symptom of a bigger problem. The setuid mechanism, in its elegant generality, is a fundamental mismatch for most organizational security policies. In most organizations, authorization can flow only from the top down; low-level employees are not empowered to pass their authority on to someone else.

Setuid programs raise an additional set of issues, which are in a sense the opposite of the Trojan horse problem. Security problems arise whenever the person providing authority is different from the person deciding how that authority will be used. A Trojan horse tricks the user running the program into providing credentials for actions specified by the program’s author. Conversely, a setuid program provides the author’s credentials, but might unintentionally allow the user running it to control what actions it carries out. Either way, there is a mismatch between the source of authority and the source of control.

Programming oversights explain most cases where a setuid program cedes control to the user running it. For example, suppose the designer of a setuid program wants it to print out a file and wants the user running the program to specify the name of the printer (but not of the file). The program might execute a shell command like `lpr -P printername filename`, where the `printername` comes from the user’s input
and the filename is controlled by the setuid program itself. This seemingly innocent command could be compromised in several ways, such as the following:

- If the adversary can control the directory search path, the `lpr` command might be executing a program of the adversary’s choice, rather than the normal printing command.
- If the adversary can input a printer name that contains a space, the print command might gain an extra argument, which would be taken as another filename to print, this one specified by the adversary.
- If the adversary can input a printer name that contains a semicolon, the print command might turn into two separate commands, one to run `lpr` and one to run some totally different program of the adversary’s choice.

UNIX system programmers have developed a whole body of lore on how to write setuid (or setgid) programs without falling into traps such as the preceding example. Some of this lore addresses particular pitfalls, such as interpolating arbitrary user input into shell commands. However, there are also some more fundamental steps you can take to reduce the risk of a program being exploited. Keep in mind that risk is a function both of the chance of exploitation and of the damage that can be done:

- You can reduce the opportunity for exploitation by making each setuid (or setgid) program as small and simple as possible and by making it executable by as few users as possible.
- You can reduce the damage an exploitation could do by having each setuid (or setgid) program owned by a special user (or group) that exists just for that one purpose and that has only the relevant permissions. The program should not be owned by a normal user or group that has many other unrelated permissions. (The worst choice is if the setuid program is owned by the special system administration account, `root`, which has permission to do absolutely anything.)

On the positive side, setuid programs can be very valuable in enforcing security policies that go beyond what basic owner-group-other permissions (or even full ACLs) can represent. For example, suppose you want to allow a group of employees to write into a file, but only with the following limitations:

- These employees may only add entries to the end of the file, not modify existing entries.
- Each entry must include a time stamp and the name of the employee making the addition.
These employees may make additions only during normal business hours, when they are subject to physical observation, so as to provide greater protection against impersonation.

A sophisticated protection system might have special accommodation for some of these needs; for example, you saw that Microsoft Windows has separate permissions for “append data” versus “write data.” However, it is unlikely that any system would directly support the whole package of application-specific policies. Instead, you could funnel this group’s access through a setuid program that enforces the policies. Database programmers commonly use a similar technique: rather than granting users permission to directly access a table, they grant the users permission to run a stored procedure or to access a specialized view of the table.

Because I showed Microsoft Windows’s ACLs through the graphical user interface, I have a good opportunity to point out the importance of user interface design to security. A protection system does not enhance security by virtue of being able to correctly enforce a security policy; instead, it enhances security only if it is actually used to correctly enforce the policy. In general, the more sophisticated a mechanism, the lower the chance that users will actually figure out how to use it correctly. If they make mistakes that result in overly restrictive protections, someone will notice and complain. If they make mistakes that result in insufficiently restrictive permissions, no one is likely to complain. Thus, the user interface design must help the user manage complexity and reduce the chance of errors. Microsoft has done this in several ways, such as providing a simplified interface to common groupings of permissions, with the individual underlying permissions visible only on request. Also, the uniform rule that deny permissions take precedence over allow permissions is less likely to result in accidental underprotection than the lower-level rule of processing the allow and deny permissions in a user-specified order.

My description of the meaning of rwx permission bits on directories ignored an important issue. When I discuss file naming in Chapter 8, you will see that a single file can have multiple filenames, listed in multiple directories. Thus, saying that the x permission bit on a directory controls access to files in that directory is an oversimplification. This directory permission controls whether names in that directory can be used to access files—but the same files may in any case be accessible through other names in other directories. Unless you know that a file only has one name, the only sure-fire way to restrict its access is with its own permission bits, not with an ancestor directory’s x bit.

In discussing Virtual Machine Monitors, I remarked that a VMM can keep processes running in separate virtual machines isolated from one another, even in the face of a security breach in one or both virtual machines’ operating systems. This sounds on the
surface like an example of defense in depth, the general security principle of providing multiple independent safeguards, so that even if one is breached, the others prevent a system security failure. However, this view is not entirely correct, because a VMM has complete power over the virtual machines; if the VMM’s security is breached, the security of the operating systems becomes irrelevant. Therefore, isolating two processes with a VMM and operating systems will not necessarily result in better protection than an operating system alone, because an attacker need only subvert the VMM. Of course, it may be that the VMM is more secure than the operating system, because it is much simpler. However, the enhanced security, if there is any, comes from substitution of a better protection mechanism, rather than from the cumulative contribution of an additional protection mechanism.

Exercises

7.1 Consider how fork is typically used today. On a uniprocessor system, would it make more sense to schedule the child process to run immediately after a fork or continue to run the parent process? Explain why. Be sure to take COW into account.

7.2 I described access matrices as containing access permissions for individual processes, rather than only for users. Give an example of how a POSIX process could have access permissions different from those of any user.

7.3 What is the difference between a DAC system and a MAC system? Give an example of a circumstance under which you would prefer a DAC system, and explain why. Give an example of a circumstance under which you would prefer a MAC system, and explain why.

7.4 Explain the relationship between access matrices, C-lists, and ACLs.

7.5 Explain the relationship between handles, C-lists (or handle tables), and capabilities in a system like Microsoft Windows.

7.6 Compare C-list capabilities with addressable capabilities. Which is more powerful for the application programmer? Which is simpler for the operating system designer? Justify your answers.

7.7 Suppose the processes on a computer occupy a total of 8 GB of virtual memory, half of which is occupied by addressable capabilities. Suppose that each capability is represented by a random string of 256 bits, subject to the constraint that no two of the capabilities are equal. What is the probability that a randomly generated string of 256 bits would equal one of the capabilities?

7.8 On a Microsoft Windows system, suppose there are two user groups, big and small, with the property that all users who belong to small also belong to big.
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Suppose, further, that user jdoe belongs to small (and hence to big). You are not to know what other users belong to the groups.
(a) Explain how a file’s ACL could be set to allow read access only to users who are members of big but not of small.
(b) Explain why the file’s ACL cannot be modified using the ordinary user interface to additionally allow jdoe read access, without changing any other user’s access rights.
(c) Explain how the alternative rule used within the Windows kernel for combining allow and deny permissions would make the goal stated in the previous part possible.
(d) Make an argument why this alternative is superior to the one used in the Microsoft Windows interface.
(e) Make an argument why the permission combining rule from the Microsoft Windows interface is superior to the alternative from the kernel.
(f) Which argument do you find more persuasive? Why?

7.9 For combining permissions from multiple applicable ACL entries, it is desirable to use a combining operation that is associative and commutative.
(a) Show that the combining operation specified by the table in Figure 7.17 on page 249 is associative and commutative.
(b) Show that if the operation is changed so that Neither combined with Neither yields Deny, the operation is no longer associative.

7.10 Think creatively and come up with a scenario where it would be valuable for the owner of a POSIX directory to grant someone r permission to that directory but not x permission.

7.11 On a POSIX system, a file and a directory are both owned by user 37 and group 53, and both have permissions rw-r-x--x; that is, rw- for the owner, r-x for the group, and --x for others. The members of group 53 are users 37, 42, and 71.
(a) Which user(s) may read the file?
(b) Which user(s) may write the file?
(c) Which user(s) may execute the file?
(d) When the file is executed by user 85, what are the two possibilities for the effective user ID?
(e) What determines which of these two possible user IDs is used?
(f) Which of the following are true?
  i. User 37 may list the contents of the directory.
  ii. User 37 may use the directory in a pathname to access files under it, subject to those files’ permissions.
  iii. User 42 may list the contents of the directory.
iv. User 42 may use the directory in a pathname to access files under it, subject to those files’ permissions.

v. User 85 may list the contents of the directory.

vi. User 85 may use the directory in a pathname to access files under it, subject to those files’ permissions.

7.12 What is the function of the sticky bit on a directory in a POSIX system?

7.13 In this exercise, you will prove a theorem relied upon by the JVM verifier. Let $S$ be a set of security properties, and let $(V, E)$ be a directed graph with vertices $V$ and edges $E \subseteq V \times V$. (The graph represents a program; the vertices are points in the program and the edges are possible control flows.) Let $v_0$ be a distinguished element of $V$, the start vertex. If the edge $(u,v)$ is in $E$, one says $u$ is a predecessor of $v$; the set $\text{Pred}(v)$ consists of all predecessors of $v$. For each edge $(u,v) \in E$, let $f_{uv}$ be a monotone function from $2^S$ to $2^S$. That is, $f_{uv}$ is a function such that if $A \subseteq B \subseteq S$, then $f_{uv}(A) \subseteq f_{uv}(B) \subseteq S$. If $v_0v_1\cdots v_n$ is a (possibly cyclic) path in the digraph from the start vertex $v_0$ to $v_n$, then define the security properties that hold after the path to be $H(v_0v_1\cdots v_n) = f_{v_n-1v_n}(f_{v_{n-2}v_{n-1}}(\cdots f_{v_0v_1}(\emptyset)\cdots))$. Define the security properties that are guaranteed at vertex $v$ to be $G(v)$, where $G$ is some function that satisfies the following equations:

\[
 G(v_0) = \emptyset \\
 G(v) = \bigcap_{p \in \text{Pred}(v)} f_{pv}(G(p)), \ v \neq v_0.
\]

Use induction on the length of the path $v_0v_1\cdots v_{n-1}v_n$, $n \geq 0$, to prove that $G(v_n) \subseteq H(v_0v_1\cdots v_{n-1}v_n)$, that is, after any path leading to $v_n$, all the security properties guaranteed at $v_n$ hold.

7.14 Part (b) of Figure 7.19 on page 256 shows how a hardware-level trap to the VMM is used to simulate a trap to the operating system running within a virtual machine. The accompanying text also describes this situation. When the trap handler in the operating system finishes and executes a return-from-trap instruction, how is control transferred back to the application program? What mode changes, both real and simulated, occur?

**Programming Projects**

7.1 Write and test a variant of the forker program from Figure 7.1 on page 224, in which as much code as possible is shared between the parent and child processes.

7.2 Write a variant of the forker program from Figure 7.1 on page 224, in which the parent and child processes are more dissimilar from one another than in the given program.
7.3 Learn enough C++, if you don’t already know it, to be able to read in a line of text and break it into whitespace-separated words. Then modify the microshell of Figure 7.6 on page 229 to accept multi-word commands and use `execvp` to pass the words as command line arguments.

7.4 Modify your microshell from the previous project so that if the last word in a command is `, that word is not passed as a command line argument. Instead, your program should skip the `waitpid`.

7.5 From the behavior of the `forker` program in Figure 7.1 on page 224, you can tell that each parent and child process gets its own copy of the `loopCount` variable. Are the two copies at equal virtual addresses or different virtual addresses? Testing this might help you determine whether you are using a single address space system or a multiple address space system. Modify the program so that each process prints out `&loopCount`, the address of `loopCount`. What can you conclude from the results you observe?

**Exploration Projects**

7.1 Figure 7.20 contains a simple C program that loops three times, each time calling the `fork` system call. Afterward it `sleeps` for 30 seconds. Compile and run this program, and while it is in its 30-second sleep, use the `ps` command in a second terminal window to get a listing of processes. How many processes are shown running the program? Explain by drawing a “family tree” of the processes, with one box for each process and a line connecting each (except the first one) to its parent.

```c
#include <unistd.h>

int main(int argc, char **argv){
    int i;
    for(i = 0; i < 3; i++){
        fork();
    }
    sleep(30);
}
```

*Figure 7.20* This C program, `multiforker.c`, loops three times and each time forks. At the end, it sleeps 30 seconds so that you have time to run the `ps` command and see how many copies of the process are running.
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7.2 On a Linux or UNIX system, read the documentation for the find command. Use it to search for setuid or setgid programs. In as many cases as possible, determine why the program needs to be setuid or setgid. In each case, try to determine whether the file is owned by a special-purpose user or group that owns only the file and a few related ones.

7.3 Browse the web for cases where buggy setuid programs have constituted security vulnerabilities. Write up a summary of the cases you find; look in particular for recurrent themes.

7.4 Occasionally an adversary will gain control of an FTP or web server from which widely used software is distributed. Explain why this is a particular source of concern, in terms of one of the security issues discussed in this chapter. Read CERT Advisory CA-2002-28 (which you can find on the web) for an example. What countermeasures are suggested in that advisory? How does each of them help mitigate this sort of problem?

7.5 On a Linux or UNIX system, use the same find program as in Exploration Project 7.2 to search for files that are executable by someone and writable by all users, as well as to identify directories that are writable by all users. Do you find any opportunities for the installation of Trojan horses?

7.6 Suppose you carefully check the source code of all programs you run, and you make sure to run only versions that you have compiled yourself from the source code you check. Are you then safe against Trojan horses? Think this through for yourself, and then read Thompson’s Turing Award lecture, cited in the notes at the end of this chapter. Write a brief summary explaining how Thompson has influenced your thinking on this topic or why he hasn’t.

Notes

The idea that a process is a group of threads sharing a protection context dates back at least to a seminal 1966 paper by Dennis and Van Horn [44]. The terminology has shifted over the decades, however. They (and other early authors) used the word “process” for what today is called a thread and “computation” for what today is called a process.

You can supplement my brief introduction to the POSIX API for process management in two ways. One is by reading the official documentation; the POSIX standard is on the web at http://www.opengroup.org, and the documentation for specific implementations (such as Linux) is also easily available. The other approach, which is likely to be more useful at first, would be to read a book on the topic. Two good choices are those by Stevens and Rago [123] and by Robbins and Robbins [105].
Multics was a very influential multiple address space system. Although processes could share individual memory segments (named with filenames in a directory tree), each process used its own segment numbers for addressing, rather than the shared segment names. Segments were protected using a combination of ACLs and capabilities. See, for example, Daley and Dennis’s article [38] and the later retrospective by Saltzer [110].

Another interesting feature of the Multics system, which made its way into the IA-32 architecture, was the use of intermediate processor protection modes between the kernel and user modes I describe. The availability of multiple protection modes joins segmentation as an underutilized feature of the IA-32 architecture.

The case for single address space systems has been made by Chase et al. [26]. The Itanium mechanism is described in Intel’s documentation [75]. A good source of information on the AS/400 is Soltis’s book [119]. Other relevant sources are papers on the System/38 [20, 118, 73].

Harrison, Ruzzo, and Ullman [64] use the access matrix model to show that theoretical results independent of specific protection systems are pessimistic. As mentioned in the text, they showed some important problems to be undecidable and others to be PSPACE-complete. A decision problem is PSPACE-complete if it satisfies two criteria. First, the problem must be in PSPACE, which means it is solvable using a polynomially-bounded amount of memory and unlimited time. Second, the problem must have the property that if a polynomial-time algorithm exists to solve it, then such an algorithm also exists for every other problem in PSPACE. Because of this definition, either all problems in PSPACE have polynomial-time solutions, or no PSPACE-complete problem has a polynomial-time solution. The general consensus is that the latter is the more plausible possibility.

Capabilities were introduced by Dennis and Van Horn [44] in the limited context of C-lists, where they remain in today’s mainstream systems. The greater power of addressable capabilities was explored by Fabry [51] and Linden [89]. Variants of these ideas were incorporated into various research systems, of which Hydra [137, 32] and CAP [96] are well known. The most direct influence of the ideas, however, seems to be on the design of IBM’s commercial System/38 and AS/400 systems, for which citations were given previously.

The JVM verifier is specified by Lindholm and Yellin [90]. The VMware ESX Server VMM is described in an article by Waldspurger [131], which does a wonderful job of showing how operating system concepts are applied to a practical design problem.

A good overview of current directions in VMM technology appeared in May of 2005 as a special issue of Computer magazine [52].

I said that z/VM is a VMM that simulates zSeries machines. Strictly speaking, the VMM is just one component of z/VM, the one called CP, which is short for
Control Program. Also, the simulated architecture is technically called z/Architecture; the zSeries consists of particular hardware implementations of that architecture, analogous to the Pentium family being implementations of IA-32.

IBM’s z/VM has evolved from its roots in the 1960s. In particular, the early version of CP-67 described by Meyer and Seawright [95] made use of paging for its own operation but did not allow paging within the virtual machines. Two years later, Parmelee et al. [99] describe a version of CP-67 that did provide paging within the virtual machines. The evolution of CP-67 into VM/370 is described by Seawright and MacKinnon [114] and by Creasy [36]. VM/370 itself evolved into today’s z/VM, by way of VM/XA and VM/ESA.

One of the most devious forms of Trojan horse was explained by Thompson in the lecture he gave upon receiving the Turing Award [129].