CSE 3400/CSE 5850 - Introduction to Computer & Network Security / Introduction to Cybersecurity

Lecture 2 Encryption – Part I

Ghada Almashaqbeh **UConn**

Adapted from the textbook slides by Prof. Amir Herzberg **UConn**

Outline

- Introduction and motivation.
- Ancient ciphers.
- Kerckhoffs' Principle.
- Encryption attacker models.

Encryption

- **n Prevention of exposure of secret information**
- Earliest and `basic' tool of cryptology
- Related terms:
	- Cryptography: `secret writing'
	- ⁿ Cryptanalysis: `breaking' encryption
	- $\text{Encryption scheme} = \text{Cryptosystem} = \text{Cipher}$

The Encryption World: basic terms

- Goal: **encrypt** plaintext into ciphertext
- ⁿ Only legit-recipient can **decrypt** ciphertext to plaintext
	- Adversary cannot learn **anything** from ciphertext

- Variants of encryption schemes:
	- Keyed or unkeyed?
	- Shared key (symmetric) or public/private keys (asymmetric)?
	- Stateful / stateless ? Randomized ? Input size ?

Symmetric Encryption Scheme

Ancient, Keyless Ciphers

- **n** Ancient ciphers were simple, naive
	- No key: secrecy is in the algorithm
- Monoalphabetic ciphers: encrypt/decrypt one character at a time
	- Plaintext, ciphertext are both single letters
	- A set $\{\}$ of permutation + inverse: m=D($E(m)$)

Az-By Cipher

- **n** Az-By Cipher
	- Substitute the first letter of alphabet by the last... and so on:
- **n** Mathematically: Let A be 0, B be 1, ..., Z be 25. Let m denote plaintext and c denote ciphertext.
	- **c** = $Enc(m) = 25 m$
	- **n** $=$ Dec(c) = 25 c

(Unkeyed) Caesar Cipher

- Used by Julius Caesar
- \blacksquare Rotate the 26 letters of the alphabet by 3:

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q …

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P +3

n As formula:

$$
c = E(m) = m+3 \pmod{26}
$$

$$
m = D(c) = c-3 \pmod{26}
$$

- Ceasar and AzBy are trivial to cryptanalyze
	- No key algorithm itself is 'secret'
	- 'Security by obscurity'

Monoalphabetic Substitution Ciphers

- Generalize Caesar and Az-By:
	- Other permutations of letters
		- To letters or to other symbols (no real difference)
	- Keyed: Given key k, cipher E_k is a permutation
	- Or: the 'key' is simply the permutation (table)
	- Classical, `elementary school' cryptosystem
	- Examples:

• Vulnerable to letter-frequency cryptanalysis

Letter frequencies (in English)

Given ciphertext:

UZQSOVUOHXMOPVGPOZPEVSGZWSZOPFPESXUDBMETSXAIZ VUEPHZHMDZSHZOWSFPAPPDTSVPQUZWYMXUZUHSX EPYEPOPDZSZUFPOMBZWPFUPZHMDJUDTMOHMQ

Count relative letter frequencies:

Given ciphertext:

UZQSOVUOHXMOPVGPOZPEVSGZWSZOPFPESXUDBMETSXAIZ VUEPHZHMDZSHZOWSFPAPPDTSVPQUZWYMXUZUHSX EPYEPOPDZSZUFPOMBZWPFUPZHMDJUDTMOHMQ

Sorted:

Most frequent letter is e , so: $P = E(e)$ Second frequent is t , so: $Z=E(t)$... let's replace...

Given ciphertext:

UtQSOVUOHXMOeVGeOteEVSGtWStOeFeESXUDBMETSXAIt

VUEeHtHMDtSHtOWSFeAeeDTSVeQUtWYMXUtUHSX

EeYEeOeDtStUFeOMBtWeFUetHMDJUDTMOHMQ

Sorted:

In English texts, 't' is often followed by 'h'. Count chars following $Z(t)$: Twice: W, H, U and O; once: Q, V, D & S. Pick W, since this gives 'the'...

Given ciphertext:

UtQSOVUOHXMOeVGeOteEVSGthStOeFeESXUDBMETSXAIt

VUEeHtHMDtSHtOhSFeAeeDTSVeQUthYMXUtUHSX

EeYEeOeDtStUFeOMBtheFUetHMDJUDTMOHMQ

Sorted:

We have thSt with S being third-most common. After e and t, most common letters are: aoinshr (in this order). Only `a` fits, so...

Given ciphertext:

)QaOVUOHXMOeVGeOteEVaGthatOeFeEaXUDBMETaXAIt

VUEeHtHMDtaHtOhaFeAeeDTaVeQUthYMXUtUHaX

EeYEeOeDtatUFeOMBtheFUetHMDJUDTMOHMQ

Sorted:

Next common in ciphertext is U and in English are oinshr (in this order). Few, rare words begin with `ot' (and not `oth'), but `it' is common, so: $U=Et(i)$!

Given ciphertext:

- itQaOViOHXMOeVGeOteEVaGthatQeFeEaXiDBMETaXAIt
- ViEeHtHMDtaHtOhaFeAeeDTaVeQithYMXitiHaX
- EeYEeOeDtatiFeOMBtheFietHMDJiDTMOHMO

Sorted:

Next common in ciphertext are OMH and in English are onsr (in this order). $SO=E(0)$ is unlikely since it gives 'that oeFeEa...' \rightarrow try 'M'=E('o')...

Given ciphertext:

itQaOViOHXoOeVGeOteEVaGthatOeFeEaXiDBoETaXAIt

ViEeHtHoDtaHtOhaFeAeeDTaVeQithYoXitiHaX

EeYEeOeDtatiFeOoBtheFietHoDJiDToOHoQ

Sorted:

Next common in ciphertext is O and in English is s… go for it: O=E(s)!

Given ciphertext:

- itQasVisHXoseVGesteEV&G that seFeEaXiDBoETaXAIt
- ViEeHtHoDtaHtshaFeAeeDTaVeQithYoXitiHaX
- EeYEeseDtatiFesoBtheFietHoDJiDTosHoQ

Sorted:

'that' is mostly one word. Most common last-letter not assigned yet is 'y', which is not a common word, so: $G = E(y)$...

Given ciphertext:

itQasVisHXoseVyesteEVay that seFeEaXiDBoETaXAIt

ViEeHtHoDtaHtshaFeAeeDTaVeQithYoXitiHaX

EeYEeseDtatiFesoBtheFietHoDJiDTosHoQ

Sorted:

We now simply recognize the (quite common) word 'yesterday', so: $E=F(r), V=E(d)...$

Given ciphertext:

- itQasdisHXosed yesterday that seFeraXiDBorTaXAIt
- direHtHoDtaHtshaFeAeeDTadeQithYoXitiHaX
- reYreseDtatiFesoBtheFietHoDJiDTosHoO

Sorted:

Next unused common letter is n (by far). But H doesn't seem to fit... so D=E(n)...

Given ciphertext:

itQasdisHXosed yesterday that seFeraXinBorTaXAIt

direHtHontaHtshaFeAeenTadeQithYoXitiHaX

reYresentatiFesoBtheFietHonJinTosHoO

Sorted:

Long string with only one cipher-letter, H... only c fits so: $H = E(c)$...

Given ciphertext:

- itQasdiscXosed yesterday that seFeraXinBorTaXAIt
- direct contacts haFeAeenTadeQithYoXiticaX
- reYresentatiFesoBtheFietconJinToscoO

Sorted:

Next common cipher-letter is X and plain-letter is I, and it indeed fits: $X = E(I)$!

Given ciphertext:

itQas disclosed yesterday that seFeralinBorTalAIt

direct contacts haFeAeenTadeQith Yolitical

reYresentatiFesoBtheFietconJinToscoQ

Sorted:

Next identify text begins with `it was' and also two quite common words so : $Q=E(w)$, $Y=E(p)$, $F=E(v)$!

Given ciphertext:

- it was disclosed yesterday that several inBorTalAIt
- direct contacts have AeenTade with political
- representatives oBthevietconJinToscow

Sorted:

Next: `oB'->`of', 'Aeen'->been, `Tade'->made, `vietconJ'->Vietcong, ..

Given ciphertext:

- it was disclosed yesterday that several informal bIt
- direct contacts have been made with political
- representatives of the vietcong in moscow

Sorted:

(finally: $I=E(u)$)

Security-by-Obscurity Ciphers

- Previous ciphers' security relied on obscurity
	- I.e., hope attacker does not know cipher
- Used extensively until 1883
	- Usually cryptanalyzed especially after encryption devices were captured
- What happened in 1883??
	- A conceptual leap in cryptography and security

Kerckhoffs' Known Design Principle [1883]

- **n** Assume adversary knows the design $$ everything except the secret keys
- **No** `security by obscurity'
	- **n Although attacking obscure design is harder**
- **No. 25 Why assume/use public design ?**
	- □ No need to replace system once design is exposed
	- **Q** Usually stronger
	- □ Establish standards for multiple applications:
		- **Efficiency of production and of test attacks / cryptanalysis**
- Secrecy is based only on secrecy of key

Exhaustive Key Search

- Kerckhoffs: Secrecy ≤ secrecy of key *k*
- **Exhaustive Key Search: try all keys** $k' \in \{0,1\}^{|k|}$
- **n** How to identify correct key $k = k'$??
- Depends on attacker capability (model)
	- Critical element of security analysis!!
	- Attack models we will study:
		- Cipher-Text Only (CTO) attack
		- Known-plaintext attack (KPA)
		- Chosen-plaintext attack (CPA)
		- Chosen-ciphertext attack (CCA)

Cipher-Text Only (CTO) attack

- Adversary have previous knowledge about all possible plaintexts, like their distribution.
- Attacker's goal is to infer info about the challenge plaintext m^{*} beyond the initial info it has.
	- This is given only ciphertexts and the plaintext distribution

Exhaustive Key Search and CTO

- Exhaustive Key Search: try all keys $k' \in \{0,1\}^{|k|}$
- **How to identify correct key** $k = k'$ **given CTO??**
	- **Decrypt ciphertexts, then check resulting `plaintext'**
		- **Let** m_1, m_2, \ldots be a set of random plaintext samples (adversary does not know these)
		- **Let** $c_1 = E_k(m_1), c_2 = E_k(m_2), ...$ be corresponding ciphertexts
		- **To test if the key is k', compute set** $M'=\{D_{k'}(c_1), D_{k'}(c_2), ... \}$
		- **n** If M' fits plaintext distribution: k' is probably the key
		- Otherwise: k' is probably not the key
	- Challenge: test often is inconclusive

Known Plaintext Attack (KPA)

- Sample messages $M=\{m_1, m_2,...\}$ from a given distribution.
- Give M <u>and</u> ciphertexts $c_1=E(m_1), c_2=E(m_2), ...$ to the attacker who is trying to infer more info about the challenge.

Exhaustive Key Search and KPA

- Exhaustive Key Search: try all keys $k' \in \{0,1\}^{|k|}$
- **How to identify correct key** $k = k'$ given KPA??
	- Attacker obtains known plaintext, ciphertext pairs: *(m₁,* $c_1=E_k(m_1)$, $(m_2, c_2=E_k(m_2))$, ...
	- To test if the key is k' , compute $m'_1=D_{k'}(c_1)$, $m'_2=D_{k'}(c_2)$,
	- **If for every pair i holds** $m_i = m_i$ **then** k' **is probably the key**
	- Otherwise: k' is probably not the key
	- CTO and KPA attacks must test about half the keys.
		- On average, the attacker will find the key after trying half of all possible keys.

Chosen Plaintext Attack (CPA)

- Beside the plaintext distribution/initial info, attacker can choose messages m_1 , m_2 ,...
- Give ciphertexts of these plaintext messages to the attacker who is trying to obtain more info about the challenge.

Exhaustive Key Search and CPA

Generic CPA: Table-Lookup

- Choose some fixed plaintext *m*
	- ⁿ E.g., some default message: `good morning!'
	- Quite common in practice... e.g., in web (http), GSM,...
- **n** Offline: fill a table T. For every key k' , compute $T(k')=E_k(m)$
- **n** Online: select plaintext *m*, obtain $c = E_k(m)$
- If $T(k')=c$ then k' probably the key: $k'=k$
- Otherwise: k' is probably not the key
- Time complexity $t=O(1)$ lookup time, requires $2^{|k|}$ memory
- More advanced: Time/Memory tradeoffs (e.g., rainbow tables)
	- Use hash functions, so we can't yet discuss

Chosen Ciphertext Attack (CCA)

- Beside being able to choose plaintexts and obtain their encryptions, attacker can select ciphertexts c_1 , c_2, \ldots , and receive decryptions (but not the challenge).
- Again, attacker tries to infer more info about the challenge.

The Attack Models Championship

- We discussed several attack models:
	- CTO, KPA, CPA, CCA
- Model A is stronger than model B, if a cipher secure against A is also secure against B
	- Notation: A > B
	- Example: KPA > CTO [why?]
- KPA vs. CPA?
- KPA vs. CCA?
- CPA vs. CCA ?

Sufficient Effective Key Length

■ *Sufficient Effective Key Length Principle:*

- □ Keys should be long enough to make attacks infeasible, for best adversary resources expected, during `sensitivity period` of data
- \Box Exhaustive search or other attacks

□ Large key-space is necessary, but not sufficient

- **□ Monoalphabetic substitution cipher, with permutation as** key: $26! = 4 \cdot 10^{26}$ keys... yet insecure!
- □ **Effective key length:** log of number of trials by the most effective attack
	- ^q Same as **number of bits for exhaustive search**
	- □ Defined for specific attack models

Covered Material From the Textbook

- Chapter 2:
	- From the chapter beginning until the end of section 2.4 except:
		- Section 2.1.3,
		- Section 2.2.5,
		- Section 2.4.2,
		- Any ancient ciphers from 2.2.1 that we did not study in class,

Thank You!

