

# Introduction to Cryptology

## Lecture 4

# Announcements

- HW1 due today
- HW2 up on course webpage. Due on 2/12.
- Readings up on course webpage (by 2/10)
- In-class group exercise on 2/10.

# Agenda

- Last time:
  - Definition of SKE (2.1)
  - Definition of perfect secrecy (2.1)
- This time:
  - Equivalent formulations (2.1)
  - Constructions of perfectly secret schemes (2.2)
  - Limitations of perfect secrecy (2.3)

# Definition of Perfect Secrecy

- An encryption scheme  $(Gen, Enc, Dec)$  over a message space  $\mathbf{M}$  is **perfectly secret** if for every probability distribution over  $\mathbf{M}$ , every message  $m \in \mathbf{M}$ , and every ciphertext  $c \in \mathbf{C}$  for which  $\Pr[C = c] > 0$ :  
$$\Pr[M = m | C = c] = \Pr[M = m].$$

# An Equivalent Formulation

- Lemma: An encryption scheme  $(Gen, Enc, Dec)$  over a message space  $\mathbf{M}$  is **perfectly secret** if and only if for every probability distribution over  $\mathbf{M}$ , every message  $m \in \mathbf{M}$ , and every ciphertext  $c \in \mathbf{C}$ :  
$$\Pr[C = c | M = m] = \Pr[C = c].$$

# Proof

Proof:  $\rightarrow$

- To prove: If an encryption scheme is perfectly secret then

“for every probability distribution over  $\mathbf{M}$ , every message  $m \in \mathbf{M}$ , and every ciphertext  $c \in \mathbf{C}$ :

$$\Pr[C = c | M = m] = \Pr[C = c].”$$

# Proof (cont'd)

- Fix some probability distribution over  $\mathbf{M}$ , some message  $m \in \mathbf{M}$ , and some ciphertext  $c \in \mathbf{C}$ .
- By perfect secrecy we have that

$$\Pr[M = m | C = c] = \Pr[M = m].$$

- By Bayes' Theorem we have that:

$$\Pr[M = m | C = c] = \frac{\Pr[C = c | M = m] \cdot \Pr[M = m]}{\Pr[C = c]} = \Pr[M = m].$$

- Rearranging terms we have:

$$\Pr[C = c | M = m] = \Pr[C = c].$$

# Perfect Indistinguishability

- Lemma: An encryption scheme  $(Gen, Enc, Dec)$  over a message space  $M$  is **perfectly secret** if and only if for every probability distribution over  $M$ , every  $m_0, m_1 \in M$ , and every ciphertext  $c \in C$ :  
$$\Pr[C = c | M = m_0] = \Pr[C = c | M = m_1].$$



# Proof (Preliminaries)

- Let  $F, E_1, \dots, E_n$  be events such that  $\Pr[E_1 \vee \dots \vee E_n] = 1$  and  $\Pr[E_i \wedge E_j] = 0$  for all  $i \neq j$ .
- The  $E_i$  partition the space of all possible events so that with probability 1 exactly one of the events  $E_i$  occurs. Then

$$\Pr[F] = \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr[F \wedge E_i]$$

# Proof Preliminaries

- We will use the above in the following way:
- For each  $m_i \in M$ ,  $E_{m_i}$  is the event that  $M = m_i$ .
- $F$  is the event that  $C = c$ .
- Note  $\Pr[E_{m_1} \vee \dots \vee E_{m_n}] = 1$  and  $\Pr[E_{m_i} \wedge E_{m_j}] = 0$  for all  $i \neq j$ .
- So we have:

$$\begin{aligned} - \Pr[C = c] &= \sum_{m \in M} \Pr[C = c \wedge M = m] \\ &= \sum_{m \in M} \Pr[C = c | M = m] \cdot \Pr[M = m] \end{aligned}$$

# Proof

Proof:→

Assume the encryption scheme is perfectly secret. Fix messages  $m_0, m_1 \in M$  and ciphertext  $c \in C$ .

$$\Pr[C = c | M = m_0] = \Pr[C = c] = \Pr[C = c | M = m_1]$$

# Proof

Proof  $\leftarrow$

- Assume that for every probability distribution over  $M$ , every  $m_0, m_1 \in M$ , and every ciphertext  $c \in C$  for which  $\Pr[C = c] > 0$ :  
$$\Pr[C = c | M = m_0] = \Pr[C = c | M = m_1].$$
- Fix some distribution over  $M$ , and arbitrary  $m_0 \in M$  and  $c \in C$ .
- Define  $p = \Pr[C = c | M = m_0]$ .
- Note that for all  $m$ :  
$$\Pr[C = c | M = m] = \Pr[C = c | M = m_0] = p.$$

# Proof

- $$\begin{aligned}\Pr[C = c] &= \sum_{m \in M} \Pr[C = c \wedge M = m] \\ &= \sum_{m \in M} \Pr[C = c | M = m] \cdot \Pr[M = m] \\ &= \sum_{m \in M} p \cdot \Pr[M = m] \\ &= p \cdot \sum_{m \in M} \Pr[M = m] \\ &= p \\ &= \Pr[C = c | M = m_0]\end{aligned}$$

Since  $m$  was arbitrary, we have shown that  $\Pr[C = c] = \Pr[C = c | M = m]$  for all  $c \in C, m \in M$ .  
So we conclude that the scheme is perfectly secret.

# The One-Time Pad (Vernam's Cipher)

- In 1917, Vernam patented a cipher now called the one-time pad that obtains perfect secrecy.
- There was no proof of this fact at the time.
- 25 years later, Shannon introduced the notion of perfect secrecy and demonstrated that the one-time pad achieves this level of security.

# The One-Time Pad Scheme

1. Fix an integer  $\ell > 0$ . Then the message space  $M$ , key space  $K$ , and ciphertext space  $C$  are all equal to  $\{0,1\}^\ell$ .
2. The key-generation algorithm  $Gen$  works by choosing a string from  $K = \{0,1\}^\ell$  according to the uniform distribution.
3. Encryption  $Enc$  works as follows: given a key  $k \in \{0,1\}^\ell$ , and a message  $m \in \{0,1\}^\ell$ , output  $c := k \oplus m$ .
4. Decryption  $Dec$  works as follows: given a key  $k \in \{0,1\}^\ell$ , and a ciphertext  $c \in \{0,1\}^\ell$ , output  $m := k \oplus c$ .

# Security of OTP

Theorem: The one-time pad encryption scheme is perfectly secure.



# Proof

Proof: Fix some distribution over  $M$  and fix an arbitrary  $m \in M$  and  $c \in C$ . For one-time pad:

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr[C = c \mid M = m] &= \Pr[M \oplus K = c \mid M = m] \\ &= \Pr[m \oplus K = c] = \Pr[K = m \oplus c] = \frac{1}{2^\ell}\end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for all distributions and all  $m$ , we have that for every probability distribution over  $M$ , every  $m_0, m_1 \in M$  and every  $c \in C$

$$\Pr[C = c \mid M = m_0] = \frac{1}{2^\ell} = \Pr[C = c \mid M = m_1]$$

# Drawbacks of OTP

- Key length is the same as the message length.
  - For every bit communicated over a public channel, a bit must be shared privately.
  - We will see this is not just a problem with the OTP scheme, but an **inherent** problem in perfectly secret encryption schemes.
- Key can only be used once.
  - You will see in the homework that this is also an **inherent** problem.

# Some Examples

- Is the following scheme perfectly secret?
- Message space  $M = \{0, 1, \dots, n - 1\}$ . Key space  $K = \{0, 1, \dots, n - 1\}$ .
- $\text{Gen}()$  chooses a key  $k$  at random from  $K$ .
- $\text{Enc}_k(m)$  returns  $m + k$ .
- $\text{Dec}_k(c)$  returns  $c - k$ .

# Some Examples

- Is the following scheme perfectly secret?
- Message space  $M = \{0, 1, \dots, n - 1\}$ . Key space  $K = \{0, 1, \dots, n - 1\}$ .
- $\text{Gen}()$  chooses a key  $k$  at random from  $K$ .
- $\text{Enc}_k(m)$  returns  $m + k \bmod n$ .
- $\text{Dec}_k(c)$  returns  $c - k \bmod n$ .