



Secrets & Lies, Knowledge & Trust. (Modern Cryptography)

COS 116

4/20/2006

Instructor: Sanjeev Arora

Cryptography: 1 : secret writing

2 : the enciphering and deciphering of messages in secret code or cipher

- Ancient ideas: (pre-1976)
- Complexity-based cryptography (post-1976)

Basic component of Digital World; about much more than just encryption or secret writing.



Main themes of today's lecture


- Creating problems can be easier than solving them
- Difference between seeing information and making sense of it
- Role of randomness in the above
- Ability of 2 complete strangers to exchange secret information

Theme 1: Creating problems can be easier than solving them

Example:

Trivial for computers!

Unscramble one letter in each square to find the hidden words



Arrange the circled letters to reveal the surprise answer



Reminiscent of something similar that is hard for current computers?

Comment verification:



Letter scrambling: ancient cryptographic idea

Example 1: “Caesar cipher” (c. 100BC)



Example 2: Cipher used in conspiracy plot involving Queen Mary of Scots, 1587



From Discovery Channel, Apr 17 2006

Mafia Boss's Messages Deciphered

- “Boss of bosses” Bernardo Provenzano, captured after 40 years
- Sent “pizzini” (little messages on scraps of paper) using variant of Caesar cipher
- “...I met 512151522 191212154 and we agreed that we will see each other after the holidays...,”
- 5 = B, 12 = I, 15 = N, etc.



“It will keep your kid sister out, but it won't keep the police out.” - Bruce Schneier (Cryptographer)

Letter scrambling (cont.)

■ Example 3: Enigma

- Used by Nazi Germany (1940's)
- Broken by British (Turing), Polish
- “Won us the war.” – Churchill



Moral: Computers → need for new ideas for encryption.

Integer factoring

Easy-to-generate
problem

Hard to solve

Suggest an algorithm?
Running time?

- Say $n = 128$

- **Generation:**

Pick two n -bit prime numbers p , q , and multiply them to get $r = pq$

- **Factoring problem**

Given r , find p and q




Status of factoring

Despite many centuries of work, no efficient algorithms.

Believed to be computationally hard, but remains unproved (“almost –exponential time”)

You rely on it every time you use e-commerce (coming up)

(Aside: If quantum computers ever get built, may become easy to solve.)

- 
- Theme 2: **Difference between seeing information and making sense of it**
 - Theme 3: **Role of randomness.**

Simple example that illustrates both:
one-time pad (“daily codebook.”)

Random source hypothesis

- Integral to modern cryptography



→ 0110101010011010011011101010010010001...

- I and my computer have a source of random bits
- These bits look completely random and unpredictable to the rest of the world.
- Ways to generate: Quantum phenomena in semi-conductors, timing between keystrokes, etc.

One-time pad (modern version)

- Goal: transmit n -bit message



Alice



Bob



Eve

- One-time pad: random sequence of n bits (*shared* between sender and receiver)

Using one-time pad

- Encryption: Interpret one-time pad as “noise” for the message
 - 0 means “don’t flip”
 - 1 means “flip”
- Example:

Encryption

Message	0110010
Pad	1011001
Encrypted	1101011

Decryption

Encrypted	1101011
Pad	1011001
Message	0110010

Musings about one-time pad

- Incredibly strong security: encrypted message “looks random” – equally likely to be encryption of *any* n -bit string



Insecure link (Internet)

amazon.com



- How would you use one-time pad?
- How can you and Amazon agree on a one-time pad?

(Jeff Bezos '86)


Theme: How perfect strangers can send each other encrypted messages.

Powerful idea: public-key encryption

- Diffie-Hellman-Merkle [1976]



- Rivest, Shamir, Adleman [1977]



Public-key cryptography



Message m

Public key K_{pub}
(512 bit number,
publicly available, e.g.
from Verisign Inc)

$$c = \text{Encrypt}(m, K_{pub})$$

amazon.com

Private key K_{priv}
(512-bit number,
known only to
Amazon.)

$$m = \text{Decrypt}(c, K_{priv})$$

- **Important:** encryption and decryption algorithms are *not* secret, only private key!

Public-key encryption at a conceptual level

- “Box that clicks shut, and only Amazon has the key to open it.”



01011



amazon.com



- Example: Key exchange [Diffie-Hellman]
 - User generates random string (“one-time pad”)
 - Put it in box, ship it to Amazon
 - Amazon opens box, recovers random string

Public-Key Encryption at a mathematical level (RSA version)

Key generation: Pick random primes p, q .

Let $N = p \cdot q$

Find k that is not divisible by p, q . (“Public Key”)

Encryption: m is encrypted as $m^k \pmod{N}$

Decryption: Symmetric to Encryption; use “inverse” of k (this is private key)

Random
Source
Hypothesis!

“Modular” math




Last theme:

What does it mean to learn
nothing?

Suggestions?

One-time pad revisited



- In what sense did Eve learn nothing about the message?
- Answer 1: Transmission was a sequence of random bits
- Answer 2: Transmission looked like something she could easily have generated herself




Eureka! moment for modern cryptography

Zero Knowledge Proofs

[Goldwasser, Micali, Rackoff '85]



Student



prox card



prox card reader

- Desire: Prox card reader should not store “signatures” – potential security leak
- Just ability to recognize signatures!
- Learn nothing about signature except that it is a signature

“ZK Proof”: Everything that the verifier sees in the interaction, it could easily have generated itself.

Illustration: Zero-Knowledge Proof that “Sock A is different from sock B”

Sock A



Sock B



- Usual proof: “Look, sock A has a tiny hole and sock B doesn’t!”
- ZKP: “OK, why don’t you put both socks behind your back. Show me a random one, and I will say whether it is sock A or sock B. Repeat as many times as you like, I will always be right.”
- Why does verifier learn “nothing”? (Except that socks are indeed different.)



Actual ZK Proofs

- Use numbers, number theory, etc.

(From Lecture 1): Public closed-ballot elections

- Hold an election in this room
 - Everyone can speak publicly (i.e. no computers, email, etc.)
 - At the end everyone must agree on who won and by what margin
 - No one should know which way anyone else voted
- Is this possible?
 - Yes! (A. Yao, Princeton)



“Privacy-preserving Computations” (Important research area)