

PART TWO: SYMMETRIC CIPHERS

CHAPTER 3

CLASSICAL ENCRYPTION TECHNIQUES

3.1 Symmetric Cipher Model

- Cryptography
- Cryptanalysis and Brute-Force Attack

3.2 Substitution Techniques

- Caesar Cipher
- Monoalphabetic Ciphers
- Playfair Cipher
- Hill Cipher
- Polyalphabetic Ciphers
- One-Time Pad

3.3 Transposition Techniques

3.4 Key Terms, Review Questions, and Problems

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After studying this chapter, you should be able to:

- ◆ Present an overview of the main concepts of symmetric cryptography.
- ◆ Explain the difference between cryptanalysis and brute-force attack.
- ◆ Understand the operation of a monoalphabetic substitution cipher.
- ◆ Understand the operation of a polyalphabetic cipher.
- ◆ Present an overview of the Hill cipher.

Symmetric encryption, also referred to as **conventional encryption** or **single-key encryption**, was the only type of encryption in use prior to the development of public-key encryption in the 1970s. It remains by far the most widely used of the two types of encryption. Part Two examines a number of symmetric ciphers. In this chapter, we begin with a look at a general model for the symmetric encryption process; this will enable us to understand the context within which the algorithms are used. Next, we examine a variety of algorithms in use before the computer era. Finally, we look briefly at a different approach known as steganography. Chapters 4 and 6 introduce the two most widely used symmetric cipher: DES and AES.

Before beginning, we define some terms. An original message is known as the **plaintext**, while the coded message is called the **ciphertext**. The process of converting from plaintext to ciphertext is known as **enciphering** or **encryption**; restoring the plaintext from the ciphertext is **deciphering** or **decryption**. The many schemes used for encryption constitute the area of study known as **cryptography**. Such a scheme is known as a **cryptographic system** or a **cipher**. Techniques used for deciphering a message without any knowledge of the enciphering details fall into the area of **cryptanalysis**. Cryptanalysis is what the layperson calls “breaking the code.” The areas of cryptography and cryptanalysis together are called **cryptology**.

3.1 SYMMETRIC CIPHER MODEL

A symmetric encryption scheme has five ingredients (Figure 3.1):

- **Plaintext:** This is the original intelligible message or data that is fed into the algorithm as input.
- **Encryption algorithm:** The encryption algorithm performs various substitutions and transformations on the plaintext.
- **Secret key:** The secret key is also input to the encryption algorithm. The key is a value independent of the plaintext and of the algorithm. The algorithm will produce a different output depending on the specific key being used at the time. The exact substitutions and transformations performed by the algorithm depend on the key.




Figure 3.1 Simplified Model of Symmetric Encryption

- **Ciphertext:** This is the scrambled message produced as output. It depends on the plaintext and the secret key. For a given message, two different keys will produce two different ciphertexts. The ciphertext is an apparently random stream of data and, as it stands, is unintelligible.
- **Decryption algorithm:** This is essentially the encryption algorithm run in reverse. It takes the ciphertext and the secret key and produces the original plaintext.

There are two requirements for secure use of conventional encryption:

1. We need a strong encryption algorithm. At a minimum, we would like the algorithm to be such that an opponent who knows the algorithm and has access to one or more ciphertexts would be unable to decipher the ciphertext or figure out the key. This requirement is usually stated in a stronger form: **The opponent should be unable to decrypt ciphertext or discover the key even if he or she is in possession of a number of ciphertexts together with the plaintext that produced each ciphertext.**
2. **Sender and receiver must have obtained copies of the secret key in a secure fashion and must keep the key secure.** If someone can discover the key and knows the algorithm, all communication using this key is readable.

We assume that it is impractical to decrypt a message on the basis of the ciphertext *plus* knowledge of the encryption/decryption algorithm. In other words, we do not need to keep the algorithm secret; we need to keep only the key secret. This feature of symmetric encryption is what makes it feasible for widespread use. The fact that the algorithm need not be kept secret means that manufacturers can and have developed low-cost chip implementations of data encryption algorithms. These chips are widely available and incorporated into a number of products. With the use of symmetric encryption, the principal security problem is maintaining the secrecy of the key.

Let us take a closer look at the essential elements of a symmetric encryption scheme, using Figure 3.2. A source produces a message in plaintext, $X = [X_1, X_2, \dots, X_M]$. The M elements of X are letters in some finite alphabet. Traditionally, the alphabet usually consisted of the 26 capital letters. Nowadays,




Figure 3.2 Model of Symmetric Cryptosystem

the binary alphabet $\{0, 1\}$ is typically used. For encryption, a key of the form $K = [K_1, K_2, \dots, K_J]$ is generated. If the key is generated at the message source, then it must also be provided to the destination by means of some secure channel. Alternatively, a third party could generate the key and securely deliver it to both source and destination.

With the message X and the encryption key K as input, the encryption algorithm forms the ciphertext $Y = [Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N]$. We can write this as

$$Y = E(K, X)$$

This notation indicates that Y is produced by using encryption algorithm E as a function of the plaintext X , with the specific function determined by the value of the key K .

The intended receiver, in possession of the key, is able to invert the transformation:

$$X = D(K, Y)$$

An opponent, observing Y but not having access to K or X , may attempt to recover X or K or both X and K . It is assumed that the opponent knows the encryption (E) and decryption (D) algorithms. If the opponent is interested in only this particular message, then the focus of the effort is to recover X by generating a plaintext estimate \hat{X} . Often, however, the opponent is interested in being able to read future messages as well, in which case an attempt is made to recover K by generating an estimate \hat{K} .

Cryptography

Cryptographic systems are characterized along three independent dimensions:

1. **The type of operations used for transforming plaintext to ciphertext.** All encryption algorithms are based on two general principles: substitution, in which each element in the plaintext (bit, letter, group of bits or letters) is mapped into another element, and transposition, in which elements in the plaintext are rearranged. The fundamental requirement is that no information be lost (i.e., that all operations are reversible). Most systems, referred to as *product systems*, involve multiple stages of substitutions and transpositions.
2. **The number of keys used.** If both sender and receiver use the same key, the system is referred to as symmetric, single-key, secret-key, or conventional encryption. If the sender and receiver use different keys, the system is referred to as asymmetric, two-key, or public-key encryption.
3. **The way in which the plaintext is processed.** A **block cipher** processes the input one block of elements at a time, producing an output block for each input block. A **stream cipher** processes the input elements continuously, producing output one element at a time, as it goes along.

Cryptanalysis and Brute-Force Attack

Typically, the objective of attacking an encryption system is to recover the key in use rather than simply to recover the plaintext of a single ciphertext. There are two general approaches to attacking a conventional encryption scheme:

- **Cryptanalysis:** Cryptanalytic attacks rely on the nature of the algorithm plus perhaps some knowledge of the general characteristics of the plaintext or even some sample plaintext–ciphertext pairs. This type of attack exploits the characteristics of the algorithm to attempt to deduce a specific plaintext or to deduce the key being used.
- **Brute-force attack:** The attacker tries every possible key on a piece of ciphertext until an intelligible translation into plaintext is obtained. On average, half of all possible keys must be tried to achieve success.

If either type of attack succeeds in deducing the key, the effect is catastrophic: All future and past messages encrypted with that key are compromised.

CRYPTANALYSIS Table 3.1 summarizes the various types of **cryptanalytic attacks** based on the amount of information known to the cryptanalyst. The most difficult problem is presented when all that is available is the *ciphertext only*. In some cases, not even the encryption algorithm is known, but in general, we can assume that the opponent does know the algorithm used for encryption. One possible attack under these circumstances is the brute-force approach of trying all possible keys. If the key space is very large, this becomes impractical. Thus, the opponent must rely on an analysis of the ciphertext itself, generally applying various statistical tests to it. To use this approach, the opponent must have some general idea of the type of plaintext that is concealed, such as English or French text, an EXE file, a Java source listing, an accounting file, and so on.

Table 3.1 Types of Attacks on Encrypted Messages

Type of Attack	Known to Cryptanalyst
Ciphertext Only	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Encryption algorithm ■ Ciphertext
Known Plaintext	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Encryption algorithm ■ Ciphertext ■ One or more plaintext–ciphertext pairs formed with the secret key
Chosen Plaintext	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Encryption algorithm ■ Ciphertext ■ Plaintext message chosen by cryptanalyst, together with its corresponding ciphertext generated with the secret key
Chosen Ciphertext	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Encryption algorithm ■ Ciphertext ■ Ciphertext chosen by cryptanalyst, together with its corresponding decrypted plaintext generated with the secret key
Chosen Text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Encryption algorithm ■ Ciphertext ■ Plaintext message chosen by cryptanalyst, together with its corresponding ciphertext generated with the secret key ■ Ciphertext chosen by cryptanalyst, together with its corresponding decrypted plaintext generated with the secret key

The ciphertext-only attack is the easiest to defend against because the opponent has the least amount of information to work with. In many cases, however, the analyst has more information. The analyst may be able to capture one or more plaintext messages as well as their encryptions. Or the analyst may know that certain plaintext patterns will appear in a message. For example, a file that is encoded in the Postscript format always begins with the same pattern, or there may be a standardized header or banner to an electronic funds transfer message, and so on. All these are examples of *known plaintext*. With this knowledge, the analyst may be able to deduce the key on the basis of the way in which the known plaintext is transformed.

Closely related to the known-plaintext attack is what might be referred to as a *probable-word attack*. If the opponent is working with the encryption of some general prose message, he or she may have little knowledge of what is in the message. However, if the opponent is after some very specific information, then parts of the message may be known. For example, if an entire accounting file is being transmitted, the opponent may know the placement of certain key words in the header of the file. As another example, the source code for a program developed by Corporation X might include a copyright statement in some standardized position.

If the analyst is able somehow to get the source system to insert into the system a message chosen by the analyst, then a *chosen-plaintext* attack is possible. In general, if the analyst is able to choose the messages to encrypt, the analyst may deliberately pick patterns that can be expected to reveal the structure of the key.

Table 3.1 lists two other types of attack: *chosen ciphertext* and *chosen text*. These are less commonly employed as cryptanalytic techniques but are nevertheless possible avenues of attack.

Only relatively weak algorithms fail to withstand a ciphertext-only attack. Generally, an encryption algorithm is designed to withstand a known-plaintext attack.

Two more definitions are worthy of note. An encryption scheme is **unconditionally secure** if the ciphertext generated by the scheme does not contain enough information to determine uniquely the corresponding plaintext, no matter how much ciphertext is available. That is, no matter how much time an opponent has, it is impossible for him or her to decrypt the ciphertext simply because the required information is not there. With the exception of a scheme known as the one-time pad (described later in this chapter), there is no encryption algorithm that is unconditionally secure. Therefore, all that the users of an encryption algorithm can strive for is an algorithm that meets one or both of the following criteria:

- The cost of breaking the cipher exceeds the value of the encrypted information.
- The time required to break the cipher exceeds the useful lifetime of the information.

An encryption scheme is said to be **computationally secure** if either of the foregoing two criteria are met. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to estimate the amount of effort required to cryptanalyze ciphertext successfully.

All forms of cryptanalysis for symmetric encryption schemes are designed to exploit the fact that traces of structure or pattern in the plaintext may survive encryption and be discernible in the ciphertext. This will become clear as we examine various symmetric encryption schemes in this chapter. We will see in Part Three that cryptanalysis for public-key schemes proceeds from a fundamentally different premise, namely, that the mathematical properties of the pair of keys may make it possible for one of the two keys to be deduced from the other.

BRUTE-FORCE ATTACK A **brute-force attack** involves trying every possible key until an intelligible translation of the ciphertext into plaintext is obtained. On average, half of all possible keys must be tried to achieve success. That is, if there are X different keys, on average an attacker would discover the actual key after $X/2$ tries. It is important to note that there is more to a brute-force attack than simply running through all possible keys. Unless known plaintext is provided, the analyst must be able to recognize plaintext as plaintext. If the message is just plain text in English, then the result pops out easily, although the task of recognizing English would have to be automated. If the text message has been compressed before encryption, then recognition is more difficult. And if the message is some more general type of data, such as a numerical file, and this has been compressed, the problem becomes even more difficult to automate. Thus, to supplement the brute-force approach, some degree of knowledge about the expected plaintext is needed, and some means of automatically distinguishing plaintext from garble is also needed.

STRONG ENCRYPTION For users, security managers, and organization executives, there is a requirement for strong encryption to protect data. The term *strong encryption* is an imprecise one, but in general terms, it refers to encryption schemes that make it impractically difficult for unauthorized persons or systems to gain access to plaintext that has been encrypted. [NAS18] lists the following properties that make an encryption algorithm strong: appropriate choice of cryptographic algorithm, use of sufficiently long key lengths, appropriate choice of protocols, a well-engineered implementation, and the absence of deliberately introduced hidden flaws. The first two factors relate to cryptanalysis, discussed in this section, and the third factor relates to the discussion in Part Six. The last two factors are beyond the scope of this book.

3.2 SUBSTITUTION TECHNIQUES

In this section and the next, we examine a sampling of what might be called classical encryption techniques. A study of these techniques enables us to illustrate the basic approaches to symmetric encryption used today and the types of cryptanalytic attacks that must be anticipated.

The two basic building blocks of all encryption techniques are substitution and transposition. We examine these in the next two sections. Finally, we discuss a system that combines both substitution and transposition.

A substitution technique is one in which the letters of plaintext are replaced by other letters or by numbers or symbols.¹ If the plaintext is viewed as a sequence of bits, then substitution involves replacing plaintext bit patterns with ciphertext bit patterns.

Caesar Cipher

The earliest known, and the simplest, use of a substitution cipher was by Julius Caesar. The Caesar cipher involves replacing each letter of the alphabet with the letter standing three places further down the alphabet. For example,

plain: meet me after the toga party
cipher: PHHW PH DIWHU WKH WRJD SDUWB

Note that the alphabet is wrapped around, so that the letter following Z is A. We can define the transformation by listing all possibilities, as follows:

plain: a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z
cipher: D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z A B C

Let us assign a numerical equivalent to each letter:

a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

n	o	p	q	r	s	t	u	v	w	x	y	z
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25

Then the algorithm can be expressed as follows. For each plaintext letter p , substitute the ciphertext letter C :²

$$C = E(3, p) = (p + 3) \bmod 26$$

A shift may be of any amount, so that the general Caesar algorithm is

$$C = E(k, p) = (p + k) \bmod 26 \quad (3.1)$$

¹When letters are involved, the following conventions are used in this book. Plaintext is always in lowercase; ciphertext is in uppercase; key values are in italicized lowercase.

²We define $a \bmod n$ to be the remainder when a is divided by n . For example, $11 \bmod 7 = 4$. See Chapter 2 for a further discussion of modular arithmetic.

where k takes on a value in the range 1 to 25. The decryption algorithm is simply

$$p = D(k, C) = (C - k) \bmod 26 \quad (3.2)$$

If it is known that a given ciphertext is a Caesar cipher, then a brute-force cryptanalysis is easily performed: simply try all the 25 possible keys. Figure 3.3 shows the results of applying this strategy to the example ciphertext. In this case, the plaintext leaps out as occupying the third line.

Three important characteristics of this problem enabled us to use a brute-force cryptanalysis:

1. The encryption and decryption algorithms are known.
2. There are only 25 keys to try.
3. The language of the plaintext is known and easily recognizable.

In most networking situations, we can assume that the algorithms are known. What generally makes brute-force cryptanalysis impractical is the use of an algorithm that employs a large number of keys. For example, the triple DES algorithm,

	PHHW	PH	DIWHU	WKH	WRJD	SDUWB
KEY						
1	oggv	og	chvgt	vjg	vqic	rectva
2	nffu	nf	bgufs	uif	uphb	qbsuz
3	meet	me	after	the	toga	party
4	ldds	ld	zesdq	sgd	snfz	ozqsx
5	kccr	kc	ydrp	rfe	rmey	nyprw
6	jbbq	jb	xcqbo	qeb	qldx	mxoqv
7	iaap	ia	wbpan	pda	pkcw	lwnpu
8	hzzo	hz	vaozm	ocz	objv	kvmot
9	gyyn	gy	uznyl	nby	niau	julns
10	fxxm	fx	tymxk	max	mhzt	itkmr
11	ewwl	ew	sxlwj	lzw	lgys	hsjlq
12	dvvk	dv	rwkvi	kyv	kfxr	grikp
13	cuuj	cu	qvjuh	jxu	jewq	fqhjo
14	btti	bt	putg	iwt	idvp	epgin
15	assh	as	othsf	hvs	hcuo	dofhm
16	zrrg	zr	nsgre	gur	gbtn	cnegl
17	yqqf	yq	mrfqd	ftq	fasm	bmdfk
18	xppe	xp	lqepc	esp	ezrl	alcej
19	wood	wo	kpdob	dro	dyqk	zkbdi
20	vnnc	vn	jocna	cqn	cxpj	yjach
21	ummb	um	inbmz	bpm	bwoi	xizbg
22	tlla	tl	hmaly	aol	avnh	whyaf
23	skkz	sk	glzxx	znk	zumg	vgxze
24	rjyy	rj	fkyjw	ymj	ytlf	ufwyd
25	qiix	qi	ejxiv	xli	xske	tevx

Figure 3.3 Brute-Force Cryptanalysis of Caesar Cipher

```

~+Wu"- Ω-O)≤4{∞‡, ë~Ω%ràu·-í ◇-Z-
Ú≠2Ô#Åæð æ«q7,Ωn·@3NÔÛ ÊZ'Y-f∞Í[±Û_ èΩ,<NO-±«~xã Åäfèù3Å
x}ö§k°Å
_yÍ ^ΔÉ] ,µ J/'iTê&l 'c<uΩ-
ÄD(G WÄC~y_iöÄW PÔ1«ÎÛ†ç],µj~î^ûÑπ~≈~L~9OgflO~&Æ≤ -≤ øÔ§":
~Æ!SGqèvo^ ú\,S>h<-*6ø‡%x'~|fió#≈~my%~≥ñP<,fi Áj ÅÔ¿"Zù-
Ω·Ö-6Ëÿ{% „ΩÊó ,i π+Âî°ú02çSÿ'O-
2Äfißi /@^"ΠK°ªPÆπ,úé^~3Σ~ö~ÔZÎ"Y-ÿΩæY> Ω+eô/·<KÆ¿*+~"≤û~
B ZøK~Qßÿüf, !ðfiÎzss/]>ÈQ ü

```

Figure 3.4 Sample of Compressed Text

examined in Chapter 7, makes use of a 168-bit key, giving a key space of 2^{168} or greater than 3.7×10^{50} possible keys.

The third characteristic is also significant. If the language of the plaintext is unknown, then plaintext output may not be recognizable. Furthermore, the input may be abbreviated or compressed in some fashion, again making recognition difficult. For example, Figure 3.4 shows a portion of a text file compressed using an algorithm called ZIP. If this file is then encrypted with a simple substitution cipher (expanded to include more than just 26 alphabetic characters), then the plaintext may not be recognized when it is uncovered in the brute-force cryptanalysis.

Monoalphabetic Ciphers

With only 25 possible keys, the Caesar cipher is far from secure. A dramatic increase in the key space can be achieved by allowing an arbitrary substitution. Before proceeding, we define the term *permutation*. A **permutation** of a finite set of elements S is an ordered sequence of all the elements of S , with each element appearing exactly once. For example, if $S = \{a, b, c\}$, there are six permutations of S :

abc, acb, bac, bca, cab, cba

In general, there are $n!$ permutations of a set of n elements, because the first element can be chosen in one of n ways, the second in $n - 1$ ways, the third in $n - 2$ ways, and so on.

Recall the assignment for the Caesar cipher:

```

plain:  a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z
cipher: D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z A B C

```

If, instead, the “cipher” line can be any permutation of the 26 alphabetic characters, then there are $26!$ or greater than 4×10^{26} possible keys. This is 10 orders of magnitude greater than the key space for DES and would seem to eliminate brute-force techniques for cryptanalysis. Such an approach is referred to as a **monoalphabetic substitution cipher**, because a single cipher alphabet (mapping from plain alphabet to cipher alphabet) is used per message.

There is, however, another line of attack. If the cryptanalyst knows the nature of the plaintext (e.g., noncompressed English text), then the analyst can exploit the regularities of the language. To see how such a cryptanalysis might proceed, we give a partial example here that is adapted from one in [SINK09]. The ciphertext to be solved is

UZQSOVUOHXMOPVGPOZPEVSGZWSZOPFPESXUDBMETSXAIZ
 VUEPHZHMDZSHZOWSFPAPPDTSVPQUZWYMXUZUHSX
 EPYEOPDZSZUFPOMBZWPFUPZHMDJUDTMOHMQ

As a first step, the relative frequency of the letters can be determined and compared to a standard frequency distribution for English, such as is shown in Figure 3.5 (based on [LEWA00]). If the message were long enough, this technique alone might be sufficient, but because this is a relatively short message, we cannot expect an exact match. In any case, the relative frequencies of the letters in the ciphertext (in percentages) are as follows:

P	13.33	H	5.83	F	3.33	B	1.67	C	0.00
Z	11.67	D	5.00	W	3.33	G	1.67	K	0.00
S	8.33	E	5.00	Q	2.50	Y	1.67	L	0.00
U	8.33	V	4.17	T	2.50	I	0.83	N	0.00
O	7.50	X	4.17	A	1.67	J	0.83	R	0.00
M	6.67								

Comparing this breakdown with Figure 3.5, it seems likely that cipher letters P and Z are the equivalents of plain letters e and t, but it is not certain which is which. The letters S, U, O, M, and H are all of relatively high frequency and probably




Figure 3.5 Relative Frequency of Letters in English Text

correspond to plain letters from the set {a, h, i, n, o, r, s}. The letters with the lowest frequencies (namely, A, B, G, Y, I, J) are likely included in the set {b, j, k, q, v, x, z}.

There are a number of ways to proceed at this point. We could make some tentative assignments and start to fill in the plaintext to see if it looks like a reasonable “skeleton” of a message. A more systematic approach is to look for other regularities. For example, certain words may be known to be in the text. Or we could look for repeating sequences of cipher letters and try to deduce their plaintext equivalents.

A powerful tool is to look at the frequency of two-letter combinations, known as **digrams**. A table similar to Figure 3.5 could be drawn up showing the relative frequency of digrams. The most common such digram is *th*. In our ciphertext, the most common digram is *ZW*, which appears three times. So we make the correspondence of *Z* with *t* and *W* with *h*. Then, by our earlier hypothesis, we can equate *P* with *e*. Now notice that the sequence *ZWP* appears in the ciphertext, and we can translate that sequence as “*the*.” This is the most frequent trigram (three-letter combination) in English, which seems to indicate that we are on the right track.

Next, notice the sequence *ZWSZ* in the first line. We do not know that these four letters form a complete word, but if they do, it is of the form *th_t*. If so, *S* equates with *a*.

So far, then, we have

```

UZQSOVUOHXMOPVGPOZPEVSGZWSZOPFPESXUDBMETSXAIZ
  t a           e e t e a t h a t e e a           a
VUEPHZHMDZSHZOWSFPAPPDTSVPPQUZWMYXUZUHSX
  e t   t a t h a e e e a e t h   t a
EPYEPOPDZSZUFPOMBZWPFUPZHMDJUDTMOHMQ
  e e e t a t e   t h e   t

```

Only four letters have been identified, but already we have quite a bit of the message. Continued analysis of frequencies plus trial and error should easily yield a solution from this point. The complete plaintext, with spaces added between words, follows:

```

it was disclosed yesterday that several informal but
direct contacts have been made with political
representatives of the viet cong in moscow

```

Monoalphabetic ciphers are easy to break because they reflect the frequency data of the original alphabet. A countermeasure is to provide multiple substitutes, known as homophones, for a single letter. For example, the letter *e* could be assigned a number of different cipher symbols, such as 16, 74, 35, and 21, with each homophone assigned to a letter in rotation or randomly. If the number of symbols assigned to each letter is proportional to the relative frequency of that letter, then single-letter frequency information is completely obliterated. The great mathematician Carl Friedrich Gauss believed that he had devised an unbreakable cipher using homophones. However, even with homophones, each element of plaintext affects only one element of ciphertext, and multiple-letter patterns

(e.g., digram frequencies) still survive in the ciphertext, making cryptanalysis relatively straightforward.

Two principal methods are used in substitution ciphers to lessen the extent to which the structure of the plaintext survives in the ciphertext: One approach is to encrypt multiple letters of plaintext, and the other is to use multiple cipher alphabets. We briefly examine each.

Playfair Cipher

The best-known multiple-letter encryption cipher is the Playfair, which treats digrams in the plaintext as single units and translates these units into ciphertext digrams.³

The Playfair algorithm is based on the use of a 5×5 matrix of letters constructed using a keyword. Here is an example, solved by Lord Peter Wimsey in Dorothy Sayers's *Have His Carcase*.⁴

M	O	N	A	R
C	H	Y	B	D
E	F	G	I/J	K
L	P	Q	S	T
U	V	W	X	Z

In this case, the keyword is *monarchy*. The matrix is constructed by filling in the letters of the keyword (minus duplicates) from left to right and from top to bottom, and then filling in the remainder of the matrix with the remaining letters in alphabetic order. The letters I and J count as one letter. Plaintext is encrypted two letters at a time, according to the following rules:

1. Repeating plaintext letters that are in the same pair are separated with a filler letter, such as x, so that balloon would be treated as ba lx lo on.
2. Two plaintext letters that fall in the same row of the matrix are each replaced by the letter to the right, with the first element of the row circularly following the last. For example, ar is encrypted as RM.
3. Two plaintext letters that fall in the same column are each replaced by the letter beneath, with the top element of the column circularly following the last. For example, mu is encrypted as CM.
4. Otherwise, each plaintext letter in a pair is replaced by the letter that lies in its own row and the column occupied by the other plaintext letter. Thus, hs becomes BP and ea becomes IM (or JM, as the encipherer wishes).

The Playfair cipher is a great advance over simple monoalphabetic ciphers. For one thing, whereas there are only 26 letters, there are $26 \times 26 = 676$ digrams, so

³This cipher was actually invented by British scientist Sir Charles Wheatstone in 1854, but it bears the name of his friend Baron Playfair of St. Andrews, who championed the cipher at the British foreign office.

⁴The book provides an absorbing account of a probable-word attack.

that identification of individual digrams is more difficult. Furthermore, the relative frequencies of individual letters exhibit a much greater range than that of digrams, making frequency analysis much more difficult. For these reasons, the Playfair cipher was for a long time considered unbreakable. It was used as the standard field system by the British Army in World War I and still enjoyed considerable use by the U.S. Army and other Allied forces during World War II.

Despite this level of confidence in its security, the Playfair cipher is relatively easy to break, because it still leaves much of the structure of the plaintext language intact. A few hundred letters of ciphertext are generally sufficient.

One way of revealing the effectiveness of the Playfair and other ciphers is shown in Figure 3.6. The line labeled *plaintext* plots a typical frequency distribution of the 26 alphabetic characters (no distinction between upper and lower case) in ordinary text. This is also the frequency distribution of any monoalphabetic substitution cipher, because the frequency values for individual letters are the same, just with different letters substituted for the original letters. The plot is developed in the following way: The number of occurrences of each letter in the text is counted and divided by the number of occurrences of the most frequently used letter. Using the results of Figure 3.5, we see that *e* is the most frequently used letter. As a result, *e* has a relative frequency of 1, *t* of $9.056/12.702 \approx 0.72$, and so on. The points on the horizontal axis correspond to the letters in order of decreasing frequency.

Figure 3.6 also shows the frequency distribution that results when the text is encrypted using the Playfair cipher. To normalize the plot, the number of occurrences of each letter in the ciphertext was again divided by the number of occurrences of *e* in the plaintext. The resulting plot therefore shows the extent to which the frequency distribution of letters, which makes it trivial to solve substitution




Figure 3.6 Relative Frequency of Occurrence of Letters

ciphers, is masked by encryption. If the frequency distribution information were totally concealed in the encryption process, the ciphertext plot of frequencies would be flat, and cryptanalysis using ciphertext only would be effectively impossible. As the figure shows, the Playfair cipher has a flatter distribution than does plaintext, but nevertheless, it reveals plenty of structure for a cryptanalyst to work with. The plot also shows the Vigenère cipher, discussed subsequently. The Hill and Vigenère curves on the plot are based on results reported in [SIMM93].

Hill Cipher⁵

Another interesting multiletter cipher is the Hill cipher, developed by the mathematician Lester Hill in 1929.

CONCEPTS FROM LINEAR ALGEBRA Before describing the Hill cipher, let us briefly review some terminology from linear algebra. In this discussion, we are concerned with matrix arithmetic modulo 26. For the reader who needs a refresher on matrix multiplication and inversion, see Appendix A.

We define the inverse \mathbf{M}^{-1} of a square matrix \mathbf{M} by the equation $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{M}^{-1}) = \mathbf{M}^{-1}\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{I}$, where \mathbf{I} is the identity matrix. \mathbf{I} is a square matrix that is all zeros except for ones along the main diagonal from upper left to lower right. The inverse of a matrix does not always exist, but when it does, it satisfies the preceding equation. For example,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{A} &= \begin{pmatrix} 5 & 8 \\ 17 & 3 \end{pmatrix} & \mathbf{A}^{-1} \bmod 26 &= \begin{pmatrix} 9 & 2 \\ 1 & 15 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} (5 \times 9) + (8 \times 1) & (5 \times 2) + (8 \times 15) \\ (17 \times 9) + (3 \times 1) & (17 \times 2) + (3 \times 15) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 53 & 130 \\ 156 & 79 \end{pmatrix} \bmod 26 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\end{aligned}$$

To explain how the inverse of a matrix is computed, we begin with the concept of determinant. For any square matrix ($m \times m$), the **determinant** equals the sum of all the products that can be formed by taking exactly one element from each row and exactly one element from each column, with certain of the product terms preceded by a minus sign. For a 2×2 matrix,

$$\begin{pmatrix} k_{11} & k_{12} \\ k_{21} & k_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

the determinant is $k_{11}k_{22} - k_{12}k_{21}$. For a 3×3 matrix, the value of the determinant is $k_{11}k_{22}k_{33} + k_{21}k_{32}k_{13} + k_{31}k_{12}k_{23} - k_{31}k_{22}k_{13} - k_{21}k_{12}k_{33} - k_{11}k_{32}k_{23}$. If a square

⁵This cipher is somewhat more difficult to understand than the others in this chapter, but it illustrates an important point about cryptanalysis that will be useful later on. This subsection can be skipped on a first reading.

matrix \mathbf{A} has a nonzero determinant, then the inverse of the matrix is computed as $[\mathbf{A}^{-1}]_{ij} = (\det \mathbf{A})^{-1}(-1)^{i+j}(\mathbf{D}_{ji})$, where (\mathbf{D}_{ji}) is the subdeterminant formed by deleting the j th row and the i th column of \mathbf{A} , $\det(\mathbf{A})$ is the determinant of \mathbf{A} , and $(\det \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ is the multiplicative inverse of $(\det \mathbf{A}) \bmod 26$.

Continuing our example,

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} 5 & 8 \\ 17 & 3 \end{pmatrix} = (5 \times 3) - (8 \times 17) = -121 \bmod 26 = 9$$

We can show that $9^{-1} \bmod 26 = 3$, because $9 \times 3 = 27 \bmod 26 = 1$ (see Chapter 2 or Appendix A). Therefore, we compute the inverse of \mathbf{A} as

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 5 & 8 \\ 17 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{A}^{-1} \bmod 26 = 3 \begin{pmatrix} 3 & -8 \\ -17 & 5 \end{pmatrix} = 3 \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 18 \\ 9 & 5 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 9 & 54 \\ 27 & 15 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 9 & 2 \\ 1 & 15 \end{pmatrix}$$

THE HILL ALGORITHM This encryption algorithm takes m successive plaintext letters and substitutes for them m ciphertext letters. The substitution is determined by m linear equations in which each character is assigned a numerical value ($a = 0, b = 1, \dots, z = 25$). For $m = 3$, the system can be described as

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= (k_{11}p_1 + k_{21}p_2 + k_{31}p_3) \bmod 26 \\ c_2 &= (k_{12}p_1 + k_{22}p_2 + k_{32}p_3) \bmod 26 \\ c_3 &= (k_{13}p_1 + k_{23}p_2 + k_{33}p_3) \bmod 26 \end{aligned}$$

This can be expressed in terms of row vectors and matrices:⁶

$$(c_1 \ c_2 \ c_3) = (p_1 \ p_2 \ p_3) \begin{pmatrix} k_{11} & k_{12} & k_{13} \\ k_{21} & k_{22} & k_{23} \\ k_{31} & k_{32} & k_{33} \end{pmatrix} \bmod 26$$

or

$$\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{PK} \bmod 26$$

where \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{P} are row vectors of length 3 representing the plaintext and ciphertext, and \mathbf{K} is a 3×3 matrix representing the encryption key. Operations are performed mod 26.

⁶Some cryptography books express the plaintext and ciphertext as column vectors, so that the column vector is placed after the matrix rather than the row vector placed before the matrix. Sage uses row vectors, so we adopt that convention.

For example, consider the plaintext “paymoremoney” and use the encryption key

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} 17 & 17 & 5 \\ 21 & 18 & 21 \\ 2 & 2 & 19 \end{pmatrix}$$

The first three letters of the plaintext are represented by the vector (15 0 24). Then $(15\ 0\ 24)\mathbf{K} = (303\ 303\ 531) \bmod 26 = (17\ 17\ 11) = \text{RRL}$. Continuing in this fashion, the ciphertext for the entire plaintext is RRLMWBKASPDH.

Decryption requires using the inverse of the matrix \mathbf{K} . We can compute $\det \mathbf{K} = 23$, and therefore, $(\det \mathbf{K})^{-1} \bmod 26 = 17$. We can then compute the inverse as⁷

$$\mathbf{K}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 9 & 15 \\ 15 & 17 & 6 \\ 24 & 0 & 17 \end{pmatrix}$$

This is demonstrated as

$$\begin{pmatrix} 17 & 17 & 5 \\ 21 & 18 & 21 \\ 2 & 2 & 19 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 9 & 15 \\ 15 & 17 & 6 \\ 24 & 0 & 17 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 443 & 442 & 442 \\ 858 & 495 & 780 \\ 494 & 52 & 365 \end{pmatrix} \bmod 26 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

It is easily seen that if the matrix \mathbf{K}^{-1} is applied to the ciphertext, then the plaintext is recovered.

In general terms, the Hill system can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{P}) = \mathbf{PK} \bmod 26$$

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{C}) = \mathbf{CK}^{-1} \bmod 26 = \mathbf{PKK}^{-1} = \mathbf{P}$$

As with Playfair, the strength of the Hill cipher is that it completely hides single-letter frequencies. Indeed, with Hill, the use of a larger matrix hides more frequency information. Thus, a 3×3 Hill cipher hides not only single-letter but also two-letter frequency information.

Although the Hill cipher is strong against a ciphertext-only attack, it is easily broken with a known plaintext attack. For an $m \times m$ Hill cipher, suppose we have m plaintext–ciphertext pairs, each of length m . We label the pairs $\mathbf{P}_j = (p_{1j} p_{1j} \dots p_{mj})$ and $\mathbf{C}_j = (c_{1j} c_{1j} \dots c_{mj})$ such that $\mathbf{C}_j = \mathbf{P}_j \mathbf{K}$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$ and for some unknown key matrix \mathbf{K} . Now define two $m \times m$ matrices $\mathbf{X} = (p_{ij})$ and $\mathbf{Y} = (c_{ij})$. Then we can form the matrix equation $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{XK}$. If \mathbf{X} has an inverse, then we can determine $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{X}^{-1}\mathbf{Y}$. If \mathbf{X} is not invertible, then a new version of \mathbf{X} can be formed with additional plaintext–ciphertext pairs until an invertible \mathbf{X} is obtained.

Consider this example. Suppose that the plaintext “hillcipher” is encrypted using a 2×2 Hill cipher to yield the ciphertext HCRZSSXNSP. Thus, we know that $(7\ 8)\mathbf{K} \bmod 26 = (7\ 2)$; $(11\ 11)\mathbf{K} \bmod 26 = (17\ 25)$; and so on. Using the first two plaintext–ciphertext pairs, we have

⁷The calculations for this example are provided in detail in Appendix A.

$$\begin{pmatrix} 7 & 2 \\ 17 & 25 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 7 & 8 \\ 11 & 11 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{K} \bmod 26$$

The inverse of \mathbf{X} can be computed:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 7 & 8 \\ 11 & 11 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 25 & 22 \\ 1 & 23 \end{pmatrix}$$

so

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} 25 & 22 \\ 1 & 23 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 7 & 2 \\ 17 & 25 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 549 & 600 \\ 398 & 577 \end{pmatrix} \bmod 26 = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 8 & 5 \end{pmatrix}$$

This result is verified by testing the remaining plaintext–ciphertext pairs.

Polyalphabetic Ciphers

Another way to improve on the simple monoalphabetic technique is to use different monoalphabetic substitutions as one proceeds through the plaintext message. The general name for this approach is **polyalphabetic substitution cipher**. All these techniques have the following features in common:

1. A set of related monoalphabetic substitution rules is used.
2. A key determines which particular rule is chosen for a given transformation.

VIGENÈRE CIPHER The best known, and one of the simplest, polyalphabetic ciphers is the Vigenère cipher. In this scheme, the set of related monoalphabetic substitution rules consists of the 26 Caesar ciphers with shifts of 0 through 25. Each cipher is denoted by a key letter, which is the ciphertext letter that substitutes for the plaintext letter a. Thus, a Caesar cipher with a shift of 3 is denoted by the key value 3.⁸

We can express the Vigenère cipher in the following manner. Assume a sequence of plaintext letters $P = p_0, p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{n-1}$ and a key consisting of the sequence of letters $K = k_0, k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{m-1}$, where typically $m < n$. The sequence of ciphertext letters $C = C_0, C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{n-1}$ is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} C &= C_0, C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{n-1} = E(K, P) = E[(k_0, k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{m-1}), (p_0, p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{n-1})] \\ &= (p_0 + k_0) \bmod 26, (p_1 + k_1) \bmod 26, \dots, (p_{m-1} + k_{m-1}) \bmod 26, \\ &\quad (p_m + k_0) \bmod 26, (p_{m+1} + k_1) \bmod 26, \dots, (p_{2m-1} + k_{m-1}) \bmod 26, \dots \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the first letter of the key is added to the first letter of the plaintext, mod 26, the second letters are added, and so on through the first m letters of the plaintext. For the next m letters of the plaintext, the key letters are repeated. This process

⁸To aid in understanding this scheme and also to aid in its use, a matrix known as the Vigenère tableau is often used. This tableau is discussed in a document at box.com/Crypto8e.

continues until all of the plaintext sequence is encrypted. A general equation of the encryption process is

$$C_i = (p_i + k_{i \bmod m}) \bmod 26 \quad (3.3)$$

Compare this with Equation (3.1) for the Caesar cipher. In essence, each plaintext character is encrypted with a different Caesar cipher, depending on the corresponding key character. Similarly, decryption is a generalization of Equation (3.2):

$$p_i = (C_i - k_{i \bmod m}) \bmod 26 \quad (3.4)$$

To encrypt a message, a key is needed that is as long as the message. Usually, the key is a repeating keyword. For example, if the keyword is *deceptive*, the message “we are discovered save yourself” is encrypted as

```
key:           deceptivedeceptive
plaintext:     wearediscoveredsaveyourself
ciphertext:    ZICVTWQNGRZGVTVAVZHCQYGLMGJ
```

Expressed numerically, we have the following result.

key	3	4	2	4	15	19	8	21	4	3	4	2	4	15
plaintext	22	4	0	17	4	3	8	18	2	14	21	4	17	4
ciphertext	25	8	2	21	19	22	16	13	6	17	25	6	21	19

key	19	8	21	4	3	4	2	4	15	19	8	21	4
plaintext	3	18	0	21	4	24	14	20	17	18	4	11	5
ciphertext	22	0	21	25	7	2	16	24	6	11	12	6	9

The strength of this cipher is that there are multiple ciphertext letters for each plaintext letter, one for each unique letter of the keyword. Thus, the letter frequency information is obscured. However, not all knowledge of the plaintext structure is lost. For example, Figure 3.6 shows the frequency distribution for a Vigenère cipher with a keyword of length 9. An improvement is achieved over the Playfair cipher, but considerable frequency information remains.

It is instructive to sketch a method of breaking this cipher, because the method reveals some of the mathematical principles that apply in cryptanalysis.

First, suppose that the opponent believes that the ciphertext was encrypted using either monoalphabetic substitution or a Vigenère cipher. A simple test can be made to make a determination. If a monoalphabetic substitution is used, then the statistical properties of the ciphertext should be the same as that of the language of the plaintext. Thus, referring to Figure 3.5, there should be one cipher letter with a relative frequency of occurrence of about 12.7%, one with about 9.06%, and so on. If only a single message is available for analysis, we would not expect an exact match of this small sample with the statistical profile of the plaintext language. Nevertheless, if the correspondence is close, we can assume a monoalphabetic substitution.

If, on the other hand, a Vigenère cipher is suspected, then progress depends on determining the length of the keyword, as will be seen in a moment. For now, let us concentrate on how the keyword length can be determined. The important insight that leads to a solution is the following: If two identical sequences of plaintext letters occur at a distance that is an integer multiple of the keyword length, they will generate identical ciphertext sequences. In the foregoing example, two instances of the sequence “red” are separated by nine character positions. Consequently, in both cases, r is encrypted using key letter *e*, e is encrypted using key letter *p*, and d is encrypted using key letter *t*. Thus, in both cases, the ciphertext sequence is VTW. We indicate this above by underlining the relevant ciphertext letters and shading the relevant ciphertext numbers.

An analyst looking at only the ciphertext would detect the repeated sequences VTW at a displacement of 9 and make the assumption that the keyword is either three or nine letters in length. The appearance of VTW twice could be by chance and may not reflect identical plaintext letters encrypted with identical key letters. However, if the message is long enough, there will be a number of such repeated ciphertext sequences. By looking for common factors in the displacements of the various sequences, the analyst should be able to make a good guess of the keyword length.

Solution of the cipher now depends on an important insight. If the keyword length is *m*, then the cipher, in effect, consists of *m* monoalphabetic substitution ciphers. For example, with the keyword DECEPTIVE, the letters in positions 1, 10, 19, and so on are all encrypted with the same monoalphabetic cipher. Thus, we can use the known frequency characteristics of the plaintext language to attack each of the monoalphabetic ciphers separately.

The periodic nature of the keyword can be eliminated by using a nonrepeating keyword that is as long as the message itself. Vigenère proposed what is referred to as an **autokey system**, in which a keyword is concatenated with the plaintext itself to provide a running key. For our example,

key:	<i>deceptivewear</i> <i>ediscovereds</i> <i>av</i>
plaintext:	<i>wear</i> <i>ediscovereds</i> <i>aveyourself</i>
ciphertext:	ZICVTWQNGKZEIIGASXSTSLVVWLA

Even this scheme is vulnerable to cryptanalysis. Because the key and the plaintext share the same frequency distribution of letters, a statistical technique can be applied. For example, e enciphered by *e*, by Figure 3.5, can be expected to occur with a frequency of $(0.127)^2 \approx 0.016$, whereas t enciphered by *t* would occur only about half as often.⁹ These regularities can be exploited to achieve successful cryptanalysis.⁹

VERNAM CIPHER The ultimate defense against such a cryptanalysis is to choose a keyword that is as long as the plaintext and has no statistical relationship to it. Such a system was introduced by an AT&T engineer named Gilbert Vernam in 1918.

⁹Although the techniques for breaking a Vigenère cipher are by no means complex, a 1917 issue of *Scientific American* characterized this system as “impossible of translation.” This is a point worth remembering when similar claims are made for modern algorithms.




Figure 3.7 Vernam Cipher

His system works on binary data (bits) rather than letters. The system can be expressed succinctly as follows (Figure 3.7):

$$c_i = p_i \oplus k_i$$

where

p_i = i th binary digit of plaintext

k_i = i th binary digit of key

c_i = i th binary digit of ciphertext

\oplus = exclusive-or (XOR) operation

Compare this with Equation (3.3) for the Vigenère cipher.

Thus, the ciphertext is generated by performing the bitwise XOR of the plaintext and the key. Because of the properties of the XOR, decryption simply involves the same bitwise operation:

$$p_i = c_i \oplus k_i$$

which compares with Equation (3.4).

The essence of this technique is the means of construction of the key. Vernam proposed the use of a running loop of tape that eventually repeated the key, so that in fact the system worked with a very long but repeating keyword. Although such a scheme, with a long key, presents formidable cryptanalytic difficulties, it can be broken with sufficient ciphertext, the use of known or probable plaintext sequences, or both.

One-Time Pad

An Army Signal Corp officer, Joseph Mauborgne, proposed an improvement to the Vernam cipher that yields the ultimate in security. Mauborgne suggested using a random key that is as long as the message, so that the key need not be repeated. In addition, the key is to be used to encrypt and decrypt a single message, and then is discarded. Each new message requires a new key of the same length as the new message. Such a scheme, known as a **one-time pad**, is unbreakable. It produces random output that bears no statistical relationship to the plaintext. Because the ciphertext

contains no information whatsoever about the plaintext, there is simply no way to break the code.

An example should illustrate our point. Suppose that we are using a Vigenère scheme with 27 characters in which the twenty-seventh character is the space character, but with a one-time key that is as long as the message. Consider the ciphertext

ANKYODKYUREPFJBYOJDSPLREYIUNOFDOIUERFPLUYTS

We now show two different decryptions using two different keys:

```
ciphertext: ANKYODKYUREPFJBYOJDSPLREYIUNOFDOIUERFPLUYTS
key:        pxlmvmsydofoyrvzwc tnlebnecvgdupahfzzlmnyih
plaintext:  mr mustard with the candlestick in the hall

ciphertext: ANKYODKYUREPFJBYOJDSPLREYIUNOFDOIUERFPLUYTS
key:        pftgpmiydgaxgoufhklllmhsqdqogtewbqfgyovuhwt
plaintext:  miss scarlet with the knife in the library
```

Suppose that a cryptanalyst had managed to find these two keys. Two plausible plaintexts are produced. How is the cryptanalyst to decide which is the correct decryption (i.e., which is the correct key)? If the actual key were produced in a truly random fashion, then the cryptanalyst cannot say that one of these two keys is more likely than the other. Thus, there is no way to decide which key is correct and therefore which plaintext is correct.

In fact, given any plaintext of equal length to the ciphertext, there is a key that produces that plaintext. Therefore, if you did an exhaustive search of all possible keys, you would end up with many legible plaintexts, with no way of knowing which was the intended plaintext. Therefore, the code is unbreakable.

The security of the one-time pad is entirely due to the randomness of the key. If the stream of characters that constitute the key is truly random, then the stream of characters that constitute the ciphertext will be truly random. Thus, there are no patterns or regularities that a cryptanalyst can use to attack the ciphertext.

In theory, we need look no further for a cipher. The one-time pad offers complete security but, in practice, has two fundamental difficulties:

1. There is the practical problem of making large quantities of random keys. Any heavily used system might require millions of random characters on a regular basis. Supplying truly random characters in this volume is a significant task.
2. Even more daunting is the problem of key distribution and protection. For every message to be sent, a key of equal length is needed by both sender and receiver. Thus, a mammoth key distribution problem exists.

Because of these difficulties, the one-time pad is of limited utility and is useful primarily for low-bandwidth channels requiring very high security.

The one-time pad is the only cryptosystem that exhibits what is referred to as *perfect secrecy*. This concept is explored in Appendix B.

3.3 TRANSPOSITION TECHNIQUES

All the techniques examined so far involve the substitution of a ciphertext symbol for a plaintext symbol. A very different kind of mapping is achieved by performing some sort of permutation on the plaintext letters. This technique is referred to as a transposition cipher.

The simplest such cipher is the rail fence technique, in which the plaintext is written down as a sequence of diagonals and then read off as a sequence of rows. For example, to encipher the message “meet me after the toga party” with a rail fence of depth 2, we write the following:

```
m e m a t r h t g p r y
e t e f e t e o a a t
```

The encrypted message is

```
MEMATRHTGPRYETEFETEOAAT
```

This sort of thing would be trivial to cryptanalyze. A more complex scheme is to write the message in a rectangle, row by row, and read the message off, column by column, but permute the order of the columns. The order of the columns then becomes the key to the algorithm. For example,

```
Key:          4 3 1 2 5 6 7
Plaintext:    a t t a c k p
               o s t p o n e
               d u n t i l t
               w o a m x y z
Ciphertext:   TTNAAPTMTSUOAODWCOIXKNLYPETZ
```

Thus, in this example, the key is 4312567. To encrypt, start with the column that is labeled 1, in this case column 3. Write down all the letters in that column. Proceed to column 4, which is labeled 2, then column 2, then column 1, then columns 5, 6, and 7.

A pure transposition cipher is easily recognized because it has the same letter frequencies as the original plaintext. For the type of columnar transposition just shown, cryptanalysis is fairly straightforward and involves laying out the ciphertext in a matrix and playing around with column positions. Digram and trigram frequency tables can be useful.

The transposition cipher can be made significantly more secure by performing more than one stage of transposition. The result is a more complex permutation that is not easily reconstructed. Thus, if the foregoing message is reencrypted using the same algorithm,

Key: 4 3 1 2 5 6 7
Input: t t n a a p t
 m t s u o a o
 d w c o i x k
 n l y p e t z
Output: NSCYAUOPTTWLTMDNAOIEPAXTTOKZ

To visualize the result of this double transposition, designate the letters in the original plaintext message by the numbers designating their position. Thus, with 28 letters in the message, the original sequence of letters is

01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 13 14
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

After the first transposition, we have

03 10 17 24 04 11 18 25 02 09 16 23 01 08
15 22 05 12 19 26 06 13 20 27 07 14 21 28

which has a somewhat regular structure. But after the second transposition, we have

17 09 05 27 24 16 12 07 10 02 22 20 03 25
15 13 04 23 19 14 11 01 26 21 18 08 06 28

This is a much less structured permutation and is much more difficult to cryptanalyze.

3.4 KEY TERMS, REVIEW QUESTIONS, AND PROBLEMS

Key Terms

block cipher brute-force attack cipher ciphertext computationally secure conventional encryption cryptanalysis cryptographic system cryptography	cryptology deciphering decryption digram enciphering encryption monoalphabetic substitution cipher one-time pad	permutation plaintext polyalphabetic substitution cipher single-key encryption stream cipher symmetric encryption unconditionally secure
--	---	---

Review Questions

- 3.1 Describe the main requirements for the secure use of symmetric encryption.
- 3.2 What are the two basic functions used in encryption algorithms?

- 3.3 Differentiate between secret-key encryption and public-key encryption.
- 3.4 What is the difference between a block cipher and a stream cipher?
- 3.5 What are the two general approaches to attacking a cipher?
- 3.6 List and briefly define types of cryptanalytic attacks based on what is known to the attacker.
- 3.7 Briefly describe the criteria that define a computationally secure cipher.
- 3.8 Why is the Caesar cipher substitution technique vulnerable to a brute-force cryptanalysis?
- 3.9 How much key space is available when a monoalphabetic substitution cipher is used to replace plaintext with ciphertext?
- 3.10 What is the drawback of a Playfair cipher?
- 3.11 What is the difference between a monoalphabetic cipher and a polyalphabetic cipher?
- 3.12 How can an attacker determine the length of the keyword used in the Vigenère cipher?
- 3.13 What is a transposition cipher?
- 3.14 What are the drawbacks of Steganography?

Problems

- 3.1 A generalization of the Caesar cipher, known as the affine Caesar cipher, has the following form: For each plaintext letter p , substitute the ciphertext letter C :

$$C = E([a, b], p) = (ap + b) \bmod 26$$

A basic requirement of any encryption algorithm is that it be one-to-one. That is, if $p \neq q$, then $E(k, p) \neq E(k, q)$. Otherwise, decryption is impossible, because more than one plaintext character maps into the same ciphertext character. The affine Caesar cipher is not one-to-one for all values of a . For example, for $a = 2$ and $b = 3$, then $E([a, b], 0) = E([a, b], 13) = 3$.

- a. Are there any limitations on the value of b ? Explain why or why not.
 - b. Determine which values of a are not allowed.
 - c. Provide a general statement of which values of a are and are not allowed. Justify your statement.
- 3.2 What is the number of monoalphabetic permutation ciphers over n elements?
 - 3.3 A ciphertext has been generated with an affine cipher. The most frequent letter of the ciphertext is “C,” and the second most frequent letter of the ciphertext is “Z.” Break this code.
 - 3.4 The following ciphertext was generated using a simple substitution algorithm.

hzsrnqc klyy wqc flo mflwf ol zqdn nsoznj wskn lj xzsrbjnf,
 wzsxz gqv zqhhnf ol ozn glco zlfnc hnlhrn; nsoznj
 jnrqosdnc lj fnqj kjsnfb, wzsxz sc xnjoqsfrv gljn efeceqr.
 zn rsdnb qrlfn sf zsc zlecn sf cqdsrrn jlw, wzssoznj flfn
 hnfnjqonb. q csfyrn blgncosx cekksxb ol cnjdn zsg. zn
 pjnqmqqconb qfb bsfnb qo ozn xrep, qo zlejc gqozngqosxqrrv
 ksanb, sf ozn cqgn jllg, qo ozn cqgn oqprn, fndnj oqmsfy
 zsc gnqrc wsoz loznj gngpnjc, gexz rncc pjsfysfy q yenco
 wsoz zsg; qfb wnfo zlgn qo naqxov gsbfsyzo, lfrv ol jnosjn
 qo lfxn ol pnb. zn fndnj ecnb ozn xlcx xzqgnjc wzsxz ozn
 jnkljg hjldsbnc klj soc kqdlejnb gngpnjc. zn hqccnb onf
 zlejc leo lk ozn ownfov-klej sf cqdsrrn jlw, nsoznj sf
 crnhsfy lj gqmsfy zsc olsrno.

Decrypt this message.

Hints:

1. As you know, the most frequently occurring letter in English is e. Therefore, the first or second (or perhaps third?) most common character in the message is likely to stand for e. Also, e is often seen in pairs (e.g., meet, fleet, speed, seen, been, agree, etc.). Try to find a character in the ciphertext that decodes to e.
2. The most common word in English is “the.” Use this fact to guess the characters that stand for t and h.
3. Decipher the rest of the message by deducing additional words.

Warning: The resulting message is in English but may not make much sense on a first reading.

- 3.5 One way to solve the key distribution problem is to use a book that both the sender and the receiver possess. The sender and the receiver use the location of a word in the book as the code. In order to avoid problems when a particular plaintext word is not present in the book, the method can be modified to encode individual letters by the location of a word beginning with that letter. Further, to ease the encoding and decoding process, the encoding of a letter is the pair of line number and the location of the word in that line.

For example, the first sentence of the 1931 book *The American Black Chamber* (by Herbert Yardley) is:

The secret activities of the American Black Chamber, which I directed, ceased in 1929, sixteen years after I arrived at the Department of State as a young telegraph operator.

Using this book, the message “tact” can be encoded as (3,4),(1,3),(1,8),(3,4).

The particular scheme discussed in this problem is based on this sentence. Answer the questions given the following enciphered message:

(1,6), (1,8) (2,1) (3,5), (1,2), (3,4)

- a. What is the plaintext?
 - b. How secure is the method?
 - c. What kind of practical problems may arise while using this method?
- 3.6 In one of his cases, Sherlock Holmes was confronted with the following message.

534 C2 13 127 36 31 4 17 21 41
DOUGLAS 109 293 5 37 BIRLSTONE
26 BIRLSTONE 9 127 171

Although Watson was puzzled, Holmes was able immediately to deduce the type of cipher. Can you?

- 3.7 a. Given the encryption of a long plaintext, how can one possibly determine if the encryption is by the Playfair cipher?
- b. The Playfair cipher has the property that if the decryption of a ciphertext digraph AB is PQ, then the decryption of the reverse digraph BA will be QP. How can one use this property to cryptanalyze a ciphertext encrypted using the Playfair cipher?
- c. Unlike the Playfair cipher which uses a single 5×5 matrix, the two-square cipher uses two 5×5 matrices placed one below the other. The two matrices are constructed similar to the Playfair cipher with two different keywords. The encryption proceeds digraph-wise, in which a rectangle is formed by the first character’s position in the first matrix and the second character’s position in the second matrix. Then the two characters at the remaining two vertices of the rectangle become the ciphertext. In case the characters of the digraph fall in the same column, the digraph encrypts to itself.

Given the two keywords TARGET and HELP, encrypt the plaintext “we will rock” using the two-square cipher.

- 3.8** A disadvantage of the general monoalphabetic cipher is that both sender and receiver must commit the permuted cipher sequence to memory. A common technique for avoiding this is to use a keyword from which the cipher sequence can be generated. For example, using the keyword CRYPTO, write out the keyword followed by unused letters in normal order, and match this against the plaintext letters:

```
plain:  a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z
cipher: C R Y P T O A B D E F G H I J K L M N Q S U V W X Z
```

If it is felt that this process does not produce sufficient mixing, write the remaining letters on successive lines and then generate the sequence by reading down the columns:

```
C R Y P T O
A B D E F G
H I J K L M
N Q S U V W
X Z
```

This yields the sequence:

```
C A H N X R B I Q Z Y D J S P E K U T F L V O G M W
```

Such a system is used in the example in Section 3.2 (the one that begins “it was disclosed yesterday”). Determine the keyword.

- 3.9** When the PT-109 American patrol boat, under the command of Lieutenant John F. Kennedy, was sunk by a Japanese destroyer, a message was received at an Australian wireless station in Playfair code:

```
KXJEY UREBE ZWEHE WRYTU HEYFS
KREHE GOYFI WTTTU OLKSY CAJPO
BOTEI ZONTX BYBNT GONEY CUZWR
GDSON SXBOU YWRHE BAAHY USEDQ
```

The key used was *royal new zealand navy*. Decrypt the message. Translate TT into tt.

- 3.10** **a.** Construct a Playfair matrix with the key *algorithm*.
b. Construct a Playfair matrix with the key *cryptography*. Make a reasonable assumption about how to treat redundant letters in the key.
- 3.11** **a.** Using this Playfair matrix:

J/K	C	D	E	F
U	N	P	Q	S
Z	V	W	X	Y
R	A	L	G	O
B	I	T	H	M

Encrypt this message:

I only regret that I have but one life to give for my country.

Note: This message is by Nathan Hale, a soldier in the American Revolutionary War.

- b.** Repeat part (a) using the Playfair matrix from Problem 3.10a.

- c. How do you account for the results of this problem? Can you generalize your conclusion?
- 3.12 a. Given the keyword SECURITY, encrypt the following plaintext using the autokey system.

We are discovered. Save yourself.

- b. Given a long ciphertext which has been encrypted with the autokey system, how can one find the secret key used?
- 3.13 What substitution system results when we use a 1×25 Playfair matrix?
- 3.14 a. Encrypt the message “meet me at the usual place at ten rather than eight o clock”

using the Hill cipher with the key $\begin{pmatrix} 7 & 3 \\ 2 & 5 \end{pmatrix}$. Show your calculations and the result.

- b. Show the calculations for the corresponding decryption of the ciphertext to recover the original plaintext.
- 3.15 We have shown that the Hill cipher succumbs to a known plaintext attack if sufficient plaintext–ciphertext pairs are provided. It is even easier to solve the Hill cipher if a chosen plaintext attack can be mounted. Describe such an attack.

- 3.16 In a language having p letters, where p is a prime number, we can encode the letters by the set of integers $Z_p = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$. Suppose we use the Hill cipher

with the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$ modulo p to encrypt messages in this language. It can be

shown that this requires the matrix to be invertible modulo p . A matrix is invertible modulo p if none of its rows can be represented as a linear combination of the other rows modulo p . If the i^{th} row is denoted by R_i , then this condition translates to $R_i \neq (c_1R_1 + c_2R_2 + \dots + c_{i-1}R_{i-1})$ modulo p , where $c_i \in Z_p$ for all i . Determine the number of different (good) keys there are for a 2×2 Hill cipher without counting them one by one, using the following steps:

- a. Assume that no row can be all zeros, because then this row can be represented as a linear combination of other rows with the coefficient c_i being 0. Find the number of possibilities for the first row.
- b. The second row should not be a multiple of the first row modulo p . Find the number of possibilities for the second row.
- c. Find the total number of 2×2 matrices, which can be used in the Hill cipher.
- d. If we encrypt 3 letters at a time using the Hill cipher, the matrix will have to be of the order 3×3 . Using arguments similar to the above, find the number of good matrices for this size.
- e. If the matrix is of size $n \times n$, where n is a product of two prime numbers p and q , then the fraction of all matrices that are invertible modulo n is equal to the fraction of all matrices that are invertible modulo p times the fraction of all matrices that are invertible modulo q . Using this knowledge, find the number of 2×2 invertible matrices modulo 26.
- 3.17 Calculate the determinant mod 26 of

a. $\begin{pmatrix} 23 & 5 \\ 13 & 7 \end{pmatrix}$ b. $\begin{pmatrix} 21 & 13 & 25 \\ 5 & 7 & 18 \\ 3 & 14 & 12 \end{pmatrix}$

- 3.18 Determine the inverse mod 26 of

a. $\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 4 \\ 15 & 9 \end{pmatrix}$ b. $\begin{pmatrix} 5 & 3 & 15 \\ 21 & 2 & 6 \\ 1 & 12 & 25 \end{pmatrix}$

- 3.19 Using the Vigenère cipher, encrypt the word “cryptographic” using the word “eng”

- 3.20** This problem explores the use of a one-time pad version of the Vigenère cipher. In this scheme, the key is a stream of random numbers between 0 and 26. For example, if the key is 3 19 5 . . . , then the first letter of plaintext is encrypted with a shift of 3 letters, the second with a shift of 19 letters, the third with a shift of 5 letters, and so on.
- Encrypt the plaintext `sendmoremoney` with the key stream
3 11 5 7 17 21 0 11 14 8 7 13 9
 - Using the ciphertext produced in part (a), find a key so that the ciphertext decrypts to the plaintext `cashnotneeded`.
- 3.21** In one of Dorothy Sayers's mysteries, Lord Peter is confronted with the message shown in Figure 3.8. He also discovers the key to the message, which is a sequence of integers:

I thought to see the fairies in the fields, but I saw only the evil elephants with their black backs. Woe! how that sight awed me! The elves danced all around and about while I heard voices calling clearly. Ah! how I tried to see—throw off the ugly cloud—but no blind eye of a mortal was permitted to spy them. So then came minstrels, having gold trumpets, harps and drums. These played very loudly beside me, breaking that spell. So the dream vanished, whereat I thanked Heaven. I shed many tears before the thin moon rose up, frail and faint as a sickle of straw. Now though the Enchanter gnash his teeth vainly, yet shall he return as the Spring returns. Oh, wretched man! Hell gapes, Erebus now lies open. The mouths of Death wait on thy end.

Figure 3.8 A Puzzle for Lord Peter

787656543432112343456567878878765654
3432112343456567878878765654433211234

- Decrypt the message. *Hint:* What is the largest integer value?
- If the algorithm is known but not the key, how secure is the scheme?
- If the key is known but not the algorithm, how secure is the scheme?

Programming Problems

- Write a program that can encrypt and decrypt using the general Caesar cipher, also known as an additive cipher.
- Write a program that can encrypt and decrypt using the affine cipher described in Problem 3.1.
- Write a program that can perform a letter frequency attack on an additive cipher without human intervention. Your software should produce possible plaintexts in rough order of likelihood. It would be good if your user interface allowed the user to specify “give me the top 10 possible plaintexts.”
- Write a program that can perform a letter frequency attack on any monoalphabetic substitution cipher without human intervention. Your software should produce possible plaintexts in rough order of likelihood. It would be good if your user interface allowed the user to specify “give me the top 10 possible plaintexts.”
- Create software that can encrypt and decrypt using a 2×2 Hill cipher.
- Create software that can perform a fast known plaintext attack on a Hill cipher, given the dimension m . How fast are your algorithms, as a function of m ?