

# *Protection*



The processes in an operating system must be protected from one another's activities. To provide such protection, we can use various mechanisms to ensure that only processes that have gained proper authorization from the operating system can operate on the files, memory segments, CPU, and other resources of a system.

Protection refers to a mechanism for controlling the access of programs, processes, or users to the resources defined by a computer system. This mechanism must provide a means for specifying the controls to be imposed, together with a means of enforcement. We distinguish between protection and security, which is a measure of confidence that the integrity of a system and its data will be preserved. In this chapter, we focus on protection. Security assurance is a much broader topic, and we address it in Chapter 14.

## **CHAPTER OBJECTIVES**

- To discuss the goals and principles of protection in a modern computer system.
- To explain how protection domains, combined with an access matrix, are used to specify the resources a process may access.
- To examine capability- and language-based protection systems.

### **13.1 Goals of Protection**

As computer systems have become more sophisticated and pervasive in their applications, the need to protect their integrity has also grown. Protection was originally conceived as an adjunct to multiprogramming operating systems, so that untrustworthy users might safely share a common logical name space, such as a directory of files, or share a common physical name space, such as memory. Modern protection concepts have evolved to increase the reliability of any complex system that makes use of shared resources.

We need to provide protection for several reasons. The most obvious is the need to prevent the mischievous, intentional violation of an access restriction

by a user. Of more general importance, however, is the need to ensure that each program component active in a system uses system resources only in ways consistent with stated policies. This requirement is an absolute one for a reliable system.

Protection can improve reliability by detecting latent errors at the interfaces between component subsystems. Early detection of interface errors can often prevent contamination of a healthy subsystem by a malfunctioning subsystem. Also, an unprotected resource cannot defend against use (or misuse) by an unauthorized or incompetent user. A protection-oriented system provides means to distinguish between authorized and unauthorized usage.

The role of protection in a computer system is to provide a mechanism for the enforcement of the policies governing resource use. These policies can be established in a variety of ways. Some are fixed in the design of the system, while others are formulated by the management of a system. Still others are defined by the individual users to protect their own files and programs. A protection system must have the flexibility to enforce a variety of policies.

Policies for resource use may vary by application, and they may change over time. For these reasons, protection is no longer the concern solely of the designer of an operating system. The application programmer needs to use protection mechanisms as well, to guard resources created and supported by an application subsystem against misuse. In this chapter, we describe the protection mechanisms the operating system should provide, but application designers can use them as well in designing their own protection software.

Note that *mechanisms* are distinct from *policies*. Mechanisms determine *how* something will be done; policies decide *what* will be done. The separation of policy and mechanism is important for flexibility. Policies are likely to change from place to place or time to time. In the worst case, every change in policy would require a change in the underlying mechanism. Using general mechanisms enables us to avoid such a situation.

## 13.2 Principles of Protection

Frequently, a guiding principle can be used throughout a project, such as the design of an operating system. Following this principle simplifies design decisions and keeps the system consistent and easy to understand. A key, time-tested guiding principle for protection is the **principle of least privilege**. It dictates that programs, users, and even systems be given just enough privileges to perform their tasks.

Consider the analogy of a security guard with a passkey. If this key allows the guard into just the public areas that she guards, then misuse of the key will result in minimal damage. If, however, the passkey allows access to all areas, then damage from its being lost, stolen, misused, copied, or otherwise compromised will be much greater.

An operating system following the principle of least privilege implements its features, programs, system calls, and data structures so that failure or compromise of a component does the minimum damage and allows the minimum damage to be done. The overflow of a buffer in a system daemon might cause the daemon process to fail, for example, but should not allow the execution of code from the daemon process's stack that would enable a remote

user to gain maximum privileges and access to the entire system (as happens too often today).

Such an operating system also provides system calls and services that allow applications to be written with fine-grained access controls. It provides mechanisms to enable privileges when they are needed and to disable them when they are not needed. Also beneficial is the creation of audit trails for all privileged function access. The audit trail allows the programmer, system administrator, or law-enforcement officer to trace all protection and security activities on the system.

Managing users with the principle of least privilege entails creating a separate account for each user, with just the privileges that the user needs. An operator who needs to mount tapes and back up files on the system has access to just those commands and files needed to accomplish the job. Some systems implement role-based access control (RBAC) to provide this functionality.

Computers implemented in a computing facility under the principle of least privilege can be limited to running specific services, accessing specific remote hosts via specific services, and doing so during specific times. Typically, these restrictions are implemented through enabling or disabling each service and through using access control lists, as described in Section 10.6.2 and in Section 13.6.

The principle of least privilege can help produce a more secure computing environment. Unfortunately, it frequently does not. For example, Windows 2000 has a complex protection scheme at its core and yet has many security holes. By comparison, Solaris is considered relatively secure, even though it is a variant of UNIX, which historically was designed with little protection in mind. One reason for the difference may be that Windows 2000 has more lines of code and more services than Solaris and thus has more to secure and protect. Another reason could be that the protection scheme in Windows 2000 is incomplete or protects the wrong aspects of the operating system, leaving other areas vulnerable.

## 13.3 Domain of Protection

A computer system is a collection of processes and objects. By *objects*, we mean both **hardware objects** (such as the CPU, memory segments, printers, disks, and tape drives) and **software objects** (such as files, programs, and semaphores). Each object has a unique name that differentiates it from all other objects in the system, and each can be accessed only through well-defined and meaningful operations. Objects are essentially abstract data types.

The operations that are possible may depend on the object. For example, on a CPU, we can only execute. Memory segments can be read and written, whereas a CD-ROM or DVD-ROM can only be read. Tape drives can be read, written, and rewound. Data files can be created, opened, read, written, closed, and deleted; program files can be read, written, executed, and deleted.

A process should be allowed to access only those resources for which it has authorization. Furthermore, at any time, a process should be able to access only those resources that it currently requires to complete its task. This second requirement, commonly referred to as the **need-to-know principle**, is useful in limiting the amount of damage a faulty process can cause in the system.

For example, when process  $p$  invokes procedure  $A()$ , the procedure should be allowed to access only its own variables and the formal parameters passed to it; it should not be able to access all the variables of process  $p$ . Similarly, consider the case in which process  $p$  invokes a compiler to compile a particular file. The compiler should not be able to access files arbitrarily but should have access only to a well-defined subset of files (such as the source file, listing file, and so on) related to the file to be compiled. Conversely, the compiler may have private files used for accounting or optimization purposes that process  $p$  should not be able to access. The need-to-know principle is similar to the principle of least privilege discussed in Section 13.2 in that the goals of protection are to minimize the risks of possible security violations.

### 13.3.1 Domain Structure

To facilitate the scheme just described, a process operates within a **protection domain**, which specifies the resources that the process may access. Each domain defines a set of objects and the types of operations that may be invoked on each object. The ability to execute an operation on an object is an **access right**. A domain is a collection of access rights, each of which is an ordered pair  $\langle \text{object-name}, \text{rights-set} \rangle$ . For example, if domain  $D$  has the access right  $\langle \text{file } F, \{\text{read}, \text{write}\} \rangle$ , then a process executing in domain  $D$  can both read and write file  $F$ . It cannot, however, perform any other operation on that object.

Domains may share access rights. For example, in Figure 13.1, we have three domains:  $D_1$ ,  $D_2$ , and  $D_3$ . The access right  $\langle O_4, \{\text{print}\} \rangle$  is shared by  $D_2$  and  $D_3$ , implying that a process executing in either of these two domains can print object  $O_4$ . Note that a process must be executing in domain  $D_1$  to read and write object  $O_1$ , while only processes in domain  $D_3$  may execute object  $O_1$ .

The association between a process and a domain may be either **static**, if the set of resources available to the process is fixed throughout the process's lifetime, or **dynamic**. As might be expected, establishing dynamic protection domains is more complicated than establishing static protection domains.

If the association between processes and domains is fixed, and we want to adhere to the need-to-know principle, then a mechanism must be available to change the content of a domain. The reason stems from the fact that a process may execute in two different phases and may, for example, need read access in one phase and write access in another. If a domain is static, we must define the domain to include both read and write access. However, this arrangement provides more rights than are needed in each of the two phases, since we have read access in the phase where we need only write access, and vice versa.




Figure 13.1 System with three protection domains.

Thus, the need-to-know principle is violated. We must allow the contents of a domain to be modified so that the domain always reflects the minimum necessary access rights.

If the association is dynamic, a mechanism is available to allow **domain switching**, enabling the process to switch from one domain to another. We may also want to allow the content of a domain to be changed. If we cannot change the content of a domain, we can provide the same effect by creating a new domain with the changed content and switching to that new domain when we want to change the domain content.

A domain can be realized in a variety of ways:

- Each *user* may be a domain. In this case, the set of objects that can be accessed depends on the identity of the user. Domain switching occurs when the user is changed—generally when one user logs out and another user logs in.
- Each *process* may be a domain. In this case, the set of objects that can be accessed depends on the identity of the process. Domain switching occurs when one process sends a message to another process and then waits for a response.
- Each *procedure* may be a domain. In this case, the set of objects that can be accessed corresponds to the local variables defined within the procedure. Domain switching occurs when a procedure call is made.

We discuss domain switching in greater detail in Section 13.4.

Consider the standard dual-mode (monitor–user mode) model of operating-system execution. When a process executes in monitor mode, it can execute privileged instructions and thus gain complete control of the computer system. In contrast, when a process executes in user mode, it can invoke only nonprivileged instructions. Consequently, it can execute only within its predefined memory space. These two modes protect the operating system (executing in monitor domain) from the user processes (executing in user domain). In a multiprogrammed operating system, two protection domains are insufficient, since users also want to be protected from one another. Therefore, a more elaborate scheme is needed. We illustrate such a scheme by examining two influential operating systems—UNIX and MULTICS—to see how they implement these concepts.

### 13.3.2 An Example: UNIX

In the UNIX operating system, a domain is associated with the user. Switching the domain corresponds to changing the user identification temporarily. This change is accomplished through the file system as follows. An owner identification and a domain bit (known as the **setuid bit**) are associated with each file. When the setuid bit is on, and a user executes that file, the `userID` is set to that of the owner of the file. When the bit is off, however, the `userID` does not change. For example, when a user *A* (that is, a user with `userID = A`) starts executing a file owned by *B*, whose associated domain bit is off, the `userID` of the process is set to *A*. When the setuid bit is on, the `userID` is set to

that of the owner of the file: *B*. When the process exits, this temporary `userID` change ends.

Other methods are used to change domains in operating systems in which `userIDs` are used for domain definition, because almost all systems need to provide such a mechanism. This mechanism is used when an otherwise privileged facility needs to be made available to the general user population. For instance, it might be desirable to allow users to access a network without letting them write their own networking programs. In such a case, on a UNIX system, the `setuid` bit on a networking program would be set, causing the `userID` to change when the program was run. The `userID` would change to that of a user with network access privilege (such as `root`, the most powerful `userID`). One problem with this method is that if a user manages to create a file with `userID` `root` and with its `setuid` bit on, that user can become `root` and do anything and everything on the system. The `setuid` mechanism is discussed further in Appendix A.

An alternative to this method used in some other operating systems is to place privileged programs in a special directory. The operating system is designed to change the `userID` of any program run from this directory, either to the equivalent of `root` or to the `userID` of the owner of the directory. This eliminates one security problem, which occurs when intruders create programs to manipulate the `setuid` feature and hide the programs in the system for later use (using obscure file or directory names). This method is less flexible than that used in UNIX, however.

Even more restrictive, and thus more protective, are systems that simply do not allow a change of `userID`. In these instances, special techniques must be used to allow users access to privileged facilities. For instance, a **daemon process** may be started at boot time and run as a special `userID`. Users then run a separate program, which sends requests to this process whenever they need to use the facility. This method is used by the TOPS-20 operating system.


In any of these systems, great care must be taken in writing privileged programs. Any oversight can result in a total lack of protection on the system. Generally, these programs are the first to be attacked by people trying to break into a system. Unfortunately, the attackers are frequently successful. For example, security has been breached on many UNIX systems because of the `setuid` feature. We discuss security in Chapter 14.

### 13.3.3 An Example: MULTICS

In the MULTICS system, the protection domains are organized hierarchically into a ring structure. Each ring corresponds to a single domain (Figure 13.2). The rings are numbered from 0 to 7. Let  $D_i$  and  $D_j$  be any two domain rings. If  $j < i$ , then  $D_i$  is a subset of  $D_j$ . That is, a process executing in domain  $D_j$  has more privileges than does a process executing in domain  $D_i$ . A process executing in domain  $D_0$  has the most privileges. If only two rings exist, this scheme is equivalent to the monitor–user mode of execution, where monitor mode corresponds to  $D_0$  and user mode corresponds to  $D_1$ .

MULTICS has a segmented address space; each segment is a file, and each segment is associated with one of the rings. A segment description includes an entry that identifies the ring number. In addition, it includes three access bits





**Figure 13.2** MULTICS ring structure.

to control reading, writing, and execution. The association between segments and rings is a policy decision with which we are not concerned here.

A `current-ring-number` counter is associated with each process, identifying the ring in which the process is executing currently. When a process is executing in ring  $i$ , it cannot access a segment associated with ring  $j$  ( $j < i$ ). It can access a segment associated with ring  $k$  ( $k \geq i$ ). The type of access, however, is restricted according to the access bits associated with that segment.

Domain switching in MULTICS occurs when a process crosses from one ring to another by calling a procedure in a different ring. Obviously, this switch must be done in a controlled manner; otherwise, a process could start executing in ring 0, and no protection would be provided. To allow controlled domain switching, we modify the ring field of the segment descriptor to include the following:

- **Access bracket.** A pair of integers,  $b1$  and  $b2$ , such that  $b1 \leq b2$ .
- **Limit.** An integer  $b3$  such that  $b3 > b2$ .
- **List of gates.** Identifies the entry points (or **gates**) at which the segments may be called.

If a process executing in ring  $i$  calls a procedure (or segment) with access bracket  $(b1, b2)$ , then the call is allowed if  $b1 \leq i \leq b2$ , and the current ring number of the process remains  $i$ . Otherwise, a trap to the operating system occurs, and the situation is handled as follows:

- If  $i < b1$ , then the call is allowed to occur, because we have a transfer to a ring (or domain) with fewer privileges. However, if parameters are passed that refer to segments in a lower ring (that is, segments not accessible to the called procedure), then these segments must be copied into an area that can be accessed by the called procedure.
- If  $i > b2$ , then the call is allowed to occur only if  $b3$  is greater than or equal to  $i$  and the call has been directed to one of the designated entry points in

the list of gates. This scheme allows processes with limited access rights to call procedures in lower rings that have more access rights, but only in a carefully controlled manner.

The main disadvantage of the ring (or hierarchical) structure is that it does not allow us to enforce the need-to-know principle. In particular, if an object must be accessible in domain  $D_j$  but not accessible in domain  $D_i$ , then we must have  $j < i$ . But this requirement means that every segment accessible in  $D_i$  is also accessible in  $D_j$ .

The MULTICS protection system is generally more complex and less efficient than are those used in current operating systems. If protection interferes with the ease of use of the system or significantly decreases system performance, then its use must be weighed carefully against the purpose of the system. For instance, we would want to have a complex protection system on a computer used by a university to process students' grades and also used by students for classwork. A similar protection system would not be suited to a computer being used for number crunching, in which performance is of utmost importance. We would prefer to separate the mechanism from the protection policy, allowing the same system to have complex or simple protection depending on the needs of its users. To separate mechanism from policy, we require a more general model of protection.

13.4 Access Matrix

Our general model of protection can be viewed abstractly as a matrix, called an **access matrix**. The rows of the access matrix represent domains, and the columns represent objects. Each entry in the matrix consists of a set of access rights. Because the column defines objects explicitly, we can omit the object name from the access right. The entry  $\text{access}(i,j)$  defines the set of operations that a process executing in domain  $D_i$  can invoke on object  $O_j$ .

To illustrate these concepts, we consider the access matrix shown in Figure 13.3. There are four domains and four objects—three files ( $F_1, F_2, F_3$ ) and one laser printer. A process executing in domain  $D_1$  can read files  $F_1$  and  $F_3$ . A process executing in domain  $D_4$  has the same privileges as one executing in

object domain	$F_1$	$F_2$	$F_3$	printer
$D_1$	read		read	
$D_2$				print
$D_3$		read	execute	
$D_4$	read write		read write	

Figure 13.3 Access matrix.



domain  $D_1$ ; but in addition, it can also write onto files  $F_1$  and  $F_3$ . The laser printer can be accessed only by a process executing in domain  $D_2$ .

The access-matrix scheme provides us with the mechanism for specifying a variety of policies. The mechanism consists of implementing the access matrix and ensuring that the semantic properties we have outlined hold. More specifically, we must ensure that a process executing in domain  $D_i$  can access only those objects specified in row  $i$ , and then only as allowed by the access-matrix entries.

The access matrix can implement policy decisions concerning protection. The policy decisions involve which rights should be included in the  $(i, j)^{th}$  entry. We must also decide the domain in which each process executes. This last policy is usually decided by the operating system.

The users normally decide the contents of the access-matrix entries. When a user creates a new object  $O_j$ , the column  $O_j$  is added to the access matrix with the appropriate initialization entries, as dictated by the creator. The user may decide to enter some rights in some entries in column  $j$  and other rights in other entries, as needed.

The access matrix provides an appropriate mechanism for defining and implementing strict control for both static and dynamic association between processes and domains. When we switch a process from one domain to another, we are executing an operation (switch) on an object (the domain). We can control domain switching by including domains among the objects of the access matrix. Similarly, when we change the content of the access matrix, we are performing an operation on an object: the access matrix. Again, we can control these changes by including the access matrix itself as an object. Actually, since each entry in the access matrix can be modified individually, we must consider each entry in the access matrix as an object to be protected. Now, we need to consider only the operations possible on these new objects (domains and the access matrix) and decide how we want processes to be able to execute these operations.

Processes should be able to switch from one domain to another. Switching from domain  $D_i$  to domain  $D_j$  is allowed if and only if the access right  $\text{switch} \in \text{access}(i, j)$ . Thus, in Figure 13.4, a process executing in domain  $D_2$  can switch to domain  $D_3$  or to domain  $D_4$ . A process in domain  $D_4$  can switch to  $D_1$ , and one in domain  $D_1$  can switch to  $D_2$ .

object domain \	$F_1$	$F_2$	$F_3$	laser printer	$D_1$	$D_2$	$D_3$	$D_4$
$D_1$	read		read			switch		
$D_2$				print			switch	switch
$D_3$		read	execute					
$D_4$	read write		read write		switch			

**Figure 13.4** Access matrix of Figure 13.3 with domains as objects.

Allowing controlled change in the contents of the access-matrix entries requires three additional operations: `copy`, `owner`, and `control`. We examine these operations next.

The ability to copy an access right from one domain (or row) of the access matrix to another is denoted by an asterisk (\*) appended to the access right. The copy right allows the access right to be copied only within the column (that is, for the object) for which the right is defined. For example, in Figure 13.5(a), a process executing in domain  $D_2$  can copy the read operation into any entry associated with file  $F_2$ . Hence, the access matrix of Figure 13.5(a) can be modified to the access matrix shown in Figure 13.5(b).

This scheme has two additional variants:

1. A right is copied from  $\text{access}(i, j)$  to  $\text{access}(k, j)$ ; it is then removed from  $\text{access}(i, j)$ . This action is a transfer of a right, rather than a copy.
2. Propagation of the copy right may be limited. That is, when the right  $R^*$  is copied from  $\text{access}(i, j)$  to  $\text{access}(k, j)$ , only the right  $R$  (not  $R^*$ ) is created. A process executing in domain  $D_k$  cannot further copy the right  $R$ .

A system may select only one of these three copy rights, or it may provide all three by identifying them as separate rights: `copy`, `transfer`, and `limited copy`.

We also need a mechanism to allow addition of new rights and removal of some rights. The owner right controls these operations. If  $\text{access}(i, j)$  includes the owner right, then a process executing in domain  $D_i$  can add and remove any right in any entry in column  $j$ . For example, in Figure 13.6(a), domain  $D_1$  is the owner of  $F_1$  and thus can add and delete any valid right in column  $F_1$ .

object domain	$F_1$	$F_2$	$F_3$
$D_1$	execute		write*
$D_2$	execute	read*	execute
$D_3$	execute		

(a)

object domain	$F_1$	$F_2$	$F_3$
$D_1$	execute		write*
$D_2$	execute	read*	execute
$D_3$	execute	read	

(b)

Figure 13.5 Access matrix with **copy** rights.

object domain	$F_1$	$F_2$	$F_3$
$D_1$	owner execute		write
$D_2$		read* owner	read* owner write
$D_3$	execute		

(a)

object domain	$F_1$	$F_2$	$F_3$
$D_1$	owner execute		write
$D_2$		owner read* write*	read* owner write
$D_3$		write	write

(b)

**Figure 13.6** Access matrix with owner rights.

Similarly, domain  $D_2$  is the owner of  $F_2$  and  $F_3$  and thus can add and remove any valid right within these two columns. Thus, the access matrix of Figure 13.6(a) can be modified to the access matrix shown in Figure 13.6(b).

The copy and owner rights allow a process to change the entries in a column. A mechanism is also needed to change the entries in a row. The control right is applicable only to domain objects. If  $\text{access}(i, j)$  includes the control right, then a process executing in domain  $D_i$  can remove any access right from row  $j$ . For example, suppose that, in Figure 13.4, we include the control right in  $\text{access}(D_2, D_4)$ . Then, a process executing in domain  $D_2$  could modify domain  $D_4$ , as shown in Figure 13.7.

The copy and owner rights provide us with a mechanism to limit the propagation of access rights. However, they do not give us the appropriate tools for preventing the propagation (or disclosure) of information. The problem of guaranteeing that no information initially held in an object can migrate outside of its execution environment is called the **confinement problem**. This problem is in general unsolvable (see the bibliographical notes at the end of the chapter).

These operations on the domains and the access matrix are not in themselves important, but they illustrate the ability of the access-matrix model to allow us to implement and control dynamic protection requirements. New objects and new domains can be created dynamically and included in the access-matrix model. However, we have shown only that the basic mechanism

object domain	$F_1$	$F_2$	$F_3$	laser printer	$D_1$	$D_2$	$D_3$	$D_4$
$D_1$	read		read			switch		
$D_2$				print			switch	switch control
$D_3$		read	execute					
$D_4$	write		write		switch			

**Figure 13.7** Modified access matrix of Figure 13.4.

exists. System designers and users must make the policy decisions concerning which domains are to have access to which objects in which ways.

## 13.5 Implementation of the Access Matrix

How can the access matrix be implemented effectively? In general, the matrix will be sparse; that is, most of the entries will be empty. Although data-structure techniques are available for representing sparse matrices, they are not particularly useful for this application, because of the way in which the protection facility is used. Here, we first describe several methods of implementing the access matrix and then compare the methods.

### 13.5.1 Global Table

The simplest implementation of the access matrix is a global table consisting of a set of ordered triples  $\langle \text{domain}, \text{object}, \text{rights-set} \rangle$ . Whenever an operation  $M$  is executed on an object  $O_j$  within domain  $D_i$ , the global table is searched for a triple  $\langle D_i, O_j, R_k \rangle$ , with  $M \in R_k$ . If this triple is found, the operation is allowed to continue; otherwise, an exception (or error) condition is raised.

This implementation suffers from several drawbacks. The table is usually large and thus cannot be kept in main memory, so additional I/O is needed. Virtual memory techniques are often used for managing this table. In addition, it is difficult to take advantage of special groupings of objects or domains. For example, if everyone can read a particular object, this object must have a separate entry in every domain.

### 13.5.2 Access Lists for Objects

Each column in the access matrix can be implemented as an access list for one object, as described in Section 10.6.2. Obviously, the empty entries can be discarded. The resulting list for each object consists of ordered pairs  $\langle \text{domain}, \text{rights-set} \rangle$ , which define all domains with a nonempty set of access rights for that object.

This approach can be extended easily to define a list plus a *default* set of access rights. When an operation  $M$  on an object  $O_j$  is attempted in domain  $D_i$ , we search the access list for object  $O_j$ , looking for an entry  $\langle D_i, R_k \rangle$  with

$M \in R_k$ . If the entry is found, we allow the operation; if it is not, we check the default set. If  $M$  is in the default set, we allow the access. Otherwise, access is denied, and an exception condition occurs. For efficiency, we may check the default set first and then search the access list.

### 13.5.3 Capability Lists for Domains

Rather than associating the columns of the access matrix with the objects as access lists, we can associate each row with its domain. A **capability list** for a domain is a list of objects together with the operations allowed on those objects. An object is often represented by its physical name or address, called a **capability**. To execute operation  $M$  on object  $O_j$ , the process executes the operation  $M$ , specifying the capability (or pointer) for object  $O_j$  as a parameter. Simple **possession** of the capability means that access is allowed.

The capability list is associated with a domain, but it is never directly accessible to a process executing in that domain. Rather, the capability list is itself a protected object, maintained by the operating system and accessed by the user only indirectly. Capability-based protection relies on the fact that the capabilities are never allowed to migrate into any address space directly accessible by a user process (where they could be modified). If all capabilities are secure, the object they protect is also secure against unauthorized access.

Capabilities were originally proposed as a kind of secure pointer, to meet the need for resource protection that was foreseen as multiprogrammed computer systems came of age. The idea of an inherently protected pointer provides a foundation for protection that can be extended up to the application level.

To provide inherent protection, we must distinguish capabilities from other kinds of objects, and they must be interpreted by an abstract machine on which higher-level programs run. Capabilities are usually distinguished from other data in one of two ways:

- Each object has a **tag** to denote whether it is a capability or accessible data. The tags themselves must not be directly accessible by an application program. Hardware or firmware support may be used to enforce this restriction. Although only one bit is necessary to distinguish between capabilities and other objects, more bits are often used. This extension allows all objects to be tagged with their types by the hardware. Thus, the hardware can distinguish integers, floating-point numbers, pointers, Booleans, characters, instructions, capabilities, and uninitialized values by their tags.
- Alternatively, the address space associated with a program can be split into two parts. One part is accessible to the program and contains the program's normal data and instructions. The other part, containing the capability list, is accessible only by the operating system. A segmented memory space (Section 7.4) is useful to support this approach.

Several capability-based protection systems have been developed; we describe them briefly in Section 13.8. The Mach operating system also uses a version of capability-based protection; it is described in Appendix B.

### 13.5.4 A Lock–Key Mechanism

The **lock–key scheme** is a compromise between access lists and capability lists. Each object has a list of unique bit patterns, called **locks**. Similarly, each domain has a list of unique bit patterns, called **keys**. A process executing in a domain can access an object only if that domain has a key that matches one of the locks of the object.

As with capability lists, the list of keys for a domain must be managed by the operating system on behalf of the domain. Users are not allowed to examine or modify the list of keys (or locks) directly.

### 13.5.5 Comparison

As you might expect, choosing a technique for implementing an access matrix involves various trade-offs. Using a global table is simple; however, the table can be quite large and often cannot take advantage of special groupings of objects or domains. Access lists correspond directly to the needs of users. When a user creates an object, he can specify which domains can access the object, as well as what operations are allowed. However, because access-right information for a particular domain is not localized, determining the set of access rights for each domain is difficult. In addition, every access to the object must be checked, requiring a search of the access list. In a large system with long access lists, this search can be time consuming.

Capability lists do not correspond directly to the needs of users, but they are useful for localizing information for a given process. The process attempting access must present a capability for that access. Then, the protection system needs only to verify that the capability is valid. Revocation of capabilities, however, may be inefficient (Section 13.7).

The lock–key mechanism, as mentioned, is a compromise between access lists and capability lists. The mechanism can be both effective and flexible, depending on the length of the keys. The keys can be passed freely from domain to domain. In addition, access privileges can be effectively revoked by the simple technique of changing some of the locks associated with the object (Section 13.7).

Most systems use a combination of access lists and capabilities. When a process first tries to access an object, the access list is searched. If access is denied, an exception condition occurs. Otherwise, a capability is created and attached to the process. Additional references use the capability to demonstrate swiftly that access is allowed. After the last access, the capability is destroyed. This strategy is used in the MULTICS system and in the CAL system.

As an example of how such a strategy works, consider a file system in which each file has an associated access list. When a process opens a file, the directory structure is searched to find the file, access permission is checked, and buffers are allocated. All this information is recorded in a new entry in a file table associated with the process. The operation returns an index into this table for the newly opened file. All operations on the file are made by specification of the index into the file table. The entry in the file table then points to the file and its buffers. When the file is closed, the file-table entry is deleted. Since the file table is maintained by the operating system, the user cannot accidentally corrupt it. Thus, the user can access only those files that have been opened.




Since access is checked when the file is opened, protection is ensured. This strategy is used in the UNIX system.

The right to access must still be checked on each access, and the file-table entry has a capability only for the allowed operations. If a file is opened for reading, then a capability for read access is placed in the file-table entry. If an attempt is made to write onto the file, the system identifies this protection violation by comparing the requested operation with the capability in the file-table entry.

## 13.6 Access Control

In Section 10.6.2, we described how access controls can be used on files within a file system. Each file and directory is assigned an owner, a group, or possibly a list of users, and for each of those entities, access-control information is assigned. A similar function can be added to other aspects of a computer system. A good example of this is found in Solaris 10.

Solaris 10 advances the protection available in the operating system by explicitly adding the principle of least privilege via **role-based access control (RBAC)**. This facility revolves around privileges. A privilege is the right to execute a system call or to use an option within that system call (such as opening a file with write access). Privileges can be assigned to processes, limiting them to exactly the access they need to perform their work. Privileges and programs can also be assigned to **roles**. Users are assigned roles or can take roles based on passwords to the roles. In this way, a user can take a role that enables a privilege, allowing the user to run a program to accomplish a specific task, as depicted in Figure 13.8. This implementation of privileges decreases the security risk associated with superusers and setuid programs.



**Figure 13.8** Role-based access control in Solaris 10.

Notice that this facility is similar to the access matrix described in Section 13.4. This relationship is further explored in the exercises at the end of the chapter.

### 13.7 Revocation of Access Rights

In a dynamic protection system, we may sometimes need to revoke access rights to objects shared by different users. Various questions about revocation may arise:

- **Immediate versus delayed.** Does revocation occur immediately, or is it delayed? If revocation is delayed, can we find out when it will take place?
- **Selective versus general.** When an access right to an object is revoked, does it affect all the users who have an access right to that object, or can we specify a select group of users whose access rights should be revoked?
- **Partial versus total.** Can a subset of the rights associated with an object be revoked, or must we revoke all access rights for this object?
- **Temporary versus permanent.** Can access be revoked permanently (that is, the revoked access right will never again be available), or can access be revoked and later be obtained again?

With an access-list scheme, revocation is easy. The access list is searched for any access rights to be revoked, and they are deleted from the list. Revocation is immediate and can be general or selective, total or partial, and permanent or temporary.

Capabilities, however, present a much more difficult revocation problem, as mentioned earlier. Since the capabilities are distributed throughout the system, we must find them before we can revoke them. Schemes that implement revocation for capabilities include the following:

- **Reacquisition.** Periodically, capabilities are deleted from each domain. If a process wants to use a capability, it may find that that capability has been deleted. The process may then try to reacquire the capability. If access has been revoked, the process will not be able to reacquire the capability.
- **Back-pointers.** A list of pointers is maintained with each object, pointing to all capabilities associated with that object. When revocation is required, we can follow these pointers, changing the capabilities as necessary. This scheme was adopted in the MULTICS system. It is quite general, but its implementation is costly.
- **Indirection.** The capabilities point indirectly, not directly, to the objects. Each capability points to a unique entry in a global table, which in turn points to the object. We implement revocation by searching the global table for the desired entry and deleting it. Then, when an access is attempted, the capability is found to point to an illegal table entry. Table entries can be reused for other capabilities without difficulty, since both the capability and the table entry contain the unique name of the object. The object for a

capability and its table entry must match. This scheme was adopted in the CAL system. It does not allow selective revocation.

- **Keys.** A key is a unique bit pattern that can be associated with a capability. This key is defined when the capability is created, and it can be neither modified nor inspected by the process that owns the capability. A **master key** is associated with each object; it can be defined or replaced with the set-key operation. When a capability is created, the current value of the master key is associated with the capability. When the capability is exercised, its key is compared with the master key. If the keys match, the operation is allowed to continue; otherwise, an exception condition is raised. Revocation replaces the master key with a new value via the set-key operation, invalidating all previous capabilities for this object.

This scheme does not allow selective revocation, since only one master key is associated with each object. If we associate a list of keys with each object, then selective revocation can be implemented. Finally, we can group all keys into one global table of keys. A capability is valid only if its key matches some key in the global table. We implement revocation by removing the matching key from the table. With this scheme, a key can be associated with several objects, and several keys can be associated with each object, providing maximum flexibility.

In key-based schemes, the operations of defining keys, inserting them into lists, and deleting them from lists should not be available to all users. In particular, it would be reasonable to allow only the owner of an object to set the keys for that object. This choice, however, is a policy decision that the protection system can implement but should not define.

## 13.8 Capability-Based Systems

In this section, we survey two capability-based protection systems. These systems differ in their complexity and in the types of policies that can be implemented on them. Neither system is widely used, but both provide interesting proving grounds for protection theories.

### 13.8.1 An Example: Hydra

Hydra is a capability-based protection system that provides considerable flexibility. The system implements a fixed set of possible access rights, including such basic forms of access as the right to read, write, or execute a memory segment. In addition, a user (of the protection system) can declare other rights. The interpretation of user-defined rights is performed solely by the user's program, but the system provides access protection for the use of these rights, as well as for the use of system-defined rights. These facilities constitute a significant development in protection technology.

Operations on objects are defined procedurally. The procedures that implement such operations are themselves a form of object, and they are accessed indirectly by capabilities. The names of user-defined procedures must be identified to the protection system if it is to deal with objects of the user-defined type. When the definition of an object is made known to Hydra, the names of operations on the type become **auxiliary rights**. Auxiliary rights

can be described in a capability for an instance of the type. For a process to perform an operation on a typed object, the capability it holds for that object must contain the name of the operation being invoked among its auxiliary rights. This restriction enables discrimination of access rights to be made on an instance-by-instance and process-by-process basis.

Hydra also provides **rights amplification**. This scheme allows a procedure to be certified as *trustworthy* to act on a formal parameter of a specified type on behalf of any process that holds a right to execute the procedure. The rights held by a trustworthy procedure are independent of, and may exceed, the rights held by the calling process. However, such a procedure must not be regarded as universally trustworthy (the procedure is not allowed to act on other types, for instance), and the trustworthiness must not be extended to any other procedures or program segments that might be executed by a process.

Amplification allows implementation procedures access to the representation variables of an abstract data type. If a process holds a capability to a typed object  $A$ , for instance, this capability may include an auxiliary right to invoke some operation  $P$  but does not include any of the so-called kernel rights, such as read, write, or execute, on the segment that represents  $A$ . Such a capability gives a process a means of indirect access (through the operation  $P$ ) to the representation of  $A$ , but only for specific purposes.

When a process invokes the operation  $P$  on an object  $A$ , however, the capability for access to  $A$  may be amplified as control passes to the code body of  $P$ . This amplification may be necessary to allow  $P$  the right to access the storage segment representing  $A$  so as to implement the operation that  $P$  defines on the abstract data type. The code body of  $P$  may be allowed to read or to write to the segment of  $A$  directly, even though the calling process cannot. On return from  $P$ , the capability for  $A$  is restored to its original, unamplified state. This case is a typical one in which the rights held by a process for access to a protected segment must change dynamically, depending on the task to be performed. The dynamic adjustment of rights is performed to guarantee consistency of a programmer-defined abstraction. Amplification of rights can be stated explicitly in the declaration of an abstract type to the Hydra operating system.

When a user passes an object as an argument to a procedure, we may need to ensure that the procedure cannot modify the object. We can implement this restriction readily by passing an access right that does not have the modification (write) right. However, if amplification may occur, the right to modify may be reinstated. Thus, the user-protection requirement can be circumvented. In general, of course, a user may trust that a procedure performs its task correctly. This assumption is not always correct, however, because of hardware or software errors. Hydra solves this problem by restricting amplifications.

The procedure-call mechanism of Hydra was designed as a direct solution to the *problem of mutually suspicious subsystems*. This problem is defined as follows. Suppose that a program can be invoked as a service by a number of different users (for example, a sort routine, a compiler, a game). When users invoke this service program, they take the risk that the program will malfunction and will either damage the given data or retain some access right to the data to be used (without authority) later. Similarly, the service program may have some private files (for accounting purposes, for example) that should not

be accessed directly by the calling user program. Hydra provides mechanisms for directly dealing with this problem.

A Hydra subsystem is built on top of its protection kernel and may require protection of its own components. A subsystem interacts with the kernel through calls on a set of kernel-defined primitives that define access rights to resources defined by the subsystem. The subsystem designer can define policies for use of these resources by user processes, but the policies are enforced by use of the standard access protection provided by the capability system.

Programmers can make direct use of the protection system after acquainting themselves with its features in the appropriate reference manual. Hydra provides a large library of system-defined procedures that can be called by user programs. Programmers can explicitly incorporate calls on these system procedures into their program code or can use a program translator that has been interfaced to Hydra.

### 13.8.2 An Example: Cambridge CAP System

A different approach to capability-based protection has been taken in the design of the Cambridge CAP system. CAP's capability system is simpler and superficially less powerful than that of Hydra. However, closer examination shows that it, too, can be used to provide secure protection of user-defined objects. CAP has two kinds of capabilities. The ordinary kind is called a **data capability**. It can be used to provide access to objects, but the only rights provided are the standard read, write, and execute of the individual storage segments associated with the object. Data capabilities are interpreted by microcode in the CAP machine.

The second kind of capability is the so-called **software capability**, which is protected, but not interpreted, by the CAP microcode. It is interpreted by a *protected* (that is, privileged) procedure, which may be written by an application programmer as part of a subsystem. A particular kind of rights amplification is associated with a protected procedure. When executing the code body of such a procedure, a process temporarily acquires the right to read or write the contents of a software capability itself. This specific kind of rights amplification corresponds to an implementation of the `seal` and `unseal` primitives on capabilities. Of course, this privilege is still subject to type verification to ensure that only software capabilities for a specified abstract type are passed to any such procedure. Universal trust is not placed in any code other than the CAP machine's microcode. (See the bibliographical notes at the end of the chapter for references.)

The interpretation of a software capability is left completely to the subsystem, through the protected procedures it contains. This scheme allows a variety of protection policies to be implemented. Although programmers can define their own protected procedures (any of which might be incorrect), the security of the overall system cannot be compromised. The basic protection system will not allow an unverified, user-defined, protected procedure access to any storage segments (or capabilities) that do not belong to the protection environment in which it resides. The most serious consequence of an insecure protected procedure is a protection breakdown of the subsystem for which that procedure has responsibility.

The designers of the CAP system have noted that the use of software capabilities allowed them to realize considerable economies in formulating and implementing protection policies commensurate with the requirements of abstract resources. However, subsystem designers who want to make use of this facility cannot simply study a reference manual, as is the case with Hydra. Instead, they must learn the principles and techniques of protection, since the system provides them with no library of procedures.

## 13.9 Language-Based Protection

To the degree that protection is provided in existing computer systems, it is usually achieved through an operating-system kernel, which acts as a security agent to inspect and validate each attempt to access a protected resource. Since comprehensive access validation may be a source of considerable overhead, either we must give it hardware support to reduce the cost of each validation, or we must allow the system designer to compromise the goals of protection. Satisfying all these goals is difficult if the flexibility to implement protection policies is restricted by the support mechanisms provided or if protection environments are made larger than necessary to secure greater operational efficiency.

As operating systems have become more complex, and particularly as they have attempted to provide higher-level user interfaces, the goals of protection have become much more refined. The designers of protection systems have drawn heavily on ideas that originated in programming languages and especially on the concepts of abstract data types and objects. Protection systems are now concerned not only with the identity of a resource to which access is attempted but also with the functional nature of that access. In the newest protection systems, concern for the function to be invoked extends beyond a set of system-defined functions, such as standard file-access methods, to include functions that may be user-defined as well.

Policies for resource use may also vary, depending on the application, and they may be subject to change over time. For these reasons, protection can no longer be considered a matter of concern only to the designer of an operating system. It should also be available as a tool for use by the application designer, so that resources of an application subsystem can be guarded against tampering or the influence of an error.

### 13.9.1 Compiler-Based Enforcement

At this point, programming languages enter the picture. Specifying the desired control of access to a shared resource in a system is making a declarative statement about the resource. This kind of statement can be integrated into a language by an extension of its typing facility. When protection is declared along with data typing, the designer of each subsystem can specify its requirements for protection, as well as its need for use of other resources in a system. Such a specification should be given directly as a program is composed, and in the language in which the program itself is stated. This approach has several significant advantages:



1. Protection needs are simply declared, rather than programmed as a sequence of calls on procedures of an operating system.
2. Protection requirements can be stated independently of the facilities provided by a particular operating system.
3. The means for enforcement need not be provided by the designer of a subsystem.
4. A declarative notation is natural because access privileges are closely related to the linguistic concept of data type.

A variety of techniques can be provided by a programming-language implementation to enforce protection, but any of these must depend on some degree of support from an underlying machine and its operating system. For example, suppose a language is used to generate code to run on the Cambridge CAP system. On this system, every storage reference made on the underlying hardware occurs indirectly through a capability. This restriction prevents any process from accessing a resource outside of its protection environment at any time. However, a program may impose arbitrary restrictions on how a resource can be used during execution of a particular code segment. We can implement such restrictions most readily by using the software capabilities provided by CAP. A language implementation might provide standard protected procedures to interpret software capabilities that would realize the protection policies that could be specified in the language. This scheme puts policy specification at the disposal of the programmers, while freeing them from implementing its enforcement.

Even if a system does not provide a protection kernel as powerful as those of Hydra or CAP, mechanisms are still available for implementing protection specifications given in a programming language. The principal distinction is that the *security* of this protection will not be as great as that supported by a protection kernel, because the mechanism must rely on more assumptions about the operational state of the system. A compiler can separate references for which it can certify that no protection violation could occur from those for which a violation might be possible, and it can treat them differently. The security provided by this form of protection rests on the assumption that the code generated by the compiler will not be modified prior to or during its execution.

What, then, are the relative merits of enforcement based solely on a kernel, as opposed to enforcement provided largely by a compiler?

- **Security.** Enforcement by a kernel provides a greater degree of security of the protection system itself than does the generation of protection-checking code by a compiler. In a compiler-supported scheme, security rests on correctness of the translator, on some underlying mechanism of storage management that protects the segments from which compiled code is executed, and, ultimately, on the security of files from which a program is loaded. Some of these considerations also apply to a software-supported protection kernel, but to a lesser degree, since the kernel may reside in fixed physical storage segments and may be loaded only from a designated file. With a tagged-capability system, in which all address

computation is performed either by hardware or by a fixed microprogram, even greater security is possible. Hardware-supported protection is also relatively immune to protection violations that might occur as a result of either hardware or system software malfunction.

- **Flexibility.** There are limits to the flexibility of a protection kernel in implementing a user-defined policy, although it may supply adequate facilities for the system to provide enforcement of its own policies. With a programming language, protection policy can be declared and enforcement provided as needed by an implementation. If a language does not provide sufficient flexibility, it can be extended or replaced with less disturbance than would be caused by the modification of an operating-system kernel.
- **Efficiency.** The greatest efficiency is obtained when enforcement of protection is supported directly by hardware (or microcode). Insofar as software support is required, language-based enforcement has the advantage that static access enforcement can be verified off-line at compile time. Also, since an intelligent compiler can tailor the enforcement mechanism to meet the specified need, the fixed overhead of kernel calls can often be avoided.

In summary, the specification of protection in a programming language allows the high-level description of policies for the allocation and use of resources. A language implementation can provide software for protection enforcement when automatic hardware-supported checking is unavailable. In addition, it can interpret protection specifications to generate calls on whatever protection system is provided by the hardware and the operating system.

One way of making protection available to the application program is through the use of a software capability that could be used as an object of computation. Inherent in this concept is the idea that certain program components might have the privilege of creating or examining these software capabilities. A capability-creating program would be able to execute a primitive operation that would seal a data structure, rendering the latter's contents inaccessible to any program components that did not hold either the seal or the unseal privilege. Such components might copy the data structure or pass its address to other program components, but they could not gain access to its contents. The reason for introducing such software capabilities is to bring a protection mechanism into the programming language. The only problem with the concept as proposed is that the use of the `seal` and `unseal` operations takes a procedural approach to specifying protection. A nonprocedural or declarative notation seems a preferable way to make protection available to the application programmer.

What is needed is a safe, dynamic access-control mechanism for distributing capabilities to system resources among user processes. To contribute to the overall reliability of a system, the access-control mechanism should be safe to use. To be useful in practice, it should also be reasonably efficient. This requirement has led to the development of a number of language constructs that allow the programmer to declare various restrictions on the use of a specific managed resource. (See the bibliographical notes for appropriate references.) These constructs provide mechanisms for three functions:

1. Distributing capabilities safely and efficiently among customer processes. In particular, mechanisms ensure that a user process will use the managed resource only if it was granted a capability to that resource.
2. Specifying the type of operations that a particular process may invoke on an allocated resource (for example, a reader of a file should be allowed only to read the file, whereas a writer should be able both to read and to write). It should not be necessary to grant the same set of rights to every user process, and it should be impossible for a process to enlarge its set of access rights, except with the authorization of the access-control mechanism.
3. Specifying the order in which a particular process may invoke the various operations of a resource (for example, a file must be opened before it can be read). It should be possible to give two processes different restrictions on the order in which they can invoke the operations of the allocated resource.

The incorporation of protection concepts into programming languages, as a practical tool for system design, is in its infancy. Protection will likely become a matter of greater concern to the designers of new systems with distributed architectures and increasingly stringent requirements on data security. Then the importance of suitable language notations in which to express protection requirements will be recognized more widely.

### 13.9.2 Protection in Java

Because Java was designed to run in a distributed environment, the Java virtual machine—or JVM—has many built-in protection mechanisms. Java programs are composed of **classes**, each of which is a collection of data fields and functions (called **methods**) that operate on those fields. The JVM loads a class in response to a request to create instances (or objects) of that class. One of the most novel and useful features of Java is its support for dynamically loading untrusted classes over a network and for executing mutually distrusting classes within the same JVM.

Because of these capabilities, protection is a paramount concern. Classes running in the same JVM may be from different sources and may not be equally trusted. As a result, enforcing protection at the granularity of the JVM process is insufficient. Intuitively, whether a request to open a file should be allowed will generally depend on which class has requested the open. The operating system lacks this knowledge.

Thus, such protection decisions are handled within the JVM. When the JVM loads a class, it assigns the class to a protection domain that gives the permissions of that class. The protection domain to which the class is assigned depends on the URL from which the class was loaded and any digital signatures on the class file. (Digital signatures are covered in Section 14.4.1.3.) A configurable policy file determines the permissions granted to the domain (and its classes). For example, classes loaded from a trusted server might be placed in a protection domain that allows them to access files in the user's home directory, whereas classes loaded from an untrusted server might have no file access permissions at all.

It can be complicated for the JVM to determine what class is responsible for a request to access a protected resource. Accesses are often performed indirectly, through system libraries or other classes. For example, consider a class that is not allowed to open network connections. It could call a system library to request the load of the contents of a URL. The JVM must decide whether or not to open a network connection for this request. But which class should be used to determine if the connection should be allowed, the application or the system library?

The philosophy adopted in Java is to require the library class to explicitly permit a network connection. More generally, in order to access a protected resource, some method in the calling sequence that resulted in the request must explicitly assert the privilege to access the resource. By doing so, this method *takes responsibility* for the request. Presumably, it will also perform whatever checks are necessary to ensure the safety of the request. Of course, not every method is allowed to assert a privilege; a method can assert a privilege only if its class is in a protection domain that is itself allowed to exercise the privilege.

This implementation approach is called **stack inspection**. Every thread in the JVM has an associated stack of its ongoing method invocations. When a caller may not be trusted, a method executes an access request within a `doPrivileged` block to perform the access to a protected resource directly or indirectly. `doPrivileged()` is a static method in the `AccessController` class that is passed a class with a `run()` method to invoke. When the `doPrivileged` block is entered, the stack frame for this method is annotated to indicate this fact. Then, the contents of the block are executed. When an access to a protected resource is subsequently requested, either by this method or a method it calls, a call to `checkPermissions()` is used to invoke stack inspection to determine if the request should be allowed. The inspection examines stack frames on the calling thread's stack, starting from the most recently added frame and working toward the oldest. If a stack frame is first found that has the `doPrivileged()` annotation, then `checkPermissions()` returns immediately and silently, allowing the access. If a stack frame is first found for which access is disallowed based on the protection domain of the method's class, then `checkPermissions()` throws an `AccessControlException`. If the stack inspection exhausts the stack without finding either type of frame, then whether access is allowed depends on the implementation (for example, some implementations of the JVM may allow access, while other implementations may not).

Stack inspection is illustrated in Figure 13.9. Here, the `gui()` method of a class in the *untrusted applet* protection domain performs two operations, first a `get()` and then an `open()`. The former is an invocation of the `get()` method of a class in the *URL loader* protection domain, which is permitted to open() sessions to sites in the `lucent.com` domain, in particular a proxy server `proxy.lucent.com` for retrieving URLs. For this reason, the untrusted applet's `get()` invocation will succeed: the `checkPermissions()` call in the networking library encounters the stack frame of the `get()` method, which performed its `open()` in a `doPrivileged` block. However, the untrusted applet's `open()` invocation will result in an exception, because the `checkPermissions()` call finds no `doPrivileged` annotation before encountering the stack frame of the `gui()` method.

protection domain:	untrusted applet	URL loader	networking
socket permission:	none	*.lucent.com:80, connect	any
class:	gui: ... get(url); open(addr); ...	get(URL u): ... doPrivileged { open('proxy.lucnet.com:80'); } <request u from proxy> ...	open(Addr a): ... checkPermission (a, connect); connect (a); ...

Figure 13.9 Stack inspection.

Of course, for stack inspection to work, a program must be unable to modify the annotations on its own stack frame or to otherwise manipulate stack inspection. This is one of the most important differences between Java and many other languages (including C++). A Java program cannot directly access memory; it can manipulate only an object for which it has a reference. References cannot be forged, and manipulations are made only through well-defined interfaces. Compliance is enforced through a sophisticated collection of load-time and run-time checks. As a result, an object cannot manipulate its run-time stack, because it cannot get a reference to the stack or other components of the protection system.

More generally, Java's load-time and run-time checks enforce **type safety** of Java classes. Type safety ensures that classes cannot treat integers as pointers, write past the end of an array, or otherwise access memory in arbitrary ways. Rather, a program can access an object only via the methods defined on that object by its class. This is the foundation of Java protection, since it enables a class to effectively **encapsulate** and protect its data and methods from other classes loaded in the same JVM. For example, a variable can be defined as `private` so that only the class that contains it can access it or `protected` so that it can be accessed only by the class that contains it, subclasses of that class, or classes in the same package. Type safety ensures that these restrictions can be enforced.

## 13.10 Summary

Computer systems contain many objects, and they need to be protected from misuse. Objects may be hardware (such as memory, CPU time, and I/O devices) or software (such as files, programs, and semaphores). An access right is permission to perform an operation on an object. A domain is a set of access rights. Processes execute in domains and may use any of the access rights in the domain to access and manipulate objects. During its lifetime, a process may be either bound to a protection domain or allowed to switch from one domain to another.