

ANAMORPHIC ENCRYPTION: PRIVATE COMMUNICATION AGAINST A DICTATOR

BYPASSING COERCION IN MODERN CRYPTO SYSTEMS

Fanizza Tahir
James Madison University
June 16, 2025

THE PROBLEM: CRYPTO UNDER COERCION

Traditional Cryptography's Vulnerable Assumptions:

- Receiver-Privacy: Assumes that a receiver's private key remains secure.
- Sender-Freedom: Assumes sender is free to choose messages.

The Dictator's Challenge:

- Coercive governments can force key revelation, which undermines receiver-privacy.
- Can force senders to transmit specific, chosen messages, undermining sender-freedom.
- This may outlaw alternative cryptosystems.

The Core Problem: How do we ensure private communication when fundamental cryptographic assumptions are legally and forcefully validated?

Motivation: To technically demonstrate the futility of government attempts to control strong cryptography.



WHAT IS ANAMORPHIC ENCRYPTION?

Anamorphic Encryption: a special encryption scheme whose public keys can be generated in one of two modes: normal or anamorphic.

Analogy: Like a distorted drawing that appears normal when viewed from a specific point or with a suitable mirror or lens.

Core Idea: Two messages in One Ciphertext:

- **Overt Message (m_0):** The normal message, visible to the dictator upon decryption with the normal secret key.
- **Covert/Anamorphic Message (m_1):** The hidden, special message that's only visible to parties with the double secret key.

Key Requirements for Plausibility & Security:

- Anamorphic public/secret key pairs must be indistinguishable from normal corresponding pairs.
- Ciphertexts produced using an anamorphic public key must be indistinguishable from those produced by a normal public key.

Goals: Zero-latency communication and high anamorphic bandwidth rate.

RECEIVER-ANAMORPHIC ENCRYPTION (COMBATTING KEY SURRENDER)

GOAL: “To protect a receiver’s private message (m_1), even if the secret key is surrendered.”

Naor-Yung Basis Mechanism

STEP 1

Bob generates ‘aPK’,
‘aSK’ (for dictator),
‘dkey’ (for Alice).

STEP 2

Alice encrypts (m_0, m_1)
with ‘dkey’ to ‘act’.

STEP 3

Dictator decrypts ‘act’
with ‘aSK’ to m_0 .

STEP 4

Bob decrypts ‘act’ with
‘dkey’ to m_1 .

Key Feature:

Simulated NIZK makes ‘act’ appear normal

Benefits:

Bandwidth Rate 1, Zero-Latency

SENDER-ANAMORPHIC ENCRYPTION

GOAL: “Alice sends (m_1) to Bob, while appearing to send (m_0) to Carol, even if coerced.”



Key Idea:
No prior shared secret between Alice and Bob
needed.

Lattice-Based Mechanism:

1

Alice uses ‘fRandom’ (coin-toss faking algorithm)

2

Generates randomness R^* for $ct = \text{Enc}(fPK, m_0; R^*)$

3

ct decrypts to m_0 (with Carol’s fSK) and m_1 (with Bob’s dSK)

Requirements: “Common randomness,” “message recovery from randomness,” “equal distribution of plaintexts.”

SECURITY AND INDISTINGUISHABILITY

CORE PRINCIPLE: “Dictator cannot distinguish between ‘normal’ and ‘fully anamorphic’”

FORMAL PROOF (VIA GAMES)

‘NormalGame’ vs. ‘FullyAGame’

Probability of distinguishing is negligible.

IMPLICATIONS

Secrecy of m_i : Covert message remains hidden

Plausibility: Operations appear legitimate; no suspicion raised.

UNDERLYING TOOLS

Underlying Tools: IND-CPA secure PKE and Simulation Sound NIZK.

PRACTICALITY AND LIMITATIONS

ADVANTAGES



- Leverages Existing Cryptosystems.
- Zero-Latency Communication
- High Bandwidth Rate (Receiver-AM)
- No Shared Secret (Sender-AM)

CHALLENGES

- 
- Simple Rejection Sampling is Inefficient
 - Shared ‘dkey’ for Receiver-AM (can be a physical exchange).
 - Not all PKEs naturally Anamorphic (Ex. Goldwasser–Micali for Sender-AM).
 - Potential “Crypto Wars” of banning specific schemes

CONCLUSION

SUMMARY

- ▶ Anamorphic Encryption demonstrates the futility of government control over strong crypto.

IMPACT

- ▶ Empowers private communication even under extreme duress.

FUTURE

- ▶ Explore anamorphic properties in more cryptosystems

- ▶ Combine Anamorphism with other covert techniques (steganography, kleptography)

- ▶ Analyze broader policy and societal implications.

THANK YOU