

Lecture Notes 3:

Perfect Secrecy

Reading.

- Katz–Lindell, Chapter 2.
- What does it mean for an encryption scheme to be secure? Some attempts:
 - Adversary can’t determine key from ciphertext.
 - Adversary can’t determine plaintext.
 - Adversary can’t determine any symbol of plaintext.
 - Adversary can’t determine “any information” about plaintext.
- **Definition 1 (perfect indistinguishability)** *Encryption scheme satisfies perfect indistinguishability if ...*
 - Intuition:
 - Why focus on only two messages?
- **Proposition 2** *Shift and Substitution ciphers do not satisfy perfect indistinguishability for messages of length > 1 .*

Proof:
- **Proposition 3** *One-time pad satisfies perfect indistinguishability.*

Proof:
- **Definition 4 (Shannon secrecy (called “perfect secrecy” in KL))** *Let M be a distribution on \mathcal{M} . An encryption scheme satisfies Shannon secrecy with respect to M if ...*

Intuition:

- **Proposition 5** *An encryption scheme satisfies perfect indistinguishability if and only if it satisfies Shannon secrecy (with respect to any M s.t. $\Pr[M = m] > 0$ for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$). Thus we refer to both as perfect secrecy (or perfect security).*

Proof: We only prove that perfect indistinguishability implies Shannon secrecy. The converse is Lemma 2.3 in the 1st edition of Katz–Lindell (Exercise 2.4 in the 2nd edition). By Bayes’ Law,

$$\Pr[M = m | \text{Enc}_K(M) = c] = \frac{\Pr[\text{Enc}_K(M) = c | M = m] \cdot \Pr[M = m]}{\Pr[\text{Enc}_K(M) = c]}$$

We need to prove that $\Pr[\text{Enc}_K(M) = c | M = m] = \Pr[\text{Enc}_K(M) = c]$, i.e. $\Pr[\text{Enc}_K(m) = c] = \Pr[\text{Enc}_K(M) = c]$. This follows from perfect indistinguishability. ■

- **Definition 6 (perfect adversarial indistinguishability)** *An encryption scheme $(\text{Gen}, \text{Enc}, \text{Dec})$ satisfies perfect adversarial indistinguishability if for every adversary \mathcal{A} , the probability that \mathcal{A} succeeds in the following “game” is at most $1/2$:*

- **Proposition 7** *An encryption scheme satisfies perfect indistinguishability iff it satisfies perfect adversarial indistinguishability.*

- Why isn’t this course over?

- **Theorem 8** *If an encryption scheme is perfectly secure, then the number of keys is at least the size of the plaintext space.*

Proof:

- How to get around this limitation? Can we relax the security definition, or does violating perfect secrecy necessarily correspond to a potential attack?
- “Statistical” security: only require encryptions of all messages to be statistically close.
 - Let X and Y be random variables taking values in a set S . X and Y are called *statistically ε -indistinguishable* if for every event $T \subseteq S$

$$|\Pr[X \in T] - \Pr[Y \in T]| \leq \varepsilon.$$

T is also called a *statistical test*.

- **Definition 9 (statistical secrecy)** *Encryption scheme satisfies statistical ε -indistinguishability if for every two $m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{M}$, the random variables $\text{Enc}_K(m_1)$ and $\text{Enc}_K(m_2)$ are statistically ε -indistinguishable. (These random variables are taken over $K \xleftarrow{R} \text{Gen}$ and the coin tosses of Enc .)*
- Intuitively, adversary has probability at most ε of getting information about the plaintext.
- Equivalent to allowing a success probability of at most $(1 + \varepsilon)/2$ in the adversarial indistinguishability game.
- Insufficient to go beyond the barrier we have with Shannon secrecy: requires $|\mathcal{K}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot |\mathcal{M}|$.
- “Computational” security: only protect against adversaries with *limited computational resources*, i.e. efficient adversaries with a reasonable amount of computational power \Rightarrow REST OF THIS COURSE.
- Other communication settings — quantum cryptography, beacon of random bits,...