Software Assurance Tips

A product of the Software Assurance Tips Team[1]

Jon Hood

Monday 2nd August, 2021

1 Stripping: An Inefficient Obfuscation Technique

Updated Tuesday 27th January, 2026

Recently, we were given a piece of software with special handling instructions. The software contained a function which was supposed to be protected: enemies, competitors, and no one without a need-to-know was to ever see how this function manipulated the parameters it was given.

While reviewing the security of the software, we discovered that the developer compiled the binary and released it on their website. When asked how they were able to release such a private routine publicly, the customer claimed that it was fine to release in binary form. Supposedly, the compilation method they used removed the "context of the Human-Readable Source Code used to generate the Machine-Readable Object Code from propagating into the Machine-Readable Object Code."

Let's put this claim to the test! For the sake of creating a fully unclassified example, suppose that no one has ever created a function for calculating factorials, and a new intern fresh out of college submits the code in Listing 1 to solve this highly-secretive, important function.

```c
#include <stdio.h>
#include <stdlib.h>
void factorial(int argc, char *argv[])
{ //SUPER SEKRIT FACTORIALS
        unsigned long long ret = 1;
        int maxVal = atoi(argv[1]); //0<=maxVal<=20
        for (int i = 1; i <= maxVal; i++)
                ret = ret * (unsigned long long)i;
        printf("%llu\n", ret);
}
```

Listing 1: Unsafe Factorial Function

When compiled into machine code, the function isn't nearly as easy to follow. Figures 2 and 3 show the unstripped and stripped functional machine code respectively. Had the software been compiled in debug mode, the source code would have been included alongside the machine code.

```
push    %rbp                                    push    %rbp
mov     %rsp,%rbp                               mov     %rsp,%rbp
sub     $0x30,%rsp                              sub     $0x30,%rsp
mov     %ecx,0x10(%rbp)                         mov     %ecx,0x10(%rbp)
mov     %rdx,0x18(%rbp)                         mov     %rdx,0x18(%rbp)
movl    $0x1,□0x4(%rbp)                         movl    $0x1,□0x4(%rbp)
mov     0x18(%rbp),%rax                         mov     0x18(%rbp),%rax
add     $0x8,%rax                               add     $0x8,%rax
mov     (%rax),%rax                             (%rax),%rax
mov     %rax,%rcx                               mov     %rax,%rcx
call    29 <factorial+0x29>                     call    0x29
mov     %eax,□0xc(%rbp)                         mov     %eax,□0xc(%rbp)
movl    $0x1,□0x8(%rbp)                         movl    $0x1,□0x8(%rbp)
jmp     45 <factorial+0x45>                     jmp     0x45
mov     □0x8(%rbp),%eax                         mov     □0x8(%rbp),%eax
mov     □0x4(%rbp),%edx                         mov     □0x4(%rbp),%edx
imul    %edx,%eax                               imul    %edx,%eax
mov     %eax,□0x4(%rbp)                         mov     %eax,□0x4(%rbp)
addl    $0x1,□0x8(%rbp)                         addl    $0x1,□0x8(%rbp)
mov     □0x8(%rbp),%eax                         mov     □0x8(%rbp),%eax
cmp     □0xc(%rbp),%eax                         cmp     □0xc(%rbp),%eax
jle     35 <factorial+0x35>                     jle     0x35
mov     □0x4(%rbp),%eax                         mov     □0x4(%rbp),%eax
mov     %eax,%edx                               mov     %eax,%edx
lea     0x0(%rip),%rax # 59 <factorial+0x59>    lea     0x0(%rip),%rax # 0x59
mov     %rax,%rcx                               mov     %rax,%rcx
call    61 <factorial+0x61>                     call    0x61
nop                                             nop
add     $0x30,%rsp                              add     $0x30,%rsp
pop     %rbp                                    pop     %rbp
```

Listing 2: Unstripped Machine Code   Listing 3: Stripped Machine Code

As can be seen by the stripped vs. unstripped comparison, there is very little (other than the function name) that is different. In fact, once this code is sent through a decompiler (using Binary Ninja), the decompiled code can be seen in figures 4 and 5.

```
int64_t factorial(int32_t arg1, void* arg2)       int64_t sub_100401080(int32_t arg1, void* arg2)
{                                                 {
    int32_t var_c = 1;                                int32_t var_c = 1;
    int32_t rax_3 = atoi(*(arg2 + 8));                int32_t rax_3 = atoi(*(arg2 + 8));
    for (int32_t var_10 = 1; var_10 s                 for (int32_t var_10 = 1; var_10 s
        <= rax_3; var_10 = var_10 + 1)                    <= rax_3; var_10 = var_10 + 1)
            var_c = var_10 * var_c;                           var_c = var_10 * var_c;
    return printf(_.rdata, zx.q(var_c));              return printf(data_100403000, zx.q(var_c));
}                                                 }
```

Listing 4: Unstripped Decompilation with Bi-   Listing 5: Stripped Decompilation with Bi-
nary Ninja   nary Ninja

While compilation and obfuscation definitely make it more difficult to glean the original meaning of software, it's not impossible to trace through the decompilation and figure out the original intent of the developer. If source code is protected because of what it does, the binary generated from that source code should probably be handled with the same protections.

References

[1] Jon Hood, ed. SwATips. https://www.SwATips.com/.