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Spends way too much time on Twitter
Crypto is everywhere

And its domain extends way beyond mere encryption.
encryption - Simply encrypt a string in C - Stack Overflow
https://stackoverflow.com/questions/7622617/simply-encrypt-a-string-in-c
Oct 1, 2011 - I'm trying to encrypt a query string on a game I'm making when opening a url. ... I wish I could give a code example but I'm not too experienced in C, and I'm not .... I got something going but then some things screwed up the url.

Write a Basic Encryption/Decryption Program in C on Vimeo
https://vimeo.com › ringneckparrot › Videos
Apr 9, 2012
In this video, we create a simple C Program, that performs a very basic Encryption and Decryption, by ...

Caesar Cipher in C and C++ [Encryption & Decryption] - The Crazy ...
www.thecrazyprogrammer.com/2016/.../caesar-cipher-c-c-encryption-decryption.htm...
Here you can learn C, C++, Java, Python, Android Development, PHP, SQL, JavaScript, ... Get program for caesar cipher in C and C++ for encryption and decryption. ..... Thanks man ,you're awesome,looking forward for more encryption stuff.

How to Write Caesar Cipher in C Program with ... - The Geek Stuff
www.thedgeekstuff.com/2014/08/c-caesar-cipher-example/
Aug 7, 2014 - One simple and basic method to encrypt a message is using ... you'll learn how to create a C program code that will encrypt and decrypt the text ...
how to encrypt stuff in c

About 2,960,000 results (0.69 seconds)
Caesar Cipher in C and C++

Here you can learn C, C++, Java, Python... program for caesar cipher in C and C++ awesome, looking forward for more encryption

How to Write Caesar Cipher
You can use a variant of base64 with a custom alphabet, or just a shuffled alphabet. It's not really secure, but in your case it is probably sufficient. The algorithm is widely used, so it will be easy for you to find an implementation where you can provide a custom alphabet.

The bonus point is, that whatever you put into the query string, the encoded form will consist of valid URL characters, if you choose the alphabet appropriately.

I did a lot of research and think you're right. I got something going but then some things screwed up the url. Is there any resources around with some simplistic c base64 functions? – Isaiah Oct 2 '11 at 5:41

google.com/search?q=base64+implementation+c. The implementations I saw are pretty simple to understand. – Roland Illig Oct 2 '11 at 7:20
char *encrypt_hardway(char *data, char *key) {

    char buffer[PATH_MAX];
    strncpy( buffer, "", PATH_MAX);

    int i = 0;
    int y = 0; int o;

    for(i = 0, y = 0; i <= strlen(data); i++) { 
    }

    for(i = 0; i < strlen( data ); i++)
    {
        buffer[i]= data[i]-15;
    }

    size_t len = strlen(buffer);
    char *r = malloc(len+1);
    return r ? memcpy(r, buffer, len+1) : NULL;
}
Another very simple XOR algorithm, I'm using it on ATMEAL microprocessors to encrypt packets transmitted and received using wireless communication.

```c
void encrypt_XOR(char *data, char *key) {
    int i = 0;
    int y = 0;
    for(i = 0, y = 0; i <= strlen(data); ) {
        int o = 0;
        for(o = 0; o <= BLOCK_SIZE; o++) {
            if(data[i] != '') {
                data[i] ^= key[y];
            }
            i++;
        }
        y++;
        if(key[y] == '') {
            y = 0;
        }
    }
}
```

Hope it will help!
How to encrypt stuff in PHP?
- MCRYPT_3DES
- MCRYPT_ARCFOUR_IV (libcrypt > 2.4.x only)
- MCRYPT_ARCFOUR (libcrypt > 2.4.x only)
- MCRYPT_BLOWFISH
- MCRYPT_CAST_128
- MCRYPT_CAST_256
- MCRYPT_CRYPT
- MCRYPT_DES
- MCRYPT_DES_COMPAT (libcrypt 2.2.x only)
- MCRYPT_ENIGMA (libcrypt > 2.4.x only, alias for MCRYPT_CRYPT)
- MCRYPT_GOST
- MCRYPT_IDEA (non-free)
- MCRYPT_LOKI97 (libcrypt > 2.4.x only)
- MCRYPT_MARS (libcrypt > 2.4.x only, non-free)
- MCRYPT_PANAMA (libcrypt > 2.4.x only)
- MCRYPT_RIJNDAEL_128 (libcrypt > 2.4.x only)
- MCRYPT_RIJNDAEL_192 (libcrypt > 2.4.x only)
- MCRYPT_RIJNDAEL_256 (libcrypt > 2.4.x only)
- MCRYPT_RC2
- MCRYPT_RC4 (libcrypt 2.2.x only)
- MCRYPT_RC6 (libcrypt > 2.4.x only)
- MCRYPT_RC6_128 (libcrypt 2.2.x only)
- MCRYPT_RC6_192 (libcrypt 2.2.x only)
- MCRYPT_RC6_256 (libcrypt 2.2.x only)
- MCRYPT_SAFER64
- MCRYPT_SAFER128
- MCRYPT_SAFERPLUS (libcrypt > 2.4.x only)
- MCRYPT_SERPENT (libcrypt > 2.4.x only)
- MCRYPT_SERPENT_128 (libcrypt 2.2.x only)
- MCRYPT_SERPENT_192 (libcrypt 2.2.x only)
- MCRYPT_SERPENT_256 (libcrypt 2.2.x only)
- MCRYPT_SKIPJACK (libcrypt > 2.4.x only)
- MCRYPT_TAN (libcrypt 2.2.x only)
- MCRYPT_THREEWAY
- MCRYPT_TRIPLEDES (libcrypt > 2.4.x only)
- MCRYPT_TWOFISH (for older crypt 2.x versions, or crypt > 2.4.x)
- MCRYPT_TWOFISH128 (TWOFISHxxx are available in newer 2.x versions, but not in the 2.4.x versions)
- MCRYPT_TWOFISH192
- MCRYPT_TWOFISH256
- MCRYPT_WAKE (libcrypt > 2.4.x only)
- MCRYPT_XTEA (libcrypt > 2.4.x only)
You must (in CFB and OFB mode) or can (in CBC mode) supply an initialization vector (IV) to the respective cipher function. The IV must be unique and must be the same when decrypting/encrypting. With data which is stored encrypted, you can take the output of a function of the index under which the data is stored (e.g. the MD5 key of the filename). Alternatively, you can transmit the IV together with the encrypted data (see chapter 9.3 of Applied Cryptography by Schneier (ISBN 0-471-11709-9) for a discussion of this topic).
Crypto is hard

*USING* crypto is hard, too
Developers are not to blame. This leads to security disasters.
Crypto is often a necessary, but tiny piece in an application.

Developers expect things to just work. Like all other pieces their application depends on.
Webcrypto API
Noooooo...
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Funded by the European Commission, released in 2010.

Focused on high-speed cryptography and improving usability.

Restricted to a small set of primitives and parameters chosen by experts

High-level APIs for common operations

Optimized for the host it was compiled on, using tricks of the C language to save extra CPU cycles
3 years later: adoption rate remains very low

State-of-the-start, simple, highly secure, high-speed cryptography!
2013: libsodium
Warning: this is not a talk about libsodium

Libsodium just happens to be a good case to look at, because its API has evolved a lot over time.

Let’s see why, how, and some takeaways from the past 4 years.
Slow version of NaCl:
Instant success!
Usability was the #1 problem to solve in cryptography

Not speed

Not security

¯\_(ツ)_/¯
Cryptography makes devices communicate securely.

Cross-platform support is no more an option.

Today’s minimum expectations:

- Linux
- MacOS
- iOS
- Android
- Windows (Visual Studio)
- Embedded systems
- Javascript / WebAssembly
Today’s applications are written using a combination of programming languages.

APIs designed for a specific language are problematic.

Macros and pointer arithmetic don’t play well with (not(C | C++))
Expose everything as a function

crypto_box_KEYBYTES -> crypto_box_keybytes()
Package maintainers are your best friends
How developers want to install **dependencies** today:

pkg_add, apt-get, brew, pacman, choco…

One pre-built, universal package.

Mainstream build systems suck. **All of them.**

But package maintainers know how to use them.

And **adoption** of your project **depends on package maintainers.**
Key idea behind NaCl/libsodium: expose high-level APIs for common operations

“I want to encrypt a message”

“I want to verify that a message hasn’t been tampered with”

“I want to store a password”

(and stay cool if my company name ever ends up on haveibeenpwned.com)
Simple functions that keep the amount of user-supplied parameters down to a minimum.

crypto_box_seal(c, "message", 7, secret_key)
Nobody reads the f* documentation

What experts want: all the gory details about the chosen primitives, constructions and parameters

What everybody else want: example code, code snippets to copy/paste

Also keep in mind that for most people, a “secret key” means “a password”
Generic hashing

Single-part example without a key

```c
#define MESSAGE ((const unsigned char *) "Arbitrary data to hash")
#define MESSAGE_LEN 22

unsigned char hash[crypto_generichash_BYTES];

crypto_generichash(hash, sizeof hash,
                   MESSAGE, MESSAGE_LEN,
                   NULL, 0);
```

Single-part example with a key

```c
#define MESSAGE ((const unsigned char *) "Arbitrary data to hash")
#define MESSAGE_LEN 22

unsigned char hash[crypto_generichash_BYTES];
unsigned char key[crypto_generichash_KEYBYTES];

randombytes_buf(key, sizeof key);

crypto_generichash(hash, sizeof hash,
                   MESSAGE, MESSAGE_LEN,
                   key, sizeof key);
```

Multi-part example with a key
Watch how people use your APIs in their own projects

Watch yourself struggle when using that very API in your own projects
How libraries are used in real-world projects

crypto_box(): everybody writes wrappers.

crypto_sign(): everybody writes wrappers. **Vulnerability** in early Golang bindings due to a misunderstanding of the API.

**OpenSSL**: libtls + a bazillion incompatible abstraction layers in all programming languages. Either close to the metal and dangerous, or completely **different from the original API**.
If people write wrappers, your API could be improved.
Watch what people are building with your APIs

Watch for recurring questions on Github, Stackoverflow, etc.
If something is not available out of the box, people will reinvent it. So, implement it.
“It’s only 1 or 2 trivial lines of code, I’m not gonna add yet another set of APIs just for that [very common feature request]”

/me, not so long ago.
Reality check

• Adding a trivial function is not always bloated. It can be well worth it.

• It will improve code clarity, prevent bugs.

• It will save you from having to answer the same questions over and over again.

• It will make users aware that this operation is actually possible.
Libsodium examples

- `crypto_box_keygen()` to create a secret key.
- `crypto_box_seal()` to delete the secret key after encryption.
- `crypto_kdf()` for key derivation.
- `randombytes_deterministic()` for deterministic random numbers.

All of these are small and trivial functions, yet turned out to be welcome additions.
High-level APIs frustrate power users

Expose low-level APIs as well, with access to more parameters.

Documentation should remain focused on high-level APIs.

Do not expose specific implementations, or you’ll be screwed later.
Does it solve a common problem impossible to solve with the current APIs?
Adding new operations

Build a distinct project, maintained independently. Experiment with new APIs. Wait for feedback. Watch how these APIs are being used.

Or if people use them at all.

Look at how people solved similar problems. Tweak the prototype. Use-it in your own apps. Tweak it again.

Eventually, port it to the main project (or not).

Example: blobcrypt
Watch how people use your APIs in their own projects

Watch yourself struggle when using that very API in your own projects
Nonces (IVs)

Supplement the secret key.

Must be unique for a given key.

The security of most nonce-based ciphers can be totally destroyed if not.

Shall a crypto API require nonces from applications?
Yes:

• Some protocols mandate specific nonces
• Nonces can be used to avoid replay attacks/associate questions with responses in non-pipelined protocols
• Come on, anyone can generate random data and maintain counters!

No:

• Users are too stupid to generate nonces (that’s what “misuse resistance” stands for, right?)
  — Not exactly.
Why “No” should be the answer today:

- Requires redundant code, that APIs could avoid.
- People don’t have time to read documentation. Documentation can be misleading or incomplete.
- Maintaining counters is complicated in today’s world where apps run in the cloud, in multiple containers sharing the same secret keys.
- Different ciphers have different requirements and security guarantees. Random nonces may not be secure. Ditto for counters. Protocols defining nonce constructions may be broken. APIs should hide these details and do the right thing instead of blaming users for “misuse”.
- iOT/embedded systems: safely generating unique/random numbers may not be possible at all.
Context separation

Reusing a **secret key** for different purposes can have catastrophic implications.

Applications will not do that, right?
It may not be obvious at all:

Dmitry Chestnykh @dchest
Signify key storage format scared me a bit with its SHA512(secretKey) checksum. Good thing Ed25519 secretKey includes public key, otherwise

Dmitry Chestnykh @dchest
It would've been possible to create signatures knowing this checksum and public key.

Dmitry Chestnykh @dchest
That's why hash functions should include domain separation.
Shall we blame the developers?

Or could APIs prevent that?

Modern crypto APIs should consider context separation.

As of today, no major library does.
Key exchange

Insufficient: provide a **DH function**.

Actually worse: provide a **DH function** + a lot of **documentation** about how to use it right.

Better in theory: use **TLS**.

Hell’s kitchen: **reimplement** a well-known AKE.

Playing with fire: invent a **custom protocol**.

Juggling with unlocked hand grenades blind-folded: **reimplement TLS**.
Limitations
No Practical Limitations
(from an API perspective)

Documentation make library developers feel guilt-free, but doesn’t fix actual problems.
Started as a lightweight crypto library for microcontrollers/constrained environments.

Also an opportunity to design new APIs based on lessons from the past, and current trends in cryptography.
Key concepts:

- Everything is built upon only two modern cryptographic building blocks: the Gimli permutation and the Curve25519 elliptic curve.

- Concise, consistent, easy-to-use, hard-to-misuse high-level API.

- One key size for all operations.

- Context (domain separation) required by virtually all APIs. One context size for all operations.

- Do not assume that a CSPRNG is available, or works as expected.

- Implement what applications frequently use in other libraries.
A single API for all your hashing needs

HMAC construction
Hash function for short messages
Hash function with 128 bit output
Hash function with 256 bit output
Hash function with 512 bit output
XOF or KDF + stream cipher

One generic hashing API

Initial libhydrogen prototype: siphash128 + blake2S + blake2SX
Today: one sponge function

Zero changes to the API
Encryption

Don’t ask applications for a nonce

Automatically attach a synthetic nonce to the ciphertext

“misuse” resistant
Encryption

Why do applications need explicit nonces/AD?

- **Check** that if we expect the 3rd message in sequence, what we just received actually is the 3rd message.

- **Check** a message id, to reorder fragmented, unordered messages (e.g. UDP datagrams).

- **Check** that a message is not older than a given timestamp.

- **Check** a protocol version.
Encryption

Why do applications need explicit nonces/AD?

• Check that a value attached to a message is the one we expect
• Check that a value attached to a message is the one we expect
• Check that a value attached to a message is the one we expect
• Check that a value attached to a message is the one we expect

From an API perspective: no AD, no nonce, but a 64 bit integer
Encryption

hydro_secretbox_keygen(key);

hydro_secretbox_encrypt(ciphertext, MESSAGE, MESSAGE_LEN, 1, CONTEXT, key);

hydro_secretbox_decrypt(decrypted, ciphertext, CIPHERTEXT_LEN, 1, CONTEXT, key)
Be consistent

HKDF parameters:
hash function, salt, key information.

Salt -> context
Key information -> 64 bit value

One vocabulary, same types used across all the APIs.

Even if the underlying primitives are more flexible, simplify their interface to what most real-world projects actually need.
Key exchange

Protocol independent
Transport independent
Can be extended
Hard to get wrong
Key exchange

Bob:

\texttt{hydro\_kx\_xx1()} \rightarrow \texttt{packet1}

Alice:

\texttt{hydro\_kx\_xx2(\texttt{packet1})} \rightarrow \texttt{packet2}

Bob:

\texttt{hydro\_kx\_xx3(\texttt{packet2})} \rightarrow \texttt{packet3}

(Optional) Alice:

\texttt{hydro\_kx\_xx4(\texttt{packet3})} \rightarrow \texttt{DONE!}
Don’t reinvent the wheel

Noise
Noisesocket
Strobe

+ well-studied constructions
Improving security through better abstractions

From:

Many raw crypto primitives and combinators + high level APIs implementing specific protocols

To:

A translation of what primitives can do into what typical applications need. High-level building blocks with a simple, unified interface modeled after real-world use cases.

Requirements: no limitations, MR, domain separation.
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Frank Denis
@jedisct1
frank@primulinus.com

https://libsodium.org
https://github.com/jedisct1/libhydrogen