

Bad Crypto: Chessography and Weak Randomness of Chess Games

Martin Stanek

Department of Computer Science
Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics
Comenius University
martin.stanek@fmph.uniba.sk

Abstract

This short communication shows that the Chessography encryption scheme is incorrect, redundant, and the security claims based on the complexity of chess games are unjustified. It also demonstrates an insufficient randomness in the final chess game positions, which could be of separate interest.

Keywords: encryption, chess, cryptanalysis

1 Failures of Chessography

Chess is an interesting and complex game with a vast number of possible positions. This sometimes leads to ideas for crossing chess with cryptography [1, 2, 4, 5]. Chessography [2] is a symmetric encryption scheme. The main idea of this scheme is to use a chess game to encrypt a plaintext block of 32 characters. Plaintext characters are placed on squares where white and black pieces are positioned at the start of the game. These characters are then transformed using the first key, and the game is used to move them on the board. The ciphertext consists of the final position of the pieces on the board, together with additional information that allows to reconstruct the initial positions of the pieces, including those that were captured during the game. The main objections to the quality and strength of the Chessography scheme are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Imprecise description of the scheme

The description of the encryption and decryption algorithms is rather vague. It lacks mathematical formulas, reference implementation, or pseudo-code. It is unclear whether distinct chess games are used for subsequent plaintext blocks or if a single game is used for all blocks. The provided example also leaves numerous questions unanswered, e.g., what is the exact procedure to produce the final ciphertext, since the text description does not correspond to the ciphertext presented in figures.

The scheme is incorrect

The scheme uses an alphabet with 71 characters, which are encoded as numbers ranging from 1 to 71. Figure 1 illustrates the initial four steps in the encryption algorithm. There are two notable issues with step 4. A minor issue is that after a modulo 71 operation, the range changes to $0, \dots, 70$.

A major issue is that XOR-ing with randomly chosen “Key 1”, whose values can be quite large, see Figure 2, and performing modulo 71 operation is not reversible. For instance, consider the plaintext characters encoded as numbers 9 and 64, and the key value 62 for both numbers:

$$(9 \text{ XOR } 62) \bmod 71 = 55 \bmod 71 = 55;$$

$$(64 \text{ XOR } 62) \bmod 71 = 126 \bmod 71 = 55.$$

It is impossible to tell what the original plaintext number was just from the result 55 and the key value 62. Hence the step 4 is not reversible. It does not matter what the next transformations are, decryption will not be able to produce the correct plaintext.

Step 1: Input the plain text, convert it to lowercase and calculate its length in terms of characters’ present. If the length is greater than 32 characters, segment the message where each segment is of 32 characters.

Step 2: Create an 8×8 matrix of 64 squares for one segment of 32 characters. Place each character sequentially, in the matrix, as the pieces are placed on the chess board.

Step 3: Map each character to a number from the character set and generate a Key 1 of random numbers, for those existing characters on the board.

Step 4: Compute XOR function on the input values and the Key 1. Then perform ‘mod 71’ on the result value. These resultant values will be used as the piece values on the board.

Figure 1: First four steps of encryption [2, Sect. 3.1]

283	413	381	286	783	285	477	62
341	583	943	584	435	537	612	596
451	394	651	377	53	771	29	235
873	105	86	820	589	500	103	321

Figure 2: Example of key 1 [2, Fig. 9]

Chess-related permutation is (sometimes) irrelevant

Let’s assume that the “XOR-mod” step is correct, e.g., the scheme uses an alphabet with 64 characters, numbered from 0 to 63, and values in Key 1 are chosen as 6-bit integers. If only a single block is encrypted, this part of the encryption algorithm alone is the one-time pad cipher, achieving perfect secrecy. Any chess-related steps afterwards are irrelevant. If new Key 1 is chosen for each plaintext block separately, btw. the paper [2] can be interpreted both ways (yes and no), this observation extends to the entire ciphertext – the key is long, the first part of the encryption algorithm is one-time pad and other transformations are redundant for secrecy.

If Key 1 is the same for each block, which is probably the intended construction, a known plaintext attack becomes a problem. It is possible to reconstruct values of Key 1, at least for characters presented in the final position on the chess board, and depending on details of the encryption algorithm even for the entire block.

Chess part of the scheme is incomplete

The scheme encodes moves by creating pairs of squares where a piece was and moved to, respectively. There is no mention whether this encoding is able to correctly work with moves like castling, en passant, and pawn promotion.

Remark. As a curiosity, the example game used in [2] is the following one (annotation symbols were added by Stockfish):

```
1. b4 e6 2. c3 f5 3. g3 g6 4. Nf3 Bd6?! 5. h4 Nf6 6. Nd4?! a6 7. e3 Bf8 8. Qf3? Nd5?
9. Nc2 Nc6 10. e4 Ne5 11. Qe2 fxe4 12. d4?? c5?? 13. dxe5 cxb4 14. cxb4?! Rb8?
15. Bg5?! Qc7 16. h5?? Ra8?? 17. hxg6 Be7?! 18. g7 Bxb4+?? 19. Nxb4 h6 20. Bxh6?! d6?!
21. Qh5+ Ke7 22. Qg5+ Kf7 23. gxh8=Q Nxb4 24. Qh7+ Ke8 25. Qh5+ Kd8 26. Bg5+ Qe7
27. Bxe7+ Kd7 28. Bxd6+ Kc6 29. Bxb4 Bd7 30. Qxe4+ Kb6 31. Qhh7 Bc6 32. Qd4#
```

The game is rather illogical, full of blunders, and white “overlooks” multiple mates in 1 opportunities, first one in move 20.

Weak chess games

Some chess games are only a few moves long, e.g., Scholar’s mate, Fool’s mate, and Legal’s Mate. These and other games leave many pieces on their original squares, thus weakening the resulting permutation. The proposal [2] does not address the possibility of weak chess games for the Chessography, neither how to select suitable chess games for encryption.

Chess game permutation is weak

Let’s assume the chess game is generated by a chess engine to be human-like, or selected from a huge pool of human played games. The final composition and placement of pieces is far from statistically random, let alone cryptographically strong random. A simple analysis presented in Section 2 demonstrates this convincingly. Using the final position of a chess game and intermediate moves as a permutation component in a cipher is a bad idea.

The claim “*The strength of this algorithm is based upon the complexity of the chess game.*” by the author of Chessography, and then using the estimate for the number of possible chess games to argue the scheme’s security, is simply deceiving.

2 Analysis of chess games final positions

The dataset consists of 100,000 games played on the Lichess server by users with an average rating of 2558. It is a subset of games played in October 2024 [3]. The dataset contains mostly blitz and rapid games, and excludes bullet time controls. White win rate is 47%, black win rate is 42%, and only 11% of the games are draws. The average length of the game is 43 moves (86 plies).

Figures 3–8 on pages 5–6 show heatmaps for the location of different pieces on the chess board for the final position of the game. The heatmaps illustrate the limited randomness of the final positions and subsequently weak (partial) permutations that chess games provide. Colors are scaled individually for each heatmap, therefore the same shade can represent different percentages in distinct heatmaps. Table 1 summarizes the maximal percentages and placement on the board for each piece type.

piece	white		black	
	max [%]	square	max [%]	square
king	22.28	g1	22.46	g8
queen	2.52	d1	3.31	d8
bishop	3.83	g2	4.75	g7
knight	3.88	f3	4.03	f6
rook	10.45	a1	12.15	a8
pawn	26.22	f2	27.89	f7

Table 1: The most common piece placement in the final position

Conclusion

This note shows that Chessography is not a good proposal. More importantly, it seems that it is impractical to base a strong encryption scheme on chess games. The rules of chess limit the range of possible moves, and the placement of pieces in final positions is not sufficiently random.

References

- [1] M. Angamuthu, M.V. Chandrasekaran, A. Gupta, R. Porwal, *Encryption and decryption using algebraic chess notations*, International Journal of Pharmacy and Technology, 8. 22098-22105, 2016. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316886484_Encryption_and_decryption_using_algebraic_chess_notations
- [2] V.K. Kamat, *Chessography: A Cryptosystem Based on the Game of Chess*, In: Computational Intelligence in Data Mining., Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, vol 556, Springer, Singapore, 2017. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3874-7_29
- [3] *Lichess Elite Database*, 2024. <https://database.nikonoel.fr/> [Accessed 2024-12-11]
- [4] M.D. Shaheer Ahmed, P. MaryAnkitha, P.U. Anitha, M. Rama Raju, B.V. Pranay Kumar, *Chess Games as a Method for File Encryption and Storage*, 2024, PREPRINT (Version 1) available at Research Square <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-5088828/v1>
- [5] M. Singh, A. Kakkar, M. Singh, *Image Encryption Scheme Based on Knight’s Tour Problem*, Procedia Computer Science, Volume 70, pp. 245-250, 2015, ISSN 1877-0509. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2015.10.081>




Figure 3: Final position of the king




Figure 4: Final position of the queen




Figure 5: Final position of the bishop




Figure 6: Final position of the knight




Figure 7: Final position of the rook




Figure 8: Final position of the pawn