

SURPRISE DYNAMICS

Unpredictability as a Higher Order of Randomness

The Source of JFES Entropy

Wolfgang Flatow
JavaScript Fractal Encryption Standard / JFES
wolfgang.flatow@portalz.solutions

Contents

Executive Summary	3
1. Cryptographic Entropy.....	3
2. Randomness	3
3. Surf.....	4
4. Surprise	4
5. Continuous Mandelbrot Surprise	5
6. Infinite Complexity > Surprise	5
7. Complexity as an Entropy Source	6
8. Cryptographic Quality of Surprise	7
9. The Higher Order	7
10. Summary.....	8
Reference Notes	8
Selected References	8

Executive Summary

Surprise Dynamics (SD) advances a different way of understanding entropy and cryptographic security. Its governing principle is surprise, not statistical randomness. Randomness remains within SD: the higher order includes the useful properties of conventional randomness rather than discarding them. But randomness is not the final or optimal measure of quality. The central question becomes how a system departs from what can be expected, and whether its behaviour remains unpredictable through the structure of its evolution.

The central proposition is direct: **SD is a higher order of entropy and cryptographic security**, with surprise—not statistical randomness—as its governing principle. Pure randomness reduces one important form of surprise because it removes the expectation of structure and character. A source can be irregular in every detail and still be recognisable in its overall character. Surprise emerges when something occurs that departs from that character.

The paper develops this proposition through cryptographic entropy, randomness, ocean surf, and the Mandelbrot field as an example of surprising continuous mathematical complexity.

Conventional [Mandelbrot zooms](#) move through neighbouring coordinates; JFES recursively navigates the field, with values obtained at one location determining the next location. The result is a trajectory through the field rather than a scan of an image.

The JFES cryptographic comparison is included as a reference point for conventional statistical behaviour. It supports the discussion of the randomness layer; it does not govern the definition of SD.

1. Cryptographic Entropy

Entropy is commonly discussed through probability distributions. Shannon entropy describes uncertainty associated with a random variable. In cryptographic work, the practical concern is closely connected to unpredictability: whether a value, key or subsequent state can be anticipated from the information available to an observer.

These perspectives are related, but they do not describe the same thing. A sequence may have balanced proportions of symbols and still follow a simple, predictable pattern. Conversely, an output can contain structure without that structure making its next value obvious. The statistical character of an output is not identical to the behaviour of the process that produces it.

The earlier paper, “Unpredictability as the Optimal Measure of Entropy,” develops the relationship between complexity and access to unpredictable outcomes. SD carries this line of thought forward, placing surprise at the centre. The question is not only how much uncertainty a statistical measure assigns to an output. It is also how the output relates to expectation, and how the system’s evolving trajectory generates outcomes that cannot be anticipated from their apparent character.

2. Randomness

Randomness is useful. It provides a conventional reference for describing outputs that lack particular predictable regularities under a given model. Statistical tests can reveal bias, correlation and other detectable patterns. Such tests remain useful in comparing generators and examining output.

But randomness is not a synonym for complexity, entropy, unpredictability or surprise. A statistically random-looking sequence can still be predictable if its generating structure is known. A structured sequence is not automatically predictable merely because it has structure. The relationship between structure and prediction is the important question.

SD includes conventional randomness as a lower-order component. It does not reject randomness in order to move beyond randomness as the governing principle. The proposal is that statistical randomness alone does not capture the full character of a system whose evolving structure produces surprise.

3. Surf

Ocean surf, which has a sound similar to white-noise from a random generator, makes the distinction tangible. A recording of surf is irregular and difficult to predict in its details. The waveforms fluctuate continuously; no listener can readily specify each next movement of the sound. Yet the recording remains recognisably surf. Its broad character establishes an expectation.

Now place a seal or bird call, a footstep, a spoken word, a single click, a guitar chord or a passage of Mozart into that recording. The unexpected sound need not itself be complex. It is surprising because it departs from the character established by the surf.

The surf can therefore be highly unpredictable in its details while remaining recognizable as surf. Irregularity and source identity coexist. Surprise lies in the relation between the expected character and what occurs.

This is the central distinction: pure randomness reduces surprise by removing the expectation of structure and character change. When a source has no recognisable character, there is less of a stable character against which a departure can be experienced.

4. Surprise

In SD, surprise is relational. It arises between an expectation and an occurrence. The expectation may be the recognisable character of a source, a pattern established over time, or the direction in which a recursive process appears to be moving. The occurrence becomes surprising through its difference from that expectation.

This means the surprising event does not need to be complicated. A single click within surf may be more surprising than another elaborate wave pattern. Complexity belongs to the source and its structure; surprise belongs to the relationship between that structure and the event that departs from it.

The governing proposition follows: SD is a higher order of entropy and security, with surprise—not statistical randomness—as its governing principle. Randomness remains included, but surprise provides the wider frame. It allows structure to matter without treating structure itself as a defect.

5. Continuous Mandelbrot Surprise

The Mandelbrot field provides a numerical setting in which complexity and surprise can be encountered across scale. Conventional zooms travel through neighbouring coordinates in an orderly spatial scan. As the image reveals spirals, filaments, nested forms and unexpected transitions, the viewer encounters structures that can be genuinely striking. Describing a structure afterwards is not the same as encountering it.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ujvy-DEA-UM&list=PLKHNBHfHxT6MRKBPaoQqVJclat-A6FVU>

The rendered zoom images are not the numerical field itself. A visualisation assigns colours to computed values and presents a finite selection of coordinates at a finite resolution. The visual complexity of a rendered fractal is an incomplete measure of the numerical complexity of its underlying field. A region that appears visually quiet is not thereby numerically simple; values associated with nearby vectors differ sharply even where the image gives little indication of it.

The Mandelbrot iteration is commonly written as $z_{n+1} = z_n^2 + c$, with c a complex parameter. A coordinate is not merely a coloured pixel: its evaluation generates an iterative trajectory of complex values. The mathematical field therefore offers numerical relationships that extend beyond what a finite rendering can display.

Shishikura established that the boundary of the Mandelbrot set has Hausdorff dimension 2, the maximum possible Hausdorff dimension for a subset of the complex plane. The Mandelbrot field's mathematical depth is not defined by the limits of any particular image. It means the Mandelbrot set is **infinitely complex**.

JFES does not navigate the field by scanning adjacent coordinates as a conventional zoom does. It recursively navigates the numerical field. The value obtained at one location determines the next location to evaluate. The next vector may be elsewhere in the field, including a region that looks visually quiet. The trajectory is determined by numerical navigation, not by the visual adjacency of pixels.

The distinction matters to Surprise Dynamics. A conventional zoom reveals surprise through orderly spatial exploration. JFES follows a different path: recursive navigation through values that determine subsequent locations. The object of interest is the infinitely complex field and the trajectory through it, not the picture.

6. Infinite Complexity > Surprise

Infinite complexity is not just a large collection of surprising complex images. It is a mathematical domain whose structure is not exhausted by any finite rendering, finite precision or finite traversal. The Mandelbrot field gives this idea a concrete form: the numerical field extends beyond every particular image made of it, and its structure is available at successively finer levels of examination.

Surprise arises when navigation through such complexity produces an outcome that departs from expectation. The important point is not simply that the field contains many possible values. Recursive navigation creates a trajectory through the field, and each computed value determines where the process goes next. The process does not follow a predetermined scan across neighbouring locations. Its path is shaped by the values encountered along the way.

THE CONCEPTUAL PROGRESSION: Infinite complexity → recursive navigation → trajectory → unpredictability → surprise

The field's complexity is not confined to what an observer can see in a rendered image. A visually quiet region does not imply a numerically quiet region, and a trajectory is not bound to remain near its previous location. JFES moves from one location to another according to the computed values. A vector in a visually intricate region is followed by a vector elsewhere in the field; the path is numerical and recursive, not a visual tour.

This is where surprise becomes more than a label for irregularity. The trajectory is generated through a field whose full numerical structure cannot be represented by the image on a screen. The next step emerges from the current computation, and the sequence of locations is shaped by that recursive relationship. Surprise is the governing lens for considering the difference between a source's apparent character and the outcomes encountered through its navigation.

The title expresses the conceptual hierarchy at the heart of SD: infinite complexity provides the domain; recursive navigation engages that complexity; unpredictability characterises the resulting trajectory; and surprise describes the departure from expectation that makes this a higher-order account than statistical randomness alone.

7. Complexity as an Entropy Source

Conventional entropy sources include physical processes such as thermal noise, radioactive decay, turbulence and acoustic variation. Their detailed behaviour can be irregular and difficult to anticipate even while the source remains recognisable. Surf is an especially clear illustration: it can supply noise-like variation while retaining a characteristic structure.

JFES approaches the source question through the Mandelbrot field rather than a physical noise signal. A starting coordinate is evaluated through Mandelbrot iteration. The values obtained from that evaluation are used to determine a subsequent coordinate. The new coordinate is evaluated in turn, producing a recursive trajectory:

$$(x_1, y_1) \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow (x_2, y_2) \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow (x_3, y_3) \rightarrow \dots$$

The values generated within each Mandelbrot iteration matter because the process does not reduce a location to a single colour or a binary inside/outside result. The intermediate complex values provide transformation material, and the trajectory links one evaluation to the next.

The central idea carried from the earlier work is that the mathematical field is not a finite table of preselected random values. JFES navigates an infinite table of infinite complexity. The values found along the trajectory shape the next step, and the resulting stream is derived from this recursive access to the field's complexity.

SD places this extraction process within a broader understanding of entropy quality. The question of interest is the trajectory and its unpredictability, considered through surprise, rather than the assumption that the output must imitate an ideal statistical random measure.

8. Cryptographic Quality of Surprise

The JFES Cryptographic Foundation Comparison provides a practical reference for the conventional randomness layer. It compares JFES with established random-number generators and cryptographic transformations, including AES-256-CTR, ChaCha20, operating-system CSPRNG output, RDRAND, AES-256-GCM and ChaCha20-Poly1305. The report examines byte-level entropy, serial correlation, compression behaviour and selected statistical tests.

These comparisons are relevant because SD includes conventional randomness rather than discarding it. They show how JFES output appears under familiar measures and provide a common reference against established systems. The comparison is one part of the overall picture, not the definition of Surprise Dynamics.

SD's governing principle is surprise. A system should not be understood solely by asking whether its output resembles statistical noise. The character of its trajectory, the way it navigates its source, and the relationship between its evolving structure and what can be expected are also central. A structured outcome is not automatically a weakness; the question is what the structure means within the trajectory and whether it gives an observer a basis for anticipation.

The reference study therefore belongs alongside the conceptual argument. It situates JFES within conventional cryptographic measurement while the SD framework considers a broader principle: unpredictability as it emerges through recursive numerical navigation, and surprise as the departure from expected character.

9. The Higher Order

SD is not a proposal to replace one narrow randomness score with another. It is a shift in the governing idea. Conventional randomness remains part of the framework, but surprise provides a broader account in which structure, trajectory and expectation are central.

The surf example shows why this matters. The recording can be irregular and difficult to predict while remaining recognisable. A single non-surf sound can be surprising without being complex. The surprise is created by the departure from the source's character.

The Mandelbrot example carries the idea into numerical navigation. A rendered image gives only a finite visual representation of a deeper infinitely complex mathematical field. JFES does not scan neighbouring pixels; it recursively navigates the field using values obtained at each location to determine the next. The trajectory is therefore the relevant object, and its character cannot be understood by looking at the image alone.

Taken together, these ideas express the SD hierarchy: infinite complexity supplies the domain, recursive navigation forms the trajectory, unpredictability characterises the process, and surprise is the resulting behavior manifested. Statistical randomness remains valuable, but it is not the highest-order principle.

10. Summary

Surprise Dynamics proposes that surprise, rather than statistical randomness, should govern a higher-order understanding and definition of entropy and security. Randomness is included within SD, but it is not the optimal measure.

Ocean surf demonstrates that unpredictable detail and recognisable character can coexist. The source remains identifiable even as its waveform varies. A bird call, footstep, spoken word, click, guitar chord or Mozart passage is surprising because it departs from the expectation established by the surf. The unexpected event need not itself be complex.

The Mandelbrot field extends the argument from sound to infinitely complex numerical structure. Its visual rendering is a beautiful, revealing and surprising, but incomplete measure of its underlying numerical complexity. Conventional zooms move through adjacent coordinates; JFES recursively navigates the field, using computed values to determine subsequent locations. The trajectory, not the image, is central.

THE SD PROGRESSION: Infinite complexity → recursive navigation → unpredictability → surprise

SD's central proposition: it is a higher order of entropy and security, with surprise—not statistical randomness—as its governing principle.

Reference Notes

This paper builds on the author's earlier work, "Unpredictability as the Optimal Measure of Entropy: Linking Complexity to Entropy," including its discussion of the Mandelbrot field, recursive navigation and JFES.

The JFES Cryptographic Foundation Comparison is included as a reference study of conventional statistical and cryptographic comparisons. It contextualises the conventional randomness layer within the broader SD argument.

Selected References

Shannon, C. E. (1949). "Communication Theory of Secrecy Systems." Bell System Technical Journal, 28(4), 656–715.

Shishikura, M. (1994). "The boundary of the Mandelbrot set has Hausdorff dimension two." Astérisque 222, 389–405.

Shishikura, M. (1998). "The Hausdorff dimension of the boundary of the Mandelbrot set and Julia sets." Annals of Mathematics, 147, 225–267.

Tiozzo, G. (2015). "Topological entropy of quadratic polynomials and dimension of sections of the Mandelbrot set." Advances in Mathematics, 273, 651–715.

"Unpredictability as the Optimal Measure of Entropy: Linking Complexity to Entropy." Author's earlier paper.

"JFES Cryptographic Foundation Comparison." Reference report, October 2026.