

## Re: Quantum computer using using artificial atoms.

*Source:* <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/sci.crypt/2005-02/4805.html>

---

*jstevh\_at\_msn.com*

*Date:* 02/26/05

Date: 26 Feb 2005 14:37:15 -0800

Trevor L. Jackson, III wrote:

> *jstevh@msn.com* wrote:

>

> > *Décio Luiz Gazzoni Filho* wrote:

> >

> > > *Here, James, I'll do you a favor and forward this to the sci.physics*

> > > *newsgroup. I'm sure they'll have a word or two to say about your*

> > > *characterization of quantum mechanics.*

> > >

> > > *Décio*

> > >

> >

> >

> > *Hey, go ahead. The reality is that quantum computers must implement*

> > *ideas that can be mathematicized, and when mathematicized, they can be*

> > *done on a gp computer.*

>

> *No.*

>

That betrays a mystical belief about quantum mechanics, as if quantum effects are not logical.

They are.

There are mathematical rules that govern quantum systems.

Quantum is NOT a mystical world, it is not a magical world.

Human beings simply think it is.

> >

> > *So, quantum computers can already be implemented--if the math is*

sci.crypt: Re: Quantum computer using using artificial atoms.

worked

> > *out--on current systems which will behave like actual quantum*

> > *computers, doing everything they can do.*

>

> *No.*

>

An analogy is the abacus.

You can write algorithms for using an abacus, which require, an abacus.

But you can mathematicize the operations, and a gp device can model an abacus.

Shor's algorithm contains instructions that require a quantum computing device.

If you understand the logic behind why the quantum computing device behaves as it does, then you can model it on a gp system, just like with the abacus.

> >

> > *Now I think a lot of you figure that "quantum" is some kind of magical*

> > *thing, so the obvious escapes you, even when smart ideas like surrogate*

> > *factoring, where actual implementations--still rough, but showing the*

> > *potential--behave a lot like quantum computers are supposed to behave,*

> > *come along.*

>

> *No they don't. Quantum mechanics works. Your Snake Fur does not.*

>

An abacus works as well, and your last statement does not follow.

Just like an abacus--a mechanical computing device--follows rules that can be mathematicized, so can a quantum computer.

> >

> > *The trouble though is that while the mainstream may reject inconvenient*

> > *reality, like gp devices--your good 'ol computer--being programmed with*

> > *algorithms that make them behave like quantum computers, the fringe*

> > *will happily develop them anyway.*

>

> *Be our guest. Just do your work quietly. Don't announce any more*

> *results until you can actually deliver on the results you have already*

Re: Quantum computer using using artificial atoms.

sci.crypt: Re: Quantum computer using using artificial atoms.

> *announced.*

>

And there your irrationality betrays itself.

Usenet is a public medium where freedom of speech is supposedly prized.

Ordering other posters to follow your rules and post as you see fit is against the very heart of the medium.

Yet routinely I face posters who do just that, betraying your own ability to be contradictory.

You cannot control Usenet. It is futile to attempt to control Usenet posters.

But you try anyway. That says something about your mental processes.

Quantum mechanics, no matter what your mind tells you, is not magic.

I know magic. And quantum mechanics is not it.

James Harris