

## Re: Quantum computer using using artificial atoms.

**Source:** <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/sci.crypt/2005-02/4812.html>

---

**From:** yama (yama\_at\_yomama.com)

**Date:** 02/27/05

Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 15:56:04 -0800

On Sat, 26 Feb 2005 19:51:21 GMT, Beth <sneeze@unlisted.net> wrote:

>In article <1109434007.865269.17710@l41g2000cwc.googlegroups.com>,

><jstevh@msn.com> wrote:

>

>> Sorry to horn in a bit, but I think there's an important point to be

>> made that quantum ideas have to do with *\*mechanical\** factoring.

>

>I've been trying to ignore your posts, but ...

>

>> Yeah, I know, it's quantum, and all kind of interesting physics

>> associated with what is to many a mystical word, but I have a B.Sc. in

>> physics, and I know that you're just talking about specialized

>> mechanical devices when you talk about quantum computing.

>

>About that B.Sc., are you sure?

>

>> It has occurred to me that given Shor's algorithm there has to be a

>> fully mathematicized version of it.

>

>There is. It's called "Shor's algorithm", oddly enough.

>

>> What a quantum computer can do, a gp computer with the appropriate

>> algorithms can do.

>

>The mathematics of quantum computing is different from the mathematics

>of classical computing. The set of algorithms that run in polynomial

>time on a quantum computer is different from the set of algorithms that

>run in polynomial time on a classical computer, as far as anyone has

>been able to determine. Maybe you should get a book on complexity

>theory to go along with that wonderful B.Sc. in physics.

>

>Keep in mind that Shor's algorithm is, like quantum mechanics,

>probabilistic. (But probabilistic algorithms aren't the same as

>quantum algorithms, just to be pedantic (different notions of

>probability).)

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

That is an interesting reply.

It is one thing to "lecture" others, who may fall for the mis-information, with falsehoods, in order to satisfy a sad thirst for undeserved recognition in another failed, ostentatious attempt.

But Harris has apparently made the (unfortunate) jump to actually believing his own BS.

Thank you for the clarity.