

• **Re:** (Score:2) by gweihir (88907) I hope this will happen never. There is not need for it and changing things without need is just incredibly bad engineering because it always causes problems. • **Re:** (Score:2) by ipaine619 (4874633) No.. no.. I believe there are a couple of quantum computers out there.. They're only going to get better/smaller.. Things don't tend to get larger/worse... • 1 hidden comment • **Re:** (Score:2) by gweihir (88907) Indeed. Some people just cannot let go of a bad idea, possibly because they have no other skills... • Pure bullshit on a level with ... (Score:5, Insightful) by CaptainDork (3678879) on Wednesday December 05, 2018 @11:09PM (#57757228) ... scary AI. I swim in the quantum theory waters and it's goddam near impossible to rake the jiggle out of one qubit. The temperature has to be at near-absolute zero and Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle plus all of the laws of thermodynamics and the properties of quantum vacuum are working against us. As the qubit count increases, the randomness multiplies at an exponential rate. It's a nice dream, as is the *theory* of AI killing us all, but the hurdles are too great. In the spirit of, "never say never," a practical quantum computer is at least 100 years away. And here's the 411 on the encryption fear, anyway: A quantum computer that could instantly break today's encryption could just as quickly create encryption that is impossible to break. Reply to This Share twitter facebook linkedin @ Flag as Inappropriate • 6 hidden comments **■ Re:** (Score:1) by <u>gravewax</u> (4772409) no, their was a retard on here claiming it is only 3 or 4 years away. 3 hidden comments Re: (Score:2) by gravewax (4772409) Yep but their are quite a few clueless individuals that look at X number of Qubits that have been successfully tested and think that somehow translates into the ability to turn this into an operational quantum computer (i.e. one that can operate for any length of time that would make such encryption breaking calculations possible). They don't seem to grasp the massive gulf between what we have now and where we need to get too. **■ Re: (Score:1)** by Anonymous Coward Don't call people retards when you don't know the difference between there and their. 1 hidden comment • <u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:3</u>) by Actually, I do RTFA (1058596) And here's the 411 on the encryption fear, anyway: A quantum computer that could instantly break today's encryption could just as quickly create encryption that is impossible to break. The difference is the NSA, and other government agencies (in various countries) will be the only ones able to

afford quantum computers. **■ Re: (Score:3)** by <u>CaptainDork</u> (<u>3678879</u>) Your point is well taken. Cost is a factor (ignoring the fact that QC can'y get that big). As the qubit count rises, the structure necessary to combat the three evils I listed gets to be enormous. We're talking LHC large, at least. "Nil Tl Son, do you see the large cold thing? Take it out." 4 hidden comments

And no more MRI scans and ... There is a reason that scientist worry about fritting away a limited and precious

resource on party balloons when you could use a hydrogen/nitrogen mix that is no more dangerous than a

■ Re: (Score:1) by mermeid007 (5624172) Just you wait. and you wait. and you wait. No christmas presents after christmas? Jokes on you.

Re: (Score:2)

• **Re:** (Score:3)

• **Re:** (Score:1)

[ieee.org]:

• **Re:** (Score:2)

by gtall (79522)

by Anonymous Coward

by jabuzz (182671)

Christmas cracker.

by angel'o'sphere (80593) plus all of the laws of thermodynamics ... are working against us. Actually: no! Thermodynamics has nothing to do with quantum computers nor Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle have anything to do with it ... • 1 hidden comment

In the spirit of, "never say never," a practical quantum computer is at least 100 years away.

your laptop in solving certain kinds of interesting problems, is between 1,000 and 100,000. So the number of continuous parameters describing the state of such a useful quantum computer at • **Re:** (Score:2) by gweihir (88907) And that is just the thing: Mass-hype and mass-panic that completely ignore practical aspects. Here is news for these people: Practical aspects are what makes or breaks a technology. Incidentally, general AI has even less substance than QCs have, because there is not even a credible theory how they could work. In the few fields where we actually have theories (like automated deduction), the effort is so great that smart human beings can do things a universe-size computer could not. QCs seem to at least work

I wouldn't even go that far. I'm not convinced that a useful quantum computer will ever be constructed. For

example, here is an interesting quote from another recent article, *The Case Against Quantum Computing*

"Experts estimate that the number of qubits needed for a useful quantum computer, one that could compete with

agencies by getting their bloomers in a twist over quantum: Big Bad Quantum is coming, be very afraid, very scared, and very willing to allow us to save you for a small sum, although it might seem vast from your point of view....we here at Quantum Uncertainty Enterprises assure you it is not. **■ Re: (Score:1)** by mermeid007 (5624172) You are right. What nice people have to deal with.

You are ignoring another Uncertainty Principle, that is the amount of money that can be squeezed out of funding

Once the Bits are tampered with (observed) they change. • 1 hidden comment

https://spectrum.ieee.org/comp... [ieee.org]

• Isn't elliptical curve good enough? (Score:3)

I thought elliptical curve cryptography was good enough?

• Wrong, Quantum encryption. (Score:2)

by wolfheart111 (2496796)

quantum computing (Score:1)

by Hrrrg (565259)

Reply to This

• **Re:** (Score:2) by gweihir (88907) I agree. The whole thing is both useful idiots and "scientists" without ethics that want to profit from the hype a bit longer. The best supporting evidence for your citation is that QCs have almost not scaled at all in now something like 40 years of research.

I'm of the opinion that practical quantum computing is impossible (see link below for the argument). Start

believing this too, and you will have one fewer things to be worried about!

Also, it occurs to me they're concerned about a "20 year" timespan to get it widely deployed. Maybe a truly

by Actually, I do RTFA (1058596) on Wednesday December 05, 2018 @11:43PM (#57757358)

excellent algorithm just got patented, and they have to wait until it's unencumbered for it to spread? Share twitter facebook linkedin 💁 Flag as Inappropriate 3 hidden comments

• <u>Yet...</u> (<u>Score:1</u>)

by <u>AndyKron</u> (937105) The world relies on encryption to protect everything from credit card transactions to databases yet they keep getting hacked repeatedly so what's the point?

• <u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:2</u>)

by ClickOnThis (137803)

The world relies on encryption to protect everything from credit card transactions to databases yet they keep getting hacked repeatedly so what's the point?

The point is to keep making it harder for the bad guys to succeed. It's an arms race. Of course, the good guys can turn into the bad guys, so be vigilant.

• **<u>Re:</u>** (<u>Score:2</u>)

by angel'o'sphere (80593) Getting hacked has usually nothing to do with encryption but with stupidity.

E.g. if I call you and ask for your credit card number, would you encrypt it somehow over the phone call? Would you give it to me?

• **<u>Re:</u>** (<u>Score:2</u>)

by gravewax (4772409) and? the encryption hasn't been hacked yet. just because many companies are incompetent doesn't make encryption broken. Just like if a house collapses it isn't the hammers fault.

• <u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:2</u>)

by AHuxley (892839) The NSA and GCHQ have the math that finds the users computer. From then its just waiting for the user to enter their pw as gov/mil pushed software collects everything.

No easy connected network? Then MI6/CIA start to look at the workers on site.

The magic was a PRISM like front door into the OS, telcos. The mathematical flaw was people had to trusted their OS crypto junk/used a telco network.

Quantum will be a cover story for more PRISM, more police ready crypto designed into products.

Quantum will

• We already have quantum safe cryptography (Score:2) by jpaine619 (4874633)

It's called the OTP (one time pad). It's immune to quantum based attacks and, if your adversary is online only, you can distribute them physically.. • 2 hidden comments

• <u>Can we _please_ stop with this nonsense?</u> (<u>Score:2</u>) by gweihir (88907)

There are no QCs of sufficient size to even break amateur-crypto. Scaling is proving difficult enough that it is unclear whether it works at all. There is no threat here. No, really not.

• 1 hidden comment

• On breaking encryption for good ends. (Score:2) by <u>3seas</u> (184403)

There's a lot of cryptocurrency mining hardware being dumped & can be repurposed to solve Wikileaks Insurance Files encryptons. Pursuing this direction & not knowing when solves will happen will motivate govs & banks to correct themselves. And that is a Good Thing to do.

• <u>meh</u> (<u>Score:2</u>) by sad (7868) who cares, encryption will be broken by the time viable quantum computers are a reality anyway.

australia is just the first domino to fall, soon other nations will follow and all encryption must be breakable by law.

Related Links Top of the: day, week, month.

• 477 comments<u>Recruiters Are Still Complaining About No-Shows At Interviews</u>

• 445 commentsShould Developers Abandon Agile?

• 441 comments Hackers Who Attended Black Hat and DefCon Conferences Say Hotel Security Personnel Demanded **Access To Their Rooms**

• 416 comments 'Kernel Memory Leaking' Intel Processor Design Flaw Forces Linux, Windows Redesign • 369 commentsChina Infiltrated Apple, Amazon and Other US Companies Using Spy Chips on Servers, According

To Bloomberg; Apple, and Amazon, Among Others Refute the Report

next

Australia Passes Anti-Encryption Laws [Update] 95 comments previous

106 comments

FCC Chairman Admits Russia Meddled In Net Neutrality Debate

<u>Slashdot</u>

<u>Post</u>

Get 1 More Comment 98 of 98 loaded

Submit Story Those who can, do; those who can't, simulate. <u>FAQ</u>

Story Archive Hall of Fame

Advertising <u>Terms</u>

Privacy Statement Privacy Choices Opt-out Choices

<u>About</u> <u>Feedback</u> Mobile View

Blog

Trademarks property of their respective owners. Comments owned by the poster. Copyright © 2018 SlashdotMedia. All Rights Reserved. Close

Slashdot

Working...