



Issue Date:	2022-11-08	CEN-CLC/FGQT	N317
Deadline:	2022-11-10	Supersedes:	–
Status:	FOR APPROVAL		

TITLE                    **Are digital computers already old-fashioned?**  
PROJECT                FGQT Roadmap  
REFERRING TO        Roadmap draft, N270 (Version “L”)  
SOURCE                Rob F.M. van den Brink (Delft Circuits, The Netherlands),  
                              [Rob.vandenBrink@Delft-Circuits.com](mailto:Rob.vandenBrink@Delft-Circuits.com)

---

## ABSTRACT

The present version of the Roadmap document is misusing the word “classical” at several places, as if it is already out-dated technology. However it is more likely that they remain in use for the next 100 years, or even to the end of mankind

This should be solved, and can be solved in an easy way

This contribution proposes alternative wording in the Roadmap document

---

## 1. Discussion

The present version of the Roadmap document is misusing the words “classical” and “conventional” in relation to computing and networking at several places, as if it is already out-dated technology. However it is more likely that they remain in use for the next 100 year, or even to the end of mankind.

The problem with words like "classical" and "conventional" is that they expresses something that expires after a while; something that is/becomes old-fashioned. Those words refer to a specific **implementation**, but not to a specific computing **principle**.

### 1.1 Terminology

There are much better ways to express what kind of computer **principle** we are referring to.

- an analogue computer
- a digital computer
- a quantum computer
- a mechanical computer
- an abacus
- etcetera

Yes, "mechanical computer" were really computers. These were heavy hardware types (>2000 kg) that were used in 2nd world-war war-ships to calculate the shooting angle of a gun!!

The principle of a digital computer will never get outdated, but the different ways a digital computer has been **implemented** can become old-fashioned. Good examples of that are implementations with relays, vacuum tubes, discrete-transistors, TTL integrated-circuits, etc

So if we speak about a **classical computer**, we are refer to the way those machines were implemented, for instance with vacuum-tubes or discrete transistors. However those implementations followed the same principles as todays digital computers; they only had lower computing power and were a bit bulky.

Therefore it is fully wrong to use words like **classical** if we are referring to a digital computer or a digital network, and we propose to replace it with proper terminology.

The same applies for network protocols. Classical network protocols do exist. RS232 is getting outdated, and USBv1 as well. But the roadmap isn't referring to that. So if the distinction has to be made between quantum and non-quantum network protocols, call them *digital network protocols*.

## 1.2 Where does it go wrong in the text?

### “Classical”

- sect 3.2, p23            classical computer (2x)
- sect 7.2, p65            classical digital communication network
- sect 7.11.5, p75        classical communications systems
- sect 8.3.2, p85        classic digital computers
- sect 8.3.6, p86        digital classical logic
- sect 8.3.7, p86        hybrid quantum-classical programs
- sect 8.3.8, p87        digital classical and quantum message
- sect 10.4.2, p98        classical bits
- sect 10.4.2, p98        classical communication channel
- sect 10.4.3, p99        classical communication (2x)
- sect 10.4.3, p99        classical information
- sect 10.4.3, p99        classical channels
- sect 10.4.3, p99        classical network protocols
- sect 10, p100          classical computing

### “conventional”

- sect 3.3, p23            conventional classical measurement strategies ?????
- sect 5.2.1.2, p38,        conventional classical signals ????
- sect 9.1.1 p88,          conventional classical measurement strategies ????

The word classical is misused in other places as well, which sometimes result in very weird expressions: For instance

- p14            QCQM Quantum Classical Division Multiplexing ?????
- p38            Quantum Classical Division Multiplexing ?????

What is classical on that????

## 2. Proposed solution

First replace wording as suggested below

- sect 3.2, p23            ~~classical~~ *digital* computer (2x)
- sect 7.2, p65            ~~classical~~ digital communication network
- sect 7.11.5, p75        ~~classical~~ *digital* communications systems
- sect 8.3.2, p85        ~~classic~~ digital computers
- sect 8.3.6, p86        digital ~~classical~~ logic
- sect 8.3.7, p86        hybrid quantum-~~classical~~ *digital* programs
- sect 8.3.8, p87        digital ~~classical~~ and quantum message
- sect 10.4.2, p98        ~~classical~~ (*digital*) bits
- sect 10.4.2, p98        ~~classical~~ *digital* communication channel
- sect 10.4.3, p99        ~~classical~~ *digital* communication (2x)
- sect 10.4.3, p99        ~~classical~~ *digital* information
- sect 10.4.3, p99        ~~classical~~ *digital* channels
- sect 10.4.3, p99        ~~classical~~ *digital* network protocols
- sect 10, p100          ~~classical~~ *digital* computing

Secondly, let's have a discussion on what to do with weird phrases like, since I have no specific solution

- conventional classical measurement strategies
- conventional classical signals
- QCQM Quantum Classical Division Multiplexing

And at last check the entire text on “classical”. It is used more often in another context, so that may be wrong as well.