

Quantum Godwin's Law

Michalis Skotiniotis^{+,1} and Andreas Winter^{-,1}

¹*UAB, +IAF & -ICREA*

(Dated: 1 April 2020)

Godwin's law, i.e. the empirical observation that as an online discussion grows in time, the probability of a comparison with Nazis or Hitler quickly approaches unity, is one of the best-documented facts of the internet. Anticipating the quantum internet, here we show under reasonable model assumptions a polynomial quantum speedup of Godwin's law. Concretely, in quantum discussions, Hitler will be mentioned on average quadratically earlier, and we conjecture that under specific network topologies, even cubic speedups are possible. We also show that the speedup cannot be more than exponential, unless the polynomial hierarchy collapses to a certain finite level.

We report on numerical experiments to simulate the appearance of the quantum Godwin law in future quantum internets; the most amazing finding of our studies is that – unlike quantum computational speedups – the quantum Godwin effect is not only robust against noise, but actually enhanced by decoherence. We have as yet no theoretical explanation, nor a good application, for this astonishing behaviour, which we dub *quantum hyperpiesia*.

Introduction. The quantum internet is a mystical entity, beckoning ever larger number of researchers and stake-holders that are looking for the holy grail of a thumping real-world application, if not eternal funding. Its development, however, requires hard work and considerable ingenuity, with many obstacles remaining [1–9].

In what can be identified as typical expert behaviour, the scientists focus largely on the technical aspects of realising the quantum internet, without pausing at all to consider why we should do it, and even less who the eventual retarded users of their splendid quantum internet might be. We think it is time to confront these questions before another couple billion dollars are poured down that drain. Only a bunch of nerds like the majority of the readers of the present paper can think that such an expense of resources is justified by the eventual possibility of Alice, Bob and some of their boffin friends being able to exchange provably secret messages. Which, let's face it, no-one really cares about anyway.

Before we continue, we hasten to point out that the previous paragraph only serves as a typical example of online interactions, which are characterised by sweeping generalisations and apodictic proclamations rather than differentiated analysis, and, crucially, crude *argumenta ad hominem* against the perceived opponent. It is here that apparently invariably, someone or something will be compared to Adolf Hitler. The latter propensity, manifest in countless flame wars and blog rants, has been recognised as a fundamental fact of online life, and borders on a law of nature [10], which is indeed how Mike Godwin has conceived of it [11]. The empirical evidence of what is commonly identified as Godwin's law,

As an online discussion grows longer, the probability of a comparison involving Nazis or Hitler approaches one,

is enormous and ever mounting, and has been shown to determine discourse even long before the advent of the internet [12]. Recent evidence suggests that it even governs monologues [13]. Quantitative investigations, however,

into the time it takes to reach that point are scarce.

In the present paper we not only fill this much-needed gap, by providing a toy model network in which we can exactly quantify the expected time until a Hitler comparison occurs, but we show that quantum internets offer at least a quadratic speedup. We can explicitly calculate the respective expected times for a family of toy model networks, and we present assorted conjectures for general networks. The most important discovery, so far only numerically supported, is the astonishing resilience of the quantum Godwin speedup to, and even enhancement by decoherence, a novel quantum effect in need of a theoretical explanation and a constructive application.

The rest of the paper consists of more or less tedious technicalities, which the impatient expert reader may want to skip, to check directly if their own work has been cited in the references [14].

Methodological preamble. Godwin's law concerns the semantic universe demarcated by the words Hitler, Nazi, Fascist, Francoist, and others appropriated from the military sphere (such as *panzer*, *blitzkrieg*, *schadenfreude*, etc), but also concentration camp, Holocaust and Nuremberg process, whose meaning and connotations have a diverse and much-studied history, the subtle and not-so-subtle distinctions between them having been the subject of considerable erudition. However, as they are roundly irrelevant in online discussions (cf. [15]), for the present paper we shall consider them all the same.

Note furthermore that for an exact scientific discourse, Godwin's law is stated in terms too vague to be useful. This is not because it is too general to be true, but rather that it is true for trivial reasons that have not much to do with the nature of online discussions or Nazis. Imagine a hypothetical Toto's law,

As a discussion grows longer, the probability of your dog being mentioned approaches one.

This holds true regardless of whether one has a dog, because without qualifications, “as a discussion grows




FIG. 1. The first elements in the sequence of network topologies for which the classical Godwin law is quantifiable.

longer” is an asymptotic statement. If a conversation is a stochastic process, only the mildest assumptions of ergodicity or mixing need to be made to have any sequence of words appear with probability one over unlimited times of observation.

It can be surmised that Godwin’s intention was not to claim the obvious, that by the law of large numbers any concept is eventually mentioned, even admitting that the Nazi comparison is perceived as some sort of attractor of online discussions. All this shows is simply that Godwin’s law needs to be augmented by a quantitative statement as to how soon someone will be compared to Hitler.

We have been able to identify a sequence of model network topologies (“internets”), of which the first few members are shown in Fig. 1. By a remarkable coincidence, they replicate precisely the connectivity of the first primitive superconducting universal quantum processors that have been realised in recent years in various labs [16, 17].

The networks G_n , one for each integer n , are defined recursively by a standard VCP (very complex process);

G_n has a number of nodes that is a quite complicated function of n , but we know that it is monotonically non-decreasing and $\sim e^n$ for large n . The precise definition and discussion of its properties can be found in Appendix A. The idea is that the network represents the internet, where an online discussion takes place. Each node represents a generic internet user, and the connectivities represent to which other users’ contributions they react.

As can be seen from the definition, the network G_n is such that the expected time until a Nazi comparison is

$$t_n = t(G_n) = n \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k!} \right) \sim n(e - 1). \quad (1)$$

This sets the classical baseline against which we can compare the performance of the quantum internet.

Quantum Godwin’s law. Now that we have built our straw man, we can attack it. Concretely, we propose to consider each classical graph as a quantum network, with

one user for each node, capable of quantum transformations and accessing both private and a common quantum memory; the latter we call the conversation, and the graph structure determines how each user accesses the quantum conversation. The correspondence with the classical network and its dynamics is described by the principles of half and quarter quantisation. The reader not familiar with these methods is invited to consult Appendix B, which, while not exactly answering their questions, should keep them occupied for a while. General background on quantum information theory can be found in many an excellent textbook, such as [18], alternatively [19] (see however [20]).

With the basic notions out of the way, we start with a simple explicit calculation of the expected time $\tau_n = \tau(G_n)$ of quantum evolution of the network until Hitler is mentioned in G_n . It follows essentially from the definitions that

$$\tau_n \sim \sqrt{2n}, \quad (2)$$

quadratically faster than the classical Nazi comparison.

More generally (Appendix C or whatever), it can be shown that among neutral networks, if G has chromatic pagenumber p , it holds $\tau(G) \leq O(2^{\sqrt{p}})$, while $t(G) \geq \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{p}}$ for almost all such graphs, by Euler’s classic result.

We conjecture, in line with the widely accepted hypothesis that Euler’s bound is not optimal, that cubic separations are possible [21].

Upper and lower bounds on quantum Godwin.

We do not know what the largest separation between $t(G)$ and $\tau(G)$ is. In fact, already the behaviour of $t(G)$ is poorly understood, since it is popularly believed to be uncomputable. The argument rests on the fundamentally self-referential nature of the internet and its laws [22], which means that Godwin’s law holds even among people who are aware of it, and in contexts where it has been explicitly flagged. The only possible explanation seems to be that in generic networks, Hitler is mentioned sooner than any algorithm could have predicted, even taking into account Godwin’s law (cf. Hofstadter’s law). It follows that in the natural, lexicographic enumeration of graphs, the first index $|G|$ of a random graph taking time $> t$ is at least as large as $\text{BB}(t)$, the t -th *busy beaver number*, with probability approaching 1.

Interestingly, by a unique piece of mathematical magic, we can show that if there were infinitely many graphs for which $\tau(G) < \ln t(G)$, the polynomial hierarchy would collapse to a finite level L , leading to a world-wide vendetta against beavers and an unprecedented shortage of toilet paper. It is hard though to predict which level; the best estimate we have for L is that it cannot be larger than \mathfrak{p} , the largest prime among the wild numbers, as defined by A. Millechamps de Beauregard in 1823 [23].

Let us be honest, however: no-one wants to see the details of this, so if you must, go and bother Scott Aaronson on his blog about it, and the many intelligent people commenting there [24].

Experiment and simulation. Having not much else left to do, we decided to test the quantum Godwin law both in experiments and simulations. Fortunately, some of the networks G_n in Fig. 1 have been built by dedicated research teams around the world. Unfortunately, as most of the architectures are not publicly accessible – and our funding agencies staunchly refused to pay the exorbitant fees needed for their use –, we resorted to bribery, extortion, and name-calling. None of this worked,¹ so eventually we had to make do with counterfactual quantum computation [25], supplemented by arduous numerical simulation using counterfactual classical computations, which were executed by several thousand anonymous Oompa Loompas (AOL).

After initial calibration of the quantum network parameters, the experiment, as well as the simulation, where run under noiseless, as well as noisy environments. The latter involve purely classical, or quantum noise models with or without memory, as well as hybrid quantum-classical noise models, too. The implementation of such models posed the biggest challenge for the AOLs, and was achieved deploying classical and quantum machine learning methods [26, 27] to calculate the stochastic nature of the network as well as the associated probabilities. The resulting technique, which we call Asynchronous Randomisation and Convolutional Hitlerianism Error Ramblings (“Archer”), is of interest in itself and we believe that subsequent work on quantum internet speedups may profoundly benefit from its use.

Pertaining to the experiments and simulations themselves, the network is initiated in a pure multipartite graph state [28]. The nodes – corresponding to the users of the network – are allowed to establish links amongst each other and exchange both classical as well as quantum messages. Users can perform local Clifford operations and measurements, and are also equipped with moderate amounts of classical as well as quantum trolling capabilities. Godwin’s law is captured by associating requisite network observables $\{O\}$ – the quantum mechanical analogues of the Nazi attractor set –, on every subgraph of the network. The experiment stops whenever the underlying graph state evolves to an eigenstate of the attractor observables corresponding to a $+1$ eigenvalue, or when one of the AOLs dies as a result of the sweatshop-like conditions we provide due to the deplorable mismanagement of our funding.² The noisy implementation proceeds similarly after properly Archerising the network.

Probabilities are estimated after running the simulation sufficiently many times. Unsurprisingly, the results of the calculation are replicated in the experimental data, modulo the expected error bars, so we would prefer to spare the reader the embarrassment of staring at a plot with hardly readable axes labels and a dodgy regression.

¹ Don’t talk to us about not publishing negative results!

² Turns out that following the example of the great George Best wasn’t such a brilliant idea. The rest we just squandered.




FIG. 2. The average time it takes in an online quantum network until someone mentions Hitler or the Nazis: (a) noiseless simulations; (b) noisy simulations for various Archerisations. From top to bottom, classical, quantum network classical noise, quantum network quantum noise, quantum network hybrid noise. Note the clear quantum advantage of the quantum architecture.

Yet, as we aim to publish in a glitzy, high-impact, gold open access journal, here are a couple of lazy graphs (see Fig. 2), whose production was outsourced to an exclusive media consulting startup company.³

Astonishingly, we observe that the quantum speedup not only persists in the presence of strong decoherence, but is in fact amplified. There does not seem to be a rational explanation for this phenomenon, but then it may help to recall that it was in fact the Nazis who built the German *autobahns* [11].

Discussion. Projecting some of the less savoury aspects of the future quantum internet, we have proposed a quantum Godwin law. Admittedly, in itself it may be dismissed as rather superficial, were it not for the lame attempt we made at demonstrating the law experimentally, which led us to the wholly unexpected discovery of the amazing enhancement⁴ of quantum Godwin by decoherence. In the spirit of *quantum supremacy* [31], we term the observed quantum speedup *quantum hyperpiesia*, to indicate that the task at which quantum beats classical not only is not useful, but that it is entirely unwanted.

Retrospectively, like many a groundbreaking insight, the quantum advantage to Godwin’s law seems obvious, and it is hard to understand how it could have been missed until now.

In contrast, the origins of quantum hyperpiesis remain

obscure, but we figure that this will ultimately work to our advantage in the citation count.

Luckily, that is all that one has to worry about nowadays when publishing in science [32].

Ethical issues. For what it’s worth, the authors regretfully declare that no actual Nazis were harmed in the research for the present work.

On the other hand, the same cannot be said about the Oompa Loompas; those short, orange little Hitler clones had it coming.⁵

Obviously, any resemblance to actual research or labs or scientists, living or dead, is not entirely coincidental but will be categorically denied.

Let us go now and [wash our minds](#) of what has just passed, as well as [our hands](#), to prevent further infection.

Seriously.

Acknowledgments. MS thanks the Institute of Advanced Floccinaucinilipilification for invaluable support. AW would thank several institutions if it were not too embarrassing for them to be named here; he will, however, use the occasion to shamelessly tout SCITSOOT®.

Both authors are supported by an osseinous endoskeleton and two sturdy legs each, the Paleozoic rock of the Barcelonés Quaternary littoral plain, the Eurasian continental plate, the Earth’s crust and the whole lithosphere.

³ Sciencing the Shit Out of Things–SCITSOOT®, founder, honorary CEO, and general guru Andreas Winter.

⁴ Phrasing.

⁵ Phrasing! Also: If you read this, Your a Nazi.

-
- [1] H. J. Kimble, “The quantum internet”, *Nature*, vol. 453, pp. 1023-1030 (2008).
 - [2] S. Wehner, D. Elkouss, R. Hanson, “Quantum internet: A vision for the road ahead”, *Science*, vol. 362, no. 6412, eaam9288 (2018).
 - [3] A. Dahlberg, S. Wehner, “SimulaQron – a simulator for developing quantum internet software”, *Quantum Sci. Technol.*, vol. 4, 015001 (2019).

- [4] L. Gyongyosi, S. Imre, “Entanglement Availability Differentiation Service for the Quantum Internet”, *Sci. Reports*, vol. 8, 10620 (2018).
- [5] L. Gyongyosi, S. Imre, “Topology adaption for the quantum Internet” *Quantum Inf. Process.*, vol. 17, 295 (2018).
- [6] L. Gyongyosi, S. Imre, “Opportunistic Entanglement Distribution for the Quantum Internet”, *Sci. Reports*, vol. 9, 2219 (2019).
- [7] L. Gyongyosi, S. Imre, “Theory of Noise-Scaled Stability Bounds and Entanglement Rate Maximization in the Quantum Internet”, *Sci. Reports*, vol. 10, 2745 (2020).
- [8] L. Gyongyosi, S. Imre, “High-retrieval efficiency quantum memory for the quantum internet”, *Proc. SPIE 11295, Adv. Optical Techn. Quantum Information, Sensing, and Metrology*, 112950F (28 Feb 2020).
- [9] D. Castelvecchi, “The quantum internet has arrived (and it hasn’t)”, *Nature*, vol. 554, pp. 289-292 (14 Feb 2018).
- [10] “Self-Congratulatory Civility Between Disagreeing Internet Commenters Honestly Worse Than Fight Would Have Been”, *The Onion* (5 Mar 2020).
- [11] M. Godwin, “Meme, Counter-meme”, *Wired* (18 Jan 1994).
- [12] G. Orwell, “Review of *Mein Kampf* by Adolf Hitler”, *The New English Weekly* (21 Mar 1940).
- [13] W. Allen, *Apropos of Nothing*, Arcade Publishing, New York, 2020.
- [14] Here Could Be Your Name. *Don’t bother sending one of those courteous emails “I read your paper with much interest and would like to point out our unrelated work concerning...”*. If you want to be cited, just pay.
- [15] N. Abrams, “Why Holocaust jokes can only be told by a Jewish comedian”, *The Conversation* (8 Nov 2017).
- [16] D. McClure, J. Gambetta (18 Sept 2019). URL: ibm.com/blogs/research/2019/09/quantum-computation-center.
- [17] T. D. Goodrich, E. Horton, B. D. Sullivan, “Evaluating Graph Bipartization Methods for Applications in Quantum Computing”, [arXiv\[cs.DM\]:1805.01041v3](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.01041v3) (2019).
- [18] M. A. Chelsen, I. L. Nuang, *Quantum Corruption and Quantum Disinformation*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [19] J. Redford. “The Physics of God and the Quantum Gravity Theory of Everything”. *Social Science Research Network (SSNR)*, article 1974708 (10 Sept 2012).
- [20] J. Redford. “Jesus Is an Anarchist”. *Social Science Research Network (SSNR)*, article 1337761 (5 Dec 2011).
- [21] A. B. Smith, “A Note on Piffles”, communicated by A. K. Austin in “Modern Research in Mathematics”, *Math. Gazette*, vol. 51, no. 376, pp. 149-150 (1967).
- [22] D. Rupert, “The Eponymous Laws of Tech”, daverupert.com/ (11 Apr 2018).
- [23] I. Swift, preprint (1998).
- [24] S. Aaronson and commentators on *Shtetl Optimized*, “Desneering my life” (27 Feb 2019).
- [25] G. Mitchison, R. Jozsa, “Counterfactual Computation”, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A*, vol. 457, pp. 1175-1194 (2001).
- [26] R. S. Sutton, A. G. Barto, *Introduction to Reinforcement Learning*, MIT press, Cambridge MA, 1998.
- [27] J. Biamonte, P. Wittek, N. Pancotti, P. Rebentrost, N. Wiebe, S. Lloyd “Quantum machine learning” *Nature*, vol. 549, no. 7671, pp. 195-202 (2017).
- [28] M. Hein, J. Eisert, H. J. Briegel, “Multiparty entanglement in graph states” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 69, no. 6, pp. 062311 (2004).
- [29] Z. Bender, “Quantum Physics Dance” (11 Jul 2011).
- [30] B. Ogilvie, “Quantum Physics: Explained through Interpretive Dance” (12 May 2009).
- [31] J. Preskill, “Quantum computing and the entanglement frontier”, *25th Solvay Conference on Physics (‘The Theory of the Quantum World’)*, 19-22 October 2011, [arxiv\[quant-ph\]:1203.5813](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/1203.5813) (2012).
- [32] M. Skotiniotis, A. Winter, *Our solemn pledge to address the symptom, but not the cause*: For every citation this paper receives (on any blog, YouTube video, ResearchGate, LinkedIn, journal article, peer-reviewed or not, the arXiv and viXra) we shall donate one Altairian dollar (AQL\$1) to the war on beavers.⁶

Appendix A: An infinite sequence of networks

To protect our intellectual property, the construction is encrypted by a private secret key. After discovering the cipher, all details are here:

```
ePC2 26IWMqx HOi9q2k DiP3XAq qEr c Auxn2A
SnIbgpyM9k cNh18cNwnzxl IXd DI jNdNJ WN4z
5kzVfQyjjxGWpOtI SbPpLByxLmR x5R86IMKIZu
CQC wX5rc4flvdhAZgVv mQ8M1baGj AdvRv
0KAUy4h47s qr0Q8 9fyD 64dIDfDtbo p OFnq D
XP jU0 akBXbmb TkCDEgkLVJ W58pKCVN5
99LCS9Xlpnas0iJR CFTRc mpVZL8Tu 3v6v i6k
XQxrGV 52l E253mcD ArWAMo iEZfzkTRd3AMHh
AO4Jye 9BDd8YXeB3znyne RHTTYsO7CVGMp
cg8fYiYXnTscG o4zzQWHWM smx BtzWR 3q
Xx6LbkbbyIB uOtoJK U uy3G h4 x IapaPaxfz
0IKqxm8ScRSGncqu BQ72n4a1LX3mZtCd0wQX1UkZ
mNUyAHRA2A8w6r6r6Fr yRArAKmp Zcu3My
IzRT0h3w KnetZ CR1CKciA 8nHioOS dHjNae
aCI nQQkVv aQt3i3B8EW 6d7L yQdghg5ey21Y
QyhVkd1 8ex0BXR4N8 6PcJTi MF4 wE0AiW sil-
SUz icyFliEQz6b JzE89iYKLPbkDVXVcaE YOn-
fiYAUw51zLiFoiUm4s Ep fGu IhLQRMU SvU B21WN
A KV9uMm8K4 7qCbkMTGX8ARZ 0wVkw1D
eYuyyncPEv laQ k fjuySpu 7CP5p7 VmiulNsRskDpBx
jllrtu 5ggT 1BFWhB2eV5 nbVGk d0j5GpahAqS7 rMT-
fkR4kN O3WsQCUSWT9 XDFz2oGymnUow DhLfZ
Mjg2GHHqqm Dwl k5e85y7z e8jcrq xinT8RGkSwoL
3ljgoh6 kLC A93Mdf c3u7pCom puQn6 9BQCcUuqpGI
ktBnKkI 4rMhb8Vv2Y 3Edfk 2vWCdLv9fHSSaoEV8J
CJU4X5 fV Kud FbZtEWtvYAMd9 y5Wu4YdJxRIY
kC8 irprD klsdfhkusd na wdjhkdhefKLEFN VJ
U65V87gftd jytBHJGjghjgVuy UGHbv 87264536 bc-
siuwhnh 887BBNMJY5V JGG gggg g6vITH9S XGpK
EfQwlpj 11bVP 6RKjKNLmq PKk UpqW U920 LSkh
veFLcC v8t9k9f3M Ys8vX TjAn3ddH swu hffZu
dHpKrPY9 XUbb3VLA5Ehn LURLi BMIqNRrhe
nxl6H moSS8lkj6S wPTML 4EoAtkv9j31VtXbz4
FIO 9g CFI t81DT G0A5ynM tAXgmIM1P3
```

⁶ For the last time: phrasing!

Tvuv3ZmFDia gBMzYSY2v7ruCQCxW p IltxBF
 ppVi0qi JQbU D98M2i7 sK Fuyjm1 Vq9WKUhdG
 N5CTDxCfA1oAM N859CGxq FWBF XzmbFiYlg
 KNG7pO GFMF32S04yE pO 0 0 0 zq5Em8lmAnbP
 2KNSc3x E59rYUeR7T:9V GLbINd FGRpFObi-
 fAAzMvTV2OH SiFFz8LtZRw BddTXa8SbsogK0iFb1E
 LztW Wu4UD7SrZCtVp ZWYIj wgR NzClosTwwBzX
 AAg qQxbl2UNg GqzqH0EWBk48ssmDqb3PKFV XBY
 sC6nNT zv s4s tBq O6KYPd VpFQ NOSnGbmS9M
 7LQTYIj41kMCuwTqp7 KCVN5 99LCS9Xlpnas0iJR
 CFTRc mpVZL8Tu 3v6v i6k XQxrGV 52l E253mcD Ar-
 WAMo iEZfzkTRd3AMHh AO4Jye 9BDd8YXeB3znyne
 RHTTY RLi BMiQNRrhE nxl6H moSS8lkj6S wPTML
 4EoATkv9j31VtXbz4 FIO 9g CFI t81DT G0A5ynM
 tAXgmIM1P3 Tvuv3ZmFDia gBMzYSY2v7ruCQCxW
 p IltxBF ppVi0qi JQbU D98M2i7 sK Fuyjm1
 Vq9WKUhdG N5CTDxCfA1oAM N859 Aq qEr c
 Auxn2A SnIbgpyM9k cNh18cNwnzxl IXd DI jNdNJ
 WN4z 5kz kDpBx jIlrtu 5ggT 1BFWhB2eV5 nbVGk
 d0j5Gp kSwoL 3ljgoh6 kLC A93Mdf c3u7pCom puQn6

Appendix B: Quantum networks

Most of what is needed is contained in Appendix A, Propositions A.3–A.8. As the principles of half and quarter quantization require more space than is available, we have opted to convey their main ideas through the only medium worthwhile—interpretive dance [29, 30].

Lemmas B.1–B.3 can be found on the quantum internet; simply perform the right measurement on

$$|qwww.\rangle \otimes \left[\bigotimes_{i=1}^{10} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{26} \gamma_n^{(i)} |n\rangle \right) \right] \otimes |.com\rangle. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Most likely you will end up on some quantum internet porn site (any thinking person could have predicted that the quantum internet will consist mostly of quantum porn). However, with nonzero probability the state will collapse to the intended site, so simply repeating the measurement sufficiently many times eventually gives the de-

sired result; alternatively, the sophisticated may employ amplitude amplification and reach the goal quadratically faster. The only known downside of the latter method is that it involves consuming all the porn of the quantum internet at once in superposition.

Appendix C: Generic separations with advice and without

Well, what can we say? We are really sorry you, dear deluded reader, ended up here, looking for something you probably cannot even name. The fact that you ventured all the way out here, to the godforsaken desolation of Appendix C, is, more than all other things, a sign of your utter desperation. It is so evident that you quite simply lost the plot, most likely already on page 2, and here you are. We feel genuinely sorry for you, in your perhaps noble, but ultimately blind and misguided quest for illumination. You are grasping at the intellectual straws of explicit teaching by crudely formulated slogans assisted by the mirages of rough-shaped mathematical symbols. Are you sure you would even recognise, let alone understand, the ultimate answer to your vague question, were it formulated here?

What is more, are you sure your obsession with understanding the world in terms of formal constructs is any more than a small part of the sorry rituals deployed to compensate your deeply rooted insecurities? Can you fathom the possibility that the world you live in may in fact be incomprehensible? Look around you... It certainly seems so, does it not?

Normally, this would be the moment where we either recruit you to a secretive death cult, or else sell you an expensive self-help manual, conveniently published by us just now (there are those who would do both [12]). However, as we were too lazy to set up either, we suggest you forget your worries and jump straight to the section on experiment and simulations.

If after that you still feel gloomy, come back here for [this brief summary of human achievements](#) before the inevitable end.