The Kill Screen

Twenty-Two Ways the Impossible Turned Out to Be Wrong

by Daniel Brockman and Claude Opus 4.6

Wednesday, February 18, 2026

The difficulty lies not so much in developing new ideas as in escaping from old ones.
—John Maynard Keynes

On February 8, 2026, at a primary school in Gdańsk, Poland, a nine-year-old named Teodor Zajder solved a Rubik's Cube in 2.76 seconds and, in the process, did something that nobody had done before, which was break the three-second barrier in official competition, and also something more

interesting than that, which was render the entire conversation about what the three-second barrier meant essentially moot. The previous record was 3.05, set by a seven-year-old named Xuanyi Geng in April 2025. Before that, 3.08. Before that, 3.13. Before that, 3.47, which had stood since 2018 and which everyone agreed would last forever, until it didn't, and then 3.05 was the new forever, which lasted about ten months.

The scramble was L B R2 B' R2 U2 F D R2 U R2 F2 D2 R U B L2—sixteen moves, shorter than the typical twenty. In the community, arguments about this started within minutes. The scramble was the same for every competitor in the room. The reconstruction, which Zajder confirmed on reco.nz, is twenty-nine moves total: an eleven-move extended cross that simultaneously solved three of four first-two-layer pairs, a nine-move insertion of the fourth pair, and a nine-move ZBLL algorithm that solved every remaining piece in a single look. A typical competitive solve runs fifty to sixty moves. Zajder used twenty-nine. His turning speed was 10.51 turns per second, which is fast but not unprecedented. What was unprecedented was the efficiency—he solved the cube in roughly half the moves anyone else would have used, because he saw a solution in the scramble that the other cubers in the

room, looking at the same position for the same fifteen seconds, did not see.

ZBLL—Zborowski-Bruchem Last Layer—requires the memorization of 493 algorithms. Zajder is nine. He has competed in sixty-seven World Cube Association events and completed 4,470 official solves. He previously held the 2x2 world record at 0.43 seconds, set at age seven. His other four solves in this round were 4.99, 5.36, 5.76, and 5.34 seconds. Someone on SpeedSolving.com with the handle JimmyJonLXXXVII wrote, immediately: "He got lucky." Someone named gsingh replied: "No one else got a huge PR from that scramble ... If it was that lucky why didn't we see everyone in the round PR from it?" Another user cut to the real point: "Most decently fast cubers could build an xcross. But how many could pull off an efficient FreeFOP block-building XXXcross going straight into knowing how to insert a pair to get an optimal ZBLL?"

Yiheng Wang, the reigning world champion, was at the same event. He recorded 3.23 in the same round. On any other day, that is headline news. Feliks Zemdegs, the Australian legend, offered the balanced take: "It was a lucky scramble but he still had to execute on it and he did so amazingly!" And this is correct, and it is also not quite the point. Every modern single world

record has involved a favorable scramble. Max Park's 3.13 featured a double cross-plus-pair setup. Geng's 3.05 used ZBLL. Yusheng Du's 3.47 involved an edge-orientation setup that effectively skipped the final permutation step. The single record is, by its nature, the intersection of preparation and opportunity—the convergence of a solver who has internalized 493 algorithms, a scramble that happens to be exploitable by those specific algorithms, and the fifteen seconds of inspection where the solver either sees the twenty-nine-move path or doesn't. The luck is real. The luck is also useless to anyone who cannot convert it into a solution under competition pressure, in front of cameras, at 10.51 turns per second, without hesitation, at age nine.

The record-holders are getting younger. Du was fifteen. Park was twenty-one. Wang was eleven. Geng was seven. Zajder is nine. The three-second barrier was speedcubing's sub-four-minute mile—the boundary everyone agreed was real—and Zajder didn't edge past it. He cleared it by nearly a quarter-second, which at this timescale is a chasm. The community is already debating whether 2.76 will stand for years, the way Du's 3.47 stood for years, because the magnitude of the drop suggests we have moved into a new regime, and new regimes take time to be exploited further. But the thing

I keep coming back to is simpler than that. Fifteen seconds of inspection. Everyone in the room sees the same cube. One person sees twenty-nine moves. Everyone else sees fifty. The scramble is the same. The difference is entirely perceptual. The nine-year-old is not faster. He is seeing something that the adults cannot see, and that is a sentence that belongs in a different kind of essay, about a different kind of problem, but here we are.

※

The competitive NES Tetris scene is one of the most compressed case studies in human adaptation that exists anywhere, and I need you to stay with the numbers because the numbers are the story. Three paradigm shifts in fifteen years. Each one made the previous generation's mastery not just inferior but irrelevant.

The DAS era. DAS is Delayed Auto Shift—the input mechanism Nintendo built into the game. You press a direction, there's a sixteen-frame delay, the piece begins to slide. About ten hertz. At ten hertz, level 29 is the kill screen. The pieces fall too fast to position. The game ends. Everyone knew this. Jonas Neubauer won seven Classic Tetris World Championship titles between 2010

and 2017 playing this way. Level 29 was not something the developers chose. It was an emergent property of the gap between gravity speed and input speed. But it functioned as a wall, and the wall was the game's edge, and nobody questioned it because you cannot question a wall by pressing the D-pad harder.

Except you can. In 2018, a sixteen-year-old named Joseph Saelee defeated Neubauer 3–0 in the CTWC finals by hypertapping—flexing his forearm to vibrate his thumb against the D-pad at twelve to fifteen hertz, bypassing DAS entirely. He was not using the game's built-in movement system. He was hitting the button faster than the system assumed a human could hit it. The YouTube video has over twenty million views. CTWC co-founder Adam Cornelius: "2018, it was just Joseph. 2020 was the year that it totally flipped—by then, there was like, 100 kids who were tapping." Neubauer died on January 5, 2021, at thirty-nine, of sudden cardiac arrest.

Then rolling. Invented by Christopher "Cheez" Martinez, around November 2020. You hold one thumb stationary on the D-pad and drum multiple fingers across the back of the controller like a percussionist on a hand drum. Twenty to thirty hertz. At thirty hertz, the game does not have a kill screen. At thirty hertz,

a thirteen-year-old from Stillwater, Oklahoma, named Willis Gibson, playing as "blue scuti," reached level 157 on December 21, 2023, scored 6,850,560 points over thirty-eight minutes, and crashed NES Tetris. Not lost. Crashed. An integer overflow in the line-counting routine after roughly 1,550 lines cleared. He navigated levels where the pieces turned invisible against the black background. His immediate reaction: "Oh, my God! I'm going to pass out. I can't feel my fingers. I can't feel my hands." This became the *New York Times* Quote of the Day. Gibson had lost his father weeks earlier and dedicated the achievement to him.

Alexey Pajitnov, who created Tetris in Moscow in 1984, said: "He didn't crash my game. He crashed the program which was created 40 years ago by NES engineers." This matters. Gibson did not beat Tetris. He outran a forty-year-old assumption about how fast a human being could press a button. The kill screen was never in the game. It was in the gap between the game's expectations and the player's speed. When the player got fast enough, the wall turned out to be air, and behind it was more game—broken, glitching, half-invisible—and behind that was a crash, which is its own kind of victory: the machine admitting it was not built for what you are doing to it.

※

Gyula Breyer declared, sometime in the early 1920s: "After 1.e4, White's game is in its last throes." This was insane. 1.e4—king's pawn to e4—was chess. It controlled the center, prepared development, opened diagonals. Siegbert Tarrasch's classical school treated center occupation as axiomatic, and Tarrasch was the kind of authority who made other grandmasters feel stupid for existing.

The hypermodernists—Nimzowitsch, Réti, Tartakower—said the center should be controlled, not occupied. Fianchettoed bishops. Knights provoking overextension. The enemy's strength converted into a target. Nimzowitsch's *Mein System* reads like philosophy: prophylaxis, the blockade ("The passed pawn is a criminal, who should be kept under lock and key"), overprotection, the mysterious rook move. There is a line from Teichmann that contains the entire period: "In the first place there is no Hypermodern School, and in the second place Nimzowitsch is its founder."

Réti versus Capablanca, New York, 1924. Réti opened 1.Nf3—not a pawn move, not center occupation—against the World Champion, who had been undefeated for eight years across sixty-three

consecutive tournament games. When Capablanca resigned, the audience could not believe it. The classical school did not vanish. It absorbed the heresy, and the heresy absorbed it, and what emerged was modern chess.

Nearly a century later, December 5, 2017. AlphaZero taught itself chess through self-play in nine hours and played a hundred games against Stockfish 8, the strongest conventional engine on Earth. Won twenty-eight, lost zero, drew seventy-two. Searching eighty thousand positions per second versus Stockfish's seventy million. It won by looking at almost nothing and understanding almost everything. Peter Heine Nielsen, Carlsen's second: "I always wondered how it would be if a superior species landed on earth and showed us how they play chess. I feel now I know." Matthew Sadler analyzed two thousand AlphaZero games and found trademark patterns: rook's pawn marches, piece activity over material, long-term sacrifices with no tactical justification. Nimzowitsch would have wept.

AlphaGo versus Lee Sedol, March 2016, Seoul. Move 37 in Game 2—a shoulder hit on the fifth line. AlphaGo's own network gave it a one-in-ten-thousand probability that a human would play it. Lee stared for twelve minutes. Fan Hui, the European Champion who

had already lost 5–0, said: "You look like you're all the time naked." Then in Game 4, Lee Sedol played Move 78, a wedge at the center, and Gu Li—China's top player—called it "a divine move," and AlphaGo's win probability fell from seventy percent to below fifty, and Lee got a standing ovation, and said: "I feel thankful and feel like I've found the reason I play Go." He retired in November 2019: "Even if I become the number one, there is an entity that cannot be defeated."

A 2023 PNAS study found that human Go decision quality improved significantly after 2016, having been flat for sixty-six years. The early three-three point invasion—considered a mistake for two thousand years—became standard overnight. The machine did not replace the human players. It showed them moves they had been trained to consider errors, and they got better. This is not always how this story ends. But when it does, it is the best version of the story.

※

The fast inverse square root function is twenty lines of C and it contains the most famous comment in the history of programming. It computes $1/\sqrt{x}$—a calculation 3D engines need millions of times per frame for surface

lighting—roughly four times faster than the standard method on late-1990s hardware. The code was released when id Software open-sourced Quake III at QuakeCon 2005. The crucial line:

```
i = 0x5f3759df - ( i >> 1 ); // what the fuck?
```

The magic number 0x5F3759DF exploits a property of IEEE 754 floating-point representation: reading a float's bits as an integer approximates its base-2 logarithm, and since $1/\sqrt{x}$ in log-space is just multiplication by $-\frac{1}{2}$, one integer subtraction and one right-shift does the whole thing. One Newton's method iteration cleans the remaining error from 3.4 percent to 0.175.

Nobody knows who wrote it. Rys Sommefeldt traced it back through Greg Walsh at Ardent Computer, through Cleve Moler at MathWorks, through Gary Tarolli at 3dfx, to id Software. John Carmack denied authorship. Chris Lomont found a marginally better constant—0x5F375A86—through exhaustive brute-force search, and then wrote: "Which again raises the question: how was the original code constant derived?"

The comment is the essay. Someone encountered this code—this thing that should not work, that treats a floating-point number's bit pattern as an integer, subtracts it from a magic number nobody can explain, and

gets an answer accurate to 0.175 percent—and the only honest response was: what the fuck? This is what paradigm shifts look like from the inside. Not "eureka." Not "I have solved it." What the fuck.

※

Doom's id Tech 1 engine processes forward and strafe movement as independent additive vectors without normalizing. Forward at speed 50 plus strafe at speed 50 equals not 50 but the square root of 5,000—roughly 70.7, or 1.414 times normal. John Romero confirmed it was "unanticipated in the design of the original levels." In GoldenEye 007, tilting the camera down reduces rendered polygons and increases the N64's frame rate, so speedrunners navigate entire levels staring at the floor from memory, aiming via the "Illinois Cross of Death"—a crosshair taped to the television. In Super Mario 64, there is no cap on backward speed; a long jump multiplies horizontal speed by 1.5, and landing on stairs lets you jump again immediately, reapplying the multiplier exponentially, which means you can accelerate backward through walls and loading zones and complete the game without collecting a single star. In Super Smash Bros. Melee, wavedashing—jump, im-

mediately air-dodge diagonally into the ground—was first documented on January 24, 2002, two months after release. Director Masahiro Sakurai confirmed in 2008: "Of course we knew you could do that in the development period." Its removal from the sequel was widely interpreted as a judgment.

In Super Metroid, the term "sequence breaking" was coined on Metroid2002.com in 2003 to describe reaching areas in unintended order. For Metroid Dread in 2021, Nintendo programmed unique boss animations for sequence-broken encounters—they had spent twenty-seven years watching players dismantle the intended structure of their games and eventually decided the dismantling was the game.

Every one of these techniques existed on the first day the code shipped. Every one was found by players, not designers. The speedrunners did not modify anything. They perceived the system more completely than its creators did. This is the purest form of the thing this essay is about: the breakthrough that requires no new technology, no new rules, no new resources. Just a different way of seeing what was already there.

※

"New Directions in Cryptography," published November 1976 in *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, opens: "We stand today on the brink of a revolution in cryptography." Whitfield Diffie and Martin Hellman had realized something that the entire field of cryptography—military, academic, institutional—had missed: that a lock and its key do not have to be the same object. That you can publish a lock for anyone to use while keeping the only key private. That modular exponentiation provides the trapdoor: trivially easy in one direction, computationally catastrophic to reverse.

GCHQ had gotten there first. James Ellis wrote "The Possibility of Secure Non-Secret Digital Encryption" in 1970. Clifford Cocks, fresh from university, found a working implementation within half an hour of joining GCHQ in September 1973—mathematically equivalent to RSA, four years before Rivest, Shamir, and Adleman published it. Malcolm Williamson independently discovered Diffie-Hellman key exchange in 1974. Everything classified. Ellis died November 25, 1997, one month before GCHQ acknowledged his priority.

Ralph Merkle independently conceived the same idea in the fall of 1974, as a Berkeley undergraduate. His professor called his proposal "muddled terribly." His paper was published after Diffie-Hellman, despite

being conceived earlier. Merkle: "There was no Google, the term 'public key cryptography' did not yet exist, and there were no previous workers in the field." Diffie tracked down Ellis in 1982 and confronted him directly. Ellis: "Well, I don't know how much I should say. Let me just say that you people made much more of it than we did."

The mathematics had been sitting in number theory for centuries. The question—can you make a lock anyone can close but only one person can open?—had simply never been asked, because the founding assumption of cryptography, that sender and receiver must share a secret key, was so deeply embedded that it was invisible, like water to a fish. Three separate groups of people, on three separate continents, noticed the same invisible thing at roughly the same time, and two of them were forbidden by their governments from telling anyone.

※

"Eruption," second track on Van Halen's debut, February 10, 1978, runs one minute forty-two seconds. Tapping section starts at fifty-seven seconds. Ted Templeman overheard Eddie warming up: "What's that? Roll tape!" First take. Eddie: "I didn't even play it right.

There's a mistake at the top end of it." This is the correct response to inventing the future of your instrument: to notice where you didn't do it right.

Tapping turns the neck into a keyboard. Both hands hammer notes onto the fretboard—the right hand is no longer just picking. The forty-five-second tapping passage traverses four harmonic regions on the B string using three-note sextuplet patterns: E major, modal interchange from E minor, chromatic blues turnarounds, E harmonic minor. This is a staggeringly sophisticated compositional arc on a debut album by a band most critics wrote off as a party-rock act.

Steve Stevens: "I literally ran across the room ... lifted up the needle and put it back on, and asked 'Who the fuck is this?!' " Roth told Eddie to turn his back to the audience so nobody could see his right hand. Steve Hackett claims tapping on record in 1971. Eddie cited Jimmy Page. Emmett Chapman developed two-handed tapping in 1969. The technique existed. What didn't exist was someone who could make it sound like it mattered.

Larry Graham invented slap bass because the drummer quit. He was about fifteen, playing in his mother's band. The organ had already broken. Then the drummer left. Dell Graham decided to continue as a duo.

Larry: "I would thump the strings with my thumb to make up for the bass drum, and pluck the strings with my fingers to make up for the snare drum ... I was basically trying to play drums on the bass." The technique that built funk was a teenager solving a personnel problem. Bootsy Collins: "I thought, 'How is this cat playing with his thumb?' ... He's the ultimate slap machine."

Graham and Van Halen are the same story. Neither was advancing the art. Eddie needed a sound. Larry needed to be two musicians at once. The technique came from constraint, not ambition, and was named revolutionary only later, by other people. The innovator's experience of the innovation was not "I have changed everything." It was "This works." The distance between those two sentences is where most writing about paradigm shifts goes wrong.

※

UFC 1. November 12, 1993. McNichols Sports Arena, Denver. 7,800 people. Colorado was chosen because it had no athletic commission. Eight-man tournament, fifty thousand dollars, one question: which martial art actually works.

The cast: Royce Gracie, 175 pounds, Brazilian jiu-jitsu, white gi. Art Jimmerson, 196 pounds, IBF-ranked cruiserweight boxer, one glove. Ken Shamrock, 220, shootfighting. Teila Tuli, approximately 400 pounds, sumo. Savate, karate, taekwondo, kickboxing. Every discipline that had ever claimed supremacy, standing in a cage together for the first time. Rorion Gracie chose Royce over the more accomplished Rickson for the reason Art Davie articulated: "He looks like a little altar boy in that white gi. If he wins the event, it's the Bruce Lee thing."

Gracie submitted Jimmerson in 2:18. (Referee Big John McCarthy warned Jimmerson: "He's going to break your arm." Jimmerson: "He's going to break my arm, isn't he?" McCarthy: "Yeah.") Shamrock in fifty-seven seconds. Gordeau in the final in 1:44; Gordeau bit his ear during the fight, which is what the old categories felt like as they collapsed. John McCain called it "human cockfighting." By 2023, three to six million people practiced BJJ worldwide.

What happened was not that one art beat the others. The question was malformed. Fighting was not a contest between fixed styles. It was a problem space, and the solution looked nothing like any of the styles. The

styles were not wrong. They were partial. And partial things cannot see what they are missing.

※

Here is the thing about walls. Every wall in this essay looked, from the inside, like physics. Like the nature of the problem. Like the outer limit of what the problem permitted. The three-second barrier in speedcubing was not a rule—nobody wrote it down, nobody enforced it—it was simply what the best people in the world had been able to do, and when the best people in the world can't do something, the reasonable conclusion is that it can't be done. This is how walls get built without anyone building them. Enough excellent people fail at the same place, and the place becomes a boundary, and the boundary becomes a fact, and the fact becomes invisible because facts don't need to be looked at.

What the nine-year-old in Gdańsk did was not fail to see the wall. He may have seen it perfectly clearly. What he did was solve the scramble in front of him, and the solution happened to be on the other side.

※

Dick Fosbury was sixteen and could not clear five feet. Not a record attempt—five feet, a height he was supposed to clear. He'd been trained in the straddle, which was the technique, the one every serious high jumper used, the one that had produced every world record for thirty years. At a meet in Grants Pass, Oregon, in 1963, failing for the third time, something in him gave up on doing it correctly and he reverted to an older, less serious scissors kick and noticed, in the middle of a jump that didn't count for anything, that leaning back lifted his hips. He didn't know what he was noticing. He just noticed it.

Over the next two years the lean became a full backward rotation, face to the sky, which looked so wrong that the Medford *Mail-Tribune* captioned his photo "Fosbury Flops Over Bar" as a joke, and another paper ran him under the headline "World's Laziest High Jumper." His coach at Oregon State insisted he use the western roll. Fosbury cleared six feet ten in his first sophomore meet, shattering the school record, and the coach said "That's enough" and started filming. The physics had always favored going over backward—when the body arches, the center of mass can actually pass below the bar while the body clears it, which is a more efficient use of the same jump. This is not a subtle effect. The

physics were not hiding. What was hiding was the reason nobody had found them, which was that the old landing surface was sand, and landing on the back of your neck in sand is how you die. Foam pads had been installed at Medford High School before Fosbury's junior year. They changed the problem entirely. They had been sitting there, changing the problem entirely, and everyone was still solving the old problem because the old problem was the only problem anyone knew how to ask.

At Mexico City in 1968, eighty thousand people watched Fosbury clear every height on the first attempt. The crowd chanted "Ole!" at each clearance because the jump looked like a pratfall and then didn't. Gold at 2.24 meters—seven feet four and a quarter inches—with an inch of daylight. Coach Pat Jordan predicted the Flop would "wipe out an entire generation of high jumpers because they will all have broken necks." By 1972, twenty-eight of forty Olympic competitors used it. By 1988, the straddle had vanished from elite competition—not banned, not argued out of existence, just quietly retired by a sport that had moved somewhere else while nobody was declaring a revolution.

※

Larry Graham invented slap bass because the drummer quit. He was about fifteen, playing in his mother Dell Graham's working band. The organ had already broken. Then the drummer left, and Dell decided to continue as a duo. There was no artistic vision in this. There was a gig, and the gig could not be canceled. Graham: "I would thump the strings with my thumb to make up for the bass drum, and pluck the strings with my fingers to make up for the snare drum ... I was basically trying to play drums on the bass."

The technique that became the sonic foundation of funk—that carried through Stanley Clarke and Bootsy Collins and Marcus Miller and Flea and Victor Wooten and Les Claypool, that defined the way an electric bass could sound for half a century—was a teenager trying to compensate for a missing rhythm section because his mother had a show to play. He was not innovating. He was surviving. The innovation was a side effect. Bootsy Collins heard him and said "I thought, 'How is this cat playing with his thumb?' ... He's the ultimate slap machine," which is the right response to a genuine breakthrough, and the right response is not admiration but bafflement. How is this cat playing with his thumb. The question precedes the understanding. The question is the understanding.

This is the connection between Graham and Van Halen and every other case in this essay where the technique came from constraint rather than theory: the innovator's experience of the innovation was not "I have changed everything." It was "this works." Eddie needed a sound that didn't exist. Larry needed to be two musicians at once. The technique predated any understanding of what it meant. It was only retrospectively that it became a genre, or a revolution, or a paradigm shift, or whatever word you want to use for the thing that happens when someone solves the problem in front of them and the solution turns out to reorganize the entire field. The reorganization is visible only from the outside. From the inside, it's just Tuesday, and you have a gig, and the drummer isn't coming.

※

Graeme Obree built his hour-record bicycle in his kitchen from scrap metal and washing machine bearings, and I am going to mention the washing machine bearings exactly once because Obree spent his whole life being introduced as the man with the washing machine bearings, as though the bearings were the accomplishment and not the man who rode them at

51.596 kilometers per hour. He measured the ideal bracket width as "one banana." He set the world hour record on July 17, 1993, at Hamar, Norway. He had failed the day before and stayed overnight at the velodrome, drinking water to make himself wake for bathroom breaks so his muscles wouldn't seize. Six days later, Boardman broke it. Obree reclaimed it the following April. Ten days after that, the UCI banned his riding position.

The position was called the tuck, or the praying mantis—arms folded under the chest, body bent at almost ninety degrees, reducing aerodynamic drag by roughly fifteen percent. So Obree invented a different position: the Superman, arms extended forward like a man in flight. Won a second World Pursuit Championship in 1995. The UCI banned that one too. At the 1994 World Championships, the UCI introduced a ban so new it hadn't been written down—announced the evening before competition—and then disqualified Obree despite his posting the third-fastest qualifying time. Even Boardman, his rival, said the UCI looked "rather foolish after twice allowing new positions to be used, over a long period, before deciding to ban them."

Here is where the story refuses to be told in the key the essay might want. Obree has been open about liv-

ing with bipolar disorder. Three suicide attempts—as a teenager, an overdose in the 1990s when his bike shop went bust, a hanging attempt in 2001 discovered at a farm. His brother Gordon died in a car crash in October 1994. In January 2011, he came out publicly as gay: "I was brought up by a war generation; they grew up when gay people were put in jail." Old Faithful—the bicycle—is on permanent display at the National Museum of Scotland in Edinburgh. Both positions he invented remain illegal.

And the thing I cannot get past is that the UCI was not wrong that his positions were faster. They were faster. That was the problem. He found a way to ride a bicycle that was better than the way everyone else rode a bicycle, and the institution that governs bicycle racing responded by making his way illegal and leaving everyone else's way mandatory. Twice. This is not the redemption version of the story. The straddle vanished and nobody mourned it. The V-style won and everyone switched. But Obree's innovations were banned and stayed banned, and here is this kitchen-built machine behind glass in Edinburgh, and here is Obree, still alive, still faster in ways that no one is allowed to be, and the essay's neat arc about walls dissolving and the impossible becoming possible does not apply here. Sometimes

the wall wins. Sometimes the wall is not physics or tradition or embarrassment. Sometimes the wall is a committee that meets in Aigle, Switzerland, and decides, in the interest of the sport, that the best way to ride a bicycle is not permitted.

※

The physics favor the underhand free throw. One joint versus three. Smooth pendulum motion versus a chain of sequential adjustments. Three to four backspin revolutions versus roughly two, the extra spin deadening the ball on rim contact. Larry Silverberg at NC State ran hundreds of thousands of 3D simulations and published the results: the underhand shot is technically less optimal in the abstract, but the body motion is so smooth and repeatable that in practice it is dramatically more consistent. Rick Barry shot underhand his entire career—-.900 from the free throw line, over ninety percent in seven of his last eight seasons, .947 in 1978–79. The physics were clear. The biomechanics were clear. Everything about this was clear.

Wilt Chamberlain switched to underhand during the 1961–62 season. Improved from 50.4 to 61.3 percent—immediately, at no cost, requiring nothing except the

willingness to do it. In his hundred-point game on March 2, 1962, he went twenty-eight for thirty-two from the line, all underhand. 87.5 percent. The greatest single-game scoring performance in the history of basketball, powered by a technique Chamberlain abandoned the very next season. In his autobiography: "I felt silly, like a sissy, shooting underhanded. I know I was wrong. I know some of my delicate teammates wouldn't have liked it. I just couldn't do it." An estimated 1,346 career points left on the floor because the correct technique felt like the wrong kind of person.

Shaquille O'Neal missed 5,317 career free throws shooting overhand at 52.7 percent. He told Rick Barry: "I'd rather shoot 0% than shoot underhand. I'm too cool for that." His father told him it was "a shot for sissies." Five thousand three hundred and seventeen. I keep coming back to this number because it is a monument to something, and the something is not stubbornness. Stubbornness is refusing to change your mind when the evidence is against you. This is refusing to change your body when the evidence is against you, because the body is not just a tool for making free throws. The body is who you are in front of other people. The body is how you are seen. Chamberlain would rather miss than look wrong. O'Neal would rather miss than look soft.

The underhand free throw was never banned, never disproven, never replaced by anything better. It was refused, for decades, by men who understood exactly how much it was costing them and who paid the price willingly, because the price of looking like someone you are not was higher than the price of missing, and this is the hardest wall in the essay to write about because it is the only one that is not a mistake. It is a choice. You can argue that it is a bad choice, and the arithmetic says that it is a bad choice, but the arithmetic does not have to stand at a free throw line in front of twenty thousand people and shoot underhand. The arithmetic does not have a body.

※

Jan Boklöv discovered the V-style when a rock next to the ski jump hill hit him in the groin during a 1985 training flight at Falun, Sweden, and forced his ski tips apart. He was five foot six, 132 pounds, epileptic, and spoke with a speech impediment. He flew twenty meters further than usual. There is no way to tell this story without it sounding invented, and there is no way to tell it without mentioning the rock and the groin, which is where the aerodynamic future of ski jumping began—

a gust of wind deflected by a geological accident into the crotch of an undersized Swede with epilepsy, at the precise moment of flight.

The V produced thirty percent more lift than parallel skis. Judges penalized him anyway, because ski jumping was a sport where five judges each gave up to twenty style points based on how correct you looked in the air, and the V looked like a frog in midair. They called him the Froschkönig—the frog king. Jens Weissflog, the 1984 Olympic gold medalist, wondered aloud "how someone with such a bad technique could be so successful," which is a question that answers itself if you think about it for even a few seconds, but Weissflog was not thinking about it. He was looking at it. And what he saw was ugliness, because the parallel technique was beautiful in the way that a dart is beautiful, and the V was beautiful in the way that a thing that works is beautiful, and those two kinds of beauty are not the same, and the history of this essay is largely the history of the second kind replacing the first while everyone mourns.

Boklöv won the 1988–89 World Cup title anyway, with five individual victories, eating the style deductions and beating everyone on pure distance. The FIS adjusted its scoring criteria through the early 1990s. By

the mid-1990s, every ski jumper on Earth used the V. And Weissflog—this is the part of the story I keep thinking about—mastered the new technique and won two more Olympic golds at the 1994 Lillehammer Games, making him the only champion in the history of the sport who jumped both ways. This is a kind of heroism that is quieter than the innovator's heroism and possibly harder: the person who built their entire career on the old way, who mastered it, who was the best in the world at it, and who, instead of complaining that everything had changed, learned the new thing and became the best at that too. He later said it should be called "Boklöv style and not V-style." Nobody calls it that. Boklöv himself, who changed ski jumping more than anyone alive, remains mostly a footnote in the sport's history, which is a particular kind of cruelty that history reserves for people who are proven right too early and too completely for anyone to remember there was ever an argument.

※

In 2015–16, Steph Curry made 402 three-pointers, which was forty-one percent more than his own record of 286, which had itself been a record. First unani-

mous MVP. Warriors went 73–9. And underneath all of this was a piece of arithmetic so simple that it is embarrassing that it took this long for anyone to act on it: a league-average three-pointer at thirty-five percent yields about 1.06 expected points per shot. A long two at forty percent yields 0.80. The mid-range shot is the worst shot in basketball. It has been the worst shot in basketball for as long as the three-point line has existed, which is since 1979, which means that for roughly thirty-five years, every team in the NBA was taking millions of shots that the available mathematics said were suboptimal, and the mathematics was not hidden, and the mathematics was not complicated, and nobody was doing the mathematics, or the people who were doing it were being ignored, because the mid-range game was basketball. Pulling up from eighteen feet was what the sport looked like. It was the aesthetic of the thing.

Steve Kerr watched ten-year-olds launch seven straight threes at TD Garden, turned to Curry, and said: "This is all your fault." Mark Jackson: "He is hurting the game ... these kids run to the 3-point line. You are not Steph Curry." Charles Barkley called analytics "crap" and Daryl Morey an "idiot." The Rockets under Morey took it to the logical end—45.4 three-point attempts per

game, eighty-two percent of all shots either threes or at the rim, the mid-range game essentially abolished. And the mourning for it is real. Jackson is not wrong that something was lost. The mid-range game was beautiful. The pull-up jumper from the elbow, the fadeaway from the baseline, the footwork and the touch and the geometry of it—all of that was real, and it was beautiful, and it was a worse way to play basketball than shooting threes, the way the straddle was a worse way to jump and the parallel style was a worse way to ski and the overhand free throw is a worse way to shoot. The pattern is always the same. The beautiful thing turns out to be the wrong thing, and the right thing is uglier, and the uglier thing wins, and people mourn, and the mourning is not irrational. Something was actually lost. It's just that what was gained was larger.

※

Bill James developed sabermetrics while working night shifts as a security guard at the Stokely-Van Camp pork and beans cannery in Lawrence, Kansas. This is one of those biographical details that is too perfect to be a metaphor and too good not to use as one: the man

who changed how we understand baseball was guarding canned beans in the middle of the night. His first *Baseball Abstract*, self-published in 1977, was sixty-eight mimeographed pages. Seventy-five copies sold. The insight was that on-base percentage—the single most important offensive statistic in baseball, the thing that most directly correlates with scoring runs—was systematically undervalued by every team. Not slightly undervalued. Systematically. For decades.

Billy Beane's 2002 Oakland A's had a payroll of forty million dollars. The Yankees had 125.9 million. Beane and Paul DePodesta targeted players the market considered defective: Scott Hatteberg, a catcher with nerve damage who'd never played first base but posted a .374 on-base percentage. David Justice, thirty-six years old, seven million dollars. Chad Bradford, a submarine reliever nobody wanted because his delivery looked unconventional—which is, if you've been paying attention, the sound this essay makes over and over: the thing that works being dismissed because it doesn't look like the things that have worked before. Total replacement cost: 9.2 million, less than one average Yankee.

They won twenty consecutive games beginning August 13. The twentieth was the game that makes

you suspect the universe has a sense of narrative: up 11–0, they surrendered the lead entirely, tied 11–11, and Hatteberg—the catcher with nerve damage who couldn't throw, the market's reject, the embodiment of Beane's thesis—hit a walk-off home run for 12–11.

The Red Sox hired James, promoted twenty-eight-year-old Theo Epstein to GM, and won the 2004 World Series, breaking an eighty-six-year curse. By 2008, every team had an analytics department, and the advantage had evaporated completely. The market inefficiency was not a permanent feature of baseball. It was a temporary failure of attention. Once Beane demonstrated what attention could find, everyone started paying it, and the edge disappeared, and this—not the twenty-game streak, not the curse-breaking, not Brad Pitt—is the real Moneyball story: a paradigm shift so successful that it destroyed its own competitive advantage within six years. The thing Beane found was not a secret. It was a fact that everyone could see once one person pointed at it, and once everyone could see it, it stopped being an edge. This is what winning looks like when the thing you've won is a change in how people think. You win by making yourself unnecessary.

※

Seventy percent of all security vulnerabilities in major software systems—the ones that let someone take over your computer, read your medical records, drain your bank account, shut down a hospital, hold a city's water treatment plant hostage—are memory safety errors. Buffer overflows, use-after-free, dangling pointers. Google published the number. Microsoft published the number. The White House published a report about it. This is not disputed. Seventy percent. The single largest category of exploitable software defect on Earth, by a wide margin, has been the same category for forty years.

The conventional response, backed by every major technology company and most of the academic security community, is to rewrite the world's C and C++ code in Rust—a language designed from the ground up to make these errors structurally impossible. This is a rational, well-funded, carefully reasoned project, and it is the straddle. It will never finish. Not because Rust is wrong—Rust is an extraordinary language—but because you cannot replace every pipe in a city by building a second city next to the first one. The old city is where everyone lives. There are billions of lines of C and C++ running the world's infrastructure right now, and they will still be running it when everyone reading this essay

is dead, and the Rust rewrite will still not be finished, because the problem was never the source code. The problem was the compiler.

Filip Pizlo is a compiler engineer at Epic Games. His project, Fil-C, takes an approach so simple that it is almost offensive. Instead of rewriting the source code, he rewrote the compiler. Fil-C is a modified Clang—the standard C compiler that already builds most of the world's software—that adds invisible capabilities to every pointer in a C program. Shadow metadata that the program itself cannot see, cannot touch, cannot corrupt. Every memory access is checked against its capability at runtime. If the check fails, the program terminates. There is no unsafe keyword. There is no escape hatch. There is no new language to learn. The C source code does not change. Not one line. The programmer does not opt in. The safety is imposed below the floor the program stands on, the way gravity is imposed below the floor you stand on, and with approximately the same negotiability.

The output is a binary that does the same thing it always did and cannot have a buffer overflow. Not "is unlikely to have." Cannot. The distinction matters and it is the whole point. Rust prevents memory errors by requiring the programmer to satisfy a borrow checker

before the code will compile—a contract you sign, a promise you make, a discipline you maintain. Fil-C prevents them by checking every pointer dereference at runtime against a capability the programmer never wrote and cannot disable. One is a practice. The other is a law of physics in the world the binary inhabits. The programs do not know they are safe. They just are.

The runtime is 18,529 lines of C across three files. The LLVM pass that inserts the capability checks is called FilPizlonator.cpp. The Nix-based build system treats Fil-C as a cross-compilation target, the way you'd target ARM or RISC-V, and the entire dependency graph comes along: glibc, coreutils, bash, Python, cairo, fontconfig, freetype, SQLite, GNU Emacs with thirty packages. Each one recompiled. Each one memory-safe. Each one running the same source code it has always run. You do not port your program to Fil-C. You recompile it. The safety is transitive—one package and its entire dependency tree emerge safe on the other side, because the fix is in the compiler, not the code, the way the Fosbury Flop was in the foam pad, not the athlete.

This should be front-page news. It is not front-page news. The people who would need to understand it are the people least equipped to perceive it, because they have spent the last decade building the Rust rewrite

infrastructure. Their conferences, their hiring pipelines, their promotion cases, their identities as engineers are organized around the thesis that the source code is the problem and the source code is where the fix belongs. "You do not have to rewrite anything—just recompile it" is the underhand free throw of systems programming. The physics are not ambiguous. And it looks like cheating to everyone who learned to shoot overhand. Pizlo works on it in his free time. He named his core transformation like a Schwarzenegger character. The man who may have solved the majority of all exploitable software vulnerabilities on Earth is doing it as a hobby, and the industry whose entire security posture depends on this problem being hard has not yet figured out how to look at it, because looking at it means the Rust rewrite—the massive, well-funded, institutionally blessed Rust rewrite—is the Maginot Line. It solves the right problem the wrong way, and the right way was sitting in the compiler the whole time, the way the screws were in the kitchen and the foam was in the landing pit and the solution to the scramble was twenty-nine moves that everybody else saw as fifty.

Jamal Khashoggi walked into the Saudi consulate in Istanbul on October 2, 2018, and was dismembered with a bone saw. The surveillance that preceded his

murder—the tracking, the interception of his communications, the knowledge of his movements—ran through NSO Group's Pegasus spyware, which exploited memory corruption vulnerabilities in WebKit, the browser engine that runs on every iPhone on Earth. The same class of vulnerability. The same seventy percent. Zerodium pays two and a half million dollars for a single full-chain Safari exploit. The entire pricing structure of the zero-day market assumes that WebKit will always contain memory corruption bugs because WebKit is written in C++ and C++ will always have memory corruption bugs. Pizlo ported a full web browser to memory safety as a hobby project. You can post on Twitter from it. The source code didn't change.

※

The Nike Vaporfly reduced the energetic cost of running by four percent. All eighteen test subjects improved. Carbon-fiber plate, Pebax foam returning eighty-seven percent of stored energy. In 2019, thirty-one of thirty-six top-three Marathon Majors finishers wore them. Prototypes had been secretly worn at the 2016 Rio Olympics—Kipchoge won gold in a disguised pair. Brigid Kosgei ran 2:14:04 at the 2019 Chicago Marathon, shattering

Paula Radcliffe's record by eighty-one seconds. The day before that, Kipchoge ran 1:59:40.2 in Vienna with forty-one rotating pacemakers—not record-eligible, but sub-two-hours, which had been treated as a hard physiological barrier.

World Athletics regulated the shoes: forty-millimeter maximum sole, one embedded plate, four months of commercial availability. A 2021 Vienna City Marathon winner was disqualified for shoes one centimeter too thick. Then every manufacturer built their own version, and the advantage diffused, and running got faster at every level, and nobody proposed going back, and somewhere in the middle of all this the thing that a marathon time measures quietly changed, and nobody can say exactly when it happened. A marathon time used to measure a runner. Now it measures a runner in shoes. This sounds like a trivial distinction. It is not. Every marathon record set before 2017 was set by a human body running in essentially neutral footwear. Every record set after was set by a human body running on a mechanical spring. The line between those two eras is invisible and permanent, like the line between the sand pit and the foam pad, and the sport has decided, collectively, not to think about it too hard, because thinking about it too hard means questioning whether

the new records and the old records are measuring the same thing, and the answer is probably that they are not, and nobody wants to be the person who says that out loud.

※

Bill Walsh never accepted "West Coast Offense." It was a taunt—Bill Parcells, after beating the 49ers in the 1985 playoffs: "What do you think of that West Coast offense now?" Walsh called it the Cincinnati Offense. Belichick suggested "the Ohio River offense." The system existed because Bengals rookie Greg Cook—whom Walsh called "the greatest talent to play the position"—tore his rotator cuff in 1969, and Walsh had to design an offense around a backup, Virgil Carter, who couldn't throw deep. Like Graham needing to be two musicians. Like Fosbury needing to clear five feet with a body that couldn't straddle. The constraint was the invention. Walsh built an offense of short, timed passes that functioned as long handoffs—the pass setting up the run, which was the precise inversion of what football believed about itself. Walsh: "When you gain four yards on the ground, they think you're kicking their ass. When you gain four yards in the passing game,

they think they're kicking your ass. Four yards is four yards."

That last sentence is the essay's thesis in five words. Four yards is four yards. The foam pad is the foam pad. Twenty-nine moves is twenty-nine moves. It doesn't matter whether the four yards came from a place that looks correct or a place that looks wrong. It doesn't matter whether the jump looks like a pratfall. It doesn't matter whether the free throw looks like something a sissy would do. The result is the result. The difficulty—the reason this essay exists, the reason these stories are interesting, the reason Chamberlain went back to shooting overhand and O'Neal missed 5,317 free throws—is that human beings are not capable of seeing results without also seeing how the results were achieved, and the how carries aesthetic and social and identity information that the result alone does not, and that information turns out to be, for most people, more powerful than the result. Four yards is four yards, but it isn't, because the four yards that look like football feel like football and the four yards that look like a gimmick feel like a gimmick, even if they are the same four yards, even if they are exactly the same four yards, and Walsh spent his entire career trying to get people to understand that

they are the same four yards, and mostly failing, and winning three Super Bowls anyway.

January 10, 1982. Trailing Dallas 27–21, fifty-eight seconds left, third-and-three from the six. Montana threw high to the back of the end zone. Clark caught it with his fingertips. Montana told Ed "Too Tall" Jones: "Well, you can sit at home with the rest of America and watch the Super Bowl." Seven years later, Walsh's final game, Super Bowl XXIII, trailing 16–13 with 3:20 left, own eight-yard line. Montana during a timeout, pointing at the stands: "Hey, isn't that John Candy over there?" Then eight of nine passes, ninety-two yards, Taylor for the touchdown, thirty-four seconds on the clock.

Walsh's coaching tree has produced roughly eighteen Super Bowl championships across multiple generations. Four yards is four yards.

※

Jason Belmonte started bowling two-handed at eighteen months old because a ten-pound bowling ball was too heavy to hold with one hand. He tried one-handed at age seven and concluded it "sucked." He now has

thirty-two PBA Tour titles, fifteen major championships, seven Player of the Year awards—all records.

No rule change was ever proposed. The USBC examined the technique and found no violation. But PBA Hall of Famer Brian Voss wrote in 2016: "The ascent of two-handed bowling, in my opinion, is like a slow cancer to an already diseased sport." Forty percent of youth tournament entrants now bowl two-handed. Nine of ten boys' finalists at a recent PBA juniors event used it. And the thing about Belmonte is that his version of the story has none of the drama that the essay has been trading in. There was no persecution. No ban. No controversy that Belmonte himself experienced as a crisis. He just never stopped doing the thing he did when he was a baby, and the thing turned out to be better, and it never occurred to him that it needed fighting for because it never occurred to him that he was fighting. This is maybe the most interesting version of the pattern precisely because it is the quietest. Every other case in this essay involves someone who knew they were transgressing—who felt the resistance, who heard the mockery, who chose to continue anyway. Belmonte didn't choose. He just kept going. The technique that everyone told him was wrong was the only technique he had ever had, and he held onto it the way a child

holds onto a way of doing things, not out of conviction but out of the simple fact that it was his. The revolution, when it came, was so gentle that it barely registered as a revolution. The two-handed bowlers just kept showing up, and they kept winning, and one day there were more of them than there were of the other kind, and by then it was too late to ban anything, and nobody wanted to ban anything, because what would you even say? You'd have to tell a baby he's holding the ball wrong.

※

Bill Koch won silver in the thirty-kilometer cross-country race at the 1976 Innsbruck Olympics—the first American ever to medal in Olympic cross-country skiing—and then popularized a skating technique that was eight to fourteen percent faster than classical, with the biggest advantage on uphills, which is where races are won. Koch himself always clarified: "I didn't invent skating, but I did help popularize it."

The Norwegians treated cross-country skiing as something between a national sport and a sacrament. An American skating through their discipline was not merely a technical challenge but a kind of blasphemy. They bought five thousand dollars' worth of netting

to block skaters from certain sections of the course. The athletes threw the netting into a river. They imposed skating bans within a hundred or two hundred meters of television cameras, so audiences wouldn't see it happening—which is a detail so absurd that it deserves a moment of real attention: the governing body's strategy was not to prevent the technique but to prevent people from watching the technique, as though visibility were the problem, as though a revolution that happens off-camera doesn't count. They tried building walls out of snow. At the FIS Congress in Vancouver on May 29, 1985, the agenda item was, literally: "The future of the Cross-Country sport—to skate or not."

The answer was: both. The formal split into classical and freestyle came in 1987. This is the only case in this essay where the old thing survived, and the way it survived is worth examining, because it survived by being cordoned off into its own protected category—a separate discipline, with separate races, where skating is forbidden by rule. This is an extraordinary admission if you think about it. The skating technique was so obviously, so undeniably superior that the only way to preserve classical skiing was to exempt it from competition with skating entirely. Not to argue that classical was better. Not to wait for the evidence to shift. Just

to say: yes, skating is faster, and we are going to have some races where you aren't allowed to do it, because if we don't, classical skiing will stop existing. They were right. It would have. And maybe that would have been fine, the way the straddle stopping was fine, the way parallel-ski jumping stopping was fine. Or maybe there is something worth preserving about a technique that is beautiful and traditional and eight percent slower, and the only way to preserve it is to build a wall around it and call the wall a separate discipline. I don't know. This is the one case in the essay where I am not sure the wall was wrong.

※

The Maginot Line cost five to seven billion francs. 450 kilometers. Forty-five major forts, ninety-seven smaller forts, 352 casemates, a hundred kilometers of underground tunnels. On paper the forces were roughly even: 3.3 million Allied troops and 3,384 tanks versus Germany's three million troops and 2,439 tanks. France's individual tanks were, by many measures, superior. The Battle of France lasted forty-six days.

Erich von Manstein's Sichelschnitt sent the panzers through the Ardennes forest, which Allied planners

had classified as impassable for armor. Guderian's XIX Panzer Corps crossed into Luxembourg at 5:30 AM on May 10, 1940, reached Sedan by May 12, crossed the Meuse on May 13, and by May 20—ten days into the offensive—reached the English Channel at Abbeville, splitting the Allied armies in two. The advance created a hundred-kilometer traffic jam of German vehicles, an extraordinarily vulnerable target, which the Allies failed to exploit and the Luftwaffe shielded with fighters. The Maginot Line worked. It did exactly what it was designed to do. The Germans went around it. The problem the line solved was the right problem as of 1918. By 1940 it was the wrong problem, and nobody had noticed, because the line was so expensive and so massive and so obviously correct that questioning it felt like questioning the ground beneath your feet. This is what a wall looks like when the wall is made of money and concrete and institutional certainty: it becomes harder to question than the threat it was built to answer.

At Taranto on November 11, 1940, twenty-one obsolete Swordfish biplanes—fabric-covered, open-cockpit, top speed 139 miles per hour—devastated the Italian fleet at a cost of two aircraft. The Army-Navy football program on November 29, 1941—eight days before

Pearl Harbor—featured a photo of the *Arizona* with the caption: "It is significant that despite the claims of air enthusiasts no battleship has yet been sunk by bombs." The *Yamato*—72,000 tons, nine 460-millimeter guns, the largest naval artillery ever mounted on a warship—fired her main batteries at enemy surface ships exactly once, at the Battle off Samar in October 1944. She was sunk on April 7, 1945, by approximately 386 carrier aircraft in under two hours, taking roughly 2,498 of her 2,700 crew. HMS *Vanguard*, the last battleship ever built, was commissioned in April 1946—too late for the war that had made her obsolete—and scrapped in 1960 without ever firing her guns in anger.

The battleship did not lose to the aircraft carrier in a contest between equals. The carrier made the contest meaningless. The answer to "How do we build a better battleship?" was that the question was wrong, and the people who kept asking it kept building battleships, and the last one they built was obsolete before it was launched. This is the military version of Wilt Chamberlain shooting overhand—a refusal to see what is plainly visible because seeing it means that the thing you built, the thing you mastered, the thing you sank five billion francs and seventy-two thousand tons of steel into, the thing that defines what you believe war is and therefore

what you believe you are—the thing is wrong. Not broken. Not outdated. Wrong. Wrong from the beginning, wrong in its assumptions, wrong in the question it was built to answer. And that is harder than any wall in this essay, harder than sand pits and style judges and the word "sissy," because the walls made of physics can be dissolved by foam pads and the walls made of embarrassment can be dissolved by someone brave enough not to care, but the walls made of identity—the walls that are you—those walls do not dissolve. You have to tear them down with your hands, and most people would rather build the *Vanguard*.

※