

## Re: Related languages (Re: A China–Sumer connection)

*Source:* <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005–03/1558.html>

---

*phippmartin\_at\_hotmail.com*

*Date:* 03/10/05

Date: 9 Mar 2005 16:07:56 -0800

Richard Herring wrote:

> *In message*

<nsanders.DIE.SPAM–BFA7F7.11342409032005@news.verizon.net>,

> *Nathan Sanders* <nsanders.DIE.SPAM@wso.williams.edu> writes

>

> [...]

>>

>> *I wish physicists had to deal with innumerable kooks arguing from*

>> *their authority as physical beings:*

>

> *You think they don't? Just step next door to sci.physics :-(*

You don't have to go that far. Really. Layman CAN make contributions to the humanities: does anybody argue that Comm's point that Nomadic people develop an impressive ability to pick up languages (probably because they get exposed to different languages at a young age) was not a good one and relevant to the discussion that was taking place? But her analogies making reference to physics are just... embarrassing. (I'm trying to picture how someone can "put" phonons in a box. Maybe with a set of speakers.)

Just speaking for physicists, I would say that it is ultimately our own fault if laymen don't understand us. People in education do try to get people to understand: that's the job. So concepts have to be explained in the simplest yet clearest terms possible. If we used the words "sun" and "moon" to refer to elementary particles and people thought we were talking about astronomy then who would be at fault? Yep, us. As far as I know, there has never been ANY physicist who has EVER criticized a layman for not understanding terminology in physics. That would be both rude and ignorant. That's the point I was trying to make before.

Martin