

Re: Mileva Maric Einstein

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-07/4554.html>

From: greywolf42 (mingstb_at_marssim-ss.com)

Date: 07/23/04

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 2004 11:30:59 -0700

Bill Hobba <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> wrote in message
news:z%8Mc.13042\$K53.5648@news-server.bigpond.net.au...

>

> "Harry" <harald.vanlintel@epfl.ch> wrote in message

> news:41010de1\$1@epflnews.epfl.ch...

>>

>> "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> wrote in message

>> news:bi6Mc.12795\$K53.12307@news-server.bigpond.net.au...

>>>

>>> "Harry" <harald.vanlintel@epfl.ch> wrote in message

>>> news:4100c9ae\$1@epflnews.epfl.ch...

>>>

>>>>>> Did Poincare at the 1911 Solvay conference show no

>>>>>> understanding of relativity, the theory that Einstein

>>>>>> supposedly stole from him – Yes.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Wow! I never heard that rumour – and I doubt it because I know

>>>>>> from his writings that he understood it better than Lorentz. Do

>>>>>> you have a reference?

>>>>>>

>>>>>> It is no rumor – see page 170 – Pais – Subtle is the Lord.

>>>>>> Einstein meet Poincare for the first time at the Solvay conference

>>>>>> of 1911 and is it reported that Poincare showed little of no

>>>>>> understanding of relativity.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> BTW Harry I highly recommend the above source for the true facts

>>>>>> about Einstein. It is not just the authors view – the extensive

>>>>>> bibliography it is based on is amazing.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> I don't have the book, so please give me the reference it provides

>>>>>> so I can look it up – if it has such a reference!

>>>>>>

>>>>>> The reference that supports it is E12 but for some reason does not

>>>>>> actually appear in the bibliography.

It's a really amazing bibliography in this case — as the reference for this particular statement is not included in the bibliography. The characters "E12" do not constitute evidence.

> > > *"it is reported" is definitely a rumour – except if you can specify*
> > > *who reported it and on what basis, so we can judge for ourselves*
> > > *how likely it is to be correct.*
> > >
> > > *Come on Harry – Pais is a reputable source and he quotes Einstein as*
> > > *actually saying it. I am sure Pais can back it up.*
> > >
> > *If according to Pais Einstein made a bad remark about Poincare then the*
> > *contents of that remark must be correct?!*
> > *Come on!*
> >
> *Yep Harry I see your point. I remember actually thinking that as I was*
> *writing the reply. One could even argue, if Einstein did actually 'pinch'*
> *Poincare's idea, then it may have been a natural reaction. Of course I do*
> *not agree with that view – I think it is more likely Poincare actually*
> *did not understand it. I also believe it is more than rumor – Einstein*
> *actually did say it – but acknowledge the issue.*

It's still a rumor, even if Pais says that Einstein started the rumor.
Einstein wasn't God. And --- as you admit yourself --- this could have simply
been a natural reaction of a 'pincher.' Yet you reported Poincare's
response as 'proof' that Einstein hadn't 'pinched' Poincare's work!

What an amazing distortion you are pushing here.

- 1) Pais prints an undocumented claim about something Einstein said.
- 2) Bill snips up the quote from Pais, eliminating the Einstein source
(leaving a sentence fragment only).
- 3) Bill reports the claim as 'fact.'
- 4) Bill uses the 'fact' as evidence that Einstein could not have 'ripped
off' Poincare, because Poincare didn't even understand SR.

--
greywolf42
ubi dubium ibi libertas
{remove planet for return e-mail}