

Re: Mileva Maric Einstein

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-07/4558.html>

From: greywolf42 (mingstb_at_marssim-ss.com)

Date: 07/23/04

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 2004 11:53:14 -0700

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...

>>

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

>> news:0n0Mc.12366\$K53.247@news-server.bigpond.net.au...

>>>

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

>>> news:40ffe064@epflnews.epfl.ch...

>>>>

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

>>>> news:hxNLc.11341\$K53.5835@news-server.bigpond.net.au...

>>>>>

>>>>> "Australopithecus Afarensis" <fossil.lucy@cox.net> wrote in
message

>>>>> news:thJLc.12059\$Fj6.7888@lakeread07...

>>>>> SNIP

>>>>>

>>>>> 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.*

Oh, my! An invisible reference! That's good enough for our boy Billy!

> > *"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 – Pias is a reputable source and he quotes Einstein as
> actually saying it. I am sure Pias can back it up.*

LOL! Not Again!!!!

Billy, didn't you learn from the last time you placed your faith
in a printed report from a 'reputable source'? Remember Bork?

<http://www.google.com/groups?selm=vvk1uita5m1pa0%40corp.supernews.com>

And now you claim that it was Einstein himself that made the claim! That
puts a completely different spin on the quote fragment that you provided!

> > *However, for your information, I reported in my above
> > message to you that he obviously understood it quite well, and I even
> > reported how I know it and I can not only give you the references but
> > even send some of them to you.
>
> Well it seems Einstein did not agree with you.*

Since Bill originally raised the issue with regard to whether Einstein
'pinched' Poincare's work, Einstein is certainly not a valid source for
Poincare's understanding.

> > *Bill, I highly recommend you to stop spreading rumours and stick to the
> > original sources.
>
> Quoting from a standard source by a reputable researcher in the area is
> not spreading rumors.*

LOL! It certainly is — if the book includes rumors. And this is simply a
rumor.

- > > *Such books as you refer to are mainly useful for the included sources –*
- > > *and only by reading these sources.*
- >
- > *I agree that it would be better if the reference Pais gave in support*
- > *actually appeared in the bibliography*

Of course it would! Because it's pure B.S. if the document doesn't really exist. And there is no evidence of the document. No title. No date. No reference at all.

- > *but it is obvious much greater weight*
- > *must be given to such sources than the innuendo being peddled by*
- > *Australopithecus Afarensis*

But A.A. provided an actual document to support his position. Yet you think your rumor is OK, because it was printed by Pais — WITHOUT any documentation.

- > *who, has been documented by Dirk, is obviously anti Jewish.*

ROTFLMAO!

Bill proffers Dinky van der mumble as an authority on psychological motivations!

Of course, it does not matter what AA's motivation is. What matters is the documentation. Which is (of course) why Billy is reduced to pure ad hominem attacks. (AA's documents can't be right, because AA is anti-jewish.)

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