

Re: Mileva Maric Einstein

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-07/7436.html>

From: greywolf42 (mingstb_at_marssim-ss.com)

Date: 07/23/04

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 2004 08:34:20 -0700

Bill Hobba <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> wrote in message
news:On0Mc.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 – Pias – 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.

Billy is making this up. One can first find a mention of this in Billy's
June 27th post:

<http://www.google.com/groups?selm=LsJDC.68022%24sj4.33720%40news-server.bigpond.net.au>

" The standard reference on the historical development of relativity is
Subtle is the Lord by Pias. As I said earlier acquaint yourself with the
true facts – egg at the Solvay conference of 1911 Einstein met Poincare who
'was generally antipathetic in regard to relativity theory and showed little
understanding of it' (Pias – Subtle is the Lord page 170) – hardly the
attitude of someone who had his ideas stolen – you would expect Poincare to

at least understand the ideas that were supposedly taken from him."

First, note that Billy has elevated 'Subtle is the Lord' into *THE* standard reference on the history of relativity. Of course, the truth or falsity of what any one book has to say on a historical subject is subject to debate. Pais is clearly not an unbiased observer. ;) Nor was he at the Solvay conference (which was not about Relativity).

Second, note how Billy and Pais mistake Poincare's disdain for SR to be 'little understanding'.

What Billy is doing here is confabulating new meanings, onto a fragment of a quote, from a biased (third hand) source. Yet he presents it as fact.

> *BTW Harry I highly recommend the above source for the true facts about Einstein.*

ROTFLMAO!!!! "True facts," indeed!

> *It is not just the authors view – the extensive bibliography it is based on is amazing.*

LOL! What this means is it is the most amazing piece of brown-nosing around. So Billy likes it.

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