

Eddington's excused for fraud in 1919, Einstein says its okay to commit fraud

Roger J Anderton

R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com

An opinion is expressed regarding what happened in 1919 regarding Eddington's observation of starlight bending and the question is raised as to how many opinions like this need to be expressed before the science community accepts a very big mistake was made in 1919.

This article is to highlight some of the things that Michael Brooks has said.

Michael Brooks quote: "When Einstein came to write a preface for a modern edition of Galileo's book, he said Galileo's fraud was acceptable because it was well-motivated. We can gloss over Galileo's questionable methods, Einstein said, because he had eventually been proved right."

So, Einstein excuses fraud in Galileo case, if he can excuse it there then there is no reason why he would not excuse it in 1919.

Einstein became famous in 1919 with Eddington's starlight bending observation.

First Michael Brooks talks of fraud in general in science and then talks of Eddington result in 1919 being the same.

Brooks: "Roughly one-third of scientists admit to having committed fraud in the last three years. Experiments rarely go perfectly, and scientists often have to use their intuition to separate out useful results from results that arise from anomalies or difficulties with their apparatus.

"That's what the astronomer Arthur Eddington did in 1919 when he cherry-picked among his observations of an eclipse. The idea was to prove Einstein's general theory of relativity. However, Eddington's analysis of the data was questionable enough for the Nobel Prize committee to exclude relativity from Einstein's 1921 Nobel Prize for physics. Assessing the merits of relativity was impossible until it was "confirmed in the future," the committee said."

Given the possibility that Eddington did commit fraud in 1919, and if Einstein knew it was fraud then since Einstein endorsed fraud for Galileo, there would be no reason for Einstein to do otherwise than endorse fraud for Eddington. We cannot infer that Einstein knew it was fraud, just that he would have endorsed it if he knew it was.

To be fair Michael Brooks - is pointing out that fraud happens a lot in science not just in the Eddington case.

Michael Brooks says he has a PhD in quantum physics and has lectured at various universities, and written for various newspapers, and is a consultant for New Scientist etc.

Despite Michael Brooks' impressive credentials, it can only be interpreted as that it is his opinion of what happened in the Einstein-Eddington affair of 1919. But how many opinions like this is science supposed to ignore before accepting that such a thing happened in 1919. The news media loudly proclaimed Einstein a genius in 1919. If it was fraud committed, then the science community should make it clear to the news media that the news was reported wrong in 1919. However, the science community I suspect is ashamed and keeps silent. Even if mistake was made in 1919 is admitted, the science community wants to still endorse Einstein's relativity with subsequent experiments and observations; where I suspect that continuing mistakes are being made because there is pressure to try to stick to the mistake that was made in 1919. Science is supposed to be something about “truth”, building on lies is therefore not a good idea.

Reference

[1] Scientists Behaving Badly, 04/24/2012 10:22 am Michael Brooks Science Internet Newspaper http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-brooks/scientists-behaving-badly_b_1448729.html
c.RJAndertonJan2013

Additional Information:

Scientists can be so confident that the theory they have is correct that they often commit fraud in the data collected to support the theory. An interesting book dealing with this in general is: *Betrayers of the truth: Fraud and Deceit in the Halls of Science* is a book by William Broad and Nicholas Wade, published in 1982. [2] As per Wikipedia [3]: “The book argues that the conventional wisdom that science is a strictly logical process, with objectivity the essence of scientist's attitudes, errors being speedily corrected by rigorous peer scrutiny and experiment replication, is a mythical ideal.”

And cites the book saying: “Our conclusion, in brief, is that science bears little resemblance to its conventional portrait. We believe that the logical structure discernible in scientific knowledge says nothing about the process by which the structure was built or the mentality of the builders. In the acquisition of knowledge, scientists are not guided by logic and objectivity alone, but also by such nonrational factors as rhetoric, propaganda, and personal prejudice. Scientists do not depend solely on rational thought, and have no monopoly on it.”

Also, of interest, see the article: *The 10 Greatest Cases of Fraud in University Research*. [4]

There are a few of us who think that the supposed proof for Einstein's relativity by Eddington in 1919 is bogus. No way does such an experiment/observation replace Newtonian physics by Einstein's relativity.

In context of Newton gravitational theory if light bends under gravity then light has mass; and that claim is contrary to Einstein's claim that light has no mass. AND if light bends twice more than expected by Newtonian theory then that just means excuses are generated to account for the extra bending by other effect(s). No way- do we abandon Newtonian physics by just one observation like that Eddington gave. The method is mathematical modelling - so if a model based on Newtonian physics gives half what is observed, then the model gets updated as per the methodology of modelling; no way does the theory itself get abandoned! The whole reasoning of 1919 is just flawed. PLUS, Eddington often gets accused of cherry picking

References

[2] *Betrayers of the Truth: Fraud and Deceit in the Halls of Science* is a book by William Broad and Nicholas Wade, published in 1982, ISBN 0-671-44769-6

[3]https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Betrayers_of_the_Truth at 3rd May 2018

[4] <https://www.onlineuniversities.com/blog/2012/02/the-10-greatest-cases-of-fraud-in-university-research/>

Additional information: c.RJAnderton22May2018