

# Re: Are Gravitational Waves Electromagnetic waves?

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-02/2027.html>

---

**From:** Ben ([ben.b2\\_at\\_ntlworld.com](mailto:ben.b2_at_ntlworld.com))

**Date:** 02/08/05

Date: 8 Feb 2005 15:18:39 -0800

"PD" <[pdraper@yahoo.com](mailto:pdraper@yahoo.com)> wrote in message  
news:<1107887843.127385.237990@c13g2000cwb.googlegroups.com>...

> *Ben wrote:*

> > "PD" <[pdraper@yahoo.com](mailto:pdraper@yahoo.com)> wrote in message

> news:<1107809499.787661.123740@o13g2000cwo.googlegroups.com>...

> > > *Ben wrote:*

> > > > *I would like to offer a question to the masses.*

> > > >

> > > > *If gravitational waves are a ripple of space-time, caused by a*

> > > > *colossal event, then space-time will contract and expand along*

> *their*

> > > > *path.*

> > > >

> > > > *If electromagnetic waves were a ripple of space-time,*

> > >

> > > *Yeah, but they're not.*

> > >

> > > > *caused by a*

> > > > *minor event, then space-time would also expand and contract along*

> > > > *their path.*

> > > >

> > > > *If a photon decays into an electron, a positron and a neutrino.*

> > >

> > > *Yeah, but it doesn't.*

> > >

> > > > *One*

> > > > *being contracted space-time; one being expanded space-time and a*

> > > > *neutrino being residual energy.*

> > >

> > > *Yeah, but that's not what an electron, a positron, and a neutrino*

> *are.*

> > >

> > > >

> > > > *Then would this elementary theory explain the basis of mass,*

> *energy,*

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Are Gravitational Waves Electromagnetic waves?

>>>> *electromagnetic waves and a myriad of other connections between*  
>>>> *quantum mechanics and relativity?*  
>>>  
>>> *Yeah, but it's wrong.*  
>>>  
>>> *PD*  
>>>  
>> *Perhaps trying to think about what I have posted would be an*  
>> *interesting alternative to dismissing it. That way you might*  
>> *understand it.*  
>> *Of course your response will be dismissive and you will not try to*  
>> *understand anything, so just don't reply.*  
>  
> *I did think about it. I just didn't give you all the reasons why I*  
> *dismissed it. Your mistake was thinking that it's proper to sketch out*  
> *a new, from-the-ground-up concept, without worrying about whether any*  
> *of the concepts match up with anything that's already known. This is a*  
> *common mistake made by amateur or very young (perhaps that's the same*  
> *thing) physicists; they think that progress is made by coming up with*  
> *the Big Idea, the Novel Insight, and the details will follow later;*  
> *they think the big hurdle for getting acceptance of a new idea is*  
> *getting people to let go of their traditional thinking.*  
>  
> *If you like, I can go into the details about how I KNOW each of the*  
> *points you made are dismissable. Not \*believe\* they are dismissable;*  
> *\*know\* they are dismissable.*  
>  
>  
> *PD*

Yes, please go into the details of how you KNOW each of the points I made are dismissable. It would be greatly appreciated.