

Re: MIKE Hunter's smal car v large car thesis is correct

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2007-07/msg00027.html>

- *From:* Eeyore <rabbitsfriendsandrelations@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 06 Jul 2007 14:28:30 +0100
-

Mike Hunter wrote:

Whether one chooses to agree or not is immaterial, the fact is one can not defy the laws of physics. The fact remains the larger the vehicle, the more efficient the crumple zones, and the safety features are in absorbing the forces a collision and thus much less likely for properly belted passengers to be injured or killed by the "third collision" where ones organs strike ones skeleton, period.

No.

The evidence clearly says otherwise.

I'm sure it's true that a larger vehicle could be more easily engineered to absorb more energy effectively than a smaller car, but quite simply, the manufacturers don't bother doing that.

A crash test of the 'Landwind' comprehensively proves that.
<http://uk.youtube.com/watch?v=f7Ts94rjr4M>

And not just Chinese SUVs.....
<http://uk.youtube.com/watch?v=24SDvxQX-Yw>

Graham

.