

Re: Barn–Pole Nuts & Bolts contradiction

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007–08/msg01930.html>

- *From:* "Sue..." <suzysewnshow@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 28 Aug 2007 20:07:55 –0700
-

On Aug 28, 1:45 pm, dlzc <dl...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

Dear harry:

On Aug 28, 9:23 am, "harry" <harald.vanlintelButNotT...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

"dlzc" <dl...@xxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:1188316488.615852.99520@xx

...

From the context, I thought everyone would have known I meant linear acceleration. I should have been more precise in the phrasing so as not to confuse others.

Acceleration is acceleration, David. Linear or not. You are already in a realm where SR does explicitly not apply. It may be reasonably *extended* to this problem... but if you are speaking to posterity, you *are* confusing the issue.

That's wrong: from the start, SRT applied

Re: Barn–Pole Nuts & Bolts contradiction

to *any* motion (in particular
accelerating electrons) as described
relative to inertial reference frames.

Since this is not a complete sentence, I cannot guess which thing(s)
you disagree with:

- angular and linear acceleration both are accelerations,
- Special Relativity is derived for inertial (non-accelerating) frames,
- Special Relativity can be reasonably extended to some special
accelerating frames, and yield verified agreement with experiment,
- David is confusing t