

Re: Credible Challenger Closure

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.shuttle/2008-01/msg00070.html>

- *From:* "maxson@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx" <maxson@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 22 Jan 2008 10:01:16 -0800 (PST)
-

On Jan 22, 11:12 am, nf...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Nicholas Fitzpatrick) wrote:

In article <67497fc6-211b-4df6-b928-5bd6b67e6...@xx>, max...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx <max...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

After replying to any initial comments, or to any questions about the photogrammetrics of the event, I would like to proceed to the pertinent portion of the caption to be analyzed.

I don't see how this is a simple request. If it takes you more than one post to make the request, it isn't a simple request.

If you deem the request (along with the way it was described and introduced) to be unreasonable or beyond your level of interest, why bother to reply?

This accident was put to bed over 20 years ago. I can't imagine why there is any reason to microanalyse the documents at this date. No one in their right mind has any belief that this wasn't anything other than an accident.

To quote Grace Corrigan on the tenth anniversary, "So they say."

Whether wittingly or not, you've managed to take another cheap shot at Grace, as well as other tireless educators and researchers who continue in her stead.

JTM

.