

Re: Apollo One, the FBI, and Scott Grissom

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2004-06/0410.html>

From: Charleston (*Charleston_at_coxdotgoeshere.net*)

Date: 06/04/04

Date: Fri, 4 Jun 2004 00:03:32 -0700

"LaDonna Wyss" <hpywife927@yahoo.com> wrote:

> *derek11963@nospamyahoo.com (Derek Lyons) wrote:*

> > *hpywife927@yahoo.com (LaDonna Wyss) wrote:*

> > > *First, I am not going to post Gus Grissom's autopsy report on the
> > > Internet. I wouldn't even DREAM of asking Betty Grissom's permission
> > > to do such a thing. Second, my medical credentials have nothing to do
> > > with it.*

Well I just posted a few of the facts from that report because science speaks loudly on this group.

> > *They certainly do when you make medical statement with such certainty.*

Correct. Did I just agree with Derek?

> > > *Scott had that report examined by a top forensic*

> > > *pathologist; you should ask for HIS credentials.*

We should ask him if he considered all of the environmental variables associated with the accident that would explain the autopsy findings. We should also ask him how many fire related autopsies he has performed or reviewed, and how many of those occurred while the victim(s) were in a sealed pressure vessel.

> > > *We have done so on multiple occasions. scott has refused to supply
> > > them. (The credentials of said pathologist are far from the only
> > > thing he has refused to supply. He has openly admitted to concealing
> > > evidence.)*
> >

> *OK, THAT is one he** of a serious allegation, and I am not going to
> allow it to stand. Scott is not "concealing evidence." There are
> things that occur during the course of an investigation which, if
> revealed at the wrong time in the wrong forum, can and do compromise
> the investigation. That is NOT the same thing as concealing evidence.
> Let's make certain you have that straight.*

sci.space.history: Re: Apollo One, the FBI, and Scott Grissom

- > *As for Scott "refusing" to supply the pathologist's credentials: I've*
- > *come to know him rather well over the past 18 months. What you*
- > *interpret as refusal is most likely Scott's propensity to forget*
- > *things. He is NOT attentive to detail.*

He admitted to withholding information deliberately over on SSM. I distinctly remember that occurrence.

<http://makeashorterlink.com/?V34624978>

I was sticking up for him at the time. I did so until I got a copy of the Hill report.

I believe Scott is a damn good pilot with an eye for detail.

- > *When he is deluged (such as I*
- > *have been just now with 14 postings all at once)*

Take a deep breath. Ignore the unintelligent swarm/slam posts and just respond to the ones that are actually responsive to yours. Take your time too. The reasonable people on this group are patient.

- > *he tends to become*
- > *overwhelmed and skips over most, if not all, of what he is being*
- > *asked. Again, perhaps a personal flaw, but not indicative he is*
- > *hiding anything. I will see about the credentials when I ask him to*
- > *tell me the pathologist's name again. If Scott is too busy flying,*
- > *I'll do my own credential search on the Internet and get it to you*
- > *that way.*

You would have to read all of Scott's posts here, on SSM and SSH over the past what, two years, to really appreciate what he has said and more importantly what he has not said. I have read every single one of his posts.

--

Daniel

<http://www.challengerdisaster.info>

Mount Charleston, not Charleston, SC