

Re: Apollo One, the FBI, and Scott Grissom

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2004-06/0470.html>

From: LaDonna Wyss (hpywife927_at_yahoo.com)

Date: 06/04/04

Date: 4 Jun 2004 06:53:30 -0700

"Charleston" <Charleston@coxdotgoeshere.net> wrote in message
news:<69Vvc.16058\$IL1.11964@fed1read03>...

> "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.*
> > *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.*

Well, speaking of reasonable people, you appear to be one, so here goes: First, forgive me but I've been a little busy so I'm not up on all the Internet jargo. SSM and SSH? And, it's very early and the coffee has not kicked in yet, so while it rings a bell, the Hill Report?

Finally, I AGREE with you Scott is less-than-forthcoming. At the risk of sounding like an "apologist" (which I've already been accused of here), have you ever met Scott or Betty? If not, it's really difficult to explain how they view things. They are extremely cynical, understandably so. That family has really been through it over the years. Ironically, if you ask Scott (and I have on multiple occasions), he will tell you he is not cynical in the least. It's so deeply buried he does not even recognize it. He is a study in contrast; on the one hand he does repeated interviews on this subject,

on the other, he plays his cards very close to the vest. I'd have to have one of my teammates come on here and explain the psychology behind this, but he HAS explained it to me on numerous occasions and given Scott's life history his behavior is completely understandable. Please try to bear that in mind when/if he returns to this message board and continues his dialogue. He (and his mother) does not know who to trust, and they never put more of about a millimeter of themselves out there at a time because they are always waiting to be "shot at."

Frankly, that is why I am on the scene. I've had this same dialogue with the Inspector General's office. They were confused as to why I contacted them rather than the Grissom's. The answer is: They are damaged goods. Perhaps this will help you to understand: Imagine being a teenager and losing your father not only under terrible circumstances but under the relentless scrutiny of the world. Add to that NASA never providing counselling for the families, and add to THAT the fact that the boys were back in school the day after the funeral. If you remember your school days, you can imagine the crap they were exposed to. Additionally, these boys were raised to be "tough"; they had no outlet for their emotions whatsoever, not even at home because (bless her heart) Betty is an extremely tough lady. So, swallow all of that rage and pain for 37 1/2 years, and you might start to understand Scott Grissom.

I'm NOT his apologist; it is extremely frustrating to watch him sometimes. But I have come to understand some of what I see. I hope this helps you.