



VETERANS FOR PEACE
HUMBOLDT BAY
CHAPTER 56

THE FOGHORN

MARCH
2013

“Cutting Through the Fog of War”

VFP Statement of Purpose

We, having dutifully served our nation, do hereby affirm our greater responsibility to serve the cause of world peace. To this end we will work, with others

To increase public awareness of the costs of war

To restrain our government from intervening, overtly and covertly, in the internal affairs of other nations

To end the arms race and to reduce and eventually eliminate nuclear weapons

To seek justice for veterans and victims of war

To abolish war as an instrument of national policy.

To achieve these goals, members of Veterans For Peace pledge to use non-violent means and to maintain an organization that is both democratic and open with the understanding that all members are trusted to act in the best interests of the group for the larger purpose of world peace.

Statement of Nonviolence

We will use our anger at injustice as a positive nonviolent force for change.

We will not vandalize.

We will not use or carry alcohol or illegal drugs.

We will refrain from insults and swearing.

We will not run or otherwise make threatening motions.

We will not assault, either verbally or physically, those who oppose or disagree with us, even if they assault us.

We will protect those who oppose us from insult or attack.

Our attitude as conveyed through words, symbols and actions will be one of openness, friendliness, and respect toward all people we encounter including police officers, military personnel, members of the larger community and all marchers.

We will carry no weapons.

As members of a nonviolent demonstration, we will follow the directions of the designated coordinators.

In the event of a serious disagreement, we will remove ourselves from the action.

Vietnam War Veterans Unite to Help Agent Orange Kids

February 15, 2013

The Vietnam war ended nearly 40 years ago, but its effect does not. Many soldiers, with great efforts and sacrifice, are joining hands to help national construction and ease the pain of loss.

For many soldiers, it is good luck to return home safely from the battlefields. But for some, such luck turns into great pain upon seeing their children born with birth defects as they have to bear the impact of dioxin, the toxic chemical in Agent Orange, a herbicide sprayed by the US during the war.

Khong Thi Thuy, Director of Phu Quy charity centre in northern Bac Giang province said her heart was broken when seeing these children. She was determined to help them and treat them as her own children.

In 2009, Thuy and her husband, themselves having a child suffering from the effect of Agent Orange/dioxin, established the Phu Quy charity center. By now they have cared for over 200 child victims of Agent Orange. After receiving vocational training, many of them are working for the centre.

Thuy unveiled that sometimes her centre run out of rice and money so she and other staffs stay up all night to sew to have money for rice.

She recalled that on some occasions, the staff must care for 4-5 sick children at the same time. “It is really, really hard. But I think in order to do something for society and our friends, we should forget ourselves. If we just think of our own interests, it comes to nothing.”

Bac Giang authorities provided the Phu Quy charity centre with 1.3 hectares of land, and many donors are also making contributions to keep it running.

Dong Khanh Vinh, Chairman of Bac Giang provincial Agent Orange Victims’ Association, said although most of us retire and battle with diseases we are committed to sharing with our comrades, especially their children, with all our heart, conscience and responsibility. The more we care, the more we pay tribute to our fellows.

The centre has received heartfelt kindness from war veterans across the country and foreign organizations via the Foreign Ministry and Vietnamese embassies worldwide to make it a cozy home for children with the AO effect.



Study: Wind Blew Deadly Gas to U.S. Troops in Gulf War

Kelly Kennedy, USA TODAY

Troops were told chemical alarms that went off at U.S. bases in Saudi Arabia during the Gulf War were false alarms, but a new study indicates that sarin gas traveled hundreds of miles.

Weather studies show dangerous nerve agent traveled hundreds of miles to reach U.S. troops.

WASHINGTON -- U.S. bombings of Iraqi munitions factories in January 1991 released a plume of sarin gas that traveled more than 300 miles to affect American troops in Saudi Arabia, although military officials claimed at the time that chemical alarms triggered by the gas were false, a study released today shows.

The Jan. 18, 1991, bombings of the munitions plants in Nasiriyah and Khamisiya blew a plume of sarin gas high above a layer of cold, still air -- also called the boundary level -- and into a swift wind stream that carried the gas to Saudi Arabia, said the study conducted by researchers Robert Haley and James Tuite and published in the journal *Neuroepidemiology*.

The gas plumes, the researchers said, can be blamed for symptoms of Gulf War Illness, the mysterious ailment that has affected more than 250,000 veterans of the war.

The gas set off repeated chemical weapons alarms at U.S. troop points in Saudi Arabia, the report said, but commanders said they were false alarms, because if the troops had been hit with sarin gas, there would have been casualties. There were no casualties, although U.S., Czech and French systems all detected traces of sarin and mustard agents.

Compounding the effects of the sarin were Scud missile attacks on the bases by Iraqi forces, Haley and Tuite reported, because the missiles would stir up the airborne toxic gases and force the sarin to drift back into the base level of air, which would set off the chemical alarms again.

The two researchers investigated satellite images and weather charts from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to determine the movements of the sarin plume. Haley is the chief of epidemiology at the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center in Dallas, and Tuite is a former Secret Service senior agent who has worked as an investigator for the Pentagon and the Government Accountability Office.

Their report shows satellite images depicting a yellow patch of gas in the air above where U.S. troops were based.

"You can see it," Haley said. "This is simple. There it is. There's no doubt."

Haley and Tuite paired the weather data with survey results from about 8,000 troops they polled with support from the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs. They found a direct relationship between the number of times troops heard the chemical alarms and the severity of their Gulf War illness symptoms, their report said.

The VA did not respond to a request for comment.

The VA has previously challenged research attributing Gulf War illness to sarin, because there was no way to determine the amount of gas to which troops were exposed. Since no troops died at the time from exposure to the gas, and the munitions factories were so far away, U.S. forces and their commanders assumed something else had set off the chemical alarms, Haley said. In some cases, troops were told the alarms were activated by burning trash.

"This is the dose," Haley said. "The more alarms you heard, the longer you were exposed to the gas."

Veterans of suffering from Gulf War illness tend to fall in three categories:

- Syndrome 1, or cognitive and depression problems.
- Syndrome 2, or confusion ataxia, which is similar to early Alzheimer's disease.
- Syndrome 3, or severe chronic body pain.

Those with syndromes two and three had a highly significant correlation between alarms and symptoms, while Haley said Syndrome 1 does not appear to be connected. Haley called syndromes two and three "incapacitating," and said those veterans feel tired or just "not good" for no explainable reason. Recent research shows that Gulf War illness, the series of symptoms ranging from headaches to memory loss to chronic fatigue, is due to damage to the autonomic nervous systems. The autonomic nervous system controls automatic functions, such as breathing or a person's heartbeat.

Troops say their exposure to the gases was compounded by their lack of chemical protection suits. Each person was equipped with two suits, which were good for only one wearing each. Many soldiers and Marines stopped bothering to put on their gas masks and suits, if they had any fresh ones left, after hearing several of the "false alarms."

While scientists have pointed at achi-inhibitors, such as sarin, bug spray and anti-nerve agent pills as contributors to Gulf War illness, Haley he said the main cause is probably the sarin gas.

"I think the other chemicals may have compounded it," he said, but scientists hadn't been looking at low-dose, long-term sarin exposure because they didn't know the cloud had traveled so far.



....continued from previous page

The VA originally funded some of the Gulf War illness research but Veterans Affairs dropped their project in 2010 after being accused of wasting millions of dollars in research money. That came directly after a 2009 study from Haley showed that neurotoxins such as anti-nerve agent pills, insect repellent and the nerve agent sarin caused neurological changes to the brain, and that the changes seem to correlate with different symptoms. Haley and Tuite used their own money and time to complete the research before it was published in *Neuroepidemiology*, which only runs research after it is peer-reviewed by other scientists.

Haley said the findings are important because it could help veterans gain benefits from VA, and because it gives researchers a starting point for a cure. It also could serve as a warning to countries such as Syria, which security experts fear plan to use chemical weapons against insurgents, because it's hard to determine where the chemicals will end up, he said.

Staff Sgt. Tracy Dice Not Considered War Widow, Despite Loss of Wife in Afghanistan

By Drew Brooks

The Fayetteville Observer

RAEFORD - Clutching a copy of her marriage certificate and racked with grief, Tracy Dice steeled herself for a battle.

Dice had just received a call from her in-laws, summoning her to their Hoke County home.

Dice knew what lay ahead. Her wife, fellow National Guard member Donna Rae Johnson, failed to call her that October morning from Khost, Afghanistan. Worse, Dice learned through the Internet that three unidentified soldiers had been killed in the same area hours earlier.

And now National Guard officers had shown up at her in-laws' home.

On occasion, Dice and Johnson had discussed what would happen if one of them were to die while serving their country.

They knew that the military would not recognize their same-sex marriage. A federal law, the 1996 Defense of Marriage Act, defines marriage as the legal union of one man and one woman. The military abides by the letter of that law.

But Dice was determined to fight to be part of her wife's affairs. That's why she clutched her marriage certificate, intent on being able to prove her connection to Johnson and terrified that she would somehow be excluded.

The marriage certificate did little good. The casualty officers

who showed up at her in-laws' home were bound by the Defense of Marriage Act. The officers could not legally recognize Dice as the widow and notified her in-laws of Johnson's death before she arrived.

The Defense of Marriage Act held other ramifications for Dice, who is believed to be the first same-sex war widow in the U.S. military:

Since she was not recognized as a spouse or family member, Dice could have been left behind when Johnson's body arrived from Afghanistan. Instead, her mother-in-law intervened and a military officer "pushed the edges of the envelope" to allow Dice to escort Johnson's body from Dover Air Force Base in Delaware.

In correspondence from the Department of Defense, Dice said, officials expressed their condolences for the loss of her "significant other." The lone exception was President Obama, the only government official to refer to Johnson as Dice's wife.

Moments before Johnson's funeral, a small ceremony was held out of public view in the church basement. There, Dice said, uniformed officers presented her with an American flag. During the funeral, the flag that had draped the coffin was handed to Dice's mother-in-law, Sandra Johnson, instead of the grieving widow.

The Department of Veterans Affairs denied Dice's application for survivor's benefits.

Her treatment would have been even worse, Dice said, if not for the support from her in-laws and the pressure they put on the military to include their daughter's wife.

"Everything is because of Sandra's kindness," Dice said. "I don't think she understands how great she's been."

....continued on next page

Next VFP56 meeting will be held
on Thursday, March 7 at
7:00 PM.
Meeting will be held in the
Commons Room at 550 Union
Street in Arcata.
Veterans and non-veterans are
more than welcome to come and
help us dialogue about what we to-
gether can do to bring about peace
in this complex world.



...continued from previous page

Sandra Johnson said it was only fitting to include the woman both she and her daughter loved.

"I consider Tracy mine now," she said. "Any mother would do what I did for their children.

"I don't know what is taboo and what is not. I just know what is right."

Dice worries that other same-sex spouses who don't have that same love and support will suffer from the policies that led the military to disregard her marriage.

"To be shut out completely? It's a tragedy that a soldier could fall and a spouse not be supported," Dice said. "It's 100 percent wrong. It just doesn't feel right."

"Her mother is the only reason I've gotten anything. I'm not doing any of this for benefits. If I didn't stand up for people who might come behind me, it would be wrong."

For six years, Tracy Dice and Donna Rae Johnson hid their relationship - including their engagement - from the military.

For all of its good intentions, the military's don't ask don't tell policy kept the couple in the closet. If they had been open about their sexual orientation, the policy would have allowed the military to boot them out of the service.

Like a lot of other people, Dice and Johnson headed to Washington, D.C., to get married shortly after the repeal of don't ask don't tell in September 2011. They wed on Valentine's Day last year.

Sandra Johnson said the pair were obviously in love and worked hard for everything they had.

The family took vacations together, she said, and loved to go to the beach.

"I've always tried to treat (Dice) as one of my own," she said.

Dice had served on Fort Bragg for four years before switching to the National Guard so that she didn't have to worry about being stationed away from Johnson.

Both women had deployed before, Dice in 2006 and 2008 and Johnson in 2007, when she volunteered to go, and last year. Both had earned the rank of staff sergeant.

The couple knew the rigors of deployment, of being apart, Dice said. But Johnson's last deployment was different.

"I had a bad feeling about this deployment," Dice said. "I told her I didn't want her to go. But I supported her 110 percent."

Dice's intuition proved true. Johnson and two other members of her unit, the 514th Military Police Company based in Winterville, died Oct. 1 when a suicide bomber attacked while they were on patrol.

Johnson had told Dice the day before that she would call before her mission.

When that didn't happen, Dice called her mother-in-law and asked that she be prepared for a phone call. Dice knew the National Guard would not call her.

Then she lay down.

"I tried to bury my head and hopefully wake up in a few hours with a phone call from Donna," she said.

Less than an hour later, Dice was told to go to her in-laws' home.

A week later, on Oct. 13, more than 1,000 people attended Johnson's funeral at Raeford Presbyterian Church.

Sandra Johnson said she expected 50 or so people to attend. When she arrived at the funeral home that morning, the streets of Raeford were barren. When she emerged hours later, she found people lining the streets for nearly eight blocks, four and five deep.

"I was very proud of Raeford that day," Sandra Johnson said. "She would have been, too. It made you believe that there was some good to this. It made you pull together."

Months after the funeral, the flag that Dice received before the service lies in a case in the living room of the home they had shared.

The home, just south of Fort Bragg's large training area, is dotted with photographs of the pair.

The photos serve as reminders. So does the ring Dice wears next to her own wedding band - the same ring Johnson wore when she was killed.

Explosions from the nearby artillery range often shake the photographs, but Dice doesn't mind. Gently shifting the frames back in place, she said she is used to the noise.

She said the pair moved into the Hoke County home in 2008 following deployments.

It was their dream home, Dice said, describing how she first saw the house and then signed the paperwork to move in on the same day.



...continued on next page

...continued from previous page

Now, Dice busies herself with renovations, hoping to fulfill the plans she and Johnson made for the house.

The work, which Dice is completing with help from a friend, is therapeutic.

“It takes my mind off of things,” she said.

The U.S. Supreme Court is expected to review the legality of the Defense of Marriage Act later this year.

And this month, Chuck Hagel, the former U.S. senator picked by President Obama as the next secretary of defense, said he favors extending military benefits to same-sex couples.

But months after Donna Johnson’s funeral, Dice still finds it difficult to process that the military, and America in general, could so easily brush aside her marriage.

Through her in-laws, people within the N.C. National Guard and her own military service, Dice said, she’s been able to cope.

Dice does not fault the military for how she has been treated. She understands that it is bound by federal law.

“The military did the best they could under the circumstances they can work with,” Dice said. “I’m blessed to have gotten anything.”

But she’s still hurt, mostly by the fact that she’s not recognized as Johnson’s widow.

“You don’t grieve like this and not be a widow,” she said.

*Staff writer Drew Brooks can be reached at
brooksd@fayobserver.com .*

Everything We Know So Far About Drone Strikes

Glenn Stubbe/Minneapolis Star Tribune/MCT
By Cora Currier

Mechanics work on the UAS or Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicle, at Camp Ripley in Little Falls, Minnesota, July 19, 2012.

You might have heard about the “kill list.” You’ve certainly heard about drones. But the details of the U.S. campaign against militants in Pakistan, Yemen, and Somalia — a centerpiece of the Obama administration’s national security approach — remain shrouded in secrecy. Here’s our guide to what we know — and what we don’t know.

Drones have been the Obama administration’s tool of choice for

taking out militants outside of Iraq and Afghanistan. Drones aren’t the exclusive weapon — traditional airstrikes and other attacks have also been reported. But by one estimate, 95 percent of targeted killings since 9/11 have been conducted by drones. Among the benefits of drones: they don’t put American troops in harm’s way.

The first reported drone strike against al-Qaida happened in Yemen in 2002. The CIA ramped up secret drone strikes in Pakistan under President George W. Bush in 2008. Under President Barack Obama, they have expanded drastically there and in Yemen in 2011.

The CIA isn’t alone in conducting drone strikes. The military has acknowledged “direct action” in Yemen and Somalia. Strikes in those countries are reportedly carried out by the secretive, elite Joint Special Operations Command. Since 9/11, JSOC has grown more than tenfold, taking on intelligence-gathering as well as combat roles. (For example, JSOC was responsible for the operation that killed Osama Bin Laden.)

The drone war is carried out remotely, from the U.S. and a network of secret bases around the world. The Washington Post got a glimpse — through examining construction contracts and showing up uninvited — at the base in the tiny African nation of Djibouti from which many of the strikes on Yemen and Somalia are carried out. Earlier this year, Wired pieced together an account of the war against Somalia’s al-Shabaab militant group and the U.S.’s expanded military presence throughout Africa.

The number of strikes in Pakistan has ebbed in recent years, from a peak of more than 100 in 2008, to an estimated 46 last year. Meanwhile, the pace in Yemen picked up, with more than 40 last year. But there have been seven strikes in Pakistan in the first ten days of 2013.

How are targets chosen?

A series of articles based largely on anonymous comments from administration officials have given partial picture of how the U.S. picks targets and carries out strikes. Two recent reports — from researchers at Columbia Law School and from the Council on Foreign Relations — also give detailed overviews of what’s known about the process.

The CIA and the military have reportedly long maintained overlapping “kill lists.” According to news reports last spring, the military’s list was hashed out in Pentagon-run interagency meetings, with the White House approving proposed targets. Obama would authorize particularly sensitive missions himself.

This year, the process reportedly changed, to concentrate the review of individuals and targeting criteria in the White House. Ac-

...continued on next page



...continued from previous page

According to the Washington Post, the reviews now happen at regular interagency meetings at the National Counterterrorism Center. Recommendations are sent to a panel of National Security Council officials. Final revisions go through White House counterterrorism adviser John Brennan to the president. Several profiles have highlighted Brennan's powerful and controversial role in shaping the trajectory of the targeted killing program. In early January, Obama nominated Brennan to head the CIA.

At least some CIA strikes don't have to get White House signoff. The director of the CIA can reportedly green-light strikes in Pakistan. In a 2011 interview, John Rizzo, previously the CIA's top lawyer, said agency attorneys did an exhaustive review of each target.

Doesn't the U.S. sometimes target people whose names they don't know?

Yes. While administration officials often have frequently framed drone strikes as going after "high-level al-Qaida leaders who are planning attacks" against the U.S., many strikes go after apparent militants whose identities the U.S. doesn't know. The so-called "signature strikes" began under Bush in early 2008 and were expanded by Obama. Exactly what portion of strikes are signature strikes isn't clear.

At various points the CIA's use of signature strikes in Pakistan in particular have caused tensions with the White House and State Department. One official told the New York Times about a joke that for the CIA, "three guys doing jumping jacks," was a terrorist training camp.

In Yemen and Somalia, there is debate about whether the militants targeted by the U.S. are in fact plotting against the U.S. or instead fighting against their own country. Micah Zenko, a fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations who has been critical of the drone program, told ProPublica that the U.S. is essentially running "a counterinsurgency air force" for allied countries. At times, strikes have relied on local intelligence that later proves faulty. The Los Angeles Times recently examined the case of a Yemeni man killed by a U.S. drone and the complex web of allegiances and politics surrounding his death.

How many people have been killed in strikes?

The precise number isn't known, but some estimates peg the total around 3,000.

A number of groups are tracking strikes and estimating casualties:

The Long War Journal covers Pakistan and Yemen.

The New America Foundation covers Pakistan.

The London Bureau of Investigative Journalism covers Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan, as well as statistics from on drone strikes carried out in Afghanistan.

How many of those killed are have been civilians?

It's impossible to know.

There has been considerable back-and-forth about the tally of civilian casualties. For instance, the New America Foundation estimates between 261 and 305 civilians have been killed in Pakistan; The Bureau of Investigative Journalism gives a range of 475 - 891. All of the counts are much higher than the very low numbers of deaths the administration claims. (We've detailed inconsistencies even within those low estimates.) Some analyses show that civilian deaths have dropped proportionally in recent years.

The estimates are largely compiled by interpreting news reports relying on anonymous officials or accounts from local media, whose credibility may vary. (For example, the Washington Post reported last month that the Yemeni government often tries to conceal the U.S.' role in airstrikes that kill civilians.)

The controversy has been compounded by the fact that the U.S. reportedly counts any military-age male killed in a drone strike as a militant. An administration official told ProPublica, "If a group of fighting-age males are in a home where we know they are constructing explosives or plotting an attack, it's assumed that all of them are in on that effort." It's not clear what, if any, investigation occurs after the fact.

Columbia Law School conducted an in-depth analysis of what we know about the U.S.'s efforts to mitigate and calculate civilian casualties. It concluded that the drone war's covert nature hampered accountability measures taken in traditional military actions. Another report from Stanford and NYU documented "anxiety and psychological trauma" among Pakistani villagers.

This fall, the U.N. announced an investigation into the civilian impact — in particular, allegations of "double-tap" strikes, in which a second strike targets rescuers.

Why just kill? What about capture?

Administration officials have said in speeches that militants are targeted for killing when they pose an imminent threat to the U.S. and capture isn't feasible. But killing appears to be far more common than capture, and accounts of strikes don't generally shed light on "imminent" or "feasible." Cases involving secret, overseas captures under Obama show the political and diplomatic quandaries in deciding how and where a suspect could be picked up.

This fall, the Washington Post described something called the "disposition matrix" — a process that has contingency plans for what to do with terrorists depending where they are. The Atlantic mapped out how that decision-making might happen in the case

...continued on next page



...continued from previous page

of a U.S. citizen, based on known examples. But of course, the details of the disposition matrix, like the “kill lists” it reportedly supplants, aren’t known.

What’s the legal rationale for all this?

Obama administration officials have given a series of speeches broadly outlining the legal underpinning for strikes, but they never talk about specific cases. In fact, they don’t officially acknowledge the drone war at all.

The White House argues that Congress’ 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force as well as international law on nations’ right to self-defense provides sound legal basis for targeting individuals affiliated with Al Qaeda or “associated forces,” even outside Afghanistan. That can include U.S. citizens.

“Due process,” said Attorney General Eric Holder in a speech last March, “takes into account the realities of combat.”

What form that “due process” takes hasn’t been detailed. And, as Propublica has reported, the government frequently clams up when it comes to specific questions — like civilian casualties, or the reasons specific individuals were killed.

Just last week, a federal judge ruled that the government did not have to release a secret legal memo making the case for the killing of Anwar al-Awlaki, a U.S. citizen. The judge also ruled the government did not have to respond to other requests seeking more information about targeted killing in general. (In making the ruling, the judge acknowledged a “Catch-22,” saying that the government claimed “as perfectly lawful certain actions that seem on their face incompatible with our Constitution and laws while keeping the reasons for their conclusion a secret.”)

The U.S. has also sought to dismiss a lawsuit brought by family members over Awlaki’s death and that of his 16-year-old son — also a U.S. citizen — who was killed in a drone strike.

When does the drone war end?

The administration has reportedly discussed scaling back the drone war, but by other accounts, it is formalizing the targeted killing program for the long haul. The U.S. estimates there al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula has a “few thousand” members; but officials have also said the U.S. cannot “capture or kill every last terrorist who claims an affiliation with al-Qaida.”

The State Department’s legal counsel, Jeh Johnson, who just stepped down as general counsel for the Pentagon, gave a speech in December entitled, “The Conflict Against Al Qaeda and its Affiliates: How Will It End?” He didn’t give a date.

John Brennan has reportedly said the CIA should return to its focus on intelligence-gathering. But Brennan’s key role in running the drone war from the White House has led to debate about how

much he would actually curtail the agency’s involvement if he is confirmed as CIA chief.

What about backlash abroad?

There appears to be plenty of it. Drone strikes are deeply unpopular in the countries where they occur, sparking frequent protests. Despite that, Brennan said last August that the U.S. saw, “little evidence that these actions are generating widespread anti-American sentiment or recruits.”

General Stanley McChrystal, who led the military in Afghanistan, recently contradicted that, saying, “The resentment created by American use of unmanned strikes ... is much greater than the average American appreciates. They are hated on a visceral level, even by people who’ve never seen one or seen the effects of one.” The New York Times recently reported that Pakistani militants have carried out a campaign of brutal reprisals against locals, accusing them of spying for the U.S.

As for international governments: Top U.S. allies have mostly kept silent. A 2010 U.N. report raised concerns about the precedent of a covert, boundary-less war. The President of Yemen, Abdu Hadi, supports the U.S. campaign, while Pakistan maintains an uneasy combination of public protest and apparent acquiescence.

FEBRUARY GOLDEN RULE REPORT

CHUCK DEWITT

THE GOLDEN RULE NOW HAS DECKS AGAIN AND A FLOOR INSIDE. WE CAN NOW STROLL FROM STEM TO STERN WITHOUT FEAR OF FALLING THROUGH THE DECK AND WE CAN WALK AROUND INSIDE THE BOAT WITHOUT LOOKIN DOWN FOR FOOTING.

THE FUEL TANK THAT WAS DESIGNED AND FABRICATED BY DENNIS THOMPSON HAS BEEN INSTALLED AND BOLTED DOWN UNDER THE FOOT WELL. ALL THAT REMAINS TO BE DONE IS THE HOSE FROM THE TANK TO THE FILLER CAP INSTALLED AND THE FILLER CAP ITSELF POSITIONED IN THE BOTTOM OF THE FOOT WELL.

A ONE INCH THICK BULKHEAD HAS BEEN PUT IN SEPARATING THE AFT STOWAGE AREA FROM THE INTERIOR OF THE CABIN. THIS WALL EXTENDS FROM PORT TO STARBOARD AND FROM THE KEEL UP TO THE TOP OF THE CABIN. THE BULKHEAD IS SEVERAL SHEETS OF 1/2 INCH HYDROTECH GLUED TOGETHER IN SUCH A FASHION AS TO FORM ONE PIECE AND INSTALLED TO FORM A STRENGTHENING COMPONENT OF THE HULL.

TWO HATCHES WERE FRAMED IN ON THE AFT DECK, ONE ON EACH SIDE OF THE FOOT WELL. THE HATCHES THEMSELVES ARE ON ORDER BUT HAVE NOT ARRIVED YET.

...continued on next page





**Veterans For Peace
Chapter 56**

Phone 707-826-7124

Email: VFP56@aol.com

WE'RE ON THE WEB:

<http://www.vfp56.org>

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Rob Hepburn, Steve Stamnes

Steve Sottong, Jim Sorter,

John Schaefer, John Mulloy

Mashaw McGuinnis, Ernie Behm

EDITOR OF FOGHORN

Jim Sorter

STANDING COMMITTEES

DU/WMD: Peter Aronson, Rich Gilchrist

General Store: Ernie Behm

FEM: Mashaw McGuinnis

VEOP: Carl Stancil, Jon Reisdorf

VSC: Ernie Behm, John Mulloy

LET US HEAR FROM YOU!

If you would like to submit an article, opinion, comment or response to anything you have read which might interest the members of VFP-56, please e-mail it to turtldnccer@aol.com, in word format, or mail to Jim Sorter at 1762 Buttermilk Lane, Arcata, CA 95521. Submissions will be included on a first come basis until the newsletter is full. Late arriving submissions will be archived for future issues.

....continued from previous page

TEN DECK BOLTS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED, FIVE ON EACH SIDE OF THE CABIN AREA TO MAKE THE DECKS OUTSIDE OF THE CABIN MORE RIDGED. THEY ARE INSET INTO THE DECK FRAMING AND HAVE BEEN EPOXIED AND SANDED SMOOTH, INSIDE AS WELL AS OUTSIDE.

THE HULL HAS BEEN FAIRED AS WELL AS CAN BE AND IS AWAITING FINAL COATS OF PAINT. THE BOTTOM NEEDS ONE MORE GO OVER WITH SIKAFLEX AND IT ALSO WILL BE READY FOR PAINTING. THE NEXT BIG STEP WILL BE THE FRAMING AND SHEETING OF THE CABIN ITSELF. A LOT WAS ACCOMPLISHED IN JANUARY AND BY THE END OF THIS MONTH THE BOAT SHOULD BE COMPLETELY ENCLOSED.

IF ANYONE KNOWS OF SOMEONE THAT WANTS TO HELP ON THE RULE, WE NEED MORE HANDS. THIS IS BECOMING AS IMPORTANT AS FUND RAISING.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED BY CHUCK DEWITT

Veterans For Peace
Chapter 56
P.O. Box 532
Bayside, CA
95524