

Agreement between Harold Saive and the Gainesville Chapter of Veterans for Peace

1. I, Harold Saive, agree to resign from Veterans for Peace.
2. I, Harold Saive, agree to stop using the Veterans for Peace logo.
3. I, Harold Saive, agree to stop advertising myself as a member of Veterans for Peace.
4. I, Harold Saive, agree to stop bashing, complaining about or referencing Veterans for Peace.
5. In exchange, the Gainesville Chapter of Veterans for Peace will refund my membership dues and buy back my T-shirt and signs.

Signature:

Date:

Witnessed by:

Signature:

Date:

Signature:

Date:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "Harold Saive", written over a faint horizontal line.

Special Board meeting with Harold Saive to resolve the problems between Harold Saive and the Chapter.

1) The Board has made a preliminary finding that Harold Saive has violated Article II. Statement of Purpose, of the Veterans for Peace By Laws.

ARTICLE II. 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

- (a) Toward increasing public awareness of the costs of war
- (b) To restrain our government from intervening, overtly and covertly, in the internal affairs of other nations
- (c) To end the arms race and to reduce and eventually eliminate nuclear weapons
- (d) To seek justice for veterans and victims of war
- (e) 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.

2) This finding is based on the following evidence provided by Harold Saive's own e-mails

A) E-mail dated May 28-2008 (*1)

1. Harold makes the claim;

"FYI,

For no reason, and without authority, Pierce Butler has kicked an active and paid-up volunteer member off the VFP Yahoo list.

HWS"

2. Harold copies the e-mail to an outside organization, **The Bill of Rights Defense Committee in**

Washington DC.

"ben Gosscup-VFP" <ben@bordc.org>"

B) E-mail dated May 20-2008 (2*)

1. Harold asks to be taken off the list;

Mr. list owner

You have succeeded in shutting me up.
I have removed my subscription from your personal toy.

HWS

2. We find Harold's Claim to be false, he asked to be taken off the list, the false claim is divisive and creates controversy for the group.

C) E-Mail Dated May 18, 2008 9:46:48 AM EDT (3*)

1. Harold Copies E-Mail to a City of Gainesville Address, there by making it public information.

"Kurt Lannon" <lannonkm@ci.gainesville.fl.us>

2) We find that Harold making this e-Mail Public Record undermines our Group's hard earned credibility in the community.

D) E-Mail Dated May 18, 2008 9:06:42 AM EDT (4*)

1. Scott Camil the chapter coordinator is Jewish, We find that the following quote has racial undertones that we find unacceptable.

"For example - Those Americans with a Jewish heritage could be afraid to use the 9/11 justice issue if so much evidence points to the IDF, Zionists or Israelis as the culprits. This is understandable and could cause some Jews to be fearful enough that they could act as defacto (un-intentional) "gatekeepers" to advocating a 9/11 investigation for fear that it would demonize their families and innocent Jews most of who stand with the rest of us in pursuit of Peace.

If this is the issue in this debate - we should be honest about it."

3) It is the recommendation of the Board to ask Harold to resign from the Gainesville Chapter of Veterans for Peace.

If Harold refuses, we give him this opportunity to convince the Board that he can be trusted to act in the best interest of the Group putting the Chapter's agenda before his own and why his conduct should be considered acceptable.

While there is interest by individual members in exploring issues such as the 9/11 destruction of the World Trade Center and its occupants, we believe that our strength lies in the fact that we are veterans and experts on issues of war and wars of occupation. When we argue other issues, such as 9/11, it dilutes our credibility. For instance, we are not experts on how buildings fall.

If Harold cannot convince the board that he should be allowed to stay in the chapter and refuses to resign, the Board will expel him.

The Board recognizes that Harold can be a great asset when he wants to be, but the divisiveness connected with him being an instigator of problems (of which we only address a few here), far out-weigh his contributions.

For the sake of brevity and not to be considered going for overkill, we have raised these issues which we believe constitute enough reason to officially remove Harold from the Chapter.

For the Board,
Scott Camil
Chapter Coordinator.

Documentation.

(*1)

From: <Mail@Saive.com>

Date: May 28, 2008 5:39:19 PM EDT

To: "Geoffrey Stetson-VFP" <gstet@comcast.net>

Cc: "Scott Camil-VFP" <s.camil@att.net>, "Pierce Butler-VFP" <pbutler@igc.org>, "Mary Bahr-VFP" <kmlisle.mary@gmail.com>, "KU VFP" <kuoyuw@acer-access.com>, "John Fullerton-VFP" <jfullerton3@cox.net>, <jacquebetz@msn.com>, "Isolt VFP" <isolt@bellsouth.net>, "Bill Warrick-VFP" <asavetmd@gmail.com>, "Bill Gilbert-VFP" <gilberts718@hotmail.com>, "ben Gosscup-VFP" <ben@bordc.org>

Subject: Denial of due process

Reply-To: <Mail@Saive.com>

FYI,

For no reason, and without authority, Pierce Butler has kicked an active and paid-up volunteer member off the VFP Yahoo list.

HWS

(2*)

HAROLDS E-MAIL ASKING TO BE TAKEN OFF THE LIST

From: <Mail@Saive.com>

To: "Pierce R. Butler" <pbutler@igc.org>

Cc: "Mary Bahr-VFP" <kmlisle.mary@gmail.com>, "Scott Camil-VFP" <s.camil@att.net>

Subject: Re: VFP listserv

Date: Tue, 20 May 2008 19:14:00 -0400

Mr. list owner

You have succeeded in shutting me up.
I have removed my subscription from your personal toy.

HWS

(3*)

From: <Mail@Saive.com>

Date: May 18, 2008 9:46:48 AM EDT

To: "Scott Camil" <s.camil@att.net>

Cc: "Bill Warrick" <asavetmd@gmail.com>, "Mary Bahr-VFP" <kmlisle.mary@gmail.com>, "Kurt Lannon" <lannonkm@ci.gainesville.fl.us>, "John Fullerton-VFP" <jfullerton3@cox.net>

Subject: Re: Gatekeepers to Peace

Reply-To: <Mail@Saive.com>

Harold no one told you to move to a different corner, that is a lie.

You were asked.

Scott"Asking" doesn't change the breach of process. You should have held the issue until the next VFP meeting

but you chose to insult my freind without remorse. In your case - asking is not that different than "ordering".

I told you if you did not want to separate that we would do our picketing a different day.
I never heard that.

The sign you placed in the ground in front of me said 911 was an inside job,
that is different than "Investigate 9/11" the sign that you held.

I don't know what the driver saw. He expressed an issue with the sign I was holding.
A sign that says "9/11 was an inside job " is no more illegal or radical than any other sign on the corner
including the multitude of Ku's fine collection. If you think it is - **explain how.**

The real problem is you just like controversy and will always cross the line to create it.
Wrong: I hate controversy. Protecting the First Amendment is not crossing the line - It's a duty.
Authors of the First Amendment never guaranteed it would be fun.

When your on your meds you do fine when your not, watch out.
That's an un-founded smear tactic not unlike what Joe and Jenny did to my Iguana ad.
Where do you learn this shit?

I don't drink, take dope, or smoke it.
Perhaps that explains who's observations are addled vs. whose are lucid.

Scott, I have enormous respect and love for what you do except when you play the part of "the enemy"

HWS

(4*)
From: <Mail@Saive.com>
Date: May 18, 2008 9:06:42 AM EDT
To: "Mary Bahr" <kmlisle@yahoo.com>, "Scott Camil" <s.camil@att.net>
Cc: <VFP@mta356.mail.re4.yahoo.com>, <Board@mta356.mail.re4.yahoo.com>, "Bob Ivey"
<bobivey@gru.net>, "KU VFP" <kuoyuw@acer-access.com>
Subject: Re: Gatekeepers to Peace
Reply-To: <Mail@Saive.com>

This is my final comment.

FACT: I sent the original complaint only to a few people who were at the corner. Scott sent it around to everyone.

This issue **WAS** discussed and , I thought - resolved at a VFP meeting but Scott decided it would be easier to act as a dictator and insult my friend, Bob Ivey who was only there because I was there. I spent \$27.00 on the sign I was holding because the VFP chapter agreed - in principal - on a resolution to call for a new 9/11 investigation. The sign says: **"Support the Troops - Investigate 9/11"** . Duh?

This issue was unfairly pinned on me when Scott could not tell the driver the facts even though he is well versed on the issue.

I did not argue with the driver as Scott alleges he "heard". As the driver was pulling away, I pointed at my sign and shouted "This is a False Flag". The driver had ample time to pull into the station and talk to me but chose to gass-on, instead.

I never anticipated that a driver would stop to complain about a sign that another picketer was

holding. That was a surprise. I still believe the driver could have been a professional agitator (CIA). His technique to divide the group was successful, after all.

But I had the answer for the driver and a flyer that explains the goal: **Bring the Troops home to a sustainable Peace with a criminal investigation of 9/11** (ie: Nuremberg) It goes one small but important step beyond "Bring the Troops Home"...and is not a giant intellectual leap. It also addresses Scott's stated concern that "*..the government is doing to this generation what they did to my generation...*"

Why would we want to Bring the Troops Home so that a future False Flag would serve to send our Troops to another phony war? And in contrast to a few of Ku's signs, mine is neither more or less radical or obscure.

I use email to gripe about this stuff when members who support Scott "*right-or-wrong*" jump in with rhetoric that derails the point of debate.

The real problem here is that nobody wants to be honest about why they don't want to be **seen** in support of a criminal investigation of 9/11.

Perhaps this is an overlooked element of the overall Psy-ops of 9/11 that is suppressing effective dissent. (?)

For example - Those Americans with a Jewish heritage could be afraid to use the 9/11 justice issue if so much evidence points to the IDF, Zionists or Israelis as the culprits. This is understandable and could cause some Jews to be fearful enough that they could act as defacto (un-intentional) "gatekeepers" to advocating a 9/11 investigation for fear that it would demonize their families and innocent Jews most of who stand with the rest of us in pursuit of Peace.

If this is the issue in this debate - we should be honest about it.

It is reprehensible that neo-con Zionists use the peaceful Jewish population as "human shields" to get away with murder. This continues to be a real issue that cannot be ignored.

I love you all but I've earned the First Amendment right of free speech and I will not allow even my best friends to get away with telling me to "**shut up**". Joe Courter tried it and some of you came dangerously close to defending his right to do it.

Is that the Home we want the Troops to come return to?

HWS