
Subject: Re: American soldiers and their stories
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Tue, 05 Sep 2006 20:32:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

f100d3d wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006 19:21DarkDemin
I want to make clear what deserted means. They could have left there post for an hour and the CO could have walked up to check on him reported that he was not there and found out he just walked away for an hour to take a dump. Most times "deserters" are people who go home for a unscheduled leave to see family and come back and find out someone fucked up the dates on their leave sheet.

You are COMPLETELY wrong.

For those that do not already know, the US military is governed by a separate code of laws/ethics known as the UCMJ (Uniform Code of Military Justice). Under this code of laws we (myself, being a military veteren) may also be tried TWICE for the SAME crime unlike most civilians (also known as 'Double Jeopardy'). The UCMJ is divided into articles which define these laws in explicit detail. Article 85 of the UCMJ [MCM/Manual for Courts Martial] outlines Desertion which is often confused with going AWOL. Article 86 defines UA/AWOL (Unauthorized Absence/Absence WithOut Leave).

Reference:-----
<http://usmilitary.about.com/od/punitivearticles/a/mcm85.htm>
<http://usmilitary.about.com/od/punitivearticles/a/mcm86.htm>

So if someone is going to go take a dump without being authorized, and it met the criteria of an Article 86 violation - they would be charged with UA/AWOL; not desertion.

If someone were to go on leave (which for the record must be approved first through a leave chit that is signed by your entire chain of command) and something was done in error by your chain of command - you would not be charged with anything. If you were late one minute back from leave OR if you were to blame for the miscommunication falsified information you would be charged with violating article 86 (not desertion).

As for the topic at hand, though I do not appreciate the media getting too involved in a war they don't understand ... it is freedom of speech and expression to say and feel whatever they'd like about this war. And when I was in a combat zone I was defending that same right for them to say I was wasting my time. And I accept that because that is what America is all about.

But if someone wants to desert their post, especially in a time of war, or blatantly refuse to serve ... I think they should be shot. Extreme? Maybe to some civilians who are ignorant to these wars and what they're all about. These [wannabe] soldiers took an oath and committed their life to serve their country and all it stands for. They explicitly announce their loyalty to their commanding officers and those who are appointed over them. This is a volunteer military (even those who were taken from the reserves). If you want to whine about geopolitics and aren't willing to die in the 'worst-case-scenario' of going to war ... then do not enlist.

This subject just irritates the hell out of me every time I see it, and I wish the military would stop being so lenient with the jackasses that desert their posts. Be a man (or woman) and do your duty!

Idiot I was going by what most people define it as...
