



Written by [Staff](#) on November 6, 2020

Published in the November 23, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 22

Letters To The Editor

Embarrassed by His Fellows

As a retired brigadier general in the U.S. Marine Corps, I have proffered charges against other retired military officers: They should be court-martialed for comments against the president. I submitted the following letter to the Secretary of Defense on September 18, 2020, and have had no response from him to date:

Preferral of charges: I am writing you to bring charges under the UCMJ [Uniform Code of Military Justice] against currently retired officers of the military within the Department of Defense, and hereby request you initiate the necessary actions to bring these (and any others uncovered who did likewise) officers to face trial under Article 88 of the Code, Contempt toward officials, which specifically states: "Any commissioned officer who uses contemptuous words against the President, the Vice President, Congress, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of a military department, the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the Governor or legislature of any State, Commonwealth, or possession in which he is on duty or present shall be punished as a court-martial may direct."

The Supreme Court, as recently as 2019, has refused to review military cases brought against "retired military under the UCMJ," effectively supporting such cases as being constitutional.... In each of the cases against these individuals, they have made strong and readily available public remarks against the president. I will not attempt to list here each incident, but will leave that up to the DOD Legal Counsel to produce in preparing the official charges against each office.

Gen. James Mattis USMC (Ret.); Former Sec. of Defense

Gen. John Allen USMC (Ret.); Former commander of U.S. forces Afghanistan

Adm. Mike Mullen USN (Ret.); Former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

Adm. William McRaven USN (Ret.); Former commander U.S. Special Ops Cmd

Gen. Merrill McPeak USAF (Ret.); Former Air Force Chief of Staff

Lt. Col. Alexander Vindman USAF (Ret.); Former Euro Aff Dir, NatSec Council

[They are among the] 55 General Officers who signed the *Washington Post* letter supporting Biden.

Unfortunately, these officers failed to live up to their Oath of Office vs. following the example set by General Joseph Dunford USMC (Ret.), former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when he stated: "I will remain apolitical in retirement — I will not comment on President Trump or his policies in public," he said. "I do believe that retired senior leaders can contribute to shaping defense policy, but that can be done without engaging in partisan politics.... Individuals who believe they must act in a manner inconsistent with our ethos must weigh the perceived need to speak out with the potential damage to the institution of the U.S. military. As a matter of routine, nearly 80 percent of the American people trust the U.S. military.... That is in large part because we are not seen as Democrats or Republicans. We are seen as Americans who take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States."

The named officers, and others that may be added to the list, have violated the above stated "trust" and **MUST FACE THE CONSEQUENCES OF THEIR ACTIONS!** Dismissal, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for up to one (1) year are the possible penalties for a violation of Article 88.

I hereby certify that I am a retired military officer, drawing retirement pay, subject to the UCMJ, and



Written by [Staff](#) on November 6, 2020

Published in the November 23, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 22

therefore qualify under Article 2 of the UCMJ to bring these charges against the named, and unnamed who qualify, individual officers.

Brigadier General Albert E. Brewster USMC (Ret.)
Frisco, Texas

New York Courts

There was an error in the August 24 Inside Track entitled "Court Orders Release of NYC Gun Owners' Private Info": It was not *the* New York Supreme Court, but *a* New York Supreme Court in New York City.

There are many "Supreme" Courts in New York State. In the other 49 states, they are called Superior Courts, but New York likes to be confusing.

Brad Spooner
Sent via e-mail



Written by [Staff](#) on November 6, 2020

Published in the November 23, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 22

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.