Introduction

The United Nations has recognised the right of conscientious objection to military service as part of the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion or belief. However, not all States that retain a system of obligatory military service recognise this right; and even where it is recognised in principle, the provisions or the way they are applied may exclude some conscientious objectors. In either situation, unrecognised conscientious objectors may be classified as draft evaders or deserters, and treated as such (see Box 1).

Unrecognised conscientious objectors may face a wide range of serious implications for their refusal to perform military service. These can include prosecution and imprisonment, sometimes repeatedly, and also burdensome fines. However, governments more commonly promote compliance with military service requirements through other means, rather than prosecution and imprisonment, such as military documentation and the denial of rights and benefits.

There are, therefore, a number of implications beyond prosecution and imprisonment for unrecognised conscientious objectors when they refuse military service, including:

- Acquiring a criminal record
- Lack of necessary identification documentation
- Restrictions on enjoyment of civil rights
- Limited employment opportunities
- Inability to access or complete education
- Restrictions on freedom of movement, including leaving the country
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Box 1
Illustrative Example

Conscientious objector Vahan Bayaty- an was convicted and imprisoned for draft evasion despite sending letters to the General Prosecutor, the Military Commissioner and the Human Rights Commission of the National Assembly when he was summoned to serve, stating his objection to military service:

“I, Vahan Bayatyan, born in 1983, inform you that I have studied the Bible since 1996 and have trained my conscience by the Bible in harmony with the words of Isaiah 2:4, and I consciously refuse to perform military service.”

The European Court of Human Rights found that there had been a violation of the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion.
Consequences of having a criminal record

Criminal prosecution and conviction of conscientious objectors can result in a criminal record, leading to life-long societal and economic disadvantage. The Human Rights Committee has expressed concern that “convicted conscientious objectors bear the stigma of a criminal record”.

Conscientious objectors with criminal records are particularly disadvantaged in terms of employment opportunities, in both the public and private sectors. For instance, they may be ineligible for appointment to public office or for work with private employers. A representative of the Jehovah's Witnesses, a religious group known for their conscientious objection to military service, suggests that it is thus “nearly impossible” for conscientious objectors with a criminal record to find employment, particularly in the public sector or with larger corporations. In addition, conscientious objectors can be disbarred from practicing certain professions following conviction, as in the case of Iakovos Thilemmenos (see Box 2).

In addition, conscientious objectors may face further problems following criminal conviction. For instance, some have been refused residency, which makes them unable to vote and ineligible for election. Other conscientious objectors face similar problems enjoying these rights if they have been imprisoned for a certain length of time, or are involved in on-going legal proceedings.

The Human Rights Committee has called on States to expunge criminal records when convictions resulted from conscientious objection to military service.

Lack of military or other identity documentation

To ensure compliance with military service requirements, governments often use a system of military documentation. Known in Latin America as the *libreta militar*, a certificate of military service is issued in other regions, notably Eastern Europe. These act as proof that an individual has adhered to military service requirements, but is often also an essential document necessary to enjoy basic rights. Such military documentation is used as a form of identity documentation in itself or can be integrated into the national system of identity documentation; for example, the military registration number can be included on identity documents. Alternatively, military documentation is sometimes required in order to be issued with identity documents, such as identity cards or passports. For example, some conscientious objectors have been refused identity documents as they did not have a required document of registration from the military commissariat.

Conscientious objectors may, therefore, be unable to obtain military or other identity documentation because they have not complied with military service requirements.

Sometimes conscientious objectors are entitled to identity documentation, even without military documentation, but are reluctant to seek such documents for fear of alerting the authorities to their

---

Box 2

Illustrative Example

Iakovos Thlimmenos, was disbarred from practicing as an accountant because he had a criminal conviction for a “serious crime”, after he disobeyed an order to wear military uniform.

The European Court of Human Rights considered that “a conviction for refusing on religious or philosophical grounds to wear the military uniform cannot imply any dishonesty or moral turpitude likely to undermine the offender's ability to exercise this profession”.

The Court found that Thlimmenos was a victim of discrimination (Art. 14) and there had been a violation of his right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Art. 9).
presence, thereby risking arrest and forced recruitment. Without military or other identity documentation, conscientious objectors may be unable to:

- Obtain employment
- Matriculate, graduate or obtain a degree from university
- Own property
- Open a bank account
- Register residency
- Vote or be eligible for election
- Access civil registration
- Leave their country

Military or other identity documentation is often a requirement for employment in both the public and private sectors. In one example from Latin America, military documentation is required specifically to start an administrative career or to take a post in public office, and no national or foreign company is allowed by law to employ male citizens who have not complied with military service requirements.

Alternatively, in a Central Asian State, citizens often need a stamp from the military commissariat to obtain a work permit, which can be refused in the case of conscientious objectors. In such situations, conscientious objectors are unable to find work legally, which has a number of negative implications for individuals and their families, and often results in their exclusion from the formal economy. Conscientious objectors may not be able to pursue an education as documentation is often required in order to matriculate, graduate or be awarded a degree from university.

In one case, completion of military service is a formal requirement in order to graduate from university, but in practice universities sometimes also require students to show military documentation upon registration for their studies. These types of restrictions often limit conscientious objectors' ability to obtain professional qualifications.

Furthermore, if conscientious objectors are unable to obtain the necessary documentation, they may be unable to legally own property, obtain legal recognition of land purchases, open a bank account and other such activities that require documentation from the State.

Similarly, conscientious objectors may not be able to register their residency, which in turn results in exclusion from the electoral register and denial of the right to vote. Such exclusion of conscientious objectors can also occur if they do not have military documentation, such as the *libreta militar*. In 2012, the Human Rights Committee expressed concern that conscientious objectors were "practically deprived of their civil and political rights" and specifically mentioned the right to vote.

---

* The difficulties that conscientious objectors face in securing employment due to lack of military or other identity documentation is separate from those problems resulting from criminal prosecution and criminal records, which is discussed above.
Lack of military or other identity documentation has implications for civil registration, including the registration of marriage, legal recognition of a child and such documents can even be required in order to obtain or replace birth registration as an adult. Restriction on civil registration not only affects conscientious objectors themselves but can affect entire communities, including children (see Box 5).

Finally, without military or other forms of identity documents, conscientious objectors are prevented from moving freely. For instance, they may not be able to purchase tickets for travel that would allow them to move internally or leave the country. Military documentation is often required in order to leave the country, either as a necessary document in itself, or in order to be issued with a passport.

The Human Rights Committee, in 2012, expressed concern that by refusing to undertake military service, conscientious objectors were deprived of their freedom of movement. Restrictions on leaving the country also make it more difficult to flee and seek protection abroad as a refugee.

In summation, without military or other identity documentation, it is impossible for conscientious objectors to participate fully in public and political life and otherwise enjoy the rights and benefits associated with citizenship (see Box 6).

The example of Ecuador shows that it is possible to abolish the use of military documentation (see Box 7).

---

**Box 5**

**Illustrative Example**

In one case highlighted by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, twin daughters of a Syrian father and Jordanian mother, Rasha and Lina, were at risk of becoming stateless when their father was detained for refusing compulsory military service and their mother fled Syria.

Under discriminatory nationality laws their mother was unable to confer nationality, and although the children were entitled to Syrian nationality from their father, they did not have the necessary evidence, such as marriage registration.

The children had a number of serious health problems at birth but, as a result of being unregistered, did not qualify for free assistance at public hospitals.

---

**Box 6**

**Illustrative Example**

Osman Murat Ülke was unable to legally marry his partner or to legally recognise their child as a result of his conscientious objection to military service. In fear of prosecution and imprisonment, Ülke lived in hiding, had no official address and broke off all contact with administrative authorities.

The European Court of Human Rights described this “clandestine life” as amounting “almost to civil death”.

In the aggregate, these measures, including repeated prosecution and imprisonment, were found by the Court to constitute inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (Article 3).

---

**Box 7**

**Positive Development**

In a recent positive development, Ecuador reported to the Human Rights Committee that military documentation, the *libreta militar*, was no longer required:

“[T]he libreta militar, which certified the completion of service in the Armed Forces, and without which no-one could exercise the aforementioned rights, is no longer a prerequisite for men to travel, study, drive etc.

Moreover the libreta militar is in disuse and all the regulations concerning its issue and use have been repealed.”
Alternatively, it is possible to make provisions for conscientious objection, as in the examples of Serbia, Croatia and Paraguay (see Box 8), through which those who object to military service are given the correct and necessary documentation.

**Box 8
Positive Development**

When the right to conscientious objection to military service was recognised in Paraguay, an additional document was incorporated into the national system of military documentation: the *carné de objector*.41

**Additional Issues**

Beyond the question of criminal records or lack of necessary documentation, conscientious objectors may face additional, broader implications when they refuse military service, such as discrimination in employment and other financial implications, restrictions on freedom of movement and on freedom of opinion and expression.

In particular, conscientious objectors face other forms of discrimination, particularly when it comes to securing employment. They may be ineligible for work in public organisations, the civil service or the police; and, they may be deprived of official business permits and licences.44

Discrimination in terms of employment may also happen informally, even if such discrimination is unlawful. In practice, employers may include military service in job specifications and as a condition for acceptance. In a more subtle form of discrimination, conscientious objectors have been refused employment on the grounds that they do not have necessary skills or qualities without military experience.48

Those who have not completed military service may have to pay more in taxes. Conscientious objectors may also lose their eligibility for government benefits and subsidies, including mortgage loans, government housing and ration coupons for essential items. In addition, conscientious objectors may not be entitled to social security payments at the same level and under the same conditions as those who have served in the military.51

In some cases, all citizens deemed eligible for military service are restricted from leaving the country. In one example, the following groups are commonly denied exit visas: men under the age of 54 years, women under 27, children over the age of 11 and Jehovah’s Witnesses in particular. Otherwise, restrictions on leaving the country refer specifically to draft evaders or deserters; for instance, individuals considered to be draft evaders may not be allowed to work on ships that sail outside of national waters.55

**Box 9
Personal Experience**

According to a conscientious objector in Greece, “There are only a handful of objectors; most young men are afraid to refuse service. They are afraid they will have to face jail, and that they would not be able to work or have a passport – you can’t travel abroad if you are a total CO [conscientious objector].”56

Internal movement is sometimes also restricted. In one Central Asian State, conscientious objectors are subjected to curfews and restricted from travelling outside their city of residence under suspended sentences. In another case, the movement of all citizens eligible for military service is restricted, and citizens can be stopped, arrested and detained at any time.58

Furthermore, conscientious objectors are not always able to exercise their freedom of opinion and expression. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights has expressed concern about restrictions on freedom of expression for those who support conscientious objectors and the right of conscientious objection. Under the Penal Code in one case, conscientious objectors can be convicted and imprisoned for “alienating the people from the military”, if their statements or conduct “encourage and
inspire people to desert or not to participate in military service”. Similarly, in another case, incitement to conscientious objection is treated as a serious crime; the Criminal Code states “Those who have formed or joined a criminal organization with the purpose of refusing the military service or a legal obligation to pay taxes shall be sentenced to imprisonment for up to ten years or to the penalty fine”.

Similarly, in another case, incitement to conscientious objection is treated as a serious crime; the Criminal Code states “Those who have formed or joined a criminal organization with the purpose of refusing the military service or a legal obligation to pay taxes shall be sentenced to imprisonment for up to ten years or to the penalty fine”.

In 2012, the Human Rights Committee expressed concern that such provisions were “adversely affecting freedom of expression”, as human rights defenders and media professionals were subjected to conviction. There are also concerns that arrests and prosecution of conscientious objectors and human rights defenders are being used as a form of harassment or intimidation intended to deter political activity and suppress freedom of opinion and expression.

As described above, individuals are affected in numerous ways, when they object to military service and the right of conscientious objection is not recognised or implemented. However, sometimes ethnic or religious minorities are subject to particular discrimination as a group due to their members’ conscientious objection to military service.

The Jehovah’s Witnesses often face such discrimination; in one case, this religious minority was banned, with conscientious objection to military service given as a primary reason for the ban. Other forms of discriminatory treatment against Jehovah’s Witnesses are highlighted in this one case, where they faced: dismissal from the civil service and loss of eligibility for government-sector jobs; eviction from and loss of eligibility for government-owned housing; denial of identity documents and passports; denial of exit visas; and the revocation of citizenship. Citizenship has also been withheld from men of a particular ethnic minority, Meskhetians, who have delayed or avoided military service in one Central Asian state.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

When the right of conscientious objection to military service is not fully recognised and implemented in practice nationally, conscientious objectors may face a number of negative and serious implications when they refuse to perform military service. It is important to understand the full range of these implications, from prosecution to imprisonment, criminal records and a lack of military or other identity documents. Such implications make it difficult for conscientious objectors to secure employment, pursue an education, move freely, exercise their right to vote and otherwise participate fully in public and political life.

International standards prohibit discrimination against conscientious objectors because they have refused military service, in relation to any civil, cultural, economic, political, or social rights.

The UN Human Rights Council adopted, by consensus, a resolution on the right of conscientious objection, which stated that, “States, in their law and in practice, must not discriminate against conscientious objectors in relation to their terms or conditions of service, or any economic, social, cultural, civil or political rights”.

Furthermore, the Human Rights Committee states in General Comment No. 22 that, “there shall be no discrimination against conscientious objectors because they have failed to perform military service”.

To conclude, international standards recognise the right of conscientious objection to military service, and also prohibit discrimination against conscientious objectors because they have refused military service. States, therefore, have a duty to make provision for conscientious objectors to military service, including in relation to their enjoyment of the right to non-discrimination and civil, cultural, economic, political, or social rights.
For more information on international standards, how these can be used and the relevant human rights mechanisms available to conscientious objectors who are struggling for recognition of the right of conscientious objection or against discrimination, please see the Conscientious Objector’s Guide to the International Human Rights System, which can be found at: www.co-guide.info

This online, interactive guide was produced by War Resisters’ International, the Quaker United Nations Office, Conscience Peace Tax International and Centre for Civil and Political Rights.
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