



SUBMISSION

TO THE 50th SESSION OF THE UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**Conscientious objection to military service,
juvenile recruitment and related issues**

1

Updated April 2025

Contact:
Zaira Zafarana
International advocacy coordinator
zaira.zafarana@connection-ev.org

INTRODUCTION

1. This submission focuses on the right to conscientious objection to military service, juvenile recruitment and related issues. These issues are highly important in the case of the United States of America, taking into consideration the size of its armed forces and the frequent involvement in military interventions and armed conflicts abroad.

PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

2. Despite having been repeatedly highlighted by civil society organisations,¹ it appears that the issue of conscientious objection to military service has not been adequately addressed, so far, in the context of the UPR of the United States of America. A recommendation in the 2nd Cycle about "conscientious objection" in relation to religious freedom,² which was supported,³ is unclear whether it refers (also) to conscientious objection **to military service**.
3. As for juvenile recruitment, the State under review has received repeated recommendations to:
"Increase the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the armed forces to 18 years, and criminalize explicitly the violation of the provisions of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict".⁴ However, such recommendations have been not supported.⁵

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION TO MILITARY SERVICE

2

4. Although the State under review does not currently enforce compulsory military service, the issue of the right to conscientious objection to military service is still valid as far as it concerns professional members of the armed forces who have been enlisted voluntarily.
5. Current regulations provide for conscientious objection for professional members of the armed forces; however, the provisions are inadequate, fall short of international human rights law and standards and occasionally result in serious violations of the human rights of conscientious objectors, including **imprisonment**.
6. The main document regulating conscientious objection to military service for serving members of the armed forces is the Department of Defence Instruction 1300.06 (hereinafter DoD Instruction).⁶ Each branch of the armed forces has its own regulations based on the DoD Instruction.⁷
7. **The primary problem of the regulations is their definition of conscientious objection** [to military service] as "Opposition to participating in any form of war or the bearing of arms due to sincerely held morals, ethical or religious beliefs, or a combination of such beliefs". As it is explicitly stated in the DoD Instruction, "The clause 'war in any form' should be interpreted in the following manner: An individual who desires to choose a specific war in which to participate is not a conscientious objector under the law. The individual's objection must be to all wars rather than a specific war". This severely contravenes⁸ international human rights standards about conscientious objection to military service, specifically, those about selective conscientious objection (see below).

8. Furthermore, according to the DoD Instruction, "Deeply held moral or ethical beliefs should be valued with the strength and devotion of traditional religious conviction. The term 'religious, moral, or ethical belief' does not include a belief that rests solely upon considerations of policy, pragmatism, expediency, or political views". This means that conscientious objectors who object wars that they consider as wars of aggression, may be considered as grounding their objection on "political views" and therefore, not considered as conscientious objectors.
9. In addition, "The burden of establishing a claim of conscientious objection as a ground for separation or assignment to non-combatant training and service is on the applicant. To this end, the applicant must establish by clear and convincing evidence that:
- (1) The nature or basis of the claim falls within the definition of and criteria prescribed herein for conscientious objection.
 - (2) Their belief in connection therewith is firm, fixed, sincere, and deeply held."
- Therefore, it's the applicant who must prove that he/she is sincere, which is virtually impossible, and not the military authorities that someone is not.
10. Moreover, acquiring conscientious objector status becomes even more difficult since the DoD Instruction notes that "Mere affiliation with religious organizations or other groups that advocate conscientious objection as a tenet of its creed may not necessarily determine an applicant's position or belief or signify the accuracy of the applicant's claim".
11. The other very important problem is that "A Request for discharge or assignment to non-combatant training or service based on conscientious objection will be handled on an individual basis with the final determination made at the headquarters of the Military₃ Department concerned in accordance with the policy and procedures found in this issuance". As cited by the GI Rights Hotline: "The entire packet goes up the chain of command, ultimately getting to Headquarters where a CO review board will decide whether to approve or reject your application."⁹ Therefore, **the body considering applications is a military one.**
12. Further concerns arise because of the reported:
- lack of adequate information (or occasionally, misinformation),
 - lengthy procedures,
 - and the so called "stop-loss" orders, i.e., involuntary extensions of soldiers' enlistment terms. It has been reported that, between 2002 and 2007, 58,300 soldiers were given stop-loss orders, forcing them to remain in the service past the end of their enlistment periods.¹⁰
13. A combination of the above problems has resulted in serious incidents and occasionally even led to imprisonment of conscientious objectors.
- The difficulties in acquiring release on grounds of conscientious objection to military service are highlighted in the case of Michael Izbicki,¹¹ who, after two unsuccessful applications, had to file a habeas corpus petition in federal court,¹² with the help of American Civil Liberties Union, before being discharged in February 2011.
14. Throughout the years, Amnesty International has highlighted many individual cases of imprisoned (or at risk of imprisonment, including asylum seekers) conscientious objectors, recognising them as (possible) "prisoners of conscience" , such as Kimberly Rivera,¹³ Travis

Bishop,¹⁴ Matthew Lowell,¹⁵ James Corey Glass,¹⁶ Mark Lee Wilkerson,¹⁷ Agustín Aguayo,¹⁸ Kevin Benderman,¹⁹ Jeremy Hinzman,²⁰ Pablo Paredes,²¹ Abdullah William Webster,²² Camilo Mejia Castillo,²³ and, previously, Yolanda Huet-Vaughn²⁴ and George Morse.²⁵ Other organisations, like War Resisters' International, have highlighted further individual cases, such as those of Justin Colby,²⁶ Rodney Watson,²⁷ Victor Agosto,²⁸ Cliff Cornell,²⁹ and Tony Anderson.³⁰

15. One of the most highlighted cases is the one of Kimberly Rivera, which was also undertaken by the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, and the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief. "In early 2007, while Ms. Kimberly Rivera was on leave from her deployment to Iraq, she reportedly left the army without authorization. It was reported that she went to Canada after she decided that she could not participate in the war in Iraq or other conflicts for conscientious objection reasons. When Ms. Rivera was in Canada, she publicly spoke out about her objection to the conflict in Iraq. Her application for protection as a refugee in Canada was allegedly rejected on appeal and Ms. Rivera was subsequently deported back to the United States where she has been reportedly detained by the US military authorities since 20 September 2012, after being arrested for desertion from the army." ³¹ Ms. Rivera was sentenced to 14 months imprisonment, reduced to 10 months under the terms of a plea agreement. She was also given a bad conduct discharge from the army.³² Ms. Rivera even gave birth of her fifth child while in custody.³³

Applicable international human rights standards

4

• Inherent to the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion

16. According to the UN Human Rights Committee, "The right to conscientious objection to military service inheres in the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. It entitles any individual to an exemption from compulsory military service if this cannot be reconciled with that individual's religion or beliefs. The right must not be impaired by coercion." ³⁴

• Encompassing selective objection to military service

17. According to the UNHCR: "Conscientious objection to military service refers to an objection to such service which "derives from principles and reasons of conscience, including profound convictions, arising from religious, moral, ethical, humanitarian or similar motives."³⁵ Such an objection is not confined to absolute conscientious objectors [pacifists], that is, those who object to all use of armed force or participation in all wars. It also encompasses those who believe that "the use of force is justified in some circumstances but not in others, and that therefore it is necessary to object in those other cases" [partial or selective objection to military service].³⁶ A conscientious objection may develop over time, and thus volunteers may at some stage also raise claims based on conscientious objection, whether absolute or partial."³⁷
18. According to the minimum international standards as set by the OHCHR: "The right to object also applies to selective objectors who believe that the use of force is justified in some circumstances but not in others."³⁸

- **Independence and impartiality of the decision-making process**

19. According to OHCHR standards:
- “(h) No inquiry process is required by international law and consideration should be given to accepting claims of conscientious objection to military service as valid without such a process;
 - (i) States that do not accept claims of conscientious objection as valid without an inquiry should establish independent and impartial bodies under the full control of the civilian authorities”.³⁹
20. Furthermore:
- “(k) The process for consideration of any claim of conscientious objection should be timely and all duties involving the bearing of arms should be suspended pending the decision;
 - (l) After any decision on conscientious objector status, there should always be a right to appeal to an independent civilian judicial body”.⁴⁰

JUVENILE RECRUITMENT AND RELATED ISSUES

21. The United States of America has not ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child, despite numerous recommendations. However, it has ratified (albeit with a declaration and “understandings”⁴¹) the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the involvement of children in armed conflicts. This provides the opportunity for periodic reports to the CRC, which issues relevant recommendations.
22. In its latest Concluding Observations, in 2017, the Committee has stated, inter alia:
- “The Committee regrets that the State party has taken limited actions towards reviewing and amending its legislation, in particular with regard to the prohibition of recruitment of children between the ages of 15 to 18 years”.*⁴²
23. Concerning **reservations**:
- “8. The Committee regrets that the State party maintains its restrictive interpretation of the provisions of the Optional Protocol lodged as “understandings”, in particular in relation to the definition of “direct part in hostilities” and “minimum age for voluntary recruitment”. [...]*
- 9. The Committee recommends that the State party review its restrictive understanding of the Optional Protocol, in particular, the concept of “direct part in hostilities” and “minimum age of voluntary recruitment” in order to ensure that no child under the age of 18 years is exposed to a situation of armed conflict or any other activities in the context of armed conflict.”*
24. Concerning **voluntary recruitment**:
- “18. While noting the State party’s explanations for maintaining the age of 17 years for the voluntary recruitment to the armed forces, the Committee remains concerned that the State party:*
- (a) Maintains the quota system for military recruiters, which may cast doubt on the voluntary nature of the recruitment of children under the age of 18 years;*
 - (b) Continues to provide military recruiters with access to high school students’ names, addresses and telephone listings, and that parents are not always informed of their rights to opt out or to request not to release such information.*

19. The Committee recommends that the State party:

(a) Reconsider its recruitment policies and practices by, inter alia, amending the No Child Left Behind Act and ensuring that such practices do not actively target persons under the age of 18 years, abolishing the recruiter quota system and ensuring that military recruiters' access to school grounds be limited;

(b) Prohibit the disclosure of information on students without prior expressed parental consent and ensure that recruitment policies and practices are brought into line with the respect for privacy of children;

(c) Continue and strengthen monitoring and oversight of recruiters' irregularities and misconduct by effective investigation, imposition of sanctions and, when necessary, prosecution of recruiter misconduct.

20. The Committee takes note of the information provided by the State party in paragraph 19 of its report that no service members under the age of 18 years have been deployed to areas where hazardous pay and/or imminent danger pay were authorized in the previous three years. Nevertheless, the Committee remains seriously concerned that the current policies and regulations, despite certain safeguards, do allow for the deployment of 17-year-old service members to such areas where they can be requested to perform inherently dangerous duties and may be at risk of direct participation in hostilities.

21. The Committee recommends that the State party take measures to review its policies and regulations in order to ensure that under no circumstances children under the age of 18 years could be deployed to areas where hazardous pay and/or imminent danger pay were authorized."

25. Concerning **military courses**:

6

"22. The Committee takes note of the information provided by the State party (see CRC/C/OPAC/USA/3-4, para. 20) that the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps is a voluntary "elective" course from which students may withdraw at any time. Nevertheless, the Committee remains concerned that:

(a) Despite the State party's assurances, children are reportedly not always properly informed that enrolment into the Corps programme is of a voluntary nature;

(b) The programme continues to be used as a substitute for students enrolled in oversubscribed classes from which children cannot withdraw without losing their course credit (see CRC/C/OPAC/USA/CO/2, para. 24);

(c) Children enrolled in the Corps may be trained to use weapons as admitted by the State party (see CRC/C/OPAC/USA/3-4, para. 20).

23. The Committee therefore reiterates its previous recommendation (see CRC/C/OPAC/USA/CO/2, para. 25) that the State party:

(a) Ensure that families and children are properly informed of the voluntary nature of the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps programme;

(b) Ensure that the Corps is not used as a substitute for oversubscribed regular school courses;

(c) Ban training on the use of firearms for children and ensure that any military training for children takes into account human rights principles and that the educational content is periodically monitored by the Federal Department of Education.

24. The Committee is also concerned that the State party does not seem to monitor the Army Cadet Corps and lacks information on the number of children enrolled and activities undertaken in the Corps, where children as young as 11 years can be enrolled.

25. *The Committee recommends that the State party establish mechanisms to monitor the Army Cadet Corps and provide in its next periodic report data disaggregated by sex, age, ethnic and national origin and socioeconomic background on children enrolled in the Corps and on the type of activities they undertake."*

26. Concerning **criminal legislation and regulations in force:**

"26. The Committee reiterates its concern that the State party's legislation, in particular the 2008 Child Soldiers Accountability Act, criminalizes only the recruitment of children under the age of 15 years, which is not in line with the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol to protect all children under the age of 18 years from involvement in armed conflict. [...]"

27. The Committee recommends that the State party:

(a) Prohibit explicitly and criminalize the use of children under 18 years of age in hostilities by armed forces or by private military and security companies;

(b) Review and harmonize its policies and regulations concerning the activities of private military and security companies with the principles and provisions of the Optional Protocol."

The **State party's 5th Report** indicates a failure, to a great extent, and occasionally even unwillingness to implement the above recommendations.⁴³

SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS

27. Take all necessary measures to adequately recognise in law the right to conscientious objection to military service,
- including selective conscientious objection,
 - accessible to all conscientious objectors without discrimination,
 - and in accordance with the international human rights law and OHCHR and UNHCR standards.
28. Consider accepting claims of conscientious objection to military service as valid without inquiry. If not, place the assessment of conscientious objector status application, including for professional members of the armed forces, under the full control of civilian authorities, to a body having maximum independence and impartiality, without military participation.
29. Increase the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the armed forces to 18 years and criminalize explicitly the violation of the provisions of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict.
30. Implement all the recommendations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child in the context of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict.

¹ E.g. [3rd Cycle] Joint submission 52 submitted by: Center for Global Nonkilling; Conscience and Peace Tax International. See especially in p. 8. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/upr/uprus-stakeholders-info-s36>

[2nd Cycle] A/HRC/WG.6/22/USA/3, 16 February 2015, para. 65. <https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/WG.6/22/USA/3>

Joint submission 37 submitted by: International Fellowship of Reconciliation and Conscience and Peace Tax International. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/upr/uprus-stakeholders-info-s22>

[1st Cycle] A/HRC/WG.6/9/USA/3/Rev.1, 14 October 2010, para. 54. <https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/WG.6/9/USA/3/Rev.1>

Submission by Conscience and Peace Tax International.

https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/lib-docs/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/session9/US/CPTI_ConscienceandPeaceTaxInternational.pdf

² A/HRC/30/12, 20 July 2015, Recommendation 176.308 (Holy See). <https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/30/12>

³ A/HRC/30/12/Add.1, 14 September 2015, para. 6. <https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/30/12/Add.1>

⁴ [2nd Cycle] A/HRC/30/12, 20 July 2015, Recommendation 176.267 (Uruguay). <https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/30/12>

See also a similar recommendation: [1st Cycle] A/HRC/16/11, 4 January 2011, Recommendation 92.71 (Uruguay).

<https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/16/11>

⁵ [2nd Cycle] A/HRC/30/12/Add.1, 14 September 2015, para. 16. <https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/30/12/Add.1>

[1st Cycle] A/HRC/16/11/Add.1, 8 March 2011, para. 30. <https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/16/11/Add.1>

⁶ DoD Instruction 1300.06 Conscientious Objectors (12 July 2017).

https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/130006_dodi_2017.pdf

⁷ Air Force: DAFI36-3211 Military Separations (24 June 2022) Part 5 Conscientious Objector.

https://static.e-publishing.af.mil/production/1/af_a1/publication/dafi36-3211/dafi36-3211.pdf

Army: AR 600-43 (2 March 2023). https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR_pubs/DR_a/ARN32241-AR_600-43-000-WEB-1.pdf

Navy: MILPERSMAN Section 1900-020 (29 Dec 2020) CONVENIENCE OF THE GOVERNMENT SEPARATION BASED ON CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION (ENLISTED AND OFFICERS).

<https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Portals/55/Reference/MILPERSMAN/1000/1900Separation/1900-020.pdf?ver=JTAANA8KjKFTFuOLLyGekQ%3d%3d>

Coast Guard: COMDTINST 1900.8 Conscientious Objectors and the Requirement to Bear Arms (30 Nov 1990).

<https://centeronconscience.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/COMDTINST1900.8.pdf>

Marines: MCO 1306.16F Conscientious Objectors (11 JUN 2013).

<https://www.marines.mil/portals/1/Publications/MCO%201306.16F.pdf>

⁸ See in A/HRC/56/30, 23 April 2024, para. 20, how “The right of selective conscientious objectors to object is consequently protected by international human rights law”, and how the United States of America is cited as an example contrary to that, in note 42. <https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/56/30>

⁹ GI Rights Hotline, “Conscientious Objection, Fact Sheet”.

<https://girightshotline.org/en/military-knowledge-base/conscientious-objection-discharge/>

¹⁰ Julian E. Barnes, “Army ‘stop-loss’ orders up dramatically over last year”, *Los Angeles Times*, 9 May 2008.

<https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2008-may-09-na-stoploss9-story.html>

¹¹ <https://izbicki.me/blog/my-co-discharge.html>

¹² <https://izbicki.me/public/co/izbicki-habeus-petition.pdf>

¹³ Amnesty International, “USA: Further information: Woman detained for conscientious objection: Kimberly Rivera”, 21 September 2012, Index Number: AMR 51/081/2012. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/081/2012/en/>

Amnesty International, “USA: Further information: Possible trial for US conscientious objector: Kimberly Rivera”, 12 December 2012, Index Number: AMR 51/098/2012. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/098/2012/en/>

¹⁴ Amnesty International, “USA: Soldier imprisoned as conscientious objector: Travis Bishop”, 24 August 2009, Index Number: AMR 51/093/2009.

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/093/2009/en/>

Amnesty International, “USA: Further information: Reduction in prison sentence for US soldier”, 10 February 2010, Index Number: AMR 51/015/2010.

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/015/2010/en/>

¹⁵ Amnesty International, “Canada: Possible prisoner of conscience: Matthew Lowell (m)”, 24 October 2008, Index Number: AMR 20/009/2008.

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr20/009/2008/en/>

¹⁶ Amnesty International, “Canada: Prisoner of Conscience: James Corey Glass (m)”, 8 July 2008, Index Number: AMR 20/002/2008.

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr20/002/2008/en/>

¹⁷ Amnesty International, “USA: Prisoner of conscience: Mark Lee Wilkerson (m)”, 28 March 2007 Index Number: AMR 51/053/2007.

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/053/2007/en/>

Amnesty International, “USA: Further information on Prisoner of conscience: Mark Lee Wilkerson (m)”, 2 August 2007, Index Number: AMR 51/129/2007. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/129/2007/en/>

¹⁸ Amnesty International, “USA: Prisoner of conscience: Agustín Aguayo (m)”, 8 March 2007, Index Number: AMR 51/041/2007.

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/041/2007/en/>

¹⁹ Amnesty International, “USA: Further information on Prisoner of conscience, Kevin Benderman (m)”, 22 May 2006, Index Number: AMR 51/083/2006.

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/083/2006/en/>

Amnesty International, “USA: Prisoner of conscience, Kevin Benderman”, 8 August 2005, Index Number: AMR 51/123/2005.

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/123/2005/en/>

²⁰ Amnesty International, “USA: Jeremy Hinzman – Conscientious objector seeking refuge in Canada”, 12 May 2005, Index Number: AMR 51/075/2005. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/075/2005/en/>

- ²¹ Amnesty International, "USA: International Conscientious Objector Day marked by sentencing Pablo Paredes to three months of hard labour", 12 May 2005, Index Number: AMR 51/077/2005. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/077/2005/en/>
- ²² Amnesty International, "USA: Further information on: Prisoner of conscience: Abdullah William Webster", 12 April 2005, Index Number: AMR 51/062/2005. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/062/2005/en/>
 Amnesty International, "USA: Further information on Prisoner of conscience: Abdullah William Webster", 10 March 2005, Index Number: AMR 51/052/2005. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/052/2005/en/>
 Amnesty International, "USA: Prisoner of conscience: Abdullah William Webster", 16 September 2004, Index Number: AMR 51/137/2004. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/137/2004/en/>
- ²³ Amnesty International, "USA (Virginia): Further information on Prisoner of Conscience, Staff Sergeant Camilo Mejia Castillo", 20 July 2004, Index Number: AMR 51/118/2004. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/118/2004/en/>
 Amnesty International, "USA: An urgent call for the release of prisoner of conscience, Camilo Mejia Castillo: An open letter to President George W. Bush", 13 June 2004, Index Number: AMR 51/096/2004. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/096/2004/en/>
 Amnesty International, "USA: Prisoner of Conscience, Staff Sergeant Camilo Mejia Castillo", 2 June 2004, Index Number: AMR 51/092/2004. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/092/2004/en/>
- ²⁴ Amnesty International, "USA: Further information: Prisoner of conscience / conscientious objector: Captain Yolanda Huet-Vaughn", 9 April 1992, Index Number: AMR 51/048/1992. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/048/1992/en/>
 Amnesty International, "USA: Further information: Prisoner of conscience / conscientious objector: Captain Yolanda Huet-Vaughn", 15 January 1992, Index Number: AMR 51/008/1992. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/008/1992/en/>
 Amnesty International, "USA: Further information: Prisoner of conscience / conscientious objector: Captain Yolanda Huet-Vaughn", 27 November 1991, Number: AMR 51/064/1991. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/064/1991/en/>
 Amnesty International, "United States of America: prisoner of conscience / conscientious objector: Captain Yolanda Huet-Vaughn", 8 September 1991, Index Number: AMR 51/037/1991. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/037/1991/en/>
- ²⁵ Amnesty International, "AI News Release: United States of America: Amnesty International takes up conscientious objector as prisoner of conscience", 7 February 1991, Index Number: AMR 51/006/1991. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/amr51/006/1991/en/>
- ²⁶ WRI, "USA: War resister Justin Colby imprisoned", 17 April 2013. <https://wri-irg.org/en/node/21583>
- ²⁷ WRI, "USA: War resister Rodney Watson in church sanctuary in Canada", 23 October 2009. <https://wri-irg.org/en/node/9045>
- ²⁸ WRI, "USA: Conscientious objector Travis Bishop sentenced to one year in prison / 30 days for Victor Agosto", 26 August 2009. <https://wri-irg.org/en/node/8561>
- ²⁹ WRI, "USA: Conscientious objector Cliff Cornell sentenced to one year in prison", 30 Apr 2009. <https://wri-irg.org/en/node/7494>
- ³⁰ WRI, "USA: Conscientious objector Tony Anderson sentenced to 14 months", 21 Nov 2008. <https://wri-irg.org/en/news/alerts/msg00125.html>
- ³¹ A G/SO 218/2 G/SO 214 (67-17) G/SO 214 (56-23) USA 34/2012, 20 December 2012. <https://spcommreports.ohchr.org/TMResultsBase/DownloadPublicCommunicationFile?gId=19092>
- ³² <https://www.thepetitionsite.com/752/756/678/free-a-pregnant-war-resister-from-us-military-prison/>
- ³³ WRI, "USA: CO Kimberly Rivera gives birth in custody".
- ³⁴ See, *Min-Kyu Jeong et al. v. Republic of Korea* (CCPR/C/101/D/1642-1741/2007), para. 7.3. <https://undocs.org/CCPR/C/101/D/1642-1741/2007>
 See also: *Jong-nam Kim et al. v. Republic of Korea*, para. 7.4; *Abdullayev v. Turkmenistan*, para. 7.7; *Mahmud Hedaybergenov v. Turkmenistan*, para. 7.5; *Ahmet Hedaybergenov v. Turkmenistan*, para. 7.5; *Sunnet Japparow v. Turkmenistan*, para. 7.6; *Akmurad Nurjanov v. Turkmenistan*, para. 9.3; *Shadurdy Uchetov v. Turkmenistan*, para. 7.6; *Dawletow v. Turkmenistan*, para. 6.3 and others.
- ³⁵ See, UN Commission on Human Rights, Resolution 1998/77, "Conscientious Objection to Military Service", E/CN.4/RES/1998/77, 22 April 1998. <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3b00f0be10.html>.
 The Commission was replaced by the UN Human Rights Council in 2006.
- ³⁶ See, UN Conscientious Objection to Military Service, E/CN.4/Sub.2/1983/30/Rev.1, 1985 (the "Eide and Mubanga-Chipoya report"), <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/5107cd132.pdf>, para. 21. See also, paras. 128-135 regarding persecution in the context of conscientious objection to conflicts which violate basic rules of human conduct.
- ³⁷ UNHCR, Guidelines on International Protection No. 10, HCR/GIP/13/10/Corr. 1, 12 November 2014, para.3. <https://www.unhcr.org/publications/legal/529efd2e9/guidelines-international-protection-10-claims-refugee-status-related-military.html>
- ³⁸ A/HRC/41/23, 24 May 2019, para. 60 (d). <https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/41/23>
 See also: A/HRC/50/43, 11 May 2022, para. 57 (e). <https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/50/43>
- ³⁹ A/HRC/50/43, 11 May 2022, para. 57 (h) and (i). <https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/50/43>

⁴⁰ A/HRC/50/43, 11 May 2022, para. 57 (k) and (l). <https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/50/43>

⁴¹ https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-11-b&chapter=4&clang=en#EndDec

⁴² CRC/C/OPAC/USA/CO/3-4, 11 July 2017, para. 6.

<https://undocs.org/en/CRC/C/OPAC/USA/CO/3-4>

⁴³ CRC/C/OPAC/USA/5, 15 October 2024, [Date received: 23 January 2022]. See particularly paras. 5 [legislation, minimum age of voluntary recruitment], 8 [reservations], 15 [minimum age for voluntary recruitment], 16 [names, addresses, and telephone listings], 19 [goals or missions to recruiters], 20-22 [JROTC, training with arms], 23 [criminal legislation and regulations in force]. <https://undocs.org/en/CRC/C/OPAC/USA/5>