m.i.r.

movimento internazionale della riconciliazione

Italian branch of the International Fellowship Of Reconciliation - IFOR

SUBMISSION

TO THE 146th SESSION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE

For the List of Issues Prior to Reporting (LOIPR)

LITHUANIA

Conscientious objection to military service and related issues

July 2026

Content Index

- Introduction
- Previous consideration by the Human Rights Committee
- Judgements of the European Court of Human Rights
- Main issues of concern
- Suggestions for the List of Issues Prior to Reporting

Contact:
Zaira Zafarana
zaira.zafarana@proton.me

Introduction

This submission focuses on the **right to conscientious objection to military service** and related issues.

According to the **UN Human Rights Committee's** jurisprudence: "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. A State may, if it wishes, compel the objector to undertake a civilian alternative to military service, outside the military sphere and not under military command. The alternative service must not be of a punitive nature. It must be a real service to the community and compatible with respect for human rights."[i]

Despite repeated concluding observations of the **Human Rights Committee** (hereinafter "the Committee"), judgements of the **European Court of Human Rights** and subsequent amendments of the relevant legislation, the latter still falls short of international human rights standards concerning the right to conscientious objection to military service.

Most importantly, the State under review often, in **violation of its international obligations**, does not provide **asylum / international protection** to conscientious objectors to military service coming from other countries, especially from **Belarus** and the **Russian Federation,** where there is not respect of the right to conscientious objection to military service.

Further issues of concern are related to the **involvement of children in armed conflict or military activities** and the **militarisation of education**.

Previous consideration by the Human Rights Committee

The issue of the right to conscientious objection to military service has been examined by the Committee already in the context of the State Party's initial report. In 1997, in its Concluding observations, the Committee stated:

"19. The Committee expresses its concern over the conditions for alternative service available to persons who have a conscientious objection to military service, in particular the grounds for establishing the right to perform alternative service and its length. Therefore:

The Committee recommends the State party clarify the grounds and eligibility for performing, without discrimination, alternative service on grounds of conscience or religious belief to ensure that the right to freedom of conscience and religion is respected."[ii]

In 2004, the Committee reiterated its concerns:

"17. The Committee reiterates the concern expressed in its concluding observations on the previous report about conditions of alternative service available to conscientious objectors to military service, in particular with respect to the eligibility criteria applied by the Special Commission and the duration of such service as compared with military service.

The Committee recommends that the State party clarify the grounds and eligibility for performing alternative service to persons objecting to military service on grounds of conscience or religious belief, to ensure that the right to freedom of conscience and religion is respected by permitting in practice alternative service outside the defence forces, and that the duration of service is not punitive in nature (arts. 18 and 26)".[iii]

In the context of the third periodic report the issue did not appear in the concluding observations, presumably because conscription was suspended by that time.

However, following the reinstatement of conscription in 2015, the Committee, in 2018, expressed concerns that in Lithuania "the alternative national defence service does not provide for alternative civil service independent of military control and supervision and the institutions of the national defence system, and that salaries are not comparable to those of military service (arts. 18 and 26)". The Committee called on the State party to "ensure that the Law on National Conscription provides for conscientious objection in a manner consistent with articles 18 and 26 of the Covenant, ensuring that it provides for an alternative to military service outside of the military sphere and not under military command and on comparable salary terms, bearing in mind that article 18 protects freedom of conscience based on religious and non-religious beliefs".[iv]

Judgements of the European Court of Human Rights Previous

The **European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)**, taking into consideration the above findings of the Human Rights Committee,[v] in 2022 found, in the case of ***Teliatnikov v. Lithuania***, concerning a Jehovah's Witness, that "alternative national defence service is intrinsically linked to military service, and therefore cannot be seen as separate civilian service".[vi]

The Court also found that the body that was supposedly assessing claims of conscientious objection was merely making recommendations, which were transmitted to an institution of the national defence system for final decision.[vii] Based on the above, the Court found that "the refusal by the State to respect the applicant's conscientious objection to military service was not necessary in a democratic society" and constituted a violation of **Article 9 of ECHR**, concerning the **right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion**.[viii]

The findings of the ECtHR were reiterated in **2025**, in the case of ***Rutkauskas v. Lithuania***.[ix]

In order to comply with the aforementioned judgements of the ECtHR, there has been a recent reform concerning the "Alternative National Defence Service", especially as far as it concerns the issues of a genuinely civilian nature of such service independent from control and supervision of the military, and the independence and impartiality of the procedures for permitting conscripts to perform such service.[x]

However, despite progress, the current provisions of the legislation not only have been accompanied by an **increase of the duration** of alternative service from 10 to 12 months,[xi] which is not based on reasonable and objective grounds, but more importantly, they still fall short on a number of issues, including the **right to conscientious objection during military service**, i.e. after enlistment, the **right to conscientious objection for reservists**, the **right to conscientious objection for volunteers / professional members of the armed forces**, and the **grounds for conscientious objection**.

Main issues of concern

A. No recognition of the right to conscientious objection during military service

According to the response of the **Parliamentary Ombudspersons' Office of the Republic of Lithuania**, acting as the **National Human Rights Institution**, to a questionnaire of the European Bureau for Conscientious Objection (hereinafter EBCO): "Neither the current wording of the Law on Conscription and Alternative National Defence Service (in force since 1 January 2026), nor the previous wording (in force until 31 December 2025) contain provisions on the procedure in case of developing conscientious objection during the military service of conscripts / volunteers".[xii]

Such lack of legislative provisions recognising the right to conscientious objection during military service falls short of the international human rights standards.

The right to conscientious objection during military service, i.e., after enlistment in the armed forces, derives from the right to change beliefs and it has been recognised by the **Human Rights Committee**,[xiii] the **OHCHR**,[xiv] and the **UN Commission on Human Rights**.[xv] Its successor, the **UN Human Rights Council**, after noting that it is aware that persons performing military service may develop conscientious objections, has encouraged States to allow applications for conscientious objection during military service.[xvi]

At the regional level, the **Committee of Minister of the Council of Europe**, already since 1987, had mentioned in its recommendations that the law may provide for this possibility.[xvii] In 2010, the Committee of Minister in a recommendation to member states on human rights of **members of the armed forces**, explicitly asked for those who perform compulsory military service "to have the right to be granted conscientious objector status and an alternative service of a civilian nature should be proposed to them".[xviii]

Furthermore, the right to conscientious objection during military service has been recognised by the **Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe**,[xix] the **European Parliament**[xx] and the **Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) of the OSCE**.[xxi]

B. No recognition of the right to conscientious objection for reservists

According to the response of the **Parliamentary Ombudspersons' Office** to EBCO's questionnaire: "Neither the current wording of the Law on Conscription and Alternative National Defence Service (in force since 1 January 2026), nor the previous wording (in force until 31 December 2025) contains provisions on the procedure

in case of developing conscientious objection after the completion of the initial military service of conscripts / volunteers (the case of reservists)".[xxii]

Such lack of legislative provisions recognising the right to conscientious objection after military service / for reservists falls short of the international human rights standards.

The **OHCHR** in its publication about the right to conscientious objection to military service in 2013 has extensively analysed the issue of the right to conscientious objection to military service for reservists.[xxiii]

In 2017, the OHCHR stated: "Conscripts and volunteers should be able to object before the commencement of military service as well as at any stage during and **after military service**."[xxiv] (emphasis added)

In 2019, the OHCHR**,** in its **minimum criteria** in order for the provisions for conscientious objection to military service to be in line with international human rights norms and standards, explicitly stated that: "The right to conscientious objection should be recognized for conscripts, for professional members of the armed forces and for **reservists**" and that "No time limit should be applicable for the submission of a request to be recognized as a conscientious objector. Conscripts and volunteers should be able to object before the commencement of military service, or at any stage during or **after military service**". [xxv] (emphasis added)

In 2022, the OHCHR reiterated that: "The application procedure should be available to **all** persons affected by military service, including conscripts, professional members of the armed forces and **reservists**" and that "Conscripts and volunteers should be able to object before the commencement of military service, or at any stage during or **after military service**".[xxvi] (emphasis added)

At the regional level, the right to conscientious objection to military service for reservists has been cited in recommendations of bodies of the **Council of Europe (CoE)**. The **Committee of Ministers of the CoE**, already in 1987, had stated that: "The law may also provide for the possibility of applying for and obtaining conscientious objector status in cases where the requisite conditions for conscientious objection appear during military service or **periods of military training after initial service**"[xxvii]

Subsequently, the **Parliamentary Assembly of the CoE**, in 2001, has recommended that the Committee of Ministers invite those member states that have not yet done so to introduce into their legislation, *inter alia*: "the right to be registered as a conscientious objector at **any** time: before, during or **after conscription, or performance of military service**".[xxviii] (emphasis added)

Worth noting that the **UN Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief**, already since 2006, has highlighted the above-mentioned recommendation: "draws the Government's attention to Council of Europe Recommendation 1518(2001), which invites member states to introduce into their legislation '[t]he right to be registered as a conscientious objector at any time before, during or after conscription, or performance of military service'. This acknowledges that conscientious objection may develop over time, and even after a person has already participated in military training or activities."[xxix]

The **UN Human Rights Council**, "Acknowledges that an increasing number of States recognize conscientious objection to military service not only for conscripts but also for those serving voluntarily, and encourages States to allow applications for conscientious objection prior to, during **and after military service, including reserve duties**".[xxx] (emphasis added)

C. No recognition of the right to conscientious objection for volunteers / professional soldiers

In the aforementioned response of the **Parliamentary Ombudspersons' Office** to EBCO's questionnaire the lack of provisions for volunteers is also included.[xxxi]

Such lack of legislative provisions recognising the right to conscientious objection for volunteers / professional members of the armed forces falls short of the international human rights standards.

The **OHCHR,** in its **minimum criteria** in order for the provisions for conscientious objection to military service to be in line with international human rights norms and standards, has explicitly and repeatedly stated that: "The right to conscientious objection should be recognized for conscripts, for **professional members of the armed forces** and for reservists."[xxxii] (emphasis added)

The **Human Rights Committee** has advocated as well for the right to conscientious objection to military service for serving / professional members of the armed forces. In the case of another State, Latvia, the Committee has recently recommended in its Concluding Observations: "Consider revising the legislative framework to provide for honourable discharges on grounds of conscience, and to ensure that individuals who receive early termination from military service on those grounds do not face financial or other penalties."[xxxiii] Besides Latvia, the

Committee has included in recent years the issue of conscientious objection to military service for serving members of the armed forces in the Lists of issues prior to reporting of further State parties.[xxxiv] The issue was raised also during the examination of Moldova.[xxxv]

The **ODIHR of the OSCE**, has also explicitly mentioned in its recommendations that "Conscientious objection should be available both for conscripts and for professional soldiers both prior to and during military service, in line with the recommendations of international bodies".[xxxvi]

The **UN Human Rights Council** has also moved towards this direction by stating that it "acknowledges that an increasing number of States recognize conscientious objection to military service **not only for conscripts but also for those serving voluntarily** and encourages States to allow applications for conscientious objection prior to, during and after military service, including reserve duties".[xxxvii] (emphasis added)

D. Conscientious objection grounds restricted only to religious and pacifist beliefs

According to the response of the **Parliamentary Ombudspersons' Office** to EBCO's questionnaire:

> "There is a possibility to complete the alternative service, which is defined in the Law as 'the national defence service performed as a constitutional obligation by a citizen of the Republic of Lithuania who, due to religious or pacifist beliefs, cannot perform service involving the use of weapons, special means, or coercion' (Article 2(3) of the Law on Conscription and Alternative National Defence Service)[xxxviii]".[xxxix]

Similarly, it is stated that: "According to the Law on Conscription (wording in force until 31 December 2025), conscripts who wish to perform alternative service may submit an application to perform alternative service to the national defence system institution administering military service before the start of conscription into regular compulsory initial military service, and conscripts included in the list of conscripts for the calendar year may submit their request before the deadline for submitting the documents specified in this list. This request **must be based on religious or pacifist beliefs** that prevent the person from serving in the armed forces. (Article 17 (1))"[xl] (emphasis added).

Restricting the conscientious objection grounds only to religious or pacifist beliefs falls short of the international human rights standards.

It is worth noting that the Committee, in its concluding observations on the fourth periodic report of Lithuania mentioned "religious and non-religious beliefs" without restricting the latter only to pacifist ones.[xli] The right to conscientious objection to military service does not concern only, and should not be restricted to, pacifists.

Highly noteworthy, international human rights standards are absolutely clear that individuals who are not pacifists can be conscientious objectors to military service.

The **UNHCR** has stated:

> "**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.'[xlii] 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].[xliii] 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."[xliv]

The **OHCHR** has consistently requested the recognition by States of the right to conscientious objection to military service for selective conscientious objectors. In 2017 the OHCHR has pointed out:

> "C. Selective conscientious objection
>
> 15. In its Guidelines on International Protection No. 10, issued in December 2013, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) stressed that the right to conscientious objection also applied to partial or selective objectors.[xlv] Such objectors 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, whereas pacifists object to all use of armed force or participation in all wars. The General Assembly implicitly recognized one type of selective objection in its resolution 33/165, in which it called upon Member States to grant asylum or safe transit to another State to persons compelled to leave their country of nationality solely because of a conscientious objection to

assisting in the enforcement of apartheid through service in military or police forces. The Working Group on Arbitrary Detention and the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief have also taken up cases of selective conscientious objectors.[xlvi]".[xlvii]

And in the Conclusions and Recommendations, the OHCHR has affirmed: "States should ensure that the right to object applies both to pacifists and to selective objectors who believe that the use of force is justified in some circumstances but not in others."[xlviii]

In 2019, the OHCHR has pointed out that: "Disqualifying conditions should take into account the fact that the right to conscientious objection applies also to partial or selective objectors who believe that the use of force is justified in some circumstances but not in others (A/HRC/35/4, para. 15)."[xlix]

And it has included in its minimum standards:

"(d) Recognition of selective conscientious objection

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."[l]

In 2022, the OHCHR pointed out that in 2019 the UNHCR has "noted that the right to conscientious objection also applied to partial or selective objectors, who believed that the use of force was justified in some circumstances but not in others and that it was therefore necessary to object in those other cases.[li]"[lii]

And has reiterated that: "The right to object applies both to pacifists and to selective objectors who believe that the use of force is justified in some circumstances but not in others"[liii]

In 2024, the OHCHR has further elaborated on the issue of selective conscientious objectors:

"20. In previous reporting, the Office has noted that several States excluded selective conscientious objectors from recognition,[liv] i.e. persons who believed that the use of force was justified in some circumstances but not in others. It has been noted that selective conscientious objection is a form of adherence to international law,[lv] in that it protects a right to refuse to fight for an aggressor force[lvi] and to refuse the perpetration of other international crimes.[lvii] The objection to the perpetration of international crimes also overlaps with conscientious objectors' religious or moral beliefs.[lviii] The right of selective conscientious objectors to object is consequently protected by international human rights law[lix] and should therefore also be recognized in the domestic legal framework. A notable example of such recognition is the ruling of the Federal Administrative Court of Germany, in 2005, declaring that the freedom of conscience protected a major, army software engineer, who had declared that the Iraq war was illegal and refused to work on a computer programme related to the conflict for reasons of conscience.[lx]"[lxi]

E. Rejection of asylum to refugees conscientious objectors, especially from Russian Federation – Belarus

It is worth stressing that the **Parliamentary Ombudspersons' Office**, in its response to EBCO's questionnaire, did not have any information to provide about asylum to conscientious objectors to military service.[lxii]

There are serious concerns about the treatment of foreign conscientious objectors coming from States with no adequate recognition of the right to conscientious objection to military service who have sought or would seek international protection in Lithuania.

Particular concerns are raised about conscientious objectors from countries directly or indirectly involved in the regional conflict (**Russian Federation**, **Ukraine**, **Belarus**), who, **according to UN reports**, might be subjected in their countries of origin to **arbitrary detention**,[lxiii] **forced conscription**[lxiv] and even **torture or ill-treatment**.[lxv]

It should be emphasised that particularly **Russian conscientious objectors to military service face torture and other ill-treatment**. In addition to the broader issues of torture and ill-treatment in the Russian Federation, both in general and particularly in relation to the war in Ukraine, highlighted by the Human Rights Committee,[lxvi] **Russian conscientious objectors is a specific group facing such unlawful treatment.**

This is also cited in the press release for the first thematic report to the General Assembly of the **UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Russian Federation, Mariana Katzarova**:

"The report emphasised the impact of torture on political prisoners, human rights and **anti-war activists, conscientious objectors and mobilised men**, lawyers, journalists, LGBT persons, migrants and asylum seekers, Indigenous Peoples and national minorities, as well as women and girls"[lxvii] (emphasis added). Indeed, the report highlights such incidents of torture and ill-treatment.[lxviii]

The Special Rapporteur has **explicitly recommended**:

> "(e) Consider granting protection and asylum to conscientious objectors of military service who have fled the Russian Federation and exercise due diligence to prevent their expulsion or extradition back to the Russian Federation in violation of the principle of non-refoulement, since there is a well-founded fear of persecution and substantial grounds to believe that, upon their return, they would be prosecuted and face imprisonment and/or torture and ill-treatment in custody."[lxix]

In her September 2025 report, the Special Rapporteur included again a chapter on "Conscientious objection to military service and mobilization".[lxx]

The Special Rapporteur **explicitly recommended** that "the international community and the States Members of the United Nations: […] Uphold the human rights of Russian citizens in need of protection within their jurisdiction by respecting the principle of non-refoulement in regard to all torture survivors and asylum-seekers from the Russian Federation, in particular […], anti-war activists, […], conscientious objectors to military service and individuals who have refused forced mobilization to the war against Ukraine".[lxxi]

The above information is particularly important insofar Lithuania has become a country of destination for citizens especially of the Russian Federation and of Belarus who have left their countries due to conscientious objection to military service. For them, seeking asylum in Lithuania is linked to a well-founded fear of criminal prosecution, long-term imprisonment, torture and ill-treatment, or other serious human rights violations in their countries of origin. Despite this, migration authorities often refuse to grant international protection to such applicants.

According to the most recent EBCO report:

> "Applications are frequently rejected on the grounds that compulsory military service constitutes a general civic duty and does not, in itself, amount to persecution. This approach contradicts the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and fails to take into account the nature and severity of penalties for refusal of service in Belarus and Russia, as well as the link between persecution for refusal of military service and protected grounds, including freedom of conscience and political opinion. Particular concern is raised by the practice of qualifying conscientious objectors as posing a 'threat to national security'.[lxxii] Even in cases where courts conclude that there is no individual threat posed by the applicant and annul the relevant decisions, state security authorities retain the possibility to reinitiate similar assessments within migration procedures.
>
> Documented cases show that such parallel and unsynchronised application of migration and 'security' mechanisms may lead to prolonged legal confrontation without a final determination of the applicant's legal status, especially in cases where applicants have previously undergone military service or training. Such decisions are often taken without transparent criteria and individualised assessment, which may restrict access to asylum procedures and effective judicial review.
>
> In addition, in practice, access to effective legal remedies in such cases is significantly limited by financial barriers. Since 2025, free legal aid in Lithuania has been provided to asylum seekers only at the first stage of appeal. In the event of an unsuccessful appeal, the applicant is left without legal support, and further defence is possible only through paid legal services, which are often inaccessible to citizens of Belarus and Russia due to their high cost.[lxxiii]
>
> As a result, some conscientious objectors have been placed in detention or have faced the risk of removal to their country of origin, i.e. Belarus or Russia.[lxxiv] These practices create a real risk of violation of the principle of non-refoulement, which prohibits the return of individuals to countries where they face persecution, torture or other serious human rights violations. International standards, including UNHCR guidelines, explicitly recognise conscientious objection to military service as a possible ground for refugee status.
>
> It is important to note that after a final refusal of asylum, a person is obliged to leave Lithuania. In cases of refusal of asylum in Lithuania, there are no instruments for legalisation of the applicant by

any other means. At the same time, in April 2023 Lithuania adopted a law on restrictive measures, after which restrictions were introduced on the issuance of visas and certain other statuses for citizens of Belarus and Russia.[lxxv] Taken together, these factors significantly narrow alternative pathways to lawful status after an asylum refusal."[lxxvi]

In recent years, several cases of **Belarusian conscientious objectors**, as well as **human rights defenders advocating for their rights**, who have been denied asylum, have been publicised.[lxxvii]

In March 2026, dozens of international organisations issued a joint press release about **the immediate risk of deportation of a Russian conscientious objector** and called for immediate international protection, as "there are substantial grounds to believe that if returned to the Russian Federation he could face mobilisation and be forcibly sent to fight in the war against Ukraine, where he could be compelled to participate in war crimes under threat of violence or severe punishment."[lxxviii]

Our House, a human rights organization operating in Lithuania, has recently reported of a young Russian deserter deprived of his liberty in Lithuania and arrested upon his return to Russia on June 15th.[lxxix]

The above-described situations do not comply with the **EU Parliament** call which "demands that Member States protect and grant asylum to Russians and Belarusians being persecuted for speaking out against or protesting the war, as well as Russian and Belarusian deserters and conscientious objectors",[lxxx] which was recently highlighted by the **OHCHR**,[lxxxi] nor with **international human rights law and standards** as described in a non-exhaustive compilation below.

Main international standards regarding international protection for conscientious objectors to military service

The **UNHCR** has included the issue of persecution of conscientious objectors in its guidelines for international protection. The UNHCR has also clarified that "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].[lxxxii]

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."[lxxxiii]

As it has been also highlighted by the **OHCHR**[lxxxiv]:

the **Human Rights Council** has encouraged States "to consider granting asylum to those conscientious objectors to military service who have a well-founded fear of persecution in their country of origin owing to their refusal to perform military service when there is no provision, or no adequate provision, for conscientious objection to military service"[lxxxv]

UNHCR has noted that a well-founded fear of persecution may arise after an applicant has left her or his country of origin, owing to circumstances arising in the country of origin during the applicant's absence and/or as a result of her or his own actions after she or he has left the country of origin, for example for having expressed objections or taken a stance against a situation of armed conflict and violence.[lxxxvi]

in 2019, the **Working Group on Arbitrary Detention** reminded States to respect, protect and fulfil the right to personal liberty of conscientious objectors to military service by exercising due diligence to prevent their expulsion, return (refoulement) or extradition to another State where there are substantial grounds for believing that they would be in danger of being subjected to arbitrary deprivation of liberty.[lxxxvii]

in its general comment No. 4 (2017), the **Committee against Torture** noted that "violations of the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion" (as well as "desertion from the national armed forces or armed groups") were indications of the complainant's personal risk and that the Committee would assess "substantial grounds" and consider the risk of torture as foreseeable, personal, present and real when the existence of facts relating to the risk by itself, at the time of its decision, would affect the rights of the complainant under the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in case of the complainant's deportation.[lxxxviii]

In 2024, the **OHCHR** has stressed: "States should respect and protect the rights of conscientious objectors arriving from third States, including through adherence to the principle of non-refoulement and international human rights and refugee law and the implementation and dissemination of guidance on the interpretation of applicable international law, such as the UNHCR guidelines on international protection on claims to refugee status related to military service."[lxxxix]

Most recently, in April 2026, the **OHCHR** similarly recommended: "Protect without discrimination the rights of conscientious objectors fleeing their countries of origin, in line with international human rights law and international refugee law, including by upholding the principle of non-refoulement and ensuring that the relevant State officials have knowledge of the applicable international law".[xc]

There is also an evolving jurisprudence of the **European Court of Human Rights**, which takes into consideration the issue of conscientious objection to military service as for the expulsion of persons.[xci]

F. Involvement of children in armed conflict and militarisation of education

In 2007, the **Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC)** had noted that "no compulsory active military service is required before the age of 19 but that registration of Lithuanian male citizens to enter military service starts at the age of 16, and that children between the ages of 12 and 18 can receive military training through the Riflemen's Union. The Committee is thus concerned about the fact that the State party could engage children under 18 in military activities." And the CRC requested "more information and clarification, to be submitted in conjunction with the next State party report, on the purpose of the registration of male citizens from the age of 16, and on the military training provided to children between the ages of 12 and 18 within the Riflemen's Union and their possible use in armed conflicts".[xcii]

Furthermore, the **CRC** issued several recommendations regarding peace education[xciii] and "refugee, asylum-seeking and migrant children entering Lithuania who may have been recruited or used in hostilities abroad".[xciv]

In 2024, the **CRC** reiterated such recommendations:

> "46. Recalling its previous concluding observations on the report of the State party submitted under article 8 of the Optional Protocol, the Committee urges the State party:
>
> (a) To establish mechanisms for the early identification of refugee, asylum-seeking and migrant children who may have been recruited or used in hostilities abroad and to provide them with immediate culturally sensitive, child-centred and multidisciplinary assistance for their physical and psychological recovery, their rehabilitation and their social reintegration;
>
> (b) To develop systematic awareness-raising, education and training programmes on the provisions of the Optional Protocol addressing all relevant groups working with children, in particular professionals working with asylum-seeking, refugee and migrant children entering the State party from countries affected by armed conflict."[xcv]

Concerning the militarisation of the education system, EBCO reports that:

> "From the 2024–2025 school year, a three-day Civics and Defense Skills Course (PGĮK) organised by the Lithuanian Riflemen's Union became mandatory for all 7-9th grade students in general education schools, aiming at 'civic and patriotic education' and 'preparedness for emergencies and crises.'[xcvi] It is planned to expand to grades 5–6 from 2028-2029.[xcvii] The military does not organise programs for students under the age of 18. However, a voluntary 'Youth Riflemen' programme is available within the Lithuanian Riflemen's Union for young people aged 11–18.[xcviii] A Cadet Education Programme was introduced in 2024 to allow municipal and state gymnasiums to offer cadet education including 'training in basic national defense skills based on practices by existing schools like the General Povilas Plechavičius Cadet Lyceum.[xcix]"[c]

The **Parliamentary Ombudspersons' Office** states that:

There are no compulsory programs which could be seen as preparatory to military recruitment, but an "optional program called 'National Security and Defence' has been developed for students (aged 16-19) in grades III-IV of gymnasium (secondary school)".

The military does not organize programs for students under the age of 18. Students under 18 who wish to get involved are invited to join Lithuanian Riflemen's Union.

School teachers of social sciences classes (history, basics of citizenship) often invite representatives of the military to give lessons on the Lithuanian Armed Forces, national defence, or other related topics.[ci]

Suggested questions for the list of issues prior to reporting

A. Please report on measures taken in order to recognise in law and respect the right to conscientious objection

for *all* persons affected by military service, including conscripts, volunteers / professional members of the armed forces and reservists; before the commencement of military service, or at any stage during or after military service; and for both pacifists and selective objectors who believe that the use of force is justified in some circumstances but not in others, in line with international human rights standards (e.g. A/HRC/41/23, para. 60; A/HRC/50/43, para. 57; A/HRC/56/30, paras. 54-58). (articles 18 and 26)

B. Please report on measures taken in order to guarantee the right to asylum / international protection for conscientious objectors to military service who are at risk of persecution in their country of origin owing to their refusal to perform military service when there is no provision, or no adequate provision, for conscientious objection to military service, and especially to conscientious objectors asylum-seekers from the Russian Federation, Belarus and Ukraine, and to fully implement the UNHCR Guidelines on International Protection n. 10. (articles 9, 13 and 18)

C. Please report on measures taken in order to fully implement the CRC recommendations concerning refugee, asylum-seeking and migrant children who may have been recruited or used in hostilities abroad. (article 24)

D. Please report on any measures taken in order to address militarisation of the education system and to ensure that no children are involved in military activities or use of weapons. (article 24)

[i] 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: *Atasoy and Sarkut v. Turkey (nowadays Türkiye)* para 10.4; *Jong-nam Kim et al. v. Republic of Korea*, para. 7.4; *Abdullayev v. Turkmenistan*, para. 7.7; *Mahmud Hudaybergenov v. Turkmenistan*, para. 7.5; *Ahmet Hudaybergenov 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.
[ii] CCPR/C/79/Add.87, 19 November 1997, para. 19. https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/79/Add.87
[iii] CCPR/CO/80/LTU, 4 May 2004, para. 17. https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/CO/80/LTU
[iv] CCPR/C/LTU/CO/4, 29 August 2018, paras. 25-26. https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/LTU/CO/4
[v] ECtHR, *Teliatnikov v. Lithuania*, (Application no. 51914/19), 7 June 2022, para. 108. https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/fre?i=001-217607
[vi] ECtHR, *Teliatnikov v. Lithuania*, (Application no. 51914/19), 7 June 2022, para. 107. https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/fre?i=001-217607
[vii] ECtHR, *Teliatnikov v. Lithuania*, (Application no. 51914/19), 7 June 2022, para. 109. https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/fre?i=001-217607
[viii] ECtHR, *Teliatnikov v. Lithuania*, (Application no. 51914/19), 7 June 2022, paras. 110-111. https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/fre?i=001-217607
[ix] ECtHR, *Rutkauskas v. Lithuania*, (Application no. 15816/20), 26 August 2025. https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/fre?i=001-244592
[x] Communication from Lithuania concerning the group of cases of Teliatnikov v. Lithuania (Application No. 51914/19), DH-DD(2026)208, 06/02/2026. Available through: https://search.coe.int/cm?i=09125948802a909d
See also: EBCO, *Annual Report, Conscientious Objection to Military Service in Europe 2025*, 11 May 2026, pp. 10, 59-61. https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/2026-05-11-EBCO_Annual_Report_2025.pdf
[xi] Parliamentary Ombudspersons' Office of the Republic of Lithuania, National Human Rights Institution, "Information for the Report on conscientious objection to military service in Europe", February 2026, part "G. Terms of alternative service", p. 8. https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/Lithuanian%20NHRI_Questionnaire%20for%20EBCO%20Report%202025_Conscientious%20objection.pdf
[xii] Parliamentary Ombudspersons' Office of the Republic of Lithuania, National Human Rights Institution, "Information for the Report on conscientious objection to military service in Europe", February 2026, part "H. Conscientious objection during military service of conscripts/volunteers", p. 10. https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/Lithuanian%20NHRI_Questionnaire%20for%20EBCO%20Report%202025_Conscientious%20objection.pdf
Archived at: https://web.archive.org/web/20260716104501/https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/Lithuanian%20NHRI_Questionnaire%20for%20EBCO%20Report%202025_Conscientious%20objection.pdf
[xiii] CCPR/C/79/Add.61, 3 April 1996, paras. 15 and 20. http://undocs.org/CCPR/C/79/Add.61
See also in the case of Moldova the recent concluding observations: CCPR/C/MDA/CO/4, 2 April 2026, para. 39.

https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/MDA/CO/4

[xiv] OHCHR, Conscientious objection to military service, Analytical report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, (A/HRC/50/43), 11 May 2022, para. 57(g). https://undocs.org/A/HRC/50/43
See also: OHCHR, Approaches and challenges with regard to application procedures for obtaining the status of conscientious objector to military service in accordance with human rights standards, (A/HRC/41/23), 24 May 2019, para. 60(f). https://undocs.org/A/HRC/41/23
OHCHR, Conscientious objection to military service Analytical report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, (A/HRC/35/4), 1 May 2017, para. 63. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/35/4
OHCHR, Analytical report on conscientious objection to military service (A/HRC/23/22), 3 June 2013, para. 70.
https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/23/22
UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Conscientious Objection to Military Service, New York and Geneva, 2012. See relevant chapter "Conscientious objection for persons serving in the armed forces", pp. 25-26.
https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Publications/ConscientiousObjection_en.pdf
See also: "States should be encouraged to end time limits for individuals to apply for conscientious objector status" in E/CN.4/2006/51, 27 February 2006, para. 61. https://undocs.org/E/CN.4/2006/51

[xv] UN Commission on Human Rights, Resolution 1993/84, para. 2. https://www.refworld.org/legal/resolution/unchr/1993/en/11724
Resolution 1995/83, para. 2. https://www.refworld.org/legal/resolution/unchr/1995/en/8151
See also the phrase "aware that persons performing military service may develop conscientious objections" in the preamble in the previous resolutions, as well as in: Resolution 1998/77. https://www.refworld.org/legal/resolution/unchr/1998/en/8561

[xvi] UN Human Rights Council, Resolution 24/17 (A/HRC/RES/24/17), 8 October 2013, para. 5. http://undocs.org/A/HRC/RES/24/17

[xvii] Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers, Recommendation No. R(87)8, 9 April 1987, para. 8.
https://www.refworld.org/legal/resolution/coeministers/1987/en/88968

[xviii] Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers, Recommendation CM/Rec (2010) 4 "Human Rights of members of the armed forces", para. 41. https://www.refworld.org/legal/resolution/coeministers/2010/ru/88943

[xix] Council of Europe, Parliamentary Assembly, Recommendation 1518 (2001), para. 5.1.
https://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-EN.asp?fileid=16909&lang=en

[xx] European Parliament, Resolution on respect for human rights in the European Community (annual report of the European Parliament), (A3-0025/93) [known as the De Gucht Resolution], 11 March 1993, as it has been published in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 115, on 26 of April 1993, para. 49 (p. 183).
https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:JOC_1993_115_R_0139_01&from=EN
See also the term "at any time" in: European Parliament, Resolution on conscientious objection and alternative service, (A3-15/89), [known as Schmidbauer Resolution], 13 October 1989, as published in the Official Journal of the European Communities C291, 20 November 1989, para 1 (p. 124).
https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:JOC_1989_291_R_0113_01&from=EN

[xxi] OSCE, ODIHR, *Handbook on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Armed Forces Personnel, 2008*, Chapter 10 Conscientious Objection to Military Conscription and Service, 4. Best Practices and Recommendations, p. 85 [second point].
https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/0/c/31393.pdf

[xxii] Parliamentary Ombudspersons' Office of the Republic of Lithuania, National Human Rights Institution, "Information for the Report on conscientious objection to military service in Europe", February 2026, part "I. Conscientious objection after military service", pp. 10-11.
https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/Lithuanian%20NHRI_Questionnaire%20for%20EBCO%20Report%202025_Conscientious%20objection.pdf
Archived at: https://web.archive.org/web/20260716104501/https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/Lithuanian%20NHRI_Questionnaire%20for%20EBCO%20Report%202025_Conscientious%20objection.pdf

[xxiii] UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, *Conscientious Objection to Military Service*, New York and Geneva, 2012, pp. 26, 31, 53, 57, 67, 69, 82. https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Publications/ConscientiousObjection_en.pdf

[xxiv] OHCHR, Conscientious objection to military service Analytical report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, (A/HRC/35/4), 1 May 2017, para. 63. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/35/4

[xxv] A/HRC/41/23, 24 May 2019, paras. 60(c) and (f). https://undocs.org/A/HRC/41/23

[xxvi] A/HRC/50/43, 11 May 2022, paras. 57(d) and (g). https://undocs.org/A/HRC/50/43

[xxvii] Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers, Recommendation No. R(87)8, 9 April 1987, para. 8.
https://www.refworld.org/docid/5069778e2.html

[xxviii] Council of Europe, Parliamentary Assembly, Recommendation 1518 (2001), para. 5.1.
https://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-EN.asp?fileid=16909&lang=en

[xxix] UN Economic and Social Council, Commission on human rights, Civil and political rights, including the question of religious intolerance, Addendum, Summary of cases transmitted to Governments and replies received, E/CN.4/2006/5/Add.1, 27 March 2006, para. 138 (p. 36). http://undocs.org/E/CN.4/2006/5/Add.1

[xxx] UN Human Rights Council, Resolution 24/17 (A/HRC/RES/24/17), 8 October 2013, para. 5. http://undocs.org/A/HRC/RES/24/17

[xxxi] Parliamentary Ombudspersons' Office of the Republic of Lithuania, National Human Rights Institution, "Information for the Report on conscientious objection to military service in Europe", February 2026, part "H. Conscientious objection during military service of conscripts/volunteers", p. 10.
https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/Lithuanian%20NHRI_Questionnaire%20for%20EBCO%20Report%202025_Conscientious%20objection.pdf
Archived at: https://web.archive.org/web/20260716104501/https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/Lithuanian%20NHRI_Questionnaire%20for%20EBCO%20Report%202025_Conscientious%20objection.pdf

[xxxii] A/HRC/41/23, 24 May 2019, para. 60(c). https://undocs.org/A/HRC/41/23
See also: A/HRC/50/43, 11 May 2022, para. 57(d). https://undocs.org/A/HRC/50/43

[xxxiii] CCPR/C/LVA/CO/4, 3 September 2025. (paras. 37-38(b)). https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/LVA/CO/4
See also: CCPR/C/BRB/QPR/4, 22 April 2025. (para. 21(b)). https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/BRB/QPR/4

[xxxiv] E.g. Austria: CCPR/C/AUT/QPR/6, 30 August 2024, para. 21(b). https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/AUT/QPR/6
Barbados: CCPR/C/BRB/QPR/4, 22 April 2025, para. 21(b). https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/BRB/QPR/4

[xxxv] CCPR/C/SR.4273, 27 May 2026, para. 16. https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/SR.4273
[xxxvi] OSCE, ODIHR, *Handbook on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Armed Forces Personnel*, 2008, Chapter 10 Conscientious Objection to Military Conscription and Service, 4. Best Practices and Recommendations, p. 85 [second point]. https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/0/c/31393.pdf
[xxxvii] UN Human Rights Council, Resolution 24/17 (A/HRC/RES/24/17), 8 October 2013, para. 5. http://undocs.org/A/HRC/RES/24/17
[xxxviii] [Note in the original] Law on Conscription and Alternative National Defence Service, October 22, 1996, No. I-1593 (new revised version of the Law came into force January 1, 2026): https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.32330/asr
[xxxix] Parliamentary Ombudspersons' Office of the Republic of Lithuania, National Human Rights Institution, "Information for the Report on conscientious objection to military service in Europe", February 2026, p. 3.
https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/Lithuanian%20NHRI_Questionnaire%20for%20EBCO%20Report%202025_Conscientious%20objection.pdf
Archived at: https://web.archive.org/web/20260716104501/https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/Lithuanian%20NHRI_Questionnaire%20for%20EBCO%20Report%202025_Conscientious%20objection.pdf
[xl] Parliamentary Ombudspersons' Office of the Republic of Lithuania, National Human Rights Institution, "Information for the Report on conscientious objection to military service in Europe", February 2026, part "F. Application process for recognition of conscientious objectors", pp. 6-7.
https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/Lithuanian%20NHRI_Questionnaire%20for%20EBCO%20Report%202025_Conscientious%20objection.pdf
Archived at: https://web.archive.org/web/20260716104501/https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/Lithuanian%20NHRI_Questionnaire%20for%20EBCO%20Report%202025_Conscientious%20objection.pdf
[xli] CCPR/C/LTU/CO/4, 29 August 2018, para. 26. https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/LTU/CO/4
[xlii] [Note in the original] 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.
[xliii] [Note in the original] 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.
[xliv] UNHCR, Guidelines on International Protection No. 10, HCR/GIP/13/10/Corr. 1, 12 November 2014, p.1 (para. 3).
https://www.unhcr.org/publications/legal/529efd2e9/guidelines-international-protection-10-claims-refugee-status-related-military.html
[xlv] [Note in the original] See paras. 3 and 11 of the Guidelines.
[xlvi] [Note in the original] E/CN.4/2005/6/Add.1, p. 18; A/HRC/23/51, p. 28.
[xlvii] A/HRC/35/4, 1 May 2017, para. 15. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/35/4
[xlviii] A/HRC/35/4, 1 May 2017, para. 63. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/35/4
[xlix] A/HRC/41/23, 24 May 2019, para. 47. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/41/23
[l] A/HRC/41/23, 24 May 2019, para. 60(d). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/41/23
[li] [Note in the original] See https://www.refworld.org/pdfid/5cb474b27.pdf, pp. 186–189 (paras. 3 and 11); and A/HRC/41/23, para. 26.
[lii] A/HRC/50/43, 11 May 2022, para. 12. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/50/43
[liii] A/HRC/50/43, 11 May 2022, para. 57(e). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/50/43
[liv] [Note in the original] A/HRC/41/23, para. 26. For example, in Canada, Defence Administrative Orders and Directives 5516-2, Conscientious Objection, section 2.8, states that an objection founded on the participation of the Canadian Armed Forces member in a particular armed conflict or operation does not qualify as a conscientious objection and will not entitle a Canadian Armed Forces member to a voluntary release. In the interpretation of United States Code, Title 50, sect. 3806 (j), United States courts have held that a person must oppose war in any form and that objection to a particular war, but not all wars, is not sufficient for purposes of exemption; see, for example, United States Of America, Selective Service System, "Alternative service cases".
https://www.sss.gov/register/alternative-service/cases/
[lv] [Note in the original] Noam Lubell, "Selective conscientious objection in international law: refusing to participate in a specific armed conflict", Netherlands Quarterly of Human Rights, vol. 20, No. 4.
[lvi] [Note in the original] Tom Dannenbaum, "The criminalization of aggression and soldiers' rights", European Journal of International Law, vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 859–886.
[lvii] [Note in the original] Ahmed Shaheed and Laura Rodwell, "Foundations in freedom of thought, conscience and religion or belief", in A Missing Piece for Peace, Michael Wiener and David Fernández Puyana, eds. (University for Peace Press, 2022). International law contains a series of related rules. For example, customary international humanitarian law imposes a duty to disobey manifestly unlawful orders or those that would entail the commission of war crimes (see Jean-Marie Henckaerts and Louise Doswald-Beck, Customary International Humanitarian Law: Volume I – Rules (Geneva, International Committee of the Red Cross; Cambridge, United Kingdom, Cambridge University Press, 2005), rule 154), while international refugee law grants protection to individuals facing persecution for selective conscientious objection (see Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, "Guidelines on international protection: claims to refugee status related to military service within the context of article 1 (A) (2) of the 1951 Convention and/or the 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees", paras. 23–25).
[lviii] [Note in the original] Shaheed and Rodwell, "Foundations in freedom of thought, conscience, and religion or belief", p. 150.
[lix] [Note in the original] See A/HRC/35/4, para. 63; A/HRC/41/23, para. 60 (d); and A/HRC/50/43, para. 57 (e).
[lx] [Note in the original] A/HRC/23/22, para. 47.
[lxi] A/HRC/56/30, 23 April 2024, para. 20. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/56/30
[lxii] Parliamentary Ombudspersons' Office of the Republic of Lithuania, National Human Rights Institution, "Information for the Report on conscientious objection to military service in Europe", February 2026, part "J. Asylum for conscientious objectors", p. 11. https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/Lithuanian%20NHRI_Questionnaire%20for%20EBCO%20Report%202025_Conscientious%20objection.pdf
[lxiii] E.g. CED/C/UKR/CO/1, 4 October 2024, paras. 51(d), 52(d). https://docs.un.org/en/CED/C/UKR/CO/1
OHCHR, *Report on the human rights situation in Ukraine, 1 September to 30 November 2024*, 31 December 2024, para. 91.
https://ukraine.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/2025-01/2024-12-31%20OHCHR%2041st%20periodic%20report%20on%20Ukraine.pdf
A/HRC/57/59, 13 September 2024, para. 150(p). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/57/59
[lxiv] A/HRC/54/54, 18 September 2023, paras. 78, 96-98, 112(s). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/54/54

A/HRC/57/59, 13 September 2024, paras. 84-90, 101, 124. See also: 150(p), 151(e). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/57/59
OHCHR, *Report on the human rights situation in Ukraine, 1 September to 30 November 2024*, 31 December 2024, para. 91. https://ukraine.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/2025-01/2024-12-31%20OHCHR%2041st%20periodic%20report%20on%20Ukraine.pdf
[lxv] A/HRC/57/59, 13 September 2024, paras. 85, 86, 90, 150(p). See also 151(e) https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/57/59
A/79/508, 11 October 2024, paras. 67-69, 107, 113(e) and (p). https://docs.un.org/en/A/79/508
OHCHR, *Report on the human rights situation in Ukraine, 1 September to 30 November 2024*, 31 December 2024, para. 91. https://ukraine.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/2025-01/2024-12-31%20OHCHR%2041st%20periodic%20report%20on%20Ukraine.pdf
[lxvi] CCPR/C/RUS/CO/8, 1 December 2022, paras. 6, 8, 18, 20, 21, 38, 39. https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/RUS/CO/8
[lxvii] "Special Rapporteur exposes torture in Russia as a tool for repression at home and aggression abroad", 29 October 2024. https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2024/10/special-rapporteur-exposes-torture-russia-tool-repression-home-and
[lxviii] A/79/508, 11 October 2024, see particularly paras: 67-69, 107, 113(p). https://docs.un.org/en/A/79/508
[lxix] A/HRC/57/59, 13 September 2024, para. 151(e). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/57/59
[lxx] A/HRC/60/59, 15 September 2025, paras. 91-97. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/60/59
[lxxi] A/HRC/60/59, 15 September 2025, para. 142(b). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/60/59
[lxxii] [Note in the original] https://ebco-beoc.org/press-release/2025-02-14-protection-of-russian-belarusian-conscientious-objectors-in-the-eu
[lxxiii] [Note in the original] https://teisesvartai.lt/advokatu-kainos/
[lxxiv] [Note in the original] https://objectwarcampaign.org/2023/08/17/report-on-the-situation-of-belarusian-conscientious-objectors-and-draft-evaders-in-lithuania/
[lxxv] [Note in the original] https://www.lrs.lt/sip/portal.show?p_r=35403&p_k=2&p_t=284347
[lxxvi] EBCO, *Annual Report, Conscientious Objection to Military Service in Europe 2025*, 11 May 2026, pp. 62-63. https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/2026-05-11-EBCO_Annual_Report_2025.pdf
[lxxvii] E.g. WRI and Connection e.V., "Oral statement given at Interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants: UN Human Rights Council, 56th Session", 26 June 2024. https://wri-irg.org/en/story/2024/oral-statement-given-interactive-dialogue-special-rapporteur-human-rights-migrants-un
"International campaign: Protection and asylum for human rights defender Olga Karatch", 24 August 2023. https://wri-irg.org/en/story/2023/international-campaign-protection-and-asylum-human-rights-defender-olga-karatch
[lxxviii] "Joint statement: Immediate risk of deportation of Russian war resister Maksim Kuzmin", 30 March 2026. https://wri-irg.org/en/story/2026/joint-statement-immediate-risk-deportation-russian-war-resister-maksim-kuzmin
[lxxix] https://ndbelarus.com/2026/06/21/lithuania-deported-a-russian-deserter-after-six-months-of-continuous-detention/
[lxxx] European Parliament resolution of 16 February 2023 on one year of Russia's invasion and war of aggression against Ukraine (2023/2558(RSP)), para. 30. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2023-0056_EN.html
[lxxxi] A/HRC/62/24, 21 April 2026, para. 21. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/62/24
[lxxxii] 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.
[lxxxiii] UNHCR: Guidelines on International Protection No. 10, para. 3. https://www.unhcr.org/sites/default/files/legacy-pdf/529efd2e9.pdf
[lxxxiv] United Nations, General Assembly, Conscientious objection to military service, Analytical report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, (A/HRC/50/43), 11 May 2022, paras. 20-22. http://undocs.org/A/HRC/50/43
[lxxxv] UN Human Rights Council, Resolution 24/17 (A/HRC/RES/24/17), 8 October 2013, para. 13. http://undocs.org/A/HRC/RES/24/17
[lxxxvi] UNHCR, Handbook on procedures and criteria for determining refugee status and guidelines on international protection, Reissued, Geneva, February 2019, p. 226. https://www.refworld.org/pdfid/5cb474b27.pdf.
[lxxxvii] UN Human Rights Council, "Arbitrary detention. Report of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention", (A/HRC/42/39), 16 July 2019, para. 63. http://undocs.org/A/HRC/42/39
[lxxxviii] Committee against Torture, "General comment No. 4 (2017) on the implementation of article 3 of the Convention in the context of article 22", (CAT/C/GC/4), 4 September 2018, para. 45. http://undocs.org/CAT/C/GC/4
[lxxxix] UN Human Rights Council, Conscientious objection to military service, Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, (A/HRC/56/30), 23 April 2024, para. 58. https://undocs.org/A/HRC/56/30
[xc] A/HRC/62/24, 21 April 2026, para. 44(f). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/62/24
[xci] See for example ECtHR, *M.D. and others v. Russia*, paras. 45 and 110. https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-211791
[xcii] CRC/C/OPAC/LTU/CO/1, 6 December 2007, para. 6. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/OPAC/LTU/CO/1
[xciii] CRC/C/OPAC/LTU/CO/1, 6 December 2007, para. 8. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/OPAC/LTU/CO/1
[xciv] CRC/C/OPAC/LTU/CO/1, 6 December 2007, para. 9. See also para. 7. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/OPAC/LTU/CO/1
[xcv] CRC/C/LTU/CO/5-6, 7 March 2024, para. 46. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/LTU/CO/5-6
[xcvi] [Note in the original] https://www.gssc.lt/en/publication/citizens-first-total-defense-always-an-interview-with-colonel-linas-idzelis-on-the-lithuanian-riflemens-union-lfpr-vol-44-2026/
[xcvii] [Note in the original] https://www.lrt.lt/naujienos/svietimas/45/2597312/seime-pirmas-zingsnis-plesti-pilietiskumo-ir-gynybos-igudziu-kursa
[xcviii] [Note in the original] https://www.sauliusajunga.lt/en/frequently-asked-questions
[xcix] [Note in the original] https://www.baltictimes.com/lithuania_to_allow_all_willing_gymnasiums_to_offer_cadet_education/
[c] EBCO, *Annual Report, Conscientious Objection to Military Service in Europe 2025*, 11 May 2026, p. 63. https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/2026-05-11-EBCO_Annual_Report_2025.pdf
[ci] Parliamentary Ombudspersons' Office of the Republic of Lithuania, National Human Rights Institution, "Information for the Report on conscientious objection to military service in Europe", February 2026, part "D. School system", pp. 4-5. https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/Lithuanian%20NHRI_Questionnaire%20for%20EBCO%20Report%202025_Conscientious%20objection.pdf
Archived at: https://web.archive.org/web/20260716104501/https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/Lithuanian%20NHRI_Questionnaire%20for%20EBCO%20Report%202025_Conscientious%20objection.pdf