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)

THAILAND

Conscientious objection to military service, juvenile recruitment, training of children on the use of firearms and related issues

August 2026

Contact:
Zaira Zafarana
Human Rights Advocacy
zaira.zafarana@proton.me

Introduction

This submission focuses on **the right to conscientious objection to military service** and on concerns highlighted by the Committee on the Rights of the Child **in the context of the Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict (OP-CRC-AC**) and **during the Universal Periodic Review (UPR)**.
The right to conscientious objection to military service is **not recognised** and implemented by the State party, and **conscientious objectors to military service face prison sentences, as it is the case of Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal**.
There are further concerns related to **juvenile recruitment** by state and non-state actors and the need to be **explicitly criminalised**, as well as **the need to prohibit training on the use of firearms in military schools for children under 18 years of age**.

Previous consideration by the Human Rights Committee

- ***The right to conscientious objection to military service***

The right to conscientious objection to military service does not appear to have been explicitly cited so far in the concluding observations of the UN Human Rights Committee (hereinafter the Committee) concerning the State party. However, the **recent conviction and sentencing of conscientious objector to military service Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal** (see below), makes it **urgent for this issue to be included in the List of Issues Prior to Reporting of this third Cycle**.
Furthermore, the right to conscientious objection to military service inheres in the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion enshrined in article 18 of ICCPR (see below) and it is highly important that Thailand ratifies the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights about individual communications. Despite numerous and repeated relevant UPR recommendations[i] and a voluntary commitment in 2016,[ii] the State under review, so far, does not appear to have done so.[iii]

- ***Juvenile recruitment and training of children on the use of firearms***

Neither the issue of **juvenile recruitment** by state and non-state actors and the need to be **explicitly criminalised**, nor the need **to prohibit training on the use of firearms in military schools for children under 18 years of age** do not appear to have been explicitly addressed in previous concluding observations.

The right to conscientious objection to military service

International human rights law and standards
All states must respect, protect and fulfil the right to conscientious objection to military service. This is a binding legal obligation, especially for the States which are state parties to the **International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)**, as the State party since 29 October 1996.[iv]

According to the **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." [v]
Accordingly, the Committee has found violations of article 18(1) in the cases of states not recognising the right to conscientious objection to military service, such as the Republic of Korea (not recognising it by that time), Türkiye, Turkmenistan.

The **OHCHR** has repeatedly stated that "The right to conscientious objection to military service derives from the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief pursuant to article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights".[vi] And that "States should give recognition to the right to conscientious objection to military service in their domestic legal systems."[vii]

The **UN Commission on Human Rights,** the predecessor of the UN Human Rights Council, already since 1987, had appealed, "to States to recognize that conscientious objection to military service should be considered a legitimate exercise of the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion recognized by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights" and had invited "States to take measures aimed at exemption from military service on the basis of a genuinely held conscientious objection to armed service".[viii] Two years later, the Commission explicitly declared that it "Recognizes the right of everyone to have conscientious objection to military service as a legitimate exercise of the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion as laid down in article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as well as article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights."[ix]

The **UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention** has recognised that "the right to conscientious objection to military service is part of the absolutely protected right to hold a belief under article 18 (1) of the Covenant [ICCPR], which cannot be restricted by States".[x]

No recognition in Thailand

In Thailand, there is compulsory military service. Military conscription for men aged 21 and over is determined each April through a lottery system – drawing a red card results in up to two years of mandatory service, while a black card grants exemption. There is also an option for voluntary enlistment.

Thailand, so far, has not recognised the right to conscientious objection to military service. Therefore, conscientious objectors are not exempted from military service; they are not even provided with an alternative civilian service, and can be prosecuted for draft evasion and face prison sentences.

The legal case of Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal

Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal is a conscientious objector to military service, activist, and human rights defender who joined the Amnesty International movement in 2012 and served on the Board of Amnesty International Thailand between 2018 and 2019.[xi]

He first declared his conscientious objection to military service in 2014, as a teenager, after the Thai military seized power in 2014.[xii] On 5 April 2024 he refused to take part in military conscription, because of his conscientious objection to military service.

On 15 May 2025, on the occasion of the International Conscientious Objection Day, a declaration of Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal was published by War Resisters' International:

> "*My name is Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal. I am a conscientious objector from Thailand.*
> *In my country, military conscription is still enforced. Young men are expected to surrender their bodies to the state but have chosen a different path.*
> *I refused conscription not out of fear, but out of conviction. I reject the idea that peace must come through violence, that obedience is more important than conscience.*
> *Militaristic values permeate Thai society—not only in the barracks, but in our classrooms, in our politics, in how young people are taught to think and express themselves. These values make true education, democracy, and freedom of expression difficult to achieve.*
> *Our objective is to resist that mindset and instead we say: our lives should not be tools of war, our minds not moulded by fear.*
> *On this International CO Day, I stand in solidarity with objectors around the world—those who refuse to kill, those who choose compassion over conformity. Our stance may be lonely, even dangerous, BUT it is also necessary.*
> *Because conscience is not weakness. It is strength. And it may yet be the seed of a more just and peaceful world."*[xiii]

Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal's refusal to take part in military conscription has been described also as "an act of civil disobedience in relation to the army, where human rights abuses against military conscripts and low-ranking officials are rampant. In 2020, Amnesty International released a report[xiv] detailing mental, physical and sexual abuse against conscripts in the Thai military."[xv]

On 22 May 2025, the public prosecutor at the Samut Prakan Provincial Court indicted Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal for allegedly evading military conscription under the 1954 Military Conscription Act. If found guilty, Netiwit could be sentenced to up to three years' imprisonment.

On 10–11 September 2025, hearings took place at the Provincial Court of Samut Prakan. Following witness testimony, "his defence filed a motion asking the court to refer Sections 27 and 45 of the Military Service Act and Revolutionary Council Announcement No 226 (October 18, 1972) to the Constitutional Court to determine whether these laws conflict with the Constitution. […] Netiwit testified that his refusal for over 11 years is rooted in his Buddhist beliefs, particularly the principles of non-violence and not harming others. He emphasized that even handling weapons in basic military training contradicts his conscience. He argued that conscription infringes on individual freedoms guaranteed under Sections 26 and 31 of the 2017 Constitution which protect personal rights and freedom of religion, as well as international law under Article 18 of the ICCPR."[xvi]

The Samut Prakan Provincial Court referred the case to the Constitutional Court. At a meeting on 28 January 2026, the Constitutional Court agreed to consider whether Sections 27 and 45 of the Military Service Act are compatible with constitutional protections of rights, liberty and human dignity under Sections 26 and 31 of the Constitution and requested the Defence Minister to submit opinions and supporting documents within 15 days.[xvii]

While the case was pending at the Constitutional Court, Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal gave an interview where, among other aspects, he further explained his conscientious objection as well as how it is linked with Buddhist principles:

> "The first precept for Buddhists is the prohibition against killing, especially killing of human beings. Being a soldier involves training to kill and being ready to kill by perceiving others as enemies. Our history has constantly manufactured enemies – from the Burmese, the Holy Man rebels during the era of centralization, the Chinese at one point, people in the Southern Border Provinces, to the Cambodians. But if we look closely, these 'enemies' are none other than human beings with lives, blood, parents, and families who desire love and goodwill just as we do. We cannot choose where we are born; we just happen to be on different sides of a border". [xviii]

On 12 May 2026, despite the obligations of the State party under the Covenant, the **Constitutional Court ruled** unanimously that the Military Service Act's provisions do not violate constitutional protections of liberty and religious freedom.[xix] The criminal case resumed on that basis and on 20 July 2026, the Samut Prakan District Court imposed a **six-month prison sentence suspended for one year**. The conviction represents a **serious violation of the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, protected under Article 18** of the Covenant to which Thailand is a party.[xx] To our knowledge, this is the **first known case of conviction and sentencing of a publicly declared conscientious objector to military service** in the State party and sets an extremely dangerous precedent.

Juvenile recruitment, training of children on the use of firearms and related issues

Issues related to juvenile recruitment by state and non-state actors have been repeatedly emerged and examined by the **Committee on the Rights of the Child**, and in the context of the **UPR** of the State party when it has been the State under review.

Committee on the Rights of the Child

In **2006**, in its concluding observations concerning the second periodic report of Thailand, the Committee on the Rights of the Child noted "the Cabinet's recent decision to become party to the Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict and recommends that the State party ratify that Optional Protocol".[xxi] Indeed Thailand acceded to the Optional Protocol in February 2006.

In the same concluding observations, the Committee on the Rights of the Child urged "the State party to make every effort to reinforce protection of the right to life, survival and development of all children within the State party, particularly with respect to **former child soldiers** and to children in the southernmost provinces of the country, through targeted policies, programmes and services. The Committee also urges the State party to protect all children from the consequences of the civil unrest and to ensure their reintegration in society. It also urges the State party to develop, in collaboration with non-governmental and international organizations, a comprehensive system of psychosocial support and assistance for children affected by violence and conflict".[xxii]

In **2012**, in its concluding observations concerning the report submitted by the State party under article 8 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, the Committee on the Rights of the Child noted "with appreciation the establishment of 18 years of age as the age for registration for active and inactive military personnel under the Military Service Act of 1954 and Defence Ministerial Regulation of 2000".[xxiii] However, the Committee on the Rights of the Child was "concerned that the provisions of the Optional Protocol are not fully incorporated into domestic legislation, especially with regard to the criminalization of recruitment of children under the age of 18 years into armed forces" and "in light of article 6 of the Optional Protocol" urged "the State party to take measures to fully incorporate the provisions of the Optional Protocol into its domestic legislation and to explicitly criminalize the recruitment of children under the age of 18 years into armed forces".[xxiv] The same Committee was explicitly "concerned that the State party's legislation, including the 1956 Criminal Code and Child Protection Act of 2003, does not explicitly criminalize the recruitment and/or use of persons under 18 years by armed forces, village defence militias or non-State armed groups" and "in order to strengthen the national and international measures for the prevention of the recruitment of children by armed forces or armed groups and their use in hostilities" the Committee recommended "that the State party explicitly criminalize by law the recruitment and involvement of children in armed forces, village defence militias or non-State armed groups".[xxv]
Furthermore, "while welcoming the Ministerial regulation No 2, 2554 of April 2011 which prohibits persons below the age of 18 from taking part in village defence trainings", the Committee on the Rights of the Child was "concerned about reports of **informal association of children in a range of functions by the village defence militia- Chor Ror Bor in the southern border provinces**, who carry out the same or similar duties as formal members". The Committee was "further concerned at the lack of clarity of the applicable rules, and awareness of the rules among key officials, the lack of implementation of existing policy and procedures, and the lack of effective oversight and accountability, which has created a situation where children could be vulnerable to formal and informal association with Chor Ror Bor". Therefore, the same Committee urged "the State party to take necessary measures to prevent and prohibit the informal involvement of children with the Chor Ror Bor" and further recommended "that the State party establish effective monitoring and accountability mechanisms for key officials for both formal and informal involvement of children in village defence militias and raise their awareness of laws prohibiting such recruitment".[xxvi]

In addition to the above, the Committee on the Rights of the Child regretted "the lack of data and statistics on many areas covered under the Optional Protocol, in **particular the number of persons under the age of 18 enrolled in military schools**, and **refugee and asylum-seeking children who have been or may have been involved in widespread armed violence**" and made relevant recommendations.[xxvii]
In regard to **military schools**, the Committee on the Rights of the Child was "concerned that at undergraduate level, where the minimum age for attendance is 16 years and over, the curriculum includes military subjects, such as **weapons handling**, land, naval and air logistics, military disciplines" and recommended "that the State party:
(a) Undertake a comprehensive review of all military schools under its jurisdiction with a view to ensuring their compliance with the provisions of the Optional Protocol;
(b) Establish a comprehensive registration system of all pupils enrolled in military schools which collects data disaggregated by sex, age, socio-economic background and geographical location, and which is centralized and regularly monitored;
(c) Consider regular joint monitoring of military schools by the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Defence and the Child Protection Committees to ensure that such schools comply with the provisions of the Optional Protocol;
(d) Ensure a clear prohibition of training on the use of firearms in military schools for children under 18 years of age."[xxviii]

The Committee on the Rights of the Child was also "concerned about the lack of the protection of asylum-seeking and refugee children (so called " externally displaced persons"), including former child soldiers, who live in official and unofficial camps in Thailand, as well as the lack of mechanisms for identifying former child soldiers among refugees/asylum-seekers" and that "in the absence of adequate identification and protection measures, child soldiers who have escaped from Myanmar could be among the populations forcibly returned to Myanmar, where they can face re-recruitment and/or detention on charges of desertion". The Committee was "particularly

concerned that children in the camps are at risk of recruitment and re-recruitment by non-State armed groups from Myanmar operating inside the Thai border" and made detailed recommendations.[xxix]

At about the same time, in **2012**, the Committee on the Rights of the Child considered the third and fourth periodic report of Thailand regarding the Convention on the Rights of the Child and, *inter alia*, recommended "that the State party:

(a) Take immediate measures to ensure that the situation in the southern border provinces has no adverse effects directly and indirectly on children. In doing so, the Committee **recommends that the State party implement its recommendations under the Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict (CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1) without any delay**;

(b) Ensure that schools are not disrupted by State military and paramilitary units and are protected from attacks by non-state armed groups;

(c) Provide as a matter of priority psychosocial support and services to children affected by the armed violence;

(d) Expedite the adoption of the Plan of Action on the Protection and Development of Children and Youth in the Southern Border Provinces".[xxx]

UPR

- ***First Cycle***

In the **Summary of Stakeholders' information**, it was highlighted that:

> "JPF referred to the persistence of children's involvement in Chor Ror Bor (Government-established village defence volunteer units), as well as their continued involvement in armed opposition groups in southern Thailand. It highlighted the need for the Government to end children's recruitment and use by all armed parties.[xxxi"xxxii]

Furthermore, "HRW reported that the Pejuang Kemerdekaan Patani insurgency in the loose network of BRN-Coordinate (National Revolution Front-Coordinate) was a separatist movement involving Thailand's southern border provinces and that insurgents frequently targeted teachers and schools, as these were seen as Government entities. Insurgents had targeted Malay Muslim teachers at Government schools and Islamic school administrators who resisted insurgents' efforts to use classrooms for indoctrination and recruiting.[xxxiii"xxxiv]

In addition to the above, "JS9 referred to reports that 5,111 children in the south were orphaned due to the loss of their custodian and that children aged 13 and above had lost their lives and been detained in army camps with adults.[xxxv"xxxvi]

In the **Compilation of UN information**, it was noted that Thailand has acceded to the Convention on the Rights of the Child since 27 March 1992, and to the Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict since 27 February 2006, with a binding declaration under article 3 about minimum age for voluntary recruitment in the armed forces to be 18 years.

It is worth noting that the Compilation failed to highlight that already since 2006, the Committee on the Rights of the Child had explicitly raised the issue of protection of the right to life, survival and development particularly of **former child soldiers**.[xxxvii]

Nevertheless, it was highlighted that:

> "24. In 2011, the Secretary-General stated that the United Nations had received information that pointed to the alleged involvement of children in activities of non-State armed groups and village defence volunteers (Chor Ror Bor). Thailand stated that no children were associated with the village defence volunteers.[xxxviii"xxxix]

The above resulted in the issue being cited in the **Report of the Working Group**, (e.g. "Honduras noted the challenges of violence against children and children's participation in armed groups"[xl]), including in explicit recommendations, such as:

> "Adopt all necessary measures to eradicate the abuse and sexual exploitation of children, corporal punishment, the recruitment of children by armed groups and to combat the worst forms of child labour"[xli]
>
> "End the recruitment of children and their participation in armed groups"[xlii]

It is also worth noting a recommendation among the **supported** ones which called to "Review the legislation and national public policies regarding the rights of the child in the light of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its Optional Protocols".[xliii]

However, as far as it concerns the explicit recommendations about recruitment of children by armed groups, in the **Addendum**, the State under review replied:

> "16. The following recommendation enjoys our support, in part:
> • 89.36. As a State Party to the CRC, Thailand is committed to eradicating corporal punishment as well as the abuse and sexual exploitation of children, and to combatting the worst forms of child labour. However, Thailand is unable to accept the part of this recommendation to eradicate the recruitment of children by armed groups. While we are committed to protecting children from all forms of exploitation, we cannot agree to this phrase as we do not recognize the existence of armed groups within our territory.
> 17. The following recommendation does not enjoy our support:
> • 89.37. The reason has been mentioned in Paragraph 16."[xliv]

- ***Second Cycle***

In the **Summary of Stakeholders' information**, it was highlighted that:

> "JS2 noted that children as young as 14 had been recruited and used to participate in hostilities by armed groups operating in southern Thailand. In December 2013, children under the age of 18 were present in the ranks of the dominant armed opposition groups, including the Patani Malay National Revolutionary Front (Barisan Revolusi Nasional Melayu Patani or BRN).[xlv"xlvi]

In the **Compilation of UN information**, it was highlighted that:

> "29. The Committee on the Rights of the Child welcomed the 2011 ministerial regulation that prohibited persons below the age of 18 from taking part in village defence training. It was concerned about reports of informal association of children by the village defence militia Chor Ror Bor in the southern border provinces, who carried out the same or similar duties as formal members.[xlvii] It recommended that Thailand explicitly criminalize by law the recruitment and involvement of children in armed forces, village defence militias or non-State armed groups.[xlviii]
> 30. The Committee on the Rights of Child recommended that Thailand ensure that schools are not disrupted by State military and paramilitary units and protected from attacks by non-State armed groups, provide as a matter of priority psychosocial support and services to the children affected by armed violence and expedite the adoption of the Plan of Action on the Protection and Development of Children and Youth in the Southern Border Provinces.[xlix"l]

The above resulted in a relevant recommendation, which in the **Report of the Working Group** was cited among those **supported** by the State under review:

> "Criminalize the recruitment and participation of children in armed forces and non-State armed groups".[li]

- ***Third Cycle***

In the **Summary of Stakeholders' information**, it was highlighted that:

> "HKCIJ also noted that children were used for agricultural forced labour and recruited by armed groups as child soldiers, specifically in Thailand's southernmost provinces.[lii"liii]

In the **Second Batch of Advance Questions**, Panama requested:

> "Also, Panama recommended that Thailand adopt concrete measures to eradicate child labour, abuse and sexual exploitation of children, including its involvement in sexual tourism, and **criminalize the recruitment and participation of children in armed forces and non-State armed groups**. We would appreciate information on the progress made in the implementation of these recommendations, especially in light of reports on child early and forced marriage and unions, online sexual abuse and violence such as cyberbullying, online grooming, child prostitution and online pornography, trafficking for sexual exploitation, the use of children for agricultural forced labour and **their recruitment by armed groups as child soldiers, specifically in Thailand's southernmost provinces**."[liv] [Emphasis added]

However, in the **National Report**, the State under review, despite mentioning the number of the relevant recommendation of Panama of the previous cycle (107), did not appear to provide any detail on its implementation.[lv]

In light of the above, and despite that no relevant recommendation appear to have been repeated in the Third Cycle of UPR, taking also into consideration that Thailand does not appear to have reported to the Committee on the Rights of the Child since 2012, it is worth **including in the List of Issues Prior to Reporting** the issue of the need for explicit **criminalisation of the recruitment and participation of children in armed forces and non-State armed groups,** and for **prohibition of training on the use of firearms in military schools for children under 18 years of age** as well as **further related issues** raised by the **Committee on the Rights of the Child,** and in the context of the **UPR**.

Suggested questions for the list of issues prior to reporting

Taking into consideration the above, we kindly suggest the following questions for the List of Issues Prior to Reporting:

a) Please report on measures taken to adopt legislation recognizing the right to conscientious objection to military service in line with international human rights law and standards, including the exemption of conscientious objectors from the compulsory military service and reserve duties, and in case a compulsory alternative service is established, to be genuinely civilian, in the public interest and not of a punitive character. (Articles 18 and 26)

b) Please report on prosecution and punishment of conscientious objectors to military service, including in the case of Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal. (Articles 9, 18 and 26)

c) Please clarify whether the State party intends to accede to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and if so, what measures have been taken to this direction.

d) Please report on measures to criminalize the recruitment and participation of children in armed forces and non-State armed groups, to prohibit the training on the use of firearms in military schools for children under 18 years of age, and to ensure the effective implementation of all recommendations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child in the context of the Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict and relevant UPR recommendations. (Article 24)

[i] E.g. [First Cycle] A/HRC/19/8, 8 December 2011, recommendations 89.1 (Argentina), 89.2 (Uruguay), 89.3 (Spain), 89.4 (Austria), 89.6 (Hungary).

https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/19/8
[Second Cycle] A/HRC/33/16, 15 July 2016, recommendation 158.6 (Austria) (Poland) [supported by Thailand].
https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/33/16
[Third Cycle] A/HRC/49/17, 21 December 2021, recommendation 52.11 (Austria). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/49/17

[ii] [Second Cycle] A/HRC/33/16, 15 July 2016, para. 161(a). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/33/16

[iii] https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/TreatyBodyExternal/Treaty.aspx?CountryID=172&Lang=EN
https://treaties.un.org/Pages/showDetails.aspx?objid=0800000280006 80a&clang=_en

[iv] https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/TreatyBodyExternal/Treaty.aspx?CountryID=172&Lang=EN

[v] 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.

[vi] 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, para. 57(a). http://undocs.org/A/HRC/50/43

[vii] 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. 54. https://undocs.org/A/HRC/56/30
See also: A/HRC/62/24, 21 April 2026, para. 41(a). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/62/24

[viii] UN Commission on Human Rights, Resolution 1987/46, 10 March 1987, paras. 1-2.
https://www.refworld.org/legal/resolution/unchr/1987/en/8324

[ix] UN Commission on Human Rights, Resolution 1989/59, 8 March 1989, para. 1.
https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/E-CN_4-RES-1989-59.pdf
Confirmed in Resolution 1991/65, and all subsequent ones: Resolution 1993/84, para. 1, Resolution 1995/83, para. 1, Resolution 1998/77, para. 1, Resolution 2000/34, Resolution 2002/45, Resolution 2004/35.

[x] UN General Assembly, Human Rights Council, Arbitrary detention, Report of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, (A/HRC/42/39), 16 July 2019, para. 60(b). https://undocs.org/A/HRC/42/39

[xi] Amnesty International, "Thailand: Authorities must immediately drop charges against conscientious objector", 5 September 2025. https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2025/09/thailand-authorities-must-immediately-drop-charges-against-conscientious-objector/

[xii] Connection e.V., Conscientious Objection Watch, New Profile, Movement of Conscientious Objectors, War Resisters' International, World without War, "Thailand: Drop charges against Conscientious Objector Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal", 9 September 2025. https://en.connection-ev.org/article-4551

[xiii] War Resisters' International, "Refusing to Kill: Statements of Conscientious Objectors", 15 May 2025.
https://wri-irg.org/en/story/2025/refusing-kill-statements-conscientious-objectors

[xiv] Amnesty International, *Thailand: "We were just toys to them": Physical, mental and sexual abuse of conscripts in Thailand's military*, Index Number: ASA 39/1995/2020, 23 March 2020. https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/asa39/1995/2020/en/

[xv] Amnesty International, "Thailand: Authorities must immediately drop charges against conscientious objector", 5 September 2025. https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2025/09/thailand-authorities-must-immediately-drop-charges-against-conscientious-objector/

[xvi] Erich Parpart, "Witness testimony concludes in Netiwit's Military Conscription Case; Verdict Scheduled for November 3", *Thai Enquirer*, 11 September 2025. https://www.thaienquirer.com/59547/witness-testimony-concludes-in-netiwits-military-conscription-case-verdict-scheduled-for-november-3/?__cf_chl_rt_tk=3i_UuZXAzVk2R7TYVhKugq.87_VPFxraAFCcnYJ5Tbc-1757631418-1.0.1.1-SEgEGpu8O.Op7QA36kKTugEpxTBOO6vDSCpHTwlzVHg

[xvii] War Resisters' International, "Thailand: Constitutional Court requests government response in Netiwit's conscription challenge", 30 January 2026. https://wri-irg.org/en/story/2026/thailand-constitutional-court-requests-government-response-netiwits-conscription

[xviii] "112WATCH interviews activist Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal on the abolition of conscription in Thailand", 1 March 2026.
https://112watch.org/the-abolition-of-conscription-in-thailand/

[xix] Joint Statement, "Thailand: Court to rule in first criminal case on conscientious objection to military service", 16 July 2026. https://wri-irg.org/en/story/2026/thailand-court-rule-first-criminal-case-conscientious-objection-military-service

[xx] Joint "Statement on the conviction of Thai conscientious objector Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal", 22 July 2026.
https://wri-irg.org/en/story/2026/statement-conviction-thai-conscientious-objector-netiwit-chotiphatphaisal

[xxi] CRC/C/THA/CO/2, 17 March 2006, para. 80. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/THA/CO/2

[xxii] CRC/C/THA/CO/2, 17 March 2006, para. 28. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/THA/CO/2

[xxiii] CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1, 21 February 2012, para. 4. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1

[xxiv] CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1, 21 February 2012, paras. 5-6. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1

[xxv] CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1, 21 February 2012, paras. 17-18. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1

[xxvi] CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1, 21 February 2012, paras. 13-14. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1

[xxvii] CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1, 21 February 2012, paras. 11-12. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1

[xxviii] CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1, 21 February 2012, paras. 15-16. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1

[xxix] CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1, 21 February 2012, paras. 21-22. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1

[xxx] CRC/C/THA/CO/3-4, 17 February 2012, para. 85. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/THA/CO/3-4

[xxxi] [Note in the original] JPF, para. 18. [JPF: Justice for Peace Foundation; Bangkok, Thailand]

[xxxii] A/HRC/WG.6/12/THA/3, 25 July 2011, para. 29. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/WG.6/12/THA/3

[xxxiii] [Note in the original] HRW, p. 2 [HRW: Human Rights Watch; Geneva, Switzerland]

[xxxiv] A/HRC/WG.6/12/THA/3, 25 July 2011, para. 56. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/WG.6/12/THA/3

[xxxv] [Note in the original] JS9, para. 28.

[xxxvi] A/HRC/WG.6/12/THA/3, 25 July 2011, para. 28. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/WG.6/12/THA/3

[xxxvii] CRC/C/THA/CO/2, 17 March 2006, para. 28. https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/THA/CO/2

[xxxviii] [Note in the original] Report of the Secretary-General on children and armed conflict (A/65/820-S/2011/250), para. 182.

[xxxix] A/HRC/WG.6/12/THA/2, 25 July 2011, para. 24. https://docs.un..org/en/A/HRC/WG.6/12/THA/2

[xl] A/HRC/19/8, 8 December 2011, para. 62. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/19/8

[xli] A/HRC/19/8, 8 December 2011, recommendation 89.36 (Uruguay). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/19/8

[xlii] A/HRC/19/8, 8 December 2011, recommendation 89.37 (Honduras). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/19/8
[xliii] A/HRC/19/8, 8 December 2011, recommendation 88.35 (Uruguay). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/19/8
[xliv] A/HRC/19/8/Add.1, 6 March 2012, paras. 16-17. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/19/8/Add.1
[xlv] [Note in the original] JS2, para. 14.
[xlvi] A/HRC/WG.6/25/THA/3, 23 February 2016, para. 17. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/WG.6/25/THA/3
[xlvii] [Note in the original] See CRC/C/OPAC/THA/CO/1, para. 13.
[xlviii] [Note in the original] Ibid., para. 18.
[xlix] [Note in the original] See CRC/C/THA/CO/3-4, para. 85.
[l] A/HRC/WG.6/25/THA/2, 7 March 2016, paras. 29-30. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/WG.6/25/THA/2
[li] A/HRC/33/16, 15 July 2016, recommendation 158.107 (Panama). https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/33/16
[lii] [Note in the original] HKCIJ, paras. 12–15. [HKCIJ: Helena Kennedy Centre for International Justice, Sheffield Hallam University (United Kingdom)]
[liii] A/HRC/WG.6/39/THA/3, 13 August 2021, para. 53. https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/WG.6/39/THA/3
[liv] https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/2021-11/Thailand_Advance_Questions_Second-Batch.docx
[lv] A/HRC/WG.6/39/THA/1, 17 August 2021, part F. Rights of specific groups, "Children (Recommendations 96, 99-**107**, 110, 112-114, 116-121, 171-172)". https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/WG.6/39/THA/1