



International Fellowship of Reconciliation
Internationaler Versöhnungsbund
Mouvement International de la Réconciliation
Movimiento Internacional de la Reconciliación

*The International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR) is an international, spiritually-based movement composed of people who commit themselves to active nonviolence as a way of life and as a means of transformation --- personal, social, economic and political.
IFOR has special consultative status with the United Nations (ECOSOC) and representation at UNESCO.*

Spoorstraat 38
1815 BK Alkmaar
The Netherlands / Pays-Bas

Phone: +31-72 512 30 14
Fax: +31-72 515 11 02
Postbank: 2704182

Email: office@ifor.org
Website: <http://www.ifor-mir.org>
KvK Alkmaar: 41177187



Conscience and Peace Tax International

Internacional de Conciencia e Impuestos para la Paz

NGO in Special Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council of the UN

International non-profit organization (Belgium 15.075/96)

Bruineveld 11 · B-3010 Leuven · Belgium · Ph.: +32.16.254011 ·

www.cpti.ws

e-*: cpti@cpti.ws

Belgian account: 000-1709814-92 · IBAN: BE12 0001 7098 1492 · BIC: BPOTBEB1

Joint UPR Submission: SWITZERLAND Fourteenth Session: October 2012

All correspondence regarding this submission should be sent to
Derek BRETT
International Fellowship of Reconciliation
Main Representative to the United Nations, Geneva
derekubrett@gmail.com
Tel: (41) 77 462 9825

Executive Summary

This submission deals with the situation in Switzerland with regard to conscientious objection to military service and related issues. It was prepared in April 2012 on the basis of the latest information available at that time.

The concerns to which it draws attention are:

The Law on Civilian Service sets a duration for civilian service which appears to be discriminatory and punitive by comparison with that of military service; moreover amendments which took effect early in 2011 represent a move away from recognised best practices and international standards with regard to conscientious objection to military service.

Switzerland retains a “military exemption tax” which is imposed on male citizens who do not perform military service. This provision is discriminatory and impinges on conscientious objectors to military service in their exercise of their freedom of thought, conscience and religion under article 18 of the Covenant.

Revisions to the Asylum Law are currently under consideration which have the explicit intention of debarring from its provisions conscientious objectors and others who are seeking asylum in order to escape military service in countries where there is no provision for conscientious objectors.

Background

1. As specified in Article 58 of Switzerland's 1999 Constitution “In principle, the armed forces shall be organised as a militia”. Article 59.1 states “Every Swiss man is required to do military service. Alternative civilian service shall be provided for by law.”

2. Male citizens are required to attend an initial period of eighteen weeks military training at around the age of 20, followed by service in the mobilisation reserve until at least their mid-30s. Reserve service includes attendance at regular target practice and, at approximately two-yearly intervals, at refresher courses, typically of seventeen days' duration.

3. With effect from the beginning of 2004 the combined length of initial and reserve training required of each conscript was reduced from 300 to 260 days; for officers and NCOs the cumulative requirement is greater, and in the case of officers the obligations continue until the age of 50. Fully-paid leave of absence from civilian employment is normal during reserve training. Only some 4,000 training personnel and officers above the rank of brigade commander do not follow this pattern but serve in the armed forces on a continuing basis. At any one time it is estimated that some 21,700 conscripts are in uniform, but over 172,000 are available for mobilisation¹

4. Switzerland was much later than its neighbours in accepting a right of conscientious objection to military service. This was conceded partially in 1991, when those who satisfied a military tribunal that their refusal to perform military service was the result of a “severe conflict of conscience” were permitted to expunge the relevant criminal convictions by performing compulsory labour of a duration one-and-a-half times that of military service,² but it was only with the passage of a Civilian Service Law³ which took effect at the beginning of 1996 that conscientious objection to military service was effectively decriminalised.

5. The Civilian Service Law of 1995 gave the possibility for those for whom military service would present a “severe conflict of conscience” to apply to a civilian Commission reporting to the Ministry of Economic Affairs for permission to perform a purely civilian alternative service. This was an enlightened piece of legislation in that the civilian nature of the alternative service was guaranteed by placing all aspects of its administration outside the control of the military authorities, and also in that no artificial time limits were placed on application. Those who had already

¹ The Military Balance 2012 (International Institute for Strategic Studies, London), p. 160.

² Horeman, B. & Stolwijk, M., Refusing to Bear Arms, War Resisters International, London, 1998.

³ RS 824.0 *Loi fédérale du 6 octobre 1995 sur le service civil (LSC)*

commenced their military service - including those who were subject to reserve obligations - were able to take advantage of the Law's provisions, receiving credit for the proportion of their military service obligation which they had fulfilled. The duration of alternative service was set at 1.5 times that of the military service (or the remaining proportion of such service).

6. An amendment to the Civilian Service Law dated 3rd October 2008 which came into effect on 1st April 2009 abolished the role of the Commission in interviewing those who sought admission to civilian service on the grounds of conscientious objection. Article 16a of the amended law stipulates that the application will be made in writing; a sub-paragraph enables the drawing up of procedures to enable electronic submission. Article 16b stipulates that the applicant must state that he is unable to reconcile military service with his conscience and that he is prepared to undertake the civilian service prescribed in the law. No condition or reservation can be attached to this statement. This means that it is impossible for an objector to make it clear that he is performing the service under protest, prompting a small number each year to refuse outright.

The First Cycle of the UPR

7. Switzerland was examined in the Second Session of the UPR Working Group, in May 2008. Issues regarding military service and conscientious objection did not feature in that discussion. Regarding the third concern raised in this submission, however, Switzerland accepted a recommendation from Brazil "to foster internal analysis on the recently adopted law on asylum and its compatibility with international human rights law"⁴. In fact, revisions to the asylum law which deserve such analysis are still under consideration at the time of writing.

Developments in the current review period

A) The Civilian Service Law

8. On 12th October 2010, the Federal Council approved amendments to the regulations under the Civilian Service Law, with the explicit intention of reducing the attractiveness of civilian service. This was justified by the fact that the number of applications that year had reached 7,000, roughly four times the level of a decade earlier.⁵

9. In fact the "manpower reaching militarily significant age" was estimated by the CIA as 46,542 in 2010.⁶ Approximately 60% are rejected or discharged on health or (most frequently) "psychological" grounds, and are not thereafter asked to perform any form of service. (Their tax bill is however increased, see next section.) The 7,000 applicants for alternative service, by contrast, represent a mere 15% of the age cohort.

10. The changes, which came into effect on 1st February 2011, include:
that the application form will no longer be accessible by internet, but must be requested individually that applications must be reconfirmed after four weeks within a narrow time window. otherwise they will be automatically rejected
that, within the overall requirement, a period of alternative service of six consecutive months must be completed within three years of approval of the application
a substantial (just under 50%) reduction in the subsistence allowances payable to those performing alternative service
a narrowing of the definition of organisations which can accept alternative service placements to

⁴ A/HRC/8/41, para 57.2; A/HRC/8/41/Add.1, para 3.

⁵ See the figures quoted by Stolwijk, M., The Right to Conscientious Objection in Europe: A Review of the Current Situation, Quaker Council on European Affairs, Brussels, 2005, p 69

⁶ CIA World Factbook, www.cia.gov, consulted 20th April 2012.

those working in “social and environmental” fields – and increased administrative charges levied on those organisations which are accepted.

11. These changes breach the spirit of Commission on Human Rights Resolution 1998/77; they are clearly incompatible with OP6: “States, in their law and practice, must not discriminate against conscientious objectors in relation to their terms or conditions of service, or any economic, social, cultural, civil or political rights” and run contrary to the spirit of OP2, which “Welcomes the fact that some States accept claims of conscientious objection as valid without inquiry” and OP8, which “Affirms the importance of the availability of information about the right to conscientious objection to military service, and the means of acquiring conscientious objector status, to all persons affected by military service.”

12. There is furthermore no evidence that the 50% discrepancy between the length of military service and alternative civilian service is objectively justified in line with the criteria set out by the Human Rights Committee.⁷ Indeed, the Swiss conscientious objectors' organisation BfMZ points out that in practice the discrimination against those performing civilian service is greater. All 390 days civilian service must be performed by the age of 34 whereas ordinary military conscripts are discharged from all obligations on reaching that age, whether or not they have done the full stipulated quota of 260 days; according to BfMZ thousands each year are discharged “not nearly having completed their 260 days”⁸

Military exemption tax

13. The Swiss military exemption tax (*Wehrpflichtersatzabgabe / taxe d'exemption du service militaire*) was brought into question in the case of *Glor v Switzerland*⁹, decided in 2009 before the European Court of Human Rights.

14. This tax applies to the tax as all male citizens of the age group eligible for military service, whether or not resident in Switzerland, who for more than six months of a given tax year have - for whatever reason - not been attached to a military or reserve unit, or who have failed to attend when summoned to perform their military service.¹⁰

15. Revisions to the Law in 1994 exonerated the most severely handicapped persons, and stipulated that other recognised disabled persons benefit from a 50% reduction in the rate, which, with effect from 2004, was raised from 2% of taxable income, or Fr.150 if greater, to 3% of taxable income, subject to a minimum payment of Fr.200.¹¹

16. With the creation of Civilian Service in the mid-1990s, the Law was redrafted so as to exclude those who were performing this alternative to military service (this included the dropping of the word “military” from its title in French – but not in German.)¹² With this change, repeated imprisonment for non-payment of the military tax became less of a focus for the conscientious objection movement in Switzerland than it had previously been.¹³

17. The applicant before the European Court of Human Rights was a lorry-driver who suffered from diabetes and had therefore been ruled unfit for military service, although he maintained his willingness to perform such service. “The Court considered that the Swiss authorities had treated persons in similar situations differently in two respects: firstly, the applicant was liable to the exemption tax, unlike persons with more severe disabilities, and secondly, he was unable to perform alternative civilian service, which by Swiss law was reserved for conscientious objectors.”¹⁴ It

⁷ *Foin v France* Communication 666/1995, ICCPR, A/55/40 vol II (3rd November 1999)

⁸ E-mail comments, 10th March 2009

⁹ *Glor v Switzerland*, Application No. 13444/04. Chamber Judgment delivered on 30th April 2009

¹⁰ Law 661 of 12th June 1959. Article 2

¹¹ Law 661, Article 13, as revised by the Law of 4th October 2002.

¹² Now “*Loi fédérale sur la taxe d'exemption de l'obligation de servir*”

¹³ See Prasad & Smythe, 1968, op cit p127

¹⁴ “Chamber Judgement *Glor v Switzerland*”, Press Release issued by the Registrar of the European Court of Human Rights, 30th April 2009.

found unanimously that this constituted a violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), taken in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), of the European Convention on Human Rights.

18. Even though, for the purposes of assessment for this tax, periods performing alternative civilian service are treated as the equivalent of military service, it nevertheless tends to impinge more heavily on those who perform alternative service. Whereas military reserve service is typically spread throughout the years of liability, the alternative service requirement is usually discharged in fewer instalments, sometimes a single longer placement. Those who have completed their alternative service are liable to the tax for the remaining years until they reach the age limit.

19. The tax also impinges on two specific groups of conscientious objectors. One is those who are precluded from undertaking alternative civilian service. The Civilian Service Law stipulates that only those who have been declared fit for military service and do not qualify for any exemption are allowed to apply for recognition as conscientious objectors. In fact many of those who in practice are not being called into the army would have a conscientious objection to military service and for some this extends to paying what is seen as a “military tax”. There is also a small number of objectors each year who are imprisoned for their refusal even to perform the alternative service, whether because they see it as too closely related to the system of military service, or in protest against its punitive and discriminatory duration and other conditions. For these, the extra fiscal burden is a further source of grievance.

Revision of the Asylum Law

20. Consultations regarding the revision of Switzerland's Asylum Law are ongoing. Various aspects of the first draft submitted for public consultation between January and April 2009 were criticised by refugee organisations, religious groups and other civil society actors as potentially contrary to Switzerland's obligations under the Refugee Convention. This submission will however address only the implications for conscientious objection to military service.

21. The revised document submitted by the Federal Council to Parliament¹⁵ on 23rd May 2010, continues to have a section (1.4.1.2) entitled “Refusal to recognise conscientious objectors and deserters as refugees”. This is explicitly introduced as a response to a ruling of the Asylum Appeals Commission on 20th December 2005¹⁶ in favour of an Eritrean appellant who had shown that he would face the death penalty as a deserter if repatriated - a punishment which was (reasonably) held to be disproportionate. Moreover, the Commission took into account the findings by the European Court of Human Rights¹⁷ and by Immigration Appeals Tribunals in the UK and elsewhere that the treatment of deserters and military service evaders in Eritrea constituted inhuman and degrading punishment contrary to Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights.¹⁸

21. The Federal Council cites as a reason for action the subsequent increase in the number of asylum applications lodged by Eritreans - from 181 in 2005 to a peak of 2849 in 2008 (in 2009 the number fell again to 1724), although there is in fact no evidence that this increase was any steeper in Switzerland than elsewhere in Europe. When conscientious objection as a ground for asylum is linked to the situation in Eritrea this cannot be considered as reflecting scepticism regarding the reality of the persecution. The situation of conscientious objectors to military service in Eritrea is well documented. Nowhere in the world has a worse record in this regard. Military service is

¹⁵ <http://www.bfm.admin.ch/content/dam/data/migration/rechtsgrundlagen/gesetzgebung/asylg-aug/ersatz-nee/bot-f.pdf>.

¹⁶ Decision reported in EMARK 2006 No. 3, pp29 et seq.

¹⁷ *Said v Netherlands*, Application No.2345/02, Judgment of 5th July 2005.

¹⁸ Caroni, M. & Hofstatter, S., “*Flüchtlingsrechtliche und rechtsstaatliche Überlegungen zur geplanten Teilrevision des Asylgesetzes betreffend Desertion und Dienstverweigerung*”, ASYL 3/08, (Swiss Refugee Council 7th August 2008). (http://www.osar.ch/2008/08/07/eritrea_desertion)

compulsory for both men and women; there is no recognition of conscientious objection; all declared conscientious objectors have been imprisoned; none has ever been released; persons attempting to avoid enlistment face summary execution. The objective is simply to reduce the number of successful asylum applications from Eritreans.

22. In the course of this, Switzerland disregards the resolution of the Commission on Human Rights which “encourages States, subject to the circumstances of the individual case meeting the other requirements of the definition of a refugee as set out in the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, to consider granting asylum to those conscientious objectors compelled to leave their country of origin because they fear persecution owing to their refusal to perform military service when there is no provision, or no adequate provision, for conscientious objection to military service.”¹⁹ It also disregards the general advice of the UNHCR: “Where military service is compulsory, refugee status may be established if the refusal to serve is based on genuine political, religious, or moral convictions, or valid reasons of conscience... In conscientious objector cases, a law purporting to be of general application may, depending on the circumstances, nonetheless be persecutory where, for instance, it impacts differently on particular groups, where it is applied or enforced in a discriminatory manner, where the punishment itself is excessive or disproportionately severe, *or* where the military service cannot reasonably be expected to be performed by the individual because of his or her genuine beliefs or religious convictions...”²⁰

¹⁹ Commission on Human Rights, Resolution 1998/77, OP 7.

²⁰ GUIDELINES ON INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION: Religion-Based Refugee Claims under Article 1A(2) of the 1951 Convention and/or the 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees HCR/GIP/04/06, (2004), Para 26.