

OSCE Insights
2026

Cornelius Friesendorf | Argyro Kartsonaki (eds.)

OSCE Insights

Vitality amid Adversity

—IFSTH
Institute for Peace Research
and Security Policy
at the University of Hamburg



Nomos

Unseen and Unheard: OSCE Efforts to Address the Situation of Crimean Tatars Under Russian Occupation

Mariana Rodrigues*

Abstract

Crimean Tatars, an indigenous ethnic minority, have faced escalating repression following the 2014 illegal annexation of Crimea by Russia, including political persecution, cultural suppression, and human rights abuses. The OSCE has sought to address this situation through its monitoring, diplomatic, and dialogue mechanisms. The organization's efforts have been severely constrained, however, not only by the fact that its decisions are not legally binding and cannot be enforced coercively, but also by limited access to the peninsula and political obstacles posed by Russia. This paper examines the OSCE's multifaceted efforts to protect and advocate for Crimean Tatars under these challenging conditions. It presents a set of recommendations aimed at strengthening the OSCE's capacity to respond effectively to the ongoing human rights crisis in Crimea, emphasizing the urgent need for innovative strategies and increased international political will.

Keywords

OSCE, Crimean Tatars, minority rights, HCNM, ODIHR, Russian annexation

To cite this publication: Mariana Rodrigues, "Unseen and Unheard: OSCE Efforts to Address the Situation of Crimean Tatars Under Russian Occupation," in *OSCE Insights*, eds. Cornelius Friesendorf and Argyro Kartsonaki (Nomos, 2027), <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783748970071-01>

Introduction

Crimea has long occupied a contentious position at the crossroads of empires, identities, and geopolitical ambitions. Among its oldest inhabitants are Crimean Tatars, an indigenous Turkic-speaking Muslim people who have historically experienced phases of marginalization, forced displacement, and cultural suppression, most infamously during Stalin's 1944 mass deportations. The 2014 annexation of Crimea by Russia reignited these

historical wounds and intensified repression against the Crimean Tatar community. Today, Crimean Tatars endure a litany of human rights violations: arbitrary arrests, forced disappearances, the suppression of political dissent, and the outlawing of their civil society and political representative body, the Mejlis. According to the Crimean Tatar Resource Center (CTRC), 6,730 violations of the fundamental rights of indigenous Crimean Tatars were recorded between 2017 and 2024 alone.¹

Amid these grave challenges, the OSCE stands as a key international actor man-

* marparticularfr@outlook.pt

dated to uphold human rights, democratic governance, and minority rights across all of its fifty-seven participating States. Yet the implementation of its commitments in these fields is constrained by the organization's consensus-based decision-making, which allows any of the fifty-seven participating States, including Russia, to block decisions and operations. This has enabled Russia to perpetuate the geopolitical stalemate surrounding Crimea and to obstruct monitoring and reporting efforts.

This paper examines the OSCE's institutional engagement with Crimean Tatars from 2014 to 2024. It analyzes the organization's use of human rights monitoring, advisory roles, and diplomatic platforms in advocating for the rights of Crimean Tatars. Drawing on primary documents, official reports, and multilateral statements, it argues that although the OSCE has consistently expressed concern for the Crimean Tatars' plight, its interventions remain largely declaratory rather than enforceable due to the non-coercive nature of the organization. This reflects the OSCE's difficulty to move beyond consensus-based decision-making and to operationalize normative commitments.

The Crimean Tatars' situation merits research by scholars and policymakers, as it can be an indicator of the effectiveness of international human rights frameworks and minority protections. Studying their case shows how overlooking minority rights can grow into wider regional insecurity, with implications that transcend the borders of Crimea. The OSCE's in-

volvement underlines not only its principles of defending sovereignty, territorial integrity, and minority rights but also the real challenges of doing so in the current European security landscape.

This study starts by outlining the human rights situation of Crimean Tatars and the OSCE's monitoring mechanisms. It then reviews the OSCE's engagement and challenges in Russian-occupied Crimea from 2014 to 2025. The paper concludes with recommendations for strengthening the OSCE's effectiveness in addressing one of Europe's most enduring and underreported minority rights crises at the international level.

Background

The human rights situation of Crimean Tatars

Crimean Tatars, the largest indigenous people of the Crimean Peninsula, trace a major stage of their ethnogenesis to the period of the Crimean Khanate (1441–1783).² Ever since the Russian Empire's first annexation of Crimea in 1783, its history has been marked by persecution and forced displacement. An estimated 20 to 30 percent of the Crimean Tatar population emigrated during this annexation.³ Those who remained faced religious repression, "Russification" policies,⁴ land expropriation, and conditions resembling serfdom.⁵

During the Crimean War (1853–1856), Russian authorities baselessly accused

Crimean Tatars of collaborating with the Ottoman Empire, leading to surveillance, arrests, and harassment.⁶ Even in the absence of a centralized deportation program, more than 200,000 Crimean Tatars emigrated by the 1860s due to growing insecurity.⁷

Soviet rule intensified repression. Between 1917 and 1933, approximately 150,000 Crimean Tatars were either killed or forcibly displaced.⁸ On May 18, 1944, the Soviet authorities ordered the mass deportation of the entire Crimean Tatar population, over 208,000 individuals, to remote settlements in Central Asia, the Urals, and Siberia,⁹ under accusations of collaboration with Nazi Germany.¹⁰ Within the first six months, an estimated 30,000 perished due to harsh conditions.¹¹ Only in the late 1980s were they permitted to return, and mass repatriation followed the collapse of the USSR.¹²

Renewed threats emerged after Russia's 2014 annexation of Crimea, which Crimean Tatars heavily opposed. Russian forces raided the Mejlis headquarters, homes, and mosques.¹³ From 2014 to 2017, the CTIRC recorded a total of 6,730 violations of fundamental human rights against Crimean Tatars, including searches, detentions, arrests, interrogations, and systematic abuses within the judicial system.¹⁴ These abuses were largely perpetrated by the FSB (Russia's Federal Security Service), judges, court clerks, prosecutors, and occupation authorities.¹⁵

OSCE monitoring and reporting mechanisms

As a regional body with a strong human rights mandate,¹⁶ the OSCE has monitored the situation of Crimean Tatars since the collapse of the Soviet Union. While its involvement before the 2014 annexation was largely concentrated within the High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM) and the 1994–1999 OSCE Mission to Ukraine,¹⁷ the illegal annexation of Crimea prompted more active engagement by various OSCE bodies. This paper will examine the actions of various OSCE structures in relation to Crimean Tatars. These include field operations, the Permanent Council, the Parliamentary Assembly, procedures such as the Moscow Mechanism, and institutions such as the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), the HCNM, and the Representative on Freedom of the Media (RFoM). Collectively, these bodies and mechanisms comprise a significant part of the operational foundations of the OSCE, and their efforts reinforce the organization's role in promoting regional security and safeguarding the rights of vulnerable populations like the Crimean Tatars.

The OSCE's work with Crimean Tatars under Russian occupation: 2014–2024

2014: Initial human rights assessment missions, RFoM statements, and the establishment of the Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine

Russia's unlawful annexation of Crimea in early 2014 triggered urgent OSCE engagement due to its serious human and minority rights implications for Crimean Tatars. At Ukraine's request, ODIHR and the HCNM undertook a human rights assessment mission (HRAM) to Ukraine, including to Crimea, from early March to mid-April 2014.¹⁸ Their joint report assessed compliance with OSCE human dimension commitments and highlighted immediate challenges faced by Crimean Tatars, offering recommendations for safeguarding their rights.

The HRAM documented the Crimean Tatars' resistance to the annexation and increased hostility from Russian authorities and the pro-Russian community in Crimea. Within the first month of the annexation, Crimean Tatars made up 80 percent of the initial three thousand individuals who fled Crimea, largely motivated by fear and historical trauma.¹⁹ The report also drew attention to the legal uncertainty during the transition to Russian control, particularly for those refusing Russian citizenship, who risked losing access to not only property but also education, employment, and healthcare. It further emphasized the importance of upholding the land and property rights

of indigenous peoples and vulnerable minorities.²⁰ Finally, the HRAM noted credible allegations of restricted freedom of movement, including identity checks and the establishment of temporary checkpoints in Crimean Tatar-populated areas ahead of the 2014 referendum.²¹

During the same period, the RFoM repeatedly raised concerns about the rapidly deteriorating media environment in Crimea, with particular attention to the targeting of Crimean Tatar-language outlets. In March and September 2014, the RFoM condemned intimidation, censorship, and pressure against Crimean Tatar media,²² threatening the continued operation of key broadcasters such as ATR.²³

In parallel, on March 21, 2014, the OSCE Permanent Council adopted Decision No. 1117 establishing the Special Monitoring Mission (SMM) to Ukraine.²⁴ The mission was mandated to monitor the security situation, report on violations of OSCE commitments, and support respect for human rights, including minority rights.²⁵ Although Russia claimed readiness to contribute,²⁶ it barred the SMM from entering Crimea. Consequently, the mission relied on information from Crimean Tatar activists and NGOs without being able to independently verify the reports it received.²⁷ One such report came in September 2014, when Crimean Tatar leader Mustafa Djemilev informed the SMM that Russian security forces had conducted a search at the Mejlis headquarters in Simferopol, seizing documents and funds.²⁸ According to information corroborated by oth-

er Crimean Tatar sources, the Crimean de facto authorities subsequently issued a court order to confiscate the Mejlis's property.²⁹

2015: HRAM, RFoM, and SMM reporting and observations on intensifying pressure

A second HRAM in mid-2015, focused specifically on Crimea, reinforced earlier concerns about systemic restrictions on political expression, religious freedom, and the cultural rights of Crimean Tatars.³⁰ The mission met civil society representatives in Kyiv, Odessa, and Kherson and conducted interviews by phone, via Skype, and in person with, among others, Crimean Tatar representatives located either in Crimea or regularly traveling between Crimea and mainland Ukraine.³¹

The report found that rights had continued to deteriorate after the 2014 annexation, including restrictions on political rights, self-governance, religious freedom, cultural rights, and access to education in Ukrainian and Crimean Tatar languages.³² It urged Russian and de facto authorities to cease the intimidation of Mejlis leaders, guarantee freedom of movement, protect media independence, address housing and land issues, support cultural and linguistic revitalization, and facilitate access for the High Commissioner.³³

Building on the concerns first articulated in 2014, the RFoM issued a series of

warnings. In January 2015, it condemned a large-scale raid on the Crimean Tatar television broadcaster ATR, which resulted in staff detentions and the channel's being taken off air.³⁴ Later, in April, the RFoM criticized the expiry of the media re-registration deadline imposed under Russian legislation, noting that virtually all Crimean Tatar outlets had had their applications rejected on procedural grounds and warning that this was intended to silence their voices.³⁵

The SMM similarly reported increasing pressure on Crimean Tatar media and civic institutions,³⁶ as well as rising displacement to mainland Ukraine due to restrictions on political and religious activity.³⁷ Its September 2015 report covered the blockade of the Kalanchak, Chaplynka, and Chonhar crossings to Crimea, organized by the Mejlis and aimed primarily at commercial traffic while allowing passenger movement.³⁸ It involved Crimean Tatar participants, members of Right Sector and the NGO Sich, and multiple Ukrainian security forces.³⁹

2016–2017: Parliamentary Assembly resolution and 1944 remembrance in Permanent Council statements and SMM monitoring

In April 2016, the Russian Supreme court banned the Mejlis as an "extremist organization,"⁴⁰ drawing coordinated condemnation from multiple OSCE participating States at the Permanent Council and the Parliamentary Assembly. On May

12, 2016, during the seventy-second anniversary of the 1944 Soviet deportation of Crimean Tatars, the EU,⁴¹ US,⁴² and Ukrainian⁴³ delegations condemned the ongoing Russian occupation of Crimea, highlighting parallels between historical and current abuses.

Conversely, Russian Ambassador Alexander Lukashevich acknowledged historical suffering but argued that conditions had improved since Crimea's "reunification" with Russia. He referenced legal rehabilitation measures, cultural and economic support, political inclusion, and recognition of the Crimean Tatar language. At the same time, he dismissed allegations of repression as politically motivated and contrasted Russia's conduct with alleged neglect under Ukrainian rule.⁴⁴

The SMM also closely monitored commemorations of the 1944 Crimean Tatar deportation during its observations in mainland Ukraine on May 18, 2016, and May 18, 2017. In 2016, the mission reported large gatherings in Kherซอน, Henichesk, and near the Chonhar administrative boundary crossing, with participation ranging from several hundred to approximately two thousand people.⁴⁵ The SMM noted speeches delivered by regional officials, Mejlis representatives, and Crimean Tatar activists, as well as the appearance of groups in military-style attire. Smaller gatherings in Kyiv featured traditional Crimean Tatar clothing.⁴⁶ In 2017, at Chonhar, the mission recorded a peaceful symbolic procession to the bridge's midpoint, where partici-

pants sang the Ukrainian national anthem and raised both the Ukrainian and the Crimean Tatar flags.⁴⁷

Concerns about Crimean Tatars were again raised in July 2016, at the Parliamentary Assembly's Annual Session. A draft resolution introduced by the Ukrainian member of parliament Natalia Ahafonova⁴⁸ emphasized several issues, including state-sponsored repression, the persecution of the Mejlis, and restrictions on religious and media freedoms.⁴⁹ In light of this, it urged Russia to cease political repression, release unlawfully detained activists (including Mejlis Deputy Chair Ahtem Ciygoz), and comply with international human rights obligations.⁵⁰

2018–2020: Continuation of contesting narratives

In a May 2018 statement to the Permanent Council, Russia affirmed that Crimea had been fully integrated and that the rights of Crimean Tatars were being upheld. It also accused Ukraine of ongoing discrimination, claiming that roughly thirty thousand individuals from Crimea, half of them Crimean Tatars, face violations within Ukrainian territory, including restrictions on religious and cultural expression.⁵¹

By 2020, the divergence between these narratives had sharpened. On 27 February, marking six years since the illegal annexation, the EU issued a statement at the Permanent Council condemning Russia's imposition of Russian citizenship and

its systematic human rights abuses, especially against Crimean Tatars. The EU called for international monitoring access, the release of detainees, and a renewed commitment to international law. Several states aligned with this position.⁵²

The annual May commemorations of the 1944 deportation of Crimean Tatars further intensified debate. At the meeting of the Permanent Council on May 21, 2020, Russia reiterated that Crimea's "reunification" restored justice, citing infrastructure investments, cultural initiatives, and respect for religion and the media.⁵³ Ukraine countered this with stark warnings of a "second, hybrid deportation," pointing to repression, forced demographic shifts, the ban on the Mejlis, restrictions on Crimean Tatar-language education, and systemic rights violations. It urged a stronger international response, including sanctions and recognition of the 1944 deportation as genocide.⁵⁴

2022–2023: The Moscow Mechanism and HCNM efforts amid shifting priorities

Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 redirected the OSCE's focus, and while key concerns persisted, references to Crimean Tatars grew less frequent and more symbolic. The 2022 Moscow Mechanism reports devoted some attention to the situation of national and ethnic minorities, including Crimean Tatars. The April report noted ongoing human rights violations

since 2014 that disproportionately targeted those who supported Ukraine's territorial integrity and national unity, including Crimean Tatars.⁵⁵ It further stated intensified repression following the escalation of hostilities in 2022, with a growing number of minority representatives subjected to arrest on charges of alleged treason or financing terrorist activities.⁵⁶ The July report cited the findings of a May 2022 report by Marija Pejčinović Burić, Secretary General of the Council of Europe, on the human rights situation in Crimea and Sevastopol.⁵⁷ The report highlighted harassment, the detention of activists, the suppression of Crimean Tatar-language education, and the militarization of children.⁵⁸

On December 8, 2022, at the OSCE Permanent Council, HCNM Ambassador Kairat Abdrakhmanov briefly addressed Crimean Tatars in his comprehensive report.⁵⁹ He expressed concern about the disproportionate conscription of Crimean Tatars into Russian military campaigns and pointed to ongoing engagement with Ukrainian authorities and minority representatives, including Crimean Tatars, to support minority rights and improve legal frameworks as part of Ukraine's broader postwar recovery efforts.⁶⁰

2024: The Moscow Mechanism and ODIHR support for Ukrainian legislative efforts

In April 2024, a Moscow Mechanism report highlighted a long-standing pattern

of arbitrary detentions targeting Crimean Tatars for political and religious reasons.⁶¹ According to the Ukrainian Ombudsman, 208 political prisoners had been held in Crimea, 125 of whom were Crimean Tatars. The Office of the Ukrainian Prosecutor General reported slightly higher figures, noting that 134 of the 217 Crimean residents persecuted on political or religious grounds were Crimean Tatars. Although these numbers pertain to political and religious detentions, the report highlighted that other groups resisting the illegal occupation had likewise been targeted.⁶²

In June 2024, upon Ukraine's request, ODIHR reviewed the Draft Law on the Status of the Crimean Tatar People.⁶³ While the draft law constitutes a significant step toward addressing the historical marginalization of Crimean Tatars, ODIHR recommended improvements to bring it in line with international standards.⁶⁴ These included adopting an approach based on the self-identification of Crimean Tatars, ensuring representation within state institutions, strengthening protections for language, education, and access to natural resources, and incorporating a robust gender-sensitive framework. ODIHR emphasized that the process must comprise inclusive and transparent consultations with Crimean Tatars and civil society to ensure legitimacy and effectiveness.⁶⁵

Challenges to OSCE efforts

Compared to other international organizations, the OSCE is unique in its regional span, all-inclusive participation, and consensus-based structure, which allows it to sustain continuous dialogue and engagement on sensitive issues. This level of ongoing attention is difficult to achieve in organizations with a broader geographical focus and multiple competing priorities. Nonetheless, the OSCE's efforts to monitor and address the situation of Crimean Tatars under Russian occupation continue to face profound and multifaceted challenges.

Foremost among these is the shifting geopolitical landscape. Since Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022, international attention has understandably shifted to the broader war, leaving Crimean issues lower on the global agenda. As global attention has continued to concentrate on active conflict zones and large-scale humanitarian crises, the plight of the Crimean Tatars has increasingly been neglected.⁶⁶ This reflects a wider pattern of geopolitical fatigue, in which sustained international engagement with protracted or less visible crises gradually wanes. This fatigue poses a serious threat to the continuity of international advocacy and weakens the pressure necessary to uphold the rights of Crimean Tatars under international law.

Although organizations such as the UN, the EU, and the Council of Europe (CoE) have also addressed the plight of Crimean Tatars and have extensive le-

gal tools and enforcement mechanisms at their disposal, the OSCE occupies a distinct and complementary role. Its regional expertise and capacity to maintain sustained, regionally focused dialogue allow it to provide continuous monitoring, mediation, and technical support, complementing the legal and coercive instruments of other international bodies. Therefore, while efforts to monitor and report on human rights developments in Crimea may be constrained by reduced global attention, the OSCE's position also presents opportunities for closer and more effective collaboration with other international organizations.

Moreover, the Russian Federation's continued denial of access to Crimea, a policy that has remained in place since the annexation of the peninsula in 2014,⁶⁷ constitutes a direct violation of Russia's commitments under the OSCE's *acquis*. This restriction has effectively prevented the OSCE, particularly the SMM, from operating on the ground. This limitation was acknowledged and criticized during a UN General Assembly session in February 2020, where states expressed their support for the OSCE's work and underscored the importance of allowing the SMM to access Crimea.⁶⁸ The inability to conduct on-site monitoring severely limits the OSCE's capacity to independently verify reports of human rights violations and engage directly with affected communities, forcing it to rely primarily on secondary sources and remote monitoring methods.

Compounding this operational constraint is the decision-making deadlock inherent in the OSCE's consensus-based structure, which gives Russia the power to block initiatives, resolutions, the renewal of field operations, and the adoption of the unified budget.⁶⁹ In addition to repeatedly hampering the overall functioning of the OSCE, this veto power has prevented the organization from enhancing its presence in Crimea and implementing stronger measures to address the unfolding human rights crisis in the region.⁷⁰ As a result, the OSCE's ability to act decisively and cohesively on this, as on many other controversial issues, has frequently been compromised, undermining its mandate to uphold security and human rights in the region.

Further limiting the OSCE's impact is its lack of coercive and enforcement mechanisms. As a primarily political organization, the OSCE depends on the voluntary cooperation and political will of participating States to implement its recommendations.⁷¹ Without binding legal authority or the capacity to impose sanctions, its findings often provide only non-binding guidance rather than compulsory directives, thus constraining the ability to influence tangible changes in Crimea's complex and disputed environment.⁷² This has been exacerbated by Russia's active use of disinformation campaigns within the OSCE framework, which aim to undermine the organization's credibility and manipulate the narrative surrounding Crimea and the treatment of Crimean Tatars.⁷³

Finally, on the ground, Russian authorities have intensified repression against Crimean civil society, targeting independent media outlets, the Mejlis, and numerous NGOs. The banning of the Mejlis in 2016⁷⁴ and the subsequent harassment, arrests, and intimidation of activists have decimated the community's organized representation and restricted avenues for local advocacy and reporting.⁷⁵ Russia's systematic campaign of oppression seeks to silence dissent and erase independent voices, effectively consolidating control through fear and coercion.⁷⁶ This shrinking civic space not only impedes the OSCE's information-gathering efforts through local sources but also increases Crimean Tatars' vulnerability to ongoing abuses.

Recommendations

The OSCE's decade-long engagement with the plight of Crimean Tatars under Russian occupation has underscored both the potential and the limits of multilateral diplomacy in a contested and constrained environment. Although it faces severe challenges, the OSCE has played a vital role in documenting abuses through HRAMs and corroboration with Crimean Tatar sources, supporting Ukraine's legal reforms and offering a platform for marginalized voices. As the geopolitical landscape has shifted and international attention has increasingly focused on the broader war in Ukraine, however, there is an urgent need for the OSCE to recal-

ibrate its approach to ensure its continued relevance and impact in addressing the humanitarian concerns of Crimean Tatars.

To enhance its effectiveness in this context, the OSCE must prioritize strengthening its monitoring and reporting mechanisms in collaboration with local NGOs and displaced Crimean Tatars by making them more consistent and frequent, as these efforts seem to have decreased over time. Given the ongoing ban on deploying direct monitoring missions in Crimea, these actors remain essential intermediaries for providing accurate and timely information about developments on the ground. Establishing structured and sustained channels for engagement with displaced communities, journalists, and NGOs would significantly improve the organization's capacity to verify reports of repression and adapt its strategies accordingly. This approach would not only enhance the OSCE's situational awareness but also empower Crimean Tatars to participate actively in shaping international responses to their cause.

Simultaneously, participating States must reinforce their advocacy efforts, both individually and collectively, to demand that international organizations be provided unhindered access to Crimea and to draw sustained attention to the occupying authorities' persistent violations of international law. This responsibility does not rest solely on the shoulders of states with direct political or geographic ties to the conflict; rather, it should be shared across all OSCE participating

States as part of their collective commitment to upholding the principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent OSCE documents. Their engagement is crucial not only in bilateral and multilateral diplomatic arenas but also within the OSCE's main bodies, where concerted pressure and consistent messaging can help to keep the situation of Crimean Tatars on the international agenda.

With that said, OSCE institutions themselves must adopt a more proactive and strategic approach. Bodies such as ODIHR and the HCNM, while constrained in their operational capacity due to lack of access to Crimea, retain critical normative and analytical capacity that should be leveraged more assertively. To this end, these institutions should strengthen their engagement with participating States, not only to maintain awareness of the deteriorating human rights situation in Crimea but also to reinforce the significance of the Crimean Tatar issue as a core concern of the OSCE's human rights mandate. Closer coordination with participating States would help to ensure that this topic remains a priority for national delegations and is consistently raised on OSCE platforms. Cultivating political will among participating States would allow these institutions to pursue their mandates more effectively, including through thematic reports, legal analyses, and targeted recommendations, and would keep the Crimean Tatar issue visible within the organization and the wider international human rights discourse.

Finally, the OSCE's efforts would benefit from deeper coordination with other international bodies, including the UN, the EU, and the CoE. Joint monitoring efforts, shared reporting mechanisms, and collaborative advocacy campaigns would enhance international visibility, increase pressure on the occupying power, and lend greater legitimacy to the OSCE's work. Multilateral cooperation not only broadens the reach of each institution's interventions but also signals a collective rejection of the normalization of occupation and repression.

Notes

- 1 CTRC, "10018 Human Rights Violations Recorded in the Occupied Crimea," December 6, 2024, <https://ctrcenter.org/en/10018-human-rights-violations-recorded-in-the-occupied-crimea-ctrc>
- 2 Brian Glyn Williams, "The Ethnogenesis of the Crimean Tatars: An Historical Reinterpretation," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 11, no. 3 (2001): 329–48.
- 3 CTRC, Submission to the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (February 2019), [https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Document s/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/Call/CrimeanTatarResourceCentre.pdf](https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Document%20s/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/Call/CrimeanTatarResourceCentre.pdf)
- 4 CTRC, cited above (Note 3), 3.
- 5 Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, *Crimean Tatars' Struggle for Human Rights* (Council of Europe, 2023), <https://rm.coe.int/report-on-crimean-tatars-by-dunja-mijatovic-commissioner-for-human-rig/1680aaeb4b>
- 6 Mara Kozelsky, "Casualties of Conflict: Crimean Tatars During the Crimean War," *Slavic Review* 67, no. 4 (2008): 866–91.

- 7 Kozelsky, cited above (Note 6), 866.
- 8 Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, cited above (Note 5), 7.
- 9 CTRC, cited above (Note 3), 3.
- 10 Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, cited above (Note 5), 7.
- 11 CTRC, cited above (Note 3), 3.
- 12 Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, cited above (Note 5), 8.
- 13 Brian Glyn Williams, *The Crimean Tatars: From Soviet Genocide to Putin's Conquest* (Oxford University Press, 2016).
- 14 CTRC, cited above (Note 1).
- 15 CTRC, "Classification of People, Responsible for Human Rights Violations in the Occupied Crimea," <https://ctrcenter.org/en/projects/osoby-yaki-porushuyut-prava-lyudyny-v-kr-yumu>
- 16 OSCE, What Is the OSCE?, https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/d/d/35775_10.pdf
- 17 Randolph Oberschmidt, Improving the Effectiveness of OSCE Missions: The Case of Ukraine (Clingendael Institute, 2002), 89–116, https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/20020801_cru_paper_oberschmidt.pdf
- 18 OSCE ODIHR, "OSCE/ODIHR and HCNM Release Report by Human Rights Assessment Mission in Ukraine," press release, May 12, 2014, <https://www.osce.org/odihr/118454>
- 19 OSCE ODIHR, cited above (Note 18).
- 20 OSCE ODIHR, cited above (Note 18).
- 21 OSCE ODIHR, cited above (Note 18).
- 22 OSCE RFoM, "Media Freedom Under Siege in Crimea, Ukraine, Says OSCE Representative," press release, March 8, 2014, <https://www.osce.org/fom/116240>
- 23 OSCE RFoM, "Pressure on Tatar Media in Crimea Must Stop, Says OSCE Representative," press release, September 19, 2014, <https://www.osce.org/fom/123790>
- 24 OSCE PC, Decision No. 1117, Deployment of an OSCE Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine, PC.DEC/1117 (March 21, 2014), <https://www.osce.org/pc/116747>
- 25 OSCE PC, cited above (Note 24).
- 26 Russian Federation Delegation to the OSCE, Interpretative Statement Under Paragraph IV.1 (A)6 of the Rules of Procedure of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, PC.DEC/1117, Attachment 4, March 21, 2014, <https://www.osce.org/pc/116747>
- 27 OSCE SMM, "Latest from OSCE Special Monitoring Mission (SMM) to Ukraine Based on Information Received as of 18:00 (Kyiv Time), 18 September 2014," September 18, 2014, <https://www.osce.org/ukraine-smm/123792>
- 28 OSCE SMM, cited above (Note 27).
- 29 OSCE SMM, cited above (Note 27).
- 30 OSCE ODIHR, "ODIHR and HCNM Report Identifies Widespread Human Rights Violations, Discrimination and Legal Irregularities in Crimea," press release, September 17, 2015, https://www.osce.org/odihr/182526?utm_source
- 31 OSCE ODIHR and HCNM, Report of the Human Rights Assessment Mission on Crimea (6–18 July 2015) (OSCE, 2015), <https://www.osce.org/odihr/report-of-the-human-rights-assessment-mission-on-crimea>
- 32 OSCE ODIHR and HCNM, cited above (Note 31).
- 33 OSCE ODIHR and HCNM, cited above (Note 31).
- 34 OSCE RFoM, "Raid on ATR Television Channel in Crimea Unacceptable, a Clear Intrusion of Media's Independence, Says Mijatović," press release, January 26, 2015, <https://rfom.osce.org/fom/136221>
- 35 OSCE RFoM, "OSCE Representative Mijatović Warns of Further Restrictions to Media Pluralism and Access to Information in Crimea, Ukraine," press release, April 1, 2015, <https://www.osce.org/fom/148881>
- 36 OSCE SMM, "Latest from OSCE Special Monitoring Mission (SMM) to Ukraine Based on Information Received as of 18:00 (Kyiv Time), 29 March 2015," March 30, 2015, <https://www.osce.org/ukraine-smm/148321>
- 37 OSCE SMM, cited above (Note 36).
- 38 OSCE SMM, "Latest from OSCE Special Monitoring Mission (SMM) to Ukraine

- Based on Information Received as of 19:30 hrs, 20 September 2015,” September 21, 2015, <https://www.osce.org/ukraine-smm/183736>
- 39 OSCE SMM, cited above (Note 38).
- 40 Agence France-Presse in Simferopol, “Crimean Court Bans ‘Extremist’ Tatar Governing Body,” *The Guardian*, April 26, 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/apr/26/court-bans-extremist-crimean-tatar-governing-body-mejlis-russia>.
- 41 Dutch EU Presidency, Statement by the Dutch EU Presidency on the 72nd Anniversary of the Deportation of the Crimean Tatar People by the Soviet Regime, PC.DEL/671/16 (May 13, 2016), <https://www.osce.org/pc/241071>
- 42 United States Mission to the OSCE, Statement by the Delegation of the United States of America on the 72nd Anniversary of the Deportation of the Crimean Tatar People by the Soviet Regime, PC.DEL/645/16/Corr.1 (May 12, 2016), <https://www.osce.org/pc/241051>
- 43 Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the OSCE, Statement by the Delegation of Ukraine on the 72nd Anniversary of the Deportation of the Crimean Tatar People by the Soviet Regime, PC.DEL/651/16 (May 12, 2016), <https://www.osce.org/pc/241046>
- 44 Delegation of the Russian Federation to the OSCE, Statement by the Delegation of the Russian Federation on the 72nd Anniversary of the Deportation of the Crimean Tatar People by the Soviet Regime, PC.DEL/661/16 (May 13, 2016), <https://www.osce.org/pc/241061>
- 45 OSCE SMM, “Latest from OSCE Special Monitoring Mission (SMM) to Ukraine, Based on Information Received as of 19:30hrs, 18 May 2016,” May 18, 2016, <https://www.osce.org/ukraine-smm/241421>
- 46 OSCE SMM, cited above (Note 45).
- 47 OSCE SMM, “Latest from the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine (SMM), Based on Information Received as of 19:30, 19 May 2017,” May 19, 2017, <https://www.osce.org/special-monitoring-mission-to-ukraine/318506>
- 48 OSCE PA, Draft Resolution on Violations of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in Crimea, SC (16) SI 1 E (July, 1–5, 2016), <https://www.oscepa.org/en/documents/all-documents/annual-sessions/2016-tbilisi/supplementary-items/3287-violations-of-hr-in-crimea-eng/file>
- 49 OSCE PA, cited above (Note 48).
- 50 OSCE PA, cited above (Note 48).
- 51 Delegation of the Russian Federation to the OSCE, Statement by the Delegation of the Russian Federation on the Situation of the Crimean Tatars in Ukraine, PC.DEL/628/18 (May 18, 2018), <https://www.osce.org/permanent-council/382741>
- 52 European Union Delegation to the OSCE, EU Statement on Six Years of Illegal Annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the City of Sevastopol by the Russian Federation, PC.DEL/211/20 (February 28, 2020), <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/b/1/448600.pdf>
- 53 Russian Federation Delegation to the OSCE, Crimean Tatars in the Republic of Crimea, Russian Federation, PC.DEL/544/20 (May 22, 2020), <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/4/f/453552.pdf>
- 54 Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the OSCE, On Remembrance of the Victims of the Deportation of the Crimean Tatar People from Crimea by the Soviet Regime, PC.DEL/555/20 (May 22, 2020), <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/0/2/453540.pdf>
- 55 OSCE ODIHR, Report on Violations of International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law, War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity Committed in Ukraine since 24 February 2022, ODIHR/GAL/26/22/Rev.1 (April 13, 2022), <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/f/a/515868.pdf>
- 56 OSCE ODIHR, cited above (Note 55), 82.
- 57 OSCE ODIHR, Report on Violations of International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law, War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity Committed in Ukraine (1 April–25 June 2022), ODIHR.GAL/36/22/Corr.1 (July 14, 2022), https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/3/e/522616_0.pdf

- 58 OSCE ODIHR, cited above (Note 57).
- 59 OSCE HCNM, Report by the High Commissioner on National Minorities, Ambassador Kairat Abdrakhmanov, 1401st Plenary Meeting of the Permanent Council, HCNM.GAL/7/22* (December 9, 2022), <https://www.osce.org/permanent-council/534410>
- 60 OSCE HCNM, cited above (Note 59).
- 61 OSCE ODIHR, Report on Violations and Abuses of International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law, War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity, Related to the Arbitrary Deprivation of Liberty of Ukrainian Civilians by the Russian Federation, ODIHR.GAL/19/24/Corr.2* (April 25, 2024), https://www.osce.org/files/f/documentts/f/4/567367_0.pdf
- 62 OSCE ODIHR, cited above (Note 61), 19.
- 63 OSCE ODIHR, Ukraine: Opinion on the Draft Law on the Status of the Crimean Tatar People (June 14, 2024), <https://www.osce.org/odihr/570813>
- 64 OSCE ODIHR, cited above (Note 63), 32-34.
- 65 OSCE ODIHR, cited above (Note 63), 32-34.
- 66 Yulia Gorbunova and Iskra Kirova, "Rights Groups Spotlight Russia's Abuses in Crimea," *Human Rights Watch*, May 6, 2025, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2025/05/06/rights-groups-spotlight-russias-abuses-crimea>
- 67 "OSCE Mission to Visit East Ukraine After Denied Crimea Access," *The Moscow Times*, March 11, 2014, <https://www.themoscowtimes.com/2014/03/11/osce-mission-to-visit-east-ukraine-after-denied-crimea-access-a32877>
- 68 United Nations, "Concerned About Ongoing Militarization of Crimea, Human Rights Violations in Eastern Ukraine, Speakers Tell General Assembly Minsk Agreements Must Be Fully Implemented," February 20, 2020, <https://press.un.org/en/2020/ga12241.doc.htm>
- 69 Thomas Vogel, "In Troubled Waters: The OSCE in Times of War," European Platform for Democratic Elections, October 14, 2024, <https://epde.org/?news=in-troubled-waters-the-osce-in-times-of-war>
- 70 Vogel, cited above (Note 69).
- 71 House of Lords Library, "Current State of the Organization for Security and Co-operation," UK Parliament, September 19, 2023, <https://lordslibrary.parliament.uk/current-state-of-the-organization-for-security-and-co-operation/>
- 72 House of Lords Library, cited above (Note 71).
- 73 See Russian Federation Delegation to the OSCE, cited above (Note 53).
- 74 Agence France-Presse in Simferopol, cited above (Note 40).
- 75 OSCE ODIHR, cited above (Note 18); OSCE ODIHR and HCNM (Note 31).
- 76 ARTICLE 19, "Ukraine: European Court Highlights Russia's Repression in Occupied Crimea," June 28, 2024, <https://www.article19.org/resources/ukraine-european-court-highlights-russias-repression-in-occupied-crimea/>