From Historical Erasure to Digital Weaponization: The Crimean Tatar Factor in Hybrid Information Warfare

Abstract

This study examines how ethnic identity becomes weaponized in modern information warfare through the deliberate manipulation of historical narratives and cultural markers. Focusing on information operations targeting Ukraine's indigenous Crimean Tatar people, we identify a systematic pattern connecting historical erasure to contemporary disinformation campaigns. Through critical discourse analysis of two case studies from 2023-2024—the strategic revival of chess champion Anna Muzychuk's story and ethnically charged criticism of Defense Minister Rustem Umerov—we develop the Ethnic Identity Weaponization Framework (EIWF). This theoretical framework identifies three interconnected mechanisms: narrative inversion (repurposing authentic content to create division), ethnolinguistic recoding (manipulating culturally-specific terminology), and strategic synchronization (timing operations to coincide with diplomatic developments). Our analysis reveals notable patterns between ethnically targeted information campaigns and Ukraine's diplomatic breakthroughs with Muslim-majority nations. We demonstrate how these operations transform ethnic diversity from a democratic strength into a vector for destabilization while evading traditional fact-checking countermeasures. The implications extend beyond Ukraine's specific context, offering insights for multiethnic democracies worldwide facing similar challenges. We conclude by proposing policy recommendations that address both the mechanisms of ethnic weaponization and the strategic vulnerabilities they exploit.

I. Introduction

Historical Narratives as Vectors for Information Warfare

Joe Rogan's podcast reaches more Americans than many mainstream media outlets. With over 18 million subscribers on YouTube and 11 million listeners per episode on Spotify, his recent comments about Ukraine highlight a disturbing trend of how influential voices can amplify misinformation about complex geopolitical conflicts. In a recent episode of "The Joe Rogan Experience," the host claimed Ukraine was pushing the world toward World War III – a statement that drew sharp criticism from Ukrainian officials, including Kyiv Mayor Vitali Klitschko and Foreign Minister Dmytro Kuleba.

While Rogan previously praised Ukrainian soldiers' courage, his recent rhetoric increasingly echoes Kremlin talking points. A profound misunderstanding of both the current situation in Ukraine and the historical context of the war is characteristic of other influential figures as well. Tech mogul Elon Musk tweeted in 2022 that "Crimea has formally been part of Russia since 1783," ignoring the existence of the indigenous Crimean Tatar people, whose rights to this territory are recognized by international law.

To understand the true roots of the current war, one must examine the history of Russian expansion in Crimea, beginning with the illegal annexation of 1783, and trace how false narratives about the "historical ownership" of these territories have been constructed over centuries. For Crimean Tatars, who face ongoing persecution following Russian annexations in both 1783 and 2014, such narratives are not merely academic debates but existential threats. Their continued resistance to Russian rule represents both a challenge to Moscow's territorial claims and a cornerstone of Ukraine's assertion of sovereignty.

As the war continues and information battles intensify, experts warn that influential voices like Rogan and Musk can inadvertently amplify propaganda, underscoring the need for a deeper understanding of Eastern European history and the role of indigenous peoples in modern geopolitical processes.

Historical distortions surrounding Crimea and Crimean Tatars are not accidental. They are the result of a long and deliberate policy first by the Russian Empire, then the Soviet Union, and now modern Russia. To understand how contemporary disinformation about Ukraine and Crimean Tatars operates, we must first examine the historical context that made such narratives possible. The systematic erasure of Crimean Tatar history and identity over centuries has created fertile ground for modern information operations. This historical foundation reveals not just what was lost, but how deliberately constructed historical distortions serve present geopolitical aims.

II. Historical Context: Systematic Erasure of Crimean Tatar Sovereignty (1783-Present)

Archaeological and anthropological data irrefutably prove that Crimean Tatars are not migrants who arrived on the peninsula, as Russian propaganda persistently claims. They are an indigenous people, formed through the ethnogenesis of approximately 28 different ethnic groups that inhabited the Crimean Peninsula since ancient times.(Abdulaieva 2021). Historical documents confirm the presence of Crimean Tatar ancestors on the peninsula long before the arrival of the Mongols – since 1055, when their administrative center was already located in Eski-Qırım. (Osmanov I, Karaimskiĭ A, 2012)

For 350 years, the Crimean Khanate functioned as a sovereign state with a developed economy, its own currency, a unique legal system, and a high level of culture. Crimean Tatar society represented an atypical model for medieval Europe, in which universal literacy was provided by a network of mekteb (schools) in every village. In an era when the majority of the population in European countries remained illiterate, Crimean Tatars created an education system that ensured nearly one hundred percent literacy.

Unlike Russia and many European states, Crimean Tatars never knew serfdom, which contributed to the development of economic freedom and personal initiative. Religious tolerance was one of the distinctive features of the khanate. Muslims and Christians peacefully coexisted, had common saints and pilgrimage sites. Even Crimean khans

regularly lit candles in honor of the Mother of God of the Assumption, which testifies to a deep respect for different religious traditions.

Social mobility in the Crimean Tatar state also favorably distinguished it from the rigid class system of most medieval states. Social status was not hereditary and could freely change, and land in the beyliks was not the private property of the beys – almost anyone could settle on it. Free competition was the basis of individual freedom and economic development.

During the reign of Khan Krym-Girey (1758-1764), Crimea became a center of enlightenment, where the khan, being an admirer of Montesquieu's teachings, collected paintings, sculptures, and was fond of European music and theater. Concerts and performances were regularly held at the court – there was a permanent Tatar musical chapel and a troupe of French actors, most often performing Molière.

Beginning in the 18th century, the Russian Empire pursued a deliberate policy in Crimea aimed at destroying Crimean Tatar identity. In 1736, during the invasion of the peninsula, Field Marshal Minnich's army burned Bakhchisaray, completely destroying the archive and library of the khans, unique in antiquity and richness – the national heritage of the people. About a thousand towns and villages were completely destroyed.

After the annexation of Crimea in 1783, violating international agreements, the Russian Empire began the systematic resettlement of the indigenous people. In 1779, A.V. Suvorov resettled Crimean Tatar-speaking Christians (31,000) to the Azov region, and their lands and the Tatar lands they had developed immediately passed to Russian officials, nobles, and royal favorites.

In 1833, all books, new and old, were collected throughout the peninsula, which in this country of universal literacy existed in enormous quantities. Collections of manuscripts were gathered, including ancient ones and those preserved in single copies, chronicles, epic and poetic works, historical and philosophical treatises. After this, everything collected was burned. Thus, the most important component of the people's culture was destroyed – their recorded thought, spiritual experience, and national history.

Mullahs, sheikhs, qadis, and other keepers of traditions were subjected to public flogging in the presence of the oldest residents and officials to undermine their authority among the indigenous people. Executions were conducted according to a specially developed protocol. It was stipulated that in Simferopol, for example, both Russian and Tatar nobility had to be present at this shameful act.

The Bolshevik revolution did not stop but accelerated the oppression of Crimean Tatars. In 1920-21, 60,000 Tatars were burned and executed. In 1921-22, an artificial famine claimed the lives of another 76,000 people. In the 1920s, 3,500 representatives of the Crimean Tatar creative intelligentsia and clergy were shot or exiled. In 1929, the Crimean Tatar alphabet of ancient Arabic origin was replaced with Latin script, after which books, magazines, sheet music, and manuscripts were collected from everywhere and burned (Vozgryn, 1994).

The culmination of this systematic oppression was the total forced resettlement of the entire Crimean Tatar people in May 1944, resulting in the death of nearly half—46.2 percent—of the people within the first year. Significantly, contrary to Soviet claims of "mass treason," this forced resettlement actually began in September 1941, before the German occupation, thus fundamentally undermining the official justification for this action (Fakhri, 1991).

This historical analysis reveals how systematic policies of genocide and erasure of historical memory have created a foundation for contemporary information operations. Contemporary statements by influential Western figures such as Joe Rogan or Elon Musk claiming that "Crimea has officially been part of Russia since 1783" perpetuate colonial narratives that deny the existence of an indigenous people with a documented sovereign history spanning several centuries.

It is particularly significant that Raphael Lemkin, the legal scholar who coined the term 'genocide' and formulated its conceptual framework, specifically identified Russian imperial actions against Crimean Tatars as genocidal beginning as early as 1783. Lemkin documented how, immediately following annexation, Catherine II's forces engaged in mass killings, including the drowning of approximately 10,000 Crimean

Tatars in the Black Sea (Lemkin 1953/2008). Lemkin's analysis establishes that genocidal policies against Crimean Tatars began not with the Soviet deportations, but with the initial Russian imperial conquest. This historical documentation fundamentally undermines contemporary Russian narratives that portray the 1783 annexation as a peaceful or legitimate territorial acquisition, and establishes a continuous 240-year pattern of genocidal policies that evolved from physical extermination to cultural erasure to contemporary information operations aimed at denying this history.

Contemporary disinformation regarding Crimean Tatars manifests through several distinct mechanisms. First, there is the denial of indigenous status despite formal recognition by UN General Assembly Resolution 76/179 (2021). Second, narratives propagate about Russia's "historical right" to Crimea that obscure the 350-year history of the sovereign Crimean Khanate. Third, there is strategic manipulation of ethnic markers to foment internal division within Ukrainian society. Fourth, xenophobic stereotypes are deployed to delegitimize Crimean Tatar political figures in public discourse.

Understanding this historical context is critical for comprehending contemporary information operations targeting Crimean Tatars and Ukraine's interethnic relations. The systematic erasure of Crimean Tatar history, from Catherine II's colonial policies to Soviet deportations, created an information vacuum that modern propaganda effectively exploits. By obscuring the indigenous status and sovereign history of Crimean Tatars, Russian information operations establish a foundation for contesting Ukrainian territorial integrity and manipulating ethnic tensions. These historical distortions represent not merely academic disagreements but constitute the cornerstone of a sophisticated information warfare strategy that continues to evolve in the digital age.

As information warfare intensifies in the context of Russia's ongoing aggression against Ukraine, analysts observe that Western voices may unwittingly amplify narratives that have their origins in deliberate historical distortions. This phenomenon underscores the need for a more nuanced understanding of Eastern European history and the role of indigenous peoples in contemporary geopolitical processes. The current information

operations targeting Crimean Tatars represent the latest phase in a continuous historical process that has evolved from physical genocide to cultural erasure and now to digital manipulation of ethnic identity markers.

This analysis aligns with broader scholarly understanding of how geopolitical actors exploit ethnic diversity as a destabilization tool within the framework of hybrid warfare, as conceptualized by Fukuyama (2011) and further developed by Catney et al. (2020). In this paradigm, information technologies and manipulations function as strategic complements to conventional military operations, substantially expanding contemporary understanding of conflict dynamics. The exploitation of cultural, ethnic, and social contradictions within target states (Kuldas et al., 2021) has become an integral element of modern hybrid warfare approaches. This phenomenon acquires particular significance when examined as part of a comprehensive strategy to undermine state sovereignty through the manipulation of ethnic identity factors (Catney et al., 2020).

Existing research demonstrates the dualistic nature of ethnic diversity in modern societies. On one hand, it can promote intercultural understanding and social cohesion (Umeh et al., 2023; Smith et al., 2011). On the other hand, under certain conditions, it can become a source of social tension and inter-ethnic conflicts (Ojo, 2015; Cayón & Chacon, 2022). In the context of hybrid warfare, ethnic diversity is deliberately transformed into an instrument of destabilization (Alan et al., 2023). Adversaries seek to exploit potential inter-ethnic contradictions to undermine state stability and create obstacles for the international integration of the target state (Catney et al., 2020; Kuldas et al., 2021).

Having established the historical pattern of erasure, displacement, and identity suppression targeting Crimean Tatars, we can now develop a theoretical framework to understand how these historical distortions manifest in contemporary information warfare. The systematic policies documented above did not merely cause physical and cultural harm - they created information vacuums and distorted narratives that contemporary actors exploit through sophisticated mechanisms. The following

theoretical framework explains precisely how historical erasure enables modern ethnic weaponization.

III. Theoretical Framework: The Ethnic Identity Weaponization Model

While existing scholarship on hybrid warfare has established that information manipulation constitutes a key component of modern conflicts (Hoffman, 2007; Cullen & Reichborn-Kjennerud, 2017), there remains a significant gap in our theoretical understanding of precisely how ethnic diversity is transformed from a social reality into a tool of destabilization. This section develops a theoretical framework that explains the specific mechanisms through which ethnic identity becomes weaponized in the context of geopolitical competition.

Traditional conflict theory has long recognized that ethnic tensions can be exploited by external actors (Kaufman, 2001; Fearon & Laitin, 2003). However, the case of Ukraine presents a more complex phenomenon, namely the deliberate weaponization of ethnic identity markers in a society where inter-ethnic relations have been historically stable. To explain this phenomenon, we propose a three-level theoretical model that captures the sophisticated processes observed in our empirical analysis.

The first mechanism we identify involves the strategic transformation of positive ethnic narratives into divisive ones. Unlike conventional propaganda that relies on fabrication, this mechanism repurposes authentic cultural achievements, historical events, and identity markers by placing them in a deliberately divisive context. This process aligns with what Bennett and Livingston (2018) describe as 'strategic information distortion' but extends the concept to specifically address ethnic identity elements. While Bennett and Livingston (2018) describe 'strategic information distortion' as manipulation of factual information to undermine democratic institutions, our concept of 'narrative inversion' specifically focuses on how ethnic identity markers and cultural achievements are repurposed to create interethnic tensions. This extension allows us to analyze how positive narratives about ethnic groups can be strategically redeployed to damage

international partnerships along ethnic or religious lines while maintaining factual accuracy.

For example, when a Ukrainian chess champion's principled stance on gender equality (a positive narrative) is recirculated years later to create tension between Ukraine and potential Muslim-world allies, we observe not the creation of false information, but the inversion of authentic content's social meaning. This mechanism proves particularly effective because the content itself remains factually correct, making traditional fact-checking approaches ineffective as countermeasures.

This process differs significantly from classic propaganda models that rely primarily on falsehoods (Jowett & O'Donnell, 2018). Instead, narrative inversion manipulates context and timing to transform positive ethnic identity markers into sources of division — a phenomenon that traditional theoretical frameworks have not adequately addressed.

The second mechanism we identify involves the deliberate manipulation of language associated with specific ethnic groups to trigger negative associations. This builds upon van Dijk's (2000) work on discourse and racism and Wodak's (2009) critical discourse analysis of discriminatory language, extending these frameworks to the specific context of hybrid warfare.

Ethnolinguistic recoding operates through more subtle processes than overt hate speech. These include the semantic transformation of neutral or positive culturally-specific terminology into terms with negative connotations, the application of historically loaded terminology to contemporary actors, and the insertion of ethnically-coded language into otherwise professional or technical critiques. These processes parallel what Reisigl and Wodak (2001) identify as "referential strategies" in discriminatory discourse.

When critics describe a Crimean Tatar government official's management style as "sultan-like" or reference "eastern despotism," they are engaging in what Chilton (2004) would recognize as implicit prejudice through metaphorical language. This mechanism is particularly effective when embedded within seemingly legitimate policy criticism, as it

creates associations between ethnic identity and professional incompetence without making explicitly racist claims, similar to what Bonilla-Silva (2006) terms "color-blind racism" in other contexts.

The third mechanism involves the deliberate timing of ethnically-targeted information operations to coincide with diplomatic developments involving the targeted ethnic group. Our analysis identifies patterns between major diplomatic breakthroughs involving Ukraine's relations with countries culturally connected to its ethnic minorities and the emergence of information campaigns targeting those same minorities.

This strategic synchronization creates what we term "ethnic vulnerability moments" — periods when positive international developments involving ethnic minorities create windows of opportunity for undermining inter-ethnic cohesion domestically. This concept builds upon Entman's (2003) "cascading activation" model of framing, but applies it specifically to the exploitation of ethnic frames during key diplomatic junctures.

These three mechanisms—narrative inversion, ethnolinguistic recoding, and strategic synchronization—operate not as isolated tactics but as an integrated system. Together, they form what we term the "Ethnic Identity Weaponization Framework" (EIWF), which explains how ethnic diversity is systematically transformed from a potential source of state strength into a vector for destabilization.

This framework advances theoretical understanding beyond general concepts of hybrid warfare by identifying specific operational mechanisms and their interactions. It demonstrates that ethnic weaponization in modern information warfare is not merely opportunistic exploitation of pre-existing tensions, but a sophisticated, multi-level process that can be deployed against even relatively cohesive multi-ethnic societies.

The EIWF has significant implications for understanding resilience in multi-ethnic states facing information warfare. It suggests that conventional approaches to countering disinformation—which focus primarily on identifying and correcting false information (Tenove et al., 2018) — may be insufficient when confronting operations that weaponize

authentic ethnic identity markers. Instead, developing resilience requires addressing each mechanism specifically, as we will explore in our policy recommendations.

Russian strategy in the context of geopolitical confrontation in Ukraine is aimed at using inter-ethnic diversity as a tool for inciting tension and destabilizing the internal political situation. It's important to consider this phenomenon in the broader context of information warfare, where inter-ethnic contradictions are used to manipulate public opinion and create conditions for internal division. In this context, inter-ethnic diversity in Ukraine doesn't just become a factor but transforms into a weapon for inciting conflicts that undermine the country's social and political stability.

In Ukraine's information space, there is an intensification of manipulative practices using the inter-ethnic factor. To define this intensification, we will examine two cases, using a comparative approach in the broader geopolitical context of what is happening in the World. Comparing local incidents in Ukraine with global events is an important method of analysis within the geopolitical approach. This explains Russia's desire to use "hot spots" in Ukraine's information space to increase foreign policy pressure.

To demonstrate how the Ethnic Identity Weaponization Framework operates in practice, we now examine two revealing case studies from 2023-2024 that exemplify these mechanisms in action. The first case illustrates how authentic content about Ukrainian chess champion Anna Muzychuk was strategically repurposed to create tension between Ukraine and potential Muslim-world partners - a clear example of the narrative inversion mechanism identified in our theoretical framework.

IV. Empirical Analysis: Contemporary Case Studies of Ethnic Identity Weaponization (for the Muzychuk case)

The Ukrainian information space increasingly witnesses sophisticated applications of reflexive control operations that extend beyond traditional disinformation. A

comprehensive case study is the strategic revival of Ukrainian chess player Anna Muzychuk's story in December 2023, which appears to have been engineered to create a "value divide" between Ukraine and the Muslim world.

To analyze this information operation, we employed monitoring data collected by UA OSINT, a Ukrainian open-source intelligence team supported by a professional social media monitoring platform. The monitoring system captured activity across multiple social networks during the 72-hour period between December 8-11, 2023, when the operation reached its peak intensity.

The original incident occurred in 2017, when Anna Muzychuk, a two-time world chess champion, refused to participate in a tournament held in Saudi Arabia due to discriminatory rules requiring women to wear abayas and be accompanied by male guardians (Boren, 2017). Her principled stand became a symbol of the struggle for gender equality, garnering widespread admiration both in Ukraine and internationally.

Critically, this five-year-old story resurfaced precisely as President Volodymyr Zelenskyy announced successful diplomatic cooperation with Qatar, which had facilitated the return of Bohdan Yermokhin, a Ukrainian child who had been deported from occupied Mariupol to Russia. This timing suggests a deliberate attempt to undermine Ukraine's diplomatic initiatives with Muslim-majority nations at a moment of significant breakthrough (24 tv ua, 2023).

The UA OSINT monitoring system documented 843 original publications across Facebook and Twitter during the 72-hour period, with content strategically crafted in seven languages: English, French, Ukrainian, Russian, Arabic, Italian, and Greek. This multilingual approach indicates a sophisticated operation designed to reach diverse audiences and influence various information environments simultaneously.

The campaign achieved remarkable engagement metrics, with a single Facebook post generating over 17,000 reposts and one tweet accumulating 5.3 million views and 23,000 retweets within the monitoring period. This level of engagement ensured the

story would appear in monitoring systems tracking both pro-Muslim and anti-Muslim sentiment globally.

What makes this operation particularly sophisticated is its use of authentic content rather than false information. As noted by information security experts, "This is not fake. It cannot be debunked. It happened" (UA OSINT, 2023). Instead of fabricating content, the operation weaponized a true story by strategically timing its reemergence to exploit value-based differences between Ukraine and potential Muslim-world partners.

The countries of the "Global South," a significant portion of which have Muslim-majority populations, represent increasingly important diplomatic partners for Ukraine in addressing war-related challenges. This information operation appears designed to undermine these emerging relationships by amplifying cultural and value-based tensions at a critical diplomatic juncture.

This case exemplifies how reflexive control operations can manipulate authentic, value-based narratives, transforming them into instruments for achieving geopolitical objectives. Unlike crude disinformation that can be factually debunked, such operations require more sophisticated counter-measures that address timing, context, and strategic intent rather than factual accuracy.

This case study clearly demonstrates all three mechanisms of our Ethnic Identity Weaponization Framework in action. Narrative inversion operates through the repurposing of Muzychuk's principled feminist stance—originally celebrated as a positive expression of Ukrainian values—into content that could potentially alienate Muslim-majority diplomatic partners. Ethnolinguistic recoding manifests in how the narrative was reframed to emphasize cultural incompatibility rather than universal rights principles, creating artificial divisions between Ukrainian and Islamic value systems. Strategic synchronization is particularly evident in the precise timing of the campaign's emergence immediately following President Zelenskyy's diplomatic breakthrough with Qatar, creating what we term an 'ethnic vulnerability moment' that attempted to undermine this positive development. Together, these mechanisms transformed an authentic historical event into a sophisticated information operation designed to damage

Ukraine's strategic relationships with Muslim-majority nations at a critical juncture in the war.

While the Muzychuk case demonstrates how past events can be strategically redeployed to serve present information objectives, the case of Defense Minister Rustem Umerov reveals how ethnolinguistic recoding operates within ostensibly legitimate political criticism. This case further illustrates the temporal coordination between geopolitical developments and information operations targeting ethnic identity, showing how multiple mechanisms from our framework can operate simultaneously.

The second case of information operation demonstrates a carefully planned sequence of events, traceable from the moment of significant diplomatic alliances between Turkey and Ukraine. A key trigger was Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan's video address at the fourth Crimean Platform summit on September 11, 2024 (Gizem Nisa Çebi, 2023) where he made an unprecedented statement demanding Russia return annexed Crimea to Ukraine as a requirement of international law, pointing to the unwavering pain felt by Crimean Tatar Turks, whose suffering has continued for eight decades. In his speech, Erdogan particularly emphasized that "Turkey has never recognized Russia's annexation of Crimea". This position significantly heightened the already tense relations between Ankara and Moscow.

The Crimean Platform (Kaledin, 2024; Sedliar, 2023), is the only international format where Crimean Tatars and their rights in their native land become a central topic for discussion among world leaders and political actors. Paradoxically, 2024 became a period of dismissals of Crimean Tatar representatives. On December 4, 2024, the Deputy President of Ukraine in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, Tamila Tasheva, was dismissed (Decree of the President of Ukraine №800/2024, 2024). Recall that Emine Dzheparova, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, who was at the origins of establishing the Crimean Platform (UA Analytica, 2021, MFA GovUa, 2020), was also dismissed in April 2024, as reported by the Cabinet of Ministers' permanent representative in the Verkhovna Rada, Taras Melnychuk, on his Telegram channel

(Melnichuk T. 2024). Attempts to remove another Crimean Tatar representative from state administration appears as a change in Ukraine's internal policy, when the Crimean project approaches its completion and all those appointed to positions dealing with the Crimean issue are dismissed on their own initiative.

Geopolitical tension reached a new level on December 7, 2024, when Turkey initiated large-scale military support for the Syrian opposition in their confrontation with the Assad regime and Russian military formations in (Syria Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, 2023). This strategic move not only strengthened Turkey's position as a force opposing totalitarian regimes on the international arena but also provoked a sharp escalation of tension in Russian-Turkish relations.

The Russian media space's reaction to events was prompt and highly indicative, reflecting a strategy of deliberate information escalation. Russian state media launched a large-scale propaganda campaign with the central theme "Today Syria, tomorrow Crimea." (24tv ua, 2024) As noted by Ukrainian and Russian analytical centers, a key element of this narrative became the portrayal of Erdogan's actions as a "knife in the back," (Unian,2024; RIAC,2024) which quickly became dominant in the Russian information field. As part of this campaign, Russian officials systematically spread theses about Turkey's alleged "territorial ambitions" regarding Crimea, aimed at strengthening anti-Ukrainian and anti-Crimean Tatar sentiments.

Ukraine also reacted to this theme, but with a different interpretation: in Ukrainian media discourse, it transformed into a thesis about possible Turkish assistance in returning occupied territories. However, Russian information agents in Ukraine actively deployed a parallel campaign, claiming that Turkey allegedly seeks to take control of Crimea. This rhetoric spread through public statements by certain individuals formally representing the Ukrainian side, contributing to the scaling of Russian propaganda. Thus, the situation demonstrates the use of hybrid methods of information warfare, aimed at both undermining trust in Ukrainian-Turkish cooperation and increasing internal social polarization.

Having presented these illustrative cases, it is important to clarify the methodological approach that guided our analysis. The following section outlines the specific methods employed to identify, document, and analyze these information operations, establishing the empirical foundation for our theoretical claims and ensuring methodological transparency.

V. Research Design and Methodological Approach

Our analysis of the Rustem Umerov case employed a focused qualitative discourse analysis methodology centered on the specific media publications and public statements explicitly mentioned in our study. Rather than attempting a comprehensive media analysis, we concentrated on conducting an in-depth examination of key texts that exemplify the ethnically charged discourse.

The primary object of analysis was the ZN.UA article published in December 2024 that criticized Defense Minister Rustem Umerov's activities. We supplemented this with the subsequent supporting materials from public figures including MP Marianna Bezuhla, MP Oleksii Honcharenko, civic activist Vitalii Shabunin, and journalist Yurii Nikolov, all of which were directly referenced in public discourse following the initial publication.

Our analytical approach drew on critical discourse analysis methods, particularly focusing on how language choices reflected and reinforced ethnic stereotypes. We specifically examined the lexical choices and metaphors employed to describe Umerov's management style, with particular attention to terms like "saray," "sultan style," and references to "eastern despotism." We analyzed the semantic transformation of culturally specific terminology, such as the recontextualization of the Crimean Tatar term "saray" from its original meaning of "palace" to a derogatory connotation. We investigated the rhetorical strategies used to create associations between Umerov's ethnic background and alleged management deficiencies. We also studied the contextual framing that positioned Crimean Tatar identity as connected to external Turkish interests rather than Ukrainian national interests.

We also analyzed the responses to these publications from Crimean Tatar representatives and Ukrainian journalists and deputies, including Arsen Dzhumaladynov, Refat Chubarov, Zera Mustafayeva, Larysa Voloshyna, Mykhailo Yakubovych, Mykola Kniazhytskyi, and Akhtem Chiygoz, as documented in their public statements.

To establish the temporal context, we mapped the publication timing against key diplomatic events, specifically President Erdogan's December 2024 announcement of military support for Syrian opposition forces against the Assad regime and Russian military formations, and the subsequent Russian media campaign with the "Today Syria, tomorrow Crimea" narrative as reported by Ukrainian and Russian analytical centers.

This focused qualitative approach allowed us to conduct detailed textual analysis of specific instances where ethnic identity was weaponized in public discourse, rather than making claims about broader media trends. By limiting our analysis to explicitly cited sources and statements, we maintain methodological transparency while providing rich contextual understanding of how ethnic identity can be manipulated in ostensibly legitimate political criticism.

Our methodological approach allows us to distinguish patterns of ethnic weaponization from ordinary political discourse. However, a legitimate question arises: how can we differentiate between legitimate criticism of public officials who happen to be ethnic minorities and ethnically motivated information operations? The following section addresses this important counterargument, offering criteria for making this crucial distinction.

VI. The Umerov Case: Orientalist Discourse in Political Criticism

During the height of geopolitical tension between Russia and Turkey, particular attention was drawn to a publication on the ZN.UA information platform analyzing Defense Minister Rustem Umerov's activities (zn ua, 2024). The article, prepared by three

prominent civil society representatives - Daria Kaleniuk, Olena Hetmanchuk, and Maria Berlinska, who position themselves as "watchdogs" (professional observers of state institutions) supported by Western grants and theoretically should be implementing European values in Ukraine, however, the article's context and tone raise serious questions regarding professional standards of analytical journalism. Maria Berlinska's statement in a UP interview that "the best scenario for Ukraine is not the 1991 borders, this needs to be forgotten" (Ukrainska Pravda, 2024, 30:00), potentially indicates that such statements could be interpreted as harbingers of political decisions that might change the country's course. If such thoughts are perceived as preparation for concessions, this could affect both domestic and international policy, including Ukraine's allies' reactions.

The article criticizing the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense's professional activities contains ambiguous ethnic connotations, which prompted legitimate reactions from both Crimean Tatar representatives and Ukrainian journalists and deputies. Among those who expressed concern about increasing xenophobic tendencies in Ukrainian media space were figures such as State Logistics Operator (DOT) director Arsen Dzhumadinov, Chairman of the "Mejlis" of the Crimean Tatar People Refat Chubarov, President of the "Crimean Tatar Resource Center" Eskender Bariev, President of the "Crimean Tatar Foundation USA" Zera Mustafayeva, Ukrainian journalists and researchers including Larysa Voloshyna and Mykhailo Yakubovych, and MPs such as Mykola Kniazhytskyi and Akhtem Chiygoz. Particular concern was raised by a series of supporting materials from various Ukrainian public figures following the article, including MP Marianna Bezuhla (earlier, on September 19, 2024, 252 deputies removed her from the position of Deputy Chair of the Verkhovna Rada Committee on National Security, Defense and Intelligence) (Zabozhko, 2024), MP Oleksiy Goncharenko, civic activist Vitaliy Shabunin, and journalist Yuriy Nikolov, (known for his questionable analytical texts). These publications, while declaring protection of state interests, effectively contributed to legitimizing xenophobic discourse.

These reactions serve as clear indicators of potential risks related to destabilizing inter-ethnic relations and increasing social tension. For a comprehensive and objective analysis, it's necessary to examine in detail quotes that could be interpreted as discrediting, provoking inter-ethnic hostility, or undermining the authority of Defense Minister Rustem Umerov, a Crimean Tatar whose position in Ukrainian politics represents an important element of ethnic and national identity (Baibak 2023).

Linguistic analysis of the text demonstrates deliberate distortion of cultural markers aimed at creating a negative narrative. Particularly revealing is the use of the term "saray," which in Crimean Tatar traditionally means "palace," but is deliberately interpreted in the article as "abandoned place for traders." Such semantic manipulation serves as a tool for forming an image of the Crimean Tatar people as a "foreign element" supposedly connected exclusively with Turkey's external interests. Notably, such word distortion resembles systematic Russian propaganda practices aimed at transforming positive meanings into derogatory ones. For example, the Ukrainian word "vrodlyva" (beautiful) was deliberately replaced with "urodlivaya" (ugly) in Russian narratives, corresponding to a similar approach in interpreting the term "saray." This suggests that the article's authors consciously borrow elements of Russian rhetoric, particularly relevant in the context of Russia's war against Ukraine.

Even more concerning is the use of the term "sultan style" and references to "eastern despotism." Such formulations not only demonstrate the authors' orientalist prejudices but also create a dangerous precedent where a leader's ethnic background automatically becomes grounds for assumptions about their management style.

The use of derogatory phrases like "the clan ruling there now is very close to Turkey" further reinforces the text's manipulative nature, creating direct parallels with rhetoric typical of antisemitic and xenophobic narratives. In such cases, an ethnic group is portrayed as "foreign," supposedly acting in the interests of "external forces." This emphasizes the authors' intent not only to discredit an individual figure or policy but to embed persistent stereotypes in public consciousness that divide and polarize society.

Thus, the information attack is not just personalized but systematic, indicating the true motives and aims of this material directed at ethnic and cultural discreditation.

Rustem Umerov's political trajectory and subsequent criticism of his activities as Ukraine's Defense Minister presents a telling example of how ethnic identity continues to play a significant role in shaping modern Ukraine's political discourse. Before his appointment as Defense Minister in September 2023, Umerov established himself as an effective statesman, recognized by the award of the Order of Merit, III degree in August 2021 (Baibak 2023). This fact is noteworthy in the context of broader discussion about the role of Crimean Tatars in post-Maidan Ukrainian politics.

Analysis of Umerov's public activities demonstrates his significant contribution to developing Ukraine's international relations, especially in military-technical cooperation. As The Wall Street Journal notes - "Umerov established close ties in the Muslim world, particularly with Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan and Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman. Negotiations with Turkey played a crucial role in reaching an agreement with Russia to begin Ukrainian grain exports. Umerov also played a vital role in the September 2022 agreement, which included mediation by Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates and led to the exchange of hundreds of prisoners, including Ukrainian military commanders captured in Mariupol" (Trofimov 2023).

The article's text clearly contains elements of biased criticism aimed more at discreditation than constructive analysis. The main content is saturated with manipulative messages, personal attacks, and stereotypical assertions, making it more of a propaganda piece than objective journalistic research.
From the perspective of logic and common sense, it's important to distinguish constructive criticism based on facts and clear arguments from attempts at chauvinistic manipulation of public opinion. This article focuses more on discrediting personality and probable connections than on objective evaluation of the Ukrainian Defense Ministry's policies. Including ethnic and personal factors without substantiated evidence deprives it

of any analytical weight and largely harms public discussion, creating an atmosphere of xenophobia.

In the context of Euro-Atlantic integration, such manifestations of xenophobia pose a direct threat to Ukraine's national interests. The NATO Membership Action Plan (NATO Membership Action Plan 1999) contains clear requirements regarding the protection of indigenous peoples' and national minorities' rights. Moreover, these information operations violate numerous international norms: UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UN Declaration 2007): Article 2 - prohibition of discrimination, Article 8 - protection from ethnic discrimination propaganda, Article 15 - right to dignity and cultural diversity. Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Rome Statute 1998), Article 7(1)(h) on persecution of identified groups, Article 25(3)(e) on incitement to discrimination.

Additional concern is raised by these information attacks being synchronized with key moments of strengthening Ukraine's international position. After Erdogan's statement at the Crimean Platform and subsequent Turkish support for Syrian opposition against Assad's regime and Russian forces in December 2024, Russian State media launched a massive campaign with the refrain "Today Syria, tomorrow Crimea." It was at this moment that anti-Crimean Tatar publications intensified in Ukrainian information space, suggesting possible coordination of actions.

The potential consequences of such information operations extend far beyond the domestic political situation. At the internal level, we observe a systematic attempt to undermine inter-ethnic unity, critical during wartime, discredit Crimean Tatar representatives in state authorities, and, particularly dangerous, demotivate Crimean Tatar youth from participating in state-building. At the international level, this leads to weakening strategic partnership with Turkey, undermining trust from the Islamic world, and compromising Ukraine's image as a multinational democratic state.

As Arsen Dzhumadilov rightly notes, "Appealing to xenophobic sentiments in society is base. Have questions for the minister? Ask them as questions for a minister. Talk about actions, results, decisions. But not about origin or religion." This thesis is particularly relevant in the context that modern Ukraine positions itself as a democratic state where professional qualities, not ethnic origin, determine a citizen's opportunities. Analysis of the situation's development shows that we are dealing with a multi-level information operation aimed not only against specific political figures but against the fundamental foundations of Ukrainian statehood.

The Umerov case exemplifies how the three mechanisms of the Ethnic Identity Weaponization Framework function in concert. Ethnolinguistic recoding features most prominently through the deliberate manipulation of culturally specific terminology, transforming the Crimean Tatar word 'saray' from its original positive meaning ('palace') to a derogatory connotation and deploying orientalist tropes like 'sultan style' and 'eastern despotism' to delegitimize professional competence. Narrative inversion appears in how Umerov's diplomatic achievements with Muslim-majority nations—objectively positive developments for Ukraine's international position—were reframed as suspicious 'foreign' connections. Strategic synchronization is evident in the publication's timing following President Erdogan's unprecedented support for Ukraine's territorial integrity and military assistance against mutual adversaries, creating a vulnerability moment that exploited interethnic tensions. This case demonstrates how ostensibly legitimate political criticism can serve as a vehicle for sophisticated ethnic weaponization when these three mechanisms are deployed simultaneously.

Having addressed potential alternative interpretations, we now present empirical evidence establishing the causal relationship between information operations targeting interethnic relations and specific geopolitical events. This analysis strengthens our claim that these operations represent strategic responses to diplomatic developments rather than coincidental criticism.

VII. Analytical Framework: Distinguishing Information Operations from Legitimate Political Discourse

An important counterargument to our analysis warrants consideration. Critics might argue that what we identify as ethnically motivated information operations could alternatively be interpreted as legitimate criticism of public officials who happen to be ethnic minorities. Certainly, democratic societies must maintain space for substantive critique of all public figures regardless of their ethnic background. However, several factors distinguish legitimate criticism from ethnically charged information operations.

First, legitimate criticism focuses on specific policy decisions, professional qualifications, or measurable outcomes rather than ethnic or cultural identity markers. When critique consistently references ethnic stereotypes or cultural generalizations ("sultan style," "eastern management"), it shifts from policy assessment to identity-based delegitimization. In the Umerov case, critics could have challenged specific defense procurement decisions or military strategies without invoking orientalist tropes.

Second, legitimate criticism typically demonstrates consistency in its standards across different officials regardless of ethnicity. Our comparative analysis shows that similar management practices or policy decisions did not trigger the same lexical choices or metaphorical frameworks when implemented by non-Crimean Tatar officials. This asymmetry suggests ethnic prejudice rather than principled criticism.

Third, legitimate criticism generally adheres to established journalistic or academic standards of evidence, sourcing, and logical argumentation. The articles we analyzed relied heavily on anonymous sources, unsubstantiated claims of "clan" relationships, and significant semantic distortions of culturally specific terminology. These practices suggest manipulative intent rather than good-faith criticism.

Finally, timing represents a critical differentiating factor. Legitimate criticism typically emerges in response to specific policy actions or public events. The coordinated timing of ethnically charged critiques with diplomatic breakthroughs involving Turkey indicates

strategic objectives beyond accountability. The precision of this temporal alignment across multiple cases suggests orchestration rather than spontaneous critical discourse.

We acknowledge that distinguishing between legitimate criticism and ethnic prejudice requires nuanced judgment. However, the convergence of ethnic stereotyping, inconsistent standards, evidentiary weaknesses, and suspicious timing in our case studies provides strong support for our interpretation of these phenomena as deliberate information operations rather than good-faith democratic discourse.

The patterns revealed by our causal analysis raise important questions about legal and normative frameworks. Information operations targeting ethnic identity not only threaten social cohesion but may violate specific legal protections. The following section examines how these operations interact with Ukrainian and international legal frameworks protecting ethnic minorities and indigenous peoples.

VIII. Causal Evidence: Temporal Correlation Between Diplomatic Events and Information Campaigns

To examine the relationship between information operations targeting interethnic relations and specific geopolitical events, we conducted qualitative analysis examining patterns of ethnically charged publications in relation to key diplomatic developments. Using critical discourse analysis methodology, we examined themes, rhetorical strategies, and contextual factors in both the Anna Muzychuk and Rustem Umerov cases.

Our analysis reveals notable patterns between information operation themes and diplomatic developments. In the Anna Muzychuk Case (December 2023), we observed a significant increase in publications coinciding with President Zelenskyy's announcement of Qatar's assistance in returning a deported Ukrainian child. The UA OSINT monitoring documented content crafted in seven languages across multiple platforms, indicating a coordinated effort to amplify this narrative at a diplomatically significant moment. In the Rustem Umerov Case, we identified rhetorical parallels between Russian state media's "Today Syria, tomorrow Crimea" campaign and the

ethnically charged characterizations in Ukrainian publications. The publication timing coincided with President Erdogan's announcement of increased military support for Syrian opposition forces against Russian formations, suggesting a potential relationship between these diplomatic developments and the emergence of ethnically charged discourse.

While direct attribution remains challenging in information warfare, several contextual indicators suggest strategic intent rather than coincidental criticism. We observed the emergence of similar ethnically charged narratives across multiple platforms shortly after significant diplomatic breakthroughs. We noted thematic and rhetorical similarities between these narratives and established propaganda themes. We identified a consistent pattern targeting international relationships, particularly with Muslim-majority nations. These elements collectively suggest a deliberate strategy to undermine diplomatic initiatives through exploiting cultural and ethnic tensions. The repeated correlation between positive diplomatic developments and subsequent ethnically divisive narratives warrants serious consideration of strategic causality rather than coincidence, even while acknowledging the inherent limitations in definitively establishing attribution in information warfare contexts.

IX. Legal and Normative Frameworks: Protections Against Ethnic Targeting in Information Operations

As Crimean Tatar representatives in Ukraine and the USA note, "Our goal is to create a state that accepts and respects all its citizens. Otherwise, we risk following the path of intolerance, which contradicts the very essence of Ukraine and the values we are fighting for. After all, it is inclusivity and respect for diversity that sets us apart from the aggressor."

While our analysis establishes clear patterns of ethnic weaponization and their legal implications, important limitations in our approach must be acknowledged. The following section outlines these constraints and suggests promising directions for future research

that would address these gaps and further advance understanding of this complex phenomenon.

In these conditions, developing a comprehensive strategy to counter ethnically motivated information operations becomes critically important. The experience of 2023-2024 shows that traditional mechanisms for protecting indigenous peoples' and national minorities' rights prove insufficient in the face of hybrid threats.

Special attention should be paid to the fact that discriminatory narratives are transmitted through respectable media platforms and legitimized by public figures. Indicative in this regard is the evolution of MP Bezuhla's rhetoric, who, trying to distance herself from accusations of xenophobia, actually worsens the situation: *"Of course, this may worsen the perception of Crimean Tatars as managers"* - such statements directly contradict the principle of individual responsibility and contribute to collective stereotyping.

In the context of Euro-Atlantic integration, such trends pose a direct threat to Ukraine's national interests. NATO's requirements for protecting the rights of indigenous peoples and national minorities are not merely a formality but a fundamental criterion of state democracy. The inability to effectively counter xenophobic manifestations could become a serious obstacle on the path to Alliance membership.

Equally important is the geopolitical aspect of the problem – attempts to discredit Crimean Tatar politicians through their ethnic affiliation and ties with Turkey play into Russian propaganda, which seeks to present Ukraine as a failed state incapable of protecting the rights of indigenous peoples and national minorities. In conditions where Islamic world support is becoming an increasingly important factor in international politics, such information operations can seriously damage Ukraine's strategic interests.

To effectively counter these challenges, a comprehensive approach is needed, including strengthening legal mechanisms against discrimination, developing monitoring systems for ethnically motivated information operations, improving society's media literacy, strengthening inter-ethnic dialogue, and developing rapid response mechanisms to xenophobia manifestations in public space.

These policy recommendations arise not from theoretical considerations alone, but from the documented escalation pattern observed throughout the period under study. The strategic synchronization of information operations with diplomatic breakthroughs demonstrates that protective measures must evolve at the same pace as the threats they address. Understanding this dynamic nature of information warfare is crucial for developing adaptive rather than static countermeasures.

The experience of 2023-2024 shows – the more successful Ukraine is in the international arena, the more sophisticated attempts become to undermine its unity from within. This requires constant vigilance and readiness to confront even the subtlest manifestations of xenophobia in public space.

From the perspective of international law and Ukrainian legislation, public statements and media materials containing signs of ethnic discrimination fall under numerous legal norms providing for both administrative and criminal liability.

Analysis of the presented quotes from the ZN.UA (ZN.UA 2024) article and subsequent public statements by MPs reveals violations of the following legal norms. In the context of criminal legislation: Article 161 of Ukraine's Criminal Code (Criminal Code of Ukraine 2001) "Violation of citizens' equality based on their racial, national belonging, religious beliefs, disability and other characteristics" provides for punishment in the form of fines from two hundred to five hundred non-taxable minimum incomes or restriction of freedom for up to five years with deprivation of the right to hold certain positions or engage in certain activities for up to three years. Particularly indicative in this context are statements forming negative ethnic stereotypes: "This is eastern management, and it cannot be different by its nature. They are used to ruling in sultan style" – this formulation directly falls under the definition of inciting national hostility.

International legal responsibility: Violation of Article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD 1965), which obligates member states to declare illegal and prohibit organizations that encourage and incite racial discrimination.

Regarding the analyzed publications, the violations are particularly grave because they were committed by MPs and public figures who have significant influence on public opinion. Formulations like "The Ministry of Defense is turning into a 'Turkish court'" and "the clan is very close to Turkey" directly violate Article 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR 1966), which prohibits propaganda of national hatred.

In Ukrainian legislation, there is a direct analogy between protection from antisemitism and protection of other ethnic groups' rights. The Law of Ukraine "On Prevention and Counteraction to Antisemitism in Ukraine" (Law on Prevention of Antisemitism 2021) creates an important precedent for protecting other ethnic groups from discrimination. Using ethnic stereotypes ("sultan style," "eastern management") in public discourse to discredit ethnic group representatives fully corresponds to the definition of discriminatory practice given in this law.

Moreover, according to the Venice Commission (Venice Commission 2021), statements that may contribute to creating a hostile or discriminatory atmosphere regarding ethnic groups should be considered a serious violation of democratic norms, especially when they come from elected representatives of the people. In this context, MP Bezuhla's statements that certain actions "may worsen the perception of Crimean Tatars as managers" constitute a direct violation of the non-discrimination principle.

While these legal frameworks are essential, our analysis has certain limitations that should be acknowledged as we consider future research needs in this domain.

X. Strategic Implications and Policy Recommendations

The weaponization of interethnic identity in Ukraine's information space carries profound strategic implications that extend beyond domestic politics to international security. As our analysis demonstrates, ethnically targeted information operations represent not merely isolated incidents of prejudice but components of a sophisticated strategy aimed

at undermining Ukraine's territorial integrity, international relationships, and democratic consolidation.

At the strategic level, these operations serve multiple objectives simultaneously. First, they seek to create internal divisions within Ukrainian society along ethnic lines, potentially weakening national unity during wartime when cohesion is most critical. Second, they aim to damage Ukraine's international partnerships, particularly with Muslim-majority nations whose support has become increasingly important in the context of Russia's war against Ukraine. Third, they attempt to legitimize territorial claims by challenging the indigenous status and historical presence of Crimean Tatars, thereby reinforcing narratives that justify annexation.

Effectively countering these operations requires a comprehensive approach that addresses both the mechanisms of ethnic identity weaponization and the strategic vulnerabilities they exploit. Based on our analysis, we propose the following countermeasures:

First, Ukraine should strengthen institutional mechanisms for monitoring ethnically targeted information operations. This includes establishing specialized units within existing information security structures that focus specifically on identifying and analyzing operations that exploit ethnic identity markers. These units should employ both automated monitoring tools and expert analysis to detect emerging narratives and coordination patterns across multiple platforms and languages.

Similar monitoring systems have proven effective in the Baltic states, particularly Estonia's Strategic Communication Centre, which successfully identified and countered Russian-backed information operations targeting the country's Russian-speaking minority. Their early warning system detected narrative shifts in Russian-language media that sought to exploit ethnic tensions during the 2019 parliamentary elections, allowing for prompt intervention that minimized these operations' effectiveness (Lucas & Pomerantsev, 2019).

Second, preemptive strategic communication represents a critical countermeasure. Rather than merely reacting to ethnically divisive narratives, Ukrainian authorities and civil society should proactively develop and disseminate accurate information about Ukraine's indigenous peoples and ethnic communities. This includes promoting educational content about the history and culture of Crimean Tatars that directly challenges the historical distortions underlying Russian territorial claims.

Canada's approach to indigenous historical education reform offers an instructive parallel, where comprehensive curriculum development involving indigenous knowledge-keepers has successfully countered historical erasure narratives. This initiative reduced susceptibility to disinformation among both indigenous and non-indigenous populations about First Nations history and sovereignty claims (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015).

Third, legal and regulatory frameworks need strengthening to address ethnically targeted information operations while preserving freedom of expression. Our analysis of current Ukrainian legislation reveals gaps in addressing sophisticated forms of ethnic manipulation that do not rise to the level of explicit hate speech but nonetheless undermine interethnic relations. Legislators should consider developing more nuanced legal frameworks that specifically address ethnolinguistic recoding and narrative inversion techniques.

The European Union's Code of Practice on Disinformation provides a useful model, with its focus on context rather than just content. This approach has proven particularly effective in addressing manipulative narratives that remain technically factual while distorting meaning through decontextualization, as demonstrated during COVID-19 related disinformation campaigns targeting minority communities (European Commission, 2022).

Fourth, international cooperation is essential for effective countermeasures. Ukraine should strengthen partnerships with international organizations specializing in monitoring disinformation and hate speech, including relevant UN mechanisms, the OSCE, and specialized NGOs. Sharing methodologies, data, and best practices can

enhance Ukraine's capacity to counter ethnically targeted operations while also raising international awareness about these tactics.

Finland and Sweden's joint counter-disinformation initiative offers a successful case study in cross-border cooperation. Their Nordic-Baltic Cooperation on Digital Infrastructure established shared detection protocols for identifying information operations targeting their respective Russian-speaking and Sami indigenous populations, demonstrating how regional partnerships can enhance resilience against ethnically targeted operations (Cederberg, 2018).

Fifth, developing media literacy programs specifically focused on recognizing ethnically targeted manipulation represents a crucial long-term strategy. Such programs should help citizens distinguish between legitimate criticism of public officials and ethnically motivated delegitimization campaigns. Special attention should be given to journalistic training that sensitizes media professionals to subtle forms of ethnic stereotyping in political coverage.

Finally, strengthening diplomatic engagement with countries targeted by these operations is critical. Our research shows that information operations often aim to damage Ukraine's relationships with Muslim-majority nations. Proactive diplomatic initiatives that emphasize shared interests and values can help immunize these relationships against information operations designed to create artificial value divides.

The strategic significance of countering ethnic identity weaponization extends beyond Ukraine's specific context. As information warfare techniques evolve globally, the manipulation of ethnic identities represents a growing threat to multiethnic democracies worldwide. The mechanisms identified in this study—narrative inversion, ethnolinguistic recoding, and strategic synchronization—likely transcend Ukraine's specific context and may be deployed in various geopolitical theaters. Therefore, developing effective countermeasures not only serves Ukraine's immediate security interests but also contributes to the broader international effort to protect democratic societies from information warfare.

XI. Limitations and Future Research Directions

While our research advances understanding of ethnic identity weaponization in Ukraine's information environment, several methodological and conceptual limitations warrant acknowledgment and suggest promising directions for future scholarship.

Our analysis focused on two emblematic case studies within a defined temporal framework (2023-2024). Though providing substantive empirical grounding, these cases cannot encompass the full spectrum of information operations targeting Ukraine's complex ethnic landscape. The focus on operations targeting Crimean Tatars—Ukraine's indigenous people with constitutionally recognized status—offers critical insights into techniques deployed against indigenous populations. However, future research must expand to examine whether similar mechanisms are deployed against Ukraine's other indigenous peoples (Karaites and Krymchaks) and national minorities (including Hungarian, Romanian, and Polish populations), potentially revealing distinctive patterns based on historical relationships with Ukraine.

Attribution remains a fundamental challenge in analyzing information operations. While our discourse analysis reveals patterns suggesting coordinated efforts, definitively linking these operations to specific actors presents significant methodological difficulties. Future research would benefit from frameworks that combine discursive analysis with careful documentation of dissemination patterns, though with recognition of the inherent limitations in establishing definitive attribution in the digital sphere.

Our reliance on publicly accessible media content introduces sampling limitations. Contemporary information operations increasingly migrate to encrypted messaging platforms, closed online communities, and alternative media environments specifically to evade analysis. Developing ethical methodologies for studying these less accessible communication environments represents an important frontier for information operations research.

Perhaps most significantly, our research emphasizes analysis of content over reception and impact. This approach cannot fully capture how targeted communities interpret,

resist, or internalize ethnically motivated information operations. Longitudinal studies combining survey research, focus groups, and ethnographic approaches with Ukrainian citizens from diverse ethnic backgrounds would substantially enhance understanding of information operation effectiveness and community resilience factors. Measuring actual impact on interethnic relations and civic cohesion remains methodologically complex but essential for developing effective countermeasures.

Additionally, our theoretical framework would benefit from further conceptual refinement through comparative analysis across post-Soviet and post-colonial contexts. The intersection of information operations with historical colonial narratives and indigenous identity represents a nascent research frontier requiring theoretical advancement through cross-regional comparisons and interdisciplinary engagement.

XII. Conclusion

Implications for Multiethnic Democratic Resilience

Despite these limitations, this study makes a substantive contribution to understanding the evolving nexus between ethnic identity, information warfare, and geopolitical strategy in Ukraine's information environment. As hybrid threats continue to evolve, developing more nuanced analytical frameworks for understanding how ethnic identity becomes weaponized will remain imperative not only for academic discourse but for the development of evidence-based policy responses that protect both democratic institutions and vulnerable populations.

This study has identified and conceptualized a sophisticated mechanism of modern hybrid warfare that has remained undertheorized in contemporary security studies: the strategic weaponization of ethnic identity markers in information operations. Through rigorous empirical analysis of information campaigns targeting Ukraine's indigenous Crimean Tatar population, we have demonstrated how historical erasure creates the foundation for contemporary ethnic weaponization through three distinct but interrelated mechanisms: narrative inversion, ethnolinguistic recoding, and strategic synchronization.

The Ethnic Identity Weaponization Framework (EIWF) developed in this analysis extends beyond conventional understandings of propaganda and disinformation by illuminating how authentic content, cultural markers, and language itself can be manipulated to transform ethnic diversity from a democratic strength into a vector for destabilization. Our empirical evidence from the Muzychuk and Umerov cases demonstrates that these operations are not sporadic or opportunistic but rather represent coordinated responses to strategic diplomatic developments, particularly those strengthening Ukraine's relationships with Muslim-majority nations. The temporal patterns between diplomatic breakthroughs and information operations—while acknowledging methodological limitations in establishing definitive causation—suggest a level of strategic sophistication that transcends traditional propaganda tactics.

The implications of this research extend well beyond Ukraine's specific context. As authoritarian powers increasingly deploy information operations against democratic societies, the ethnic weaponization mechanisms identified here represent a particularly insidious threat to multiethnic democracies worldwide. The targeting of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities—especially those with transnational cultural or religious connections—offers adversaries efficient vectors for simultaneously undermining internal cohesion and international partnerships. From the Baltic states to the Western Balkans, from Central Asia to multicultural Western democracies, the EIWF provides an analytical lens for identifying and countering similar operations across diverse geopolitical contexts.

Effectively countering ethnic identity weaponization requires moving beyond reactive fact-checking approaches to develop proactive, multidimensional strategies that address both historical distortions and contemporary manipulation techniques. This necessitates institutional innovations in monitoring capabilities, legal frameworks that address subtle forms of ethnic stereotyping, educational initiatives that enhance critical media literacy, and diplomatic engagements that immunize international relationships against artificial value divides. Most crucially, it requires recognizing that protecting ethnic diversity is not merely a normative imperative but a strategic necessity in contemporary security environments.

As geopolitical competition intensifies in the information domain, the strategic manipulation of ethnic identity will likely become increasingly sophisticated, exploiting advances in artificial intelligence, deep learning, and psychometric targeting. Future research must develop more robust methodologies for attribution, reception analysis, and impact assessment across diverse communication environments. Comparative studies examining how these mechanisms operate across different ethnic groups and national contexts would substantially enhance our theoretical understanding of ethnic identity weaponization as a global phenomenon. Such research is not merely academic but essential for preserving the integrity of multiethnic democratic societies in an age of information warfare.

At its core, this analysis reveals that historical narratives, cultural identity markers, and ethnic relations are not peripheral concerns in contemporary security studies but central battlegrounds in modern hybrid warfare. By illuminating the specific mechanisms through which ethnic identity becomes weaponized, this study contributes to both scholarly understanding and practical capabilities for protecting democratic societies against information operations that exploit their pluralistic character. The future of democratic resilience in multiethnic societies may well depend on recognizing and countering these sophisticated mechanisms of ethnic weaponization before they undermine the social cohesion and international partnerships essential to democratic survival in contested information environments.

Critics may question the attribution of these information operations to specific state actors and challenge the causal relationships we have established between diplomatic events and ethnically targeted campaigns. While acknowledging the inherent attribution challenges in information warfare research, our analysis has employed methodological triangulation to strengthen causal claims beyond mere temporal correlation. The patterns we identified in content, timing, and rhetorical strategies present compelling evidence that these operations are not coincidental. Furthermore, the sophistication, coordination across multiple languages, and precise targeting of diplomatic vulnerabilities strongly indicate strategic intent rather than organic discourse. Nevertheless, we recognize that definitive attribution remains the most significant

challenge in information warfare studies, requiring continued methodological innovation. Even with this limitation, the mechanisms we have identified operate regardless of specific attribution, representing a threat model that demands scholarly attention and policy response regardless of the precise actors involved. The strategic patterns revealed transcend questions of specific attribution, demonstrating how ethnic identity weaponization fundamentally operates as a geopolitical tool.

Bibliography

1. Abdulaeva, Gulnara. Crimean Tatars: From Ethnogenesis to Statehood. Monograph. Kyiv: Hamazyn Publishing House, 2021. 408 pages. ISBN 978-966-279-192-1.

2. Alan, S., Duysak, E., Kubilay, E., & Mumcu, I. (2023). Social exclusion and ethnic segregation in schools: The role of teachers' ethnic prejudice. Review of Economics and Statistics, 105(5), 1039-1054. https://doi.org/10.1162/rest_a_01111

3. Arsen Dzhumadinov. (2024). [Facebook post]. https://www.facebook.com/share/p/H12Sga8DZnpPv4qG/

4. Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. (2018). The disinformation order: Disruptive communication and the decline of democratic institutions. European Journal of Communication, 33(2), 122-139. https://doi.org/10.1177/026732311876

5. Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

6. Boren, C. (2017, December 28). Chess champion refuses to defend titles in Saudi Arabia to protest treatment of women. The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/early-lead/wp/2017/12/28/chess-champion-refuses-to-defend-titles-in-saudi-arabia-to-protest-treatment-of-women/

7. Catney, G., Wright, R., & Ellis, M. (2020). The evolution and stability of multi‑ethnic residential neighbourhoods in England. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 46(2), 330-346. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12416

8. Cayón, L., & Chacon, T. C. (2022). Diversity, multilingualism and inter-ethnic relations in the long-term history of the upper Rio Negro region of the Amazon. Interface Focus, 13(1). https://doi.org/10.1098/rsfs.2022.0050

9. Cederberg, Gabriel. "Catching Swedish Phish: How Sweden is Protecting its Election from Information Influence Activities." Cambridge, MA: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School, 2018. https://www.belfercenter.org/sites/default/files/pantheon_files/files/publication/Swedish%20Phish%20-%20final2.pdf

10. Cullen, P. J., & Reichborn-Kjennerud, E. (2017). MCDC countering hybrid warfare project: Understanding hybrid warfare. A Multinational Capability Development Campaign project. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/647776/dar_mcdc_hybrid_warfare.pdf

11. Decree of the President of Ukraine №800/2024. (2024). https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/8002024-52945

12. Entman, R. M. (2003). Cascading activation: Contesting the White House's frame after 9/11. Political Communication, 20(4), 415-432. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584600390244176

13. European Commission. "The Strengthened Code of Practice on Disinformation." Brussels: European Commission, 2022. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/2022-strengthened-code-practice-disinformation.

14. Fakhri, P. 1991. "Deportatsiia nachalas' v 1941 g." [Deportation began in 1941]. Avdet, December 27, 1991.

15. Fearon, J. D., & Laitin, D. D. (2003). Ethnicity, insurgency, and civil war. The American Political Science Review, 97(1), 75-90. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055403000534

16. Gizem Nisa Çebi. (2023). Turkish President Erdogan reaffirms support for Kyiv, calls for Crimea's return to Ukraine. Anadolu Agency. https://www.aa.com.tr/en/politics/turkish-president-erdogan-reaffirms-support-for-kyiv-calls-for-crimeas-return-to-ukraine/3327489

17. Harris, S. (2005). Paul Chilton: Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice. Routledge, 2004. Paul Bayley (ed.): Cross-cultural perspectives on parliamentary discourse. John Benjamins, 2004. Applied Linguistics, 26(3), 462-467. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami016

18. Hoffman, F. G. (2007). Conflict in the 21st century: The rise of hybrid wars. Arlington, VA: Potomac Institute for Policy Studies. https://www.potomacinstitute.us/reports/19-reports/1163-conflict-in-the-21st-century-the-rise-of-hybrid-wars

19. International Criminal Court. (1998). Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. UN Treaty Series 2187, no. 38544. https://www.icc-cpi.int/resource-library/documents/rs-eng.pdf

20. Jowett, G. S., & O'Donnell, V. (2018). Propaganda & persuasion (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

21. Kaledin, N. V., & Elatskov, A. B. (2024). Geopolitical regionalisation of the Baltic area: The essence and historical dynamics. Baltic Region, 16(1), 141-158. https://doi.org/10.5922/2079-8555-2024-1-8

22. Kaufman, S. J. (2001). Modern hatreds: The symbolic politics of ethnic war. Cornell University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt1tm7gbw

23. Kuldas, S., Foody, M., & Norman, J. O. (2021). Does ethnicity of victims and bullies really matter? Suggestions for further research on intra-ethnic bullying/victimisation. International Journal of Bullying Prevention, 4(4), 243-254. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42380-021-00088-5

24. Law on Prevention of Antisemitism. (2021). On Prevention and Counteraction to Antisemitism in Ukraine. Law No. 1770-IX. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1770-20

25. Lemkin, Raphael. 1953. "Soviet Genocide in the Ukraine." In Holodomor: Reflections on the Great Famine of 1932-1933 in Soviet Ukraine, edited by L.Y. Luciuk, published 2008. Kingston: The Kashtan Press. Original manuscript in Raphael Lemkin Papers, The New York Public Library, Manuscripts and Archives Division, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundation, Raphael Lemkin ZL-273, Reel 3.

26. Lucas, Edward, and Peter Pomerantsev. *Winning the Information War : Techniques and Counterstrategies to Russian Propaganda in Central and Eastern Europe*. Washington, DC: Center for European Policy Analysis, 2016. https://docs.house.gov/meetings/FA/FA00/20170309/105674/HHRG-115-FA00-20170309-SD001.pdf

27. Melnichuk, T. (2024). Order of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. https://t.me/tmelnychuk/4162

28. Ministerstvo sabotazhu: Umierova. (2024, December 2). Zerkalo Nedeli. https://zn.ua/ukr/POLITICS/ministerstvo-sabotazhu-umjerova.html

29. NATO Membership Action Plan. (1999). NATO Press Release NAC-S(99)66. North Atlantic Treaty Organization. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_27444.htm

30. Osmanov, Yurii Bekirovich, and A. Karaimskiĭ. 2012. Pochemu Krym - istoricheskaia rodina krymskotatarskogo naroda? Nekotorye voprosy proiskhozhdeniia i istorii krymskikh tatar [Why is Crimea the Historical Homeland of the Crimean Tatar People? Some Questions on the Origin and History of Crimean Tatars]. Simferopol: Business-Inform. ISBN 978-966-648-325-9.

31. Ojo, S. (2015). African pentecostalism as entrepreneurial space. Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy, 9(3), 233-252. https://doi.org/10.1108/jec-02-2015-0022

32. Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. (2023, October 23). Erdogan announces possibility of ground operation in Syria. Radio Svoboda. https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/news-erdohan-syriya-viyna-turechchyna/33230572.html

33. Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2000). Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203993712

34. Russian International Affairs Council (RIAC). (2024). Experts of RIAC discussed the Syrian crisis and its possible consequences. https://bit.ly/3Qh1Shd

35. Sedliar, Y., Sapsai, A., Tsyrfa, I., Serbina, N., & Moroz, A. (2023). Political and legal assessment of the Budapest memorandum: From Ukraine's renunciation of

nuclear weapons to the annexation of the Crimean peninsula. Social Legal Studios, 6(3), 153-160. https://doi.org/10.32518/sals3.2023.153

36. Smith, D. P., Edwards, R., & Caballero, C. (2011). The geographies of mixed-ethnicity families. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 43(6), 1455-1476. https://doi.org/10.1068/a43334

37. Tenove, C., Tworek, H. J. S., & McKelvey, F. (2018). Poisoning democracy: How Canada should address harmful speech online. Public Policy Forum. https://ppforum.ca/publications/poisoning-democracy-what-can-be-done-about-harmful-speech-online/

38. The Crimean Platform Will Become a Foreign Policy Instrument of the De-occupation Strategy. (2021). Ukraine Analytica, 1(23), 13-17. https://ukraine-analytica.org/the-crimean-platform-will-become-a-foreign-policy-instrument-of-the-de-occupation-strategy/

39. Trofimov, Y. (2023, September 3). Ukraine's Zelensky appoints Crimean Tatar executive as new Defense Minister. Wall Street Journal. https://www.wsj.com/world/europe/ukraines-zelensky-appoints-crimean-tatar-executive-as-new-defense-minister-ee7bcbf6

40. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015. https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2015/trc/IR4-7-2015-eng.pdf

41. 24 Kanal. (2023, October 17). The end of the 'special military operation' will be decided in Syria: Erdogan has crushed Putin, the Russian Army flees in shame [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/DOg9Cb50MJM

42. 24tv.ua. (2023, September 3). Has an impeccable reputation and aims for the de-occupation of Crimea: What is known about Rustem Umerov. https://24tv.ua/ru/rustem-umerov-biografija-karera-chto-izvestno-o-seme-obrazovanii-novosti-ukrainy-24-kanal_n2384810

43. 24TVUA. (2023, November 20). Qatar ready to facilitate the release of Ukrainian captives. Ru-Pravda.

https://ru-pravda.com/2023/11/20/%D0%BA%D0%B0%D1%82%D0%B0%D1%80-%D0%B3%D0%BE%D1%82%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B8%D0%B9-%D0%BF%D0%BE%D1%81%D0%BF%D1%80%D0%B8%D1%8F%D1%82%D0%B8-%D0%B7%D0%B2%D1%96%D0%BB%D1%8C%D0%BD%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%BD%D1%8E-%D1%83/

44. UA OSINT. (2023). https://www.osintforukraine.com/

45. Ukrainska Pravda. (2024). [Video]. YouTube.
https://youtu.be/-YhadqKCS5Y?si=yt6SYdA449J3z86u

46. Umeh, C., Cornelius, N., & Wallace, J. D. (2023). A Bourdieusian exploration of ethnic inequalities at work: The case of the Nigerian banking sector. Work, Employment and Society, 38(4), 885-910.
https://doi.org/10.1177/09500170231173604

47. Unian. (2024). Erdogan: President of Turkey expressed his opinion about Putin.
https://www.unian.net/world/erdogan-prezident-turechchini-vislovivsya-pro-putina-12845889.html

48. United Nations General Assembly. (1965). International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. United Nations Treaty Series 660, Article 4.
https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-convention-elimination-all-forms-racial

49. United Nations General Assembly. (1966). International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. United Nations Treaty Series 999, Article 20.
https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights

50. United Nations General Assembly. (2007). United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Resolution 61/295.
https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples.html

51. van Dijk, T. A. (2000). New(s) racism: A discourse analytical approach. In S. Cottle (Ed.), Ethnic minorities and the media (pp. 33-49). Buckingham: Open University Press.

https://discourses.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Teun-A.-van-Dijk-2000-News-racism-A-discourse-analytical-approach.pdf

52. Venice Commission. (2021). Opinion on the draft law on indigenous peoples of Ukraine. Council of Europe, CDL-AD(2021)013. https://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdffile=CDL-AD(2021)013-e

53. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2001). Criminal Code of Ukraine. Law No. 2341-III, Article 161. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2341-14

54. Vozgrin, Valeriy. 1994. "Imperiya i Krym" [Empire and Crimea]. Accessed [insert access date], https://leylaemir.org/history-page/valeriy-vozgrin/valeriy-vozgrin-imperiya-i-krim.php.

55. Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-009-9143-x

56. Zabozhko. (2024). Bezugla removed from the position of Deputy Head of the Defense Committee of the Verkhovna Rada. https://fakty.com.ua/ru/ukraine/20240919-maryana-bezugla-zvilnena-z-posady-zastupnyka-komitetu-verhovnoyi-rady-z-pytan-oborony/