



Institute for the Documentation of
Human Rights Violations against
Religious Minorities in the Levant

WHERE SILENCE ENDS AND JUSTICE BEGINS

November 11, 2025

Report
Alawite Refugees Rescued off the Coast of
Muğla, Türkiye

(October 15–November 5, 2025)

Introduction

This report is submitted for the attention of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children in Armed Conflict (OSRSG-CAAC), the Commission of Inquiry (COI), and the International, Impartial, and Independent Mechanism (IIIM) as well as the respective bodies within the European Union (EU).

It documents the sequence of events, legal findings, and humanitarian concerns regarding a group of **17 Alawite refugees accompanied by 5 children** rescued from lifeboats off the coast of **Muğla Province, Turkey**, on **October 15, 2025**.

All data contained in this report were collected and cross-verified through direct observation, sworn statements, and legal documentation, adhering to the principles of accuracy, confidentiality, and impartial humanitarian reporting.

These include:

- Official statements and documentary materials issued by Turkish migration authorities;
- Public declarations and digital communications disseminated by the Progressive Lawyers' Association, the Lawyers for Freedom Association (ÖHD), and other recognized civil-society actors;
- Legal correspondence, direct field observations, and reports submitted by non-governmental organizations;
- Verified eyewitness testimonies and sworn interviews conducted at the Harran Temporary Shelter Center and the Ula Deportation Center.

This report situates the incident within the framework of international humanitarian law (IHL), the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol,¹ the Geneva Convention,² the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), and the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (2000/C 364/01). It references Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), Article 33 of the 1951 Refugee Convention (non-refoulement), Articles 2, 3, 5, 8, and 13 of the ECHR, Articles 3, 12, and 28 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), and Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions.

The incident, which began with an alleged **pushback operation by Greek forces**, has evolved into a case of serious **violations of refugee protection standards, due process, and humanitarian obligations** under both Turkish and international law.

I. Background of the Incident

On **October 15, 2025, at 1:58 PM**, the Turkish Coast Guard received information about irregular migrants stranded in a lifeboat off the coast of **Marmaris district, Muğla province**.

¹ Turkey is a signatory to both the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, but it must be noted that it maintains a significant reservation: a geographical limitation. Under this restriction, Turkey grants full “refugee” status only to individuals fleeing events occurring in Europe. Those escaping persecution or conflict outside of Europe are instead afforded alternative forms of protection, such as “conditional refugee” or “temporary asylum” status. Turkey signed the Convention in 1951, ratified it in 1962, and acceded to the Protocol in 1968—each time reaffirming its geographical limitation.

² Turkey is also a party to the Geneva Conventions—the foundational treaties governing the humanitarian treatment of victims of armed conflict. It ratified all four Conventions of 1949, which constitute the core of international humanitarian law. As a result, Turkey is legally obligated to uphold the provisions of these treaties, both in its conduct during armed conflict and, under limited conditions, in its treatment of refugees.

The **Coast Guard Boat (KB-116)** was dispatched and **rescued 17 Alawite refugees accompanied by 5 children** who had been **pushed back into Turkish territorial waters by Greek forces**.

According to the Coast Guard's official report³, the refugees had been placed in inflatable life rafts and left adrift by the Greek authorities.⁴

The refugees said they fled Latakia, Syria, escaping sectarian violence against Alawites. Given Germany's debates on deporting Syrians—albeit mostly from other groups—their route is striking: bypassing Greek Cyprus and traveling all the way to Greece, only to be pushed back into Turkish waters. After entering **Greek territorial waters**, their boat was intercepted by a **Greek Coast Guard vessel**, which later departed the area. Subsequently, a **boat with non-uniformed personnel** boarded their vessel, **beat them with batons, stole their money and phones, and forced them into life rafts**, pushing them back toward Turkish waters.

This is particularly significant in light of Greece's international legal responsibility for the unlawful pushbacks of Syrian nationals to Turkey, in violation of the principle of non-refoulement and other binding obligations under international and European human rights law. These actions constitute violations of international law, including Article 2 (Right to Life) and Article 3 (Prohibition of Torture) of the ECHR; Article 33 of the 1951 Refugee Convention (prohibition of refoulement); Rule 98 of Customary IHL; obligations under the International Convention on Maritime Search and Rescue (SAR) and the SOLAS Convention; Articles 18 and 19 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights; and Articles 9 and 12 of the ICCPR.

The Turkish Coast Guard rescued them and transferred them to **Marmaris**, after which they were placed in the custody of the **Provincial Directorate of Migration Management (Göç İdaresi)** and sent to the **Ula Return Center** in Muğla.

II. Chronology of Efforts to Locate and Protect the Refugees

October 21, 2025 — Initial Contact and Mobilization

Relatives of the refugees contacted **Hamide Yiğit**, journalist and human rights activist, and **Salim Taş**, ICBC-Corps Ambassador, Divisional Commander-in-Charge, Coordinator for Crisis Regions in the Middle East, and representative to the UN (New York, Geneva, Vienna). They immediately initiated efforts to trace the refugees' whereabouts, identifying the **Ula Return Center** as their likely location. Local **Alevi and Alawite NGOs** were informed and mobilized for assistance.

October 22, 2025 — Confirmation of Transfer and Legal Mobilization

Lawyers appointed by NGOs arrived in **Ula**, where officials denied that the refugees were being held. Later that evening, independent sources confirmed the group had been **transferred to Şanlıurfa**.

A **mass email campaign** was organized by Alawite and Alevi organizations to the **Muğla Provincial Directorate of Migration Management**, invoking the **principle of non-refoulement** under **Article 4 of Law No. 6458** and requesting suspension of deportation proceedings.

³ <https://www.sg.gov.tr/mugla-aciklarinda-17-duzensiz-gocmen-beraberinde-5-cocuk-kurtarilmistir-16-10-25>

⁴ Keady-Tabbal N, Mann I. Weaponizing Rescue: Law and the Materiality of Migration Management in the Aegean. *Leiden Journal of International Law*. 2023; 36(1): 61-82. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0922156522000528>.

October 22, 2025 — Public Advocacy

The **Izmir Branch of the Progressive Lawyers Association (ÇHD)** issued a statement on social media warning that deportation of the group to Syria would **violate international law**.⁵ As documented in the case descriptions and individual profiles of Syrian refugees (Appendix I, available upon request), these individuals face a substantiated risk of torture and execution if repatriated, **due to targeted persecution by the Tahrir al-Sham regime**. This group has been documented as responsible for systematic violence against minority populations, particularly Alawites.⁶ This public advocacy explicitly references Article 3 of the ECHR (prohibition of torture), Article 33 of the 1951 Refugee Convention (non-refoulement), and Articles 18 and 19 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights.

October 23–24, 2025 — Legal Intervention in Şanlıurfa

After the group was located in the **Harran Temporary Shelter Center**, DEM Party MPs contacted the **Şanlıurfa Migration Directorate**. Lawyers from the **Lawyers for Freedom Association**, **Urfa Law Clinic**, and **Urfa Bar Association Migration Commission** visited the refugees.

Attorney **Gökhan Dayık** interviewed several members and confirmed:

- This was their **first entry into Turkey**,
- They were **victims of violence and theft during pushback by Greece**, and
- They faced a **real risk of persecution if returned**.

He underscored the need for **humanitarian treatment and compliance with the non-refoulement principle**. Legal intervention referenced Articles 6 and 13 of the ECHR (access to justice and effective remedy) and Article 4 of Law No. 6458, underscoring Turkey's domestic and international obligations to protect refugees.

October 29, 2025 — Violation of Legal Protections

During a follow-up visit, Attorney **Gökhan Dayık** and **Ambassador Salim Taş** were subjected to unlawful conduct by **private security personnel** managing camp entry. Although Attorney Dayık was duly registered with the bar and had cleared security checks, he was **ordered to undergo a manual search**, and the same was demanded of the translator.

This constitutes a violation of the right to due process and undermines the obligation to ensure access to an effective remedy, as guaranteed under international human rights law, including Article 13 of the European Convention on Human Rights and Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

⁵ See: <https://x.com/chdzmirsubesi/status/1981029992705282245?s=46> and <https://www.instagram.com/p/DQHhZDrCLUh/?igsh=N3M4MWVYyYjN1bmF6>

⁶ The detailed case descriptions collected from the refugees indicate that they were subject to persecution in Latakia and its surrounding coastal areas, including El-Daatur and El-Aziziye. These places are well-documented sites of sectarian hostility, particularly targeting Alawite communities. On March 8, 2025, armed actors carried out a large-scale massacre in El-Daatur, executing and burning men of all ages in front of their homes. El-Daatur has long been a focal point for systematic abuses—arbitrary arrests, torture, enforced disappearances, and extrajudicial killings—especially against individuals perceived as “regime remnants” due to their sectarian identity. Following regime change, those with military affiliations, including conscripts and former Republican Guard members of Alawite background, have faced intensified retaliation and rights violations. The broader coastal region continues to see widespread persecution of religious minorities, compounded by impunity and the absence of accountability mechanisms. Alawite communities remain at heightened risk of discrimination, detention, and lethal violence. The individuals profiles indicate a credible risk of persecution, including arbitrary detention and ill-treatment, should they be returned to Syria.

This violates **Article 58 of the Turkish Attorney Act (Law No. 1136)**, which states:

“An attorney may not be searched except in flagrante delicto for a crime falling within the jurisdiction of the high criminal court.”

As clearly expressed in the law, **an attorney may only be searched in cases of flagrante delicto** for crimes under the jurisdiction of the high criminal court. The conduct of the camp’s private security constituted a **direct violation of Turkish law** and the **UN Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers (1990)**, which prohibit interference in legal representation.

Security officers further attempted to remain within hearing distance during attorney-client interviews, violating **attorney-client confidentiality**, and tried to **remove the authorized interpreter** despite his verified status.

November 5, 2025 — Obstruction of Family Visits

On the designated visiting day, a **relative who had traveled from abroad** sought to meet a detained refugee and deliver **cash and mobile phones** to assist communication.

The camp administration **denied the visit** and **refused to receive the items**. After intervention by **Attorney Tuğba Çelik**, the cash was eventually accepted under written record, but the **phones were withheld**, and **family contact was denied**.

Refugees were observed to **lack proper footwear and warm clothing**, being required to wear slippers even outdoors. Several individuals reported **increasing depression and suicidal thoughts**, with **no medical or psychological follow-up provided**.

These actions violate Articles 3, 5, and 8 of the ECHR (prohibition of inhuman treatment, right to liberty, and family life) and Articles 3 and 28 of the UNCRC (protection and education rights of children). The failure to provide basic medical and psychosocial care constitutes inhumane treatment under international standards.

III. Current Situation

As of **November 2025**, the **22 refugees** (17 adults, 5 children) remain under restricted conditions at the **Harran Temporary Shelter Center**.

In addition, **10 other individuals in similar circumstances**, including an **8-member Sunni family**, are being monitored. Some individuals have been **held under these same conditions for over one year and two months**, a duration that clearly exceeds lawful administrative detention limits under Turkish and international law.

Children among the group still lack access to formal education, in violation of Article 28 of the UNCRC and Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 to the ECHR. Immediate measures must be taken to enable school enrollment and provide access to psychological and social support programs. Detention exceeding statutory limits contravenes Article 5 of the ECHR and Article 19 of the ICCPR.

IV. Legal and Humanitarian Assessment

The situation presents multiple, overlapping violations:

- **Violation of Right to Life and Maritime Rescue Obligations** breaching Article 2 of the EHRC, UNCLOS and SOLAS by forcing refugees into unsafe rafts and abandoning them at sea.
- **Denial of Access to Asylum / Effective Remedy** in violation of Article 13 of the EHRC and the EU Asylum Procedures Directive by denying asylum access and registration, thus nullifying procedural safeguards and remedies.
- **Refoulement risk**, contrary to **Article 33 of the 1951 Refugee Convention** and **Article 4 of Law No. 6458**.
- **Denial of access to counsel**, in violation of **Article 36 of the Turkish Constitution** and **Article 6 of the ECHR**.
- **Illegal searches of lawyers**, breaching **Article 58 of the Turkish Attorney Act**.
- **Inhumane treatment and prolonged arbitrary detention**, violating **Articles 3 and 5 of the ECHR** and **Article 17 of the Turkish Constitution**.
- **Violation of family life and child rights**, under **Articles 8 and 14 of the ECHR** and **Articles 3 and 28 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child**.

V. Past Reports and Documented Findings on Pushbacks by Greece & the Work of Frontex

Multiple independent organizations, courts and EU bodies have documented systematic pushbacks at Greece's borders and identified serious concerns about the involvement or complicity of EU agencies and Greek authorities:

- **European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)** — In January 2025 the ECtHR described Greece's practice of summary expulsions at the border as **systematic** in its rulings, finding violations in cases of illegal deportation and lack of access to asylum procedures. This represents a landmark judicial recognition that pushbacks in Greece are not isolated incidents but a pattern requiring state accountability.⁷
- **European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) / EU-level findings** — Investigations and briefings published in 2024–2025 concluded that Frontex had been implicated in covering up or failing to report serious human-rights violations at the Greek external border, and that Frontex management withheld cases from its own Fundamental Rights Office. Summaries and policy briefs analyzing OLAF material emphasize institutional failures in oversight and compliance.⁸
- **Amnesty International** — Extensive research and country reporting (2021–2024) document violent, unlawful pushbacks at sea and land borders carried out by Greek border authorities, including incidents of summary returns, physical abuse, theft, and denial of access to asylum procedures. Amnesty has characterized such returns as a de facto border policy in multiple reports.⁹
- **Human Rights Watch (HRW) & Greek Council for Refugees (GCR)** — HRW flagged Frontex complicity and called for independent probes as early as 2020–2022; the Greek Council for Refugees has published detailed case documentation of pushbacks and contributed cases to litigation before the ECtHR and other bodies. These

⁷ <https://www.ecchr.eu/en/case/greece-before-the-european-court-of-human-rights/>

⁸ https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2025/772882/EPRS_BRI%282025%29772882_EN.pdf

⁹ <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/press-release/2021/06/greece-pushbacks-and-violence-against-refugees-and-migrants-are-de-facto-border-policy/>

NGOs' documentation describes repeated patterns of interception, violent conduct and returns without registration or asylum access.¹⁰

Together these sources establish a robust empirical record that: (a) pushbacks at Greek borders have been repeatedly documented and litigated; and (b) EU-level actors (notably Frontex) have faced serious allegations of failing to report or of being complicit in such practices — a policy context directly relevant to the incident described in this report.¹¹

While existing documentation primarily addresses violations attributable to Greece, the Syrian nationals currently face an imminent risk of deportation to Syria without due process protections.¹² Considering this threat, it is legally pertinent to include documentation of Turkey's practices in future reporting, particularly insofar as they may contribute to chain refoulement or fail to provide effective protection in accordance with international and European human rights obligations.

Such reproting will be done on the basis of Rule 9 Communications as a key mechanism in the execution of European Court of Human Rights judgments.¹³ They enable NGOs, NHRIs, and affected individuals to submit independent reports to the Committee of Ministers, which oversees compliance. These submissions will provide critical, ground-level information that may challenge or supplement state reports, highlight obstacles to implementation, and exert pressure for full compliance. They can influence case classification and prevent premature closure of supervision, thereby reinforcing transparency, accountability, and sustained oversight.

VI. Legal Norms Breached by Pushback Operations and Related Conduct

Based on the factual record and the documented pattern of pushbacks, the following national, regional and international legal norms are implicated and, where the facts match the pattern, appear to have been violated:

1. Non-refoulement (1951 Refugee Convention & Turkish Law No. 6458)

- **Rule:** States must not return a person to a territory where they face threats to life or freedom on account of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion (Article 33) — and Turkey's Law No. 6458 enshrines an equivalent domestic prohibition.
- **How a pushback violates it:** Summary returns at sea or land that prevent individuals from accessing asylum procedures or individual assessments amount to collective refoulement and contravene Article 33 and Article 4 of Law No. 6458. (See Amnesty, GCR documentation.)¹⁴

2. Right to Life and Duty to Conduct Effective Rescue (ECHR Article 2; SOLAS/UNCLOS duties at sea)

- **Rule:** Coastal states and vessels have obligations to protect life at sea and to render assistance to those in distress; states must refrain from actions that place people at risk of death.

¹⁰ <https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/11/09/eu-probe-frontex-complicity-border-abuses>

¹¹ <https://www.ecchr.eu/en/case/greece-before-the-european-court-of-human-rights/>

¹² Confidential testimonials and case descriptions are available in Appendix I upon request.

¹³ [https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=DH-DD\(2025\)381E](https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=DH-DD(2025)381E)

¹⁴ <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/press-release/2021/06/greece-pushbacks-and-violence-against-refugees-and-migrants-are-de-facto-border-policy/>

- **How a pushback violates it:** Forcibly returning people into unseaworthy inflatable rafts, abandoning them at sea, or otherwise creating life-threatening conditions undermines the duty to protect life and may engage Article 2 (ECHR) and maritime rescue obligations. ECtHR and NGO reports have linked pushbacks to dangerous conduct and loss of life.¹⁵

3. Prohibition of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment (ECHR Article 3; CAT)

- **Rule:** States may not expose people to torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, including by returning them to a real risk of such treatment.
- **How a pushback violates it:** Forcible removals to territories where individuals risk torture or summary execution — and physical assaults during interception — violate Article 3 of the ECHR and obligations under the UN Convention Against Torture. Multiple NGO reports document beatings, theft and treatment amounting to inhuman treatment during pushbacks.¹⁶

4. Right to an Effective Remedy and Access to Asylum Procedures (ECHR Article 13; EU Asylum acquis & Turkish law)

- **Rule:** Individuals must have access to procedures to claim international protection and to an effective remedy against violations of rights.
- **How a pushback violates it:** Immediate, summary expulsions that deny registration, identification, and access to asylum amount to denial of the procedural guarantees and effective remedy rights required by ECHR case law and EU law. ECtHR rulings and NGO documentation repeatedly highlight the denial of procedural safeguards.¹⁷

5. Children's Rights — Right to Protection and Education (UNCRC)

- **Rule:** States must ensure the best interests of the child, access to education and protection from harm.
- **How a pushback / detention context violates it:** Pushing back families with children across borders and detaining children without access to schooling or psychosocial care breaches Turkey's obligations under the UNCRC and regional standards. The absence of schooling for detained children is a separate right-violating condition requiring remediation.¹⁸

6. EU Charter of Fundamental Rights & Frontex Fundamental Rights Obligations

- **Rule:** EU law (including the EU Charter and Frontex Regulation) requires respect for human dignity, prohibition of torture, right to asylum, and that EU agencies observe fundamental rights in their operations. Frontex must monitor and report rights violations and ensure operations comply with fundamental rights safeguards.
- **How a pushback / Frontex failure violates it:** OLAF and EU oversight findings indicate that Frontex management may have failed in its duty to report or act on serious rights breaches; where Frontex personnel enable or fail to prevent pushbacks, the agency's legal obligations under its founding regulation and the Charter are engaged.¹⁹

¹⁵ <https://www.ecchr.eu/en/case/greece-before-the-european-court-of-human-rights/>

¹⁶ <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/press-release/2021/06/greece-pushbacks-and-violence-against-refugees-and-migrants-are-de-facto-border-policy/>

¹⁷ <https://www.ecchr.eu/en/case/greece-before-the-european-court-of-human-rights/>

¹⁸ <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/press-release/2021/06/greece-pushbacks-and-violence-against-refugees-and-migrants-are-de-facto-border-policy/>

¹⁹ https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2025/772882/EPRS_BRI%282025%29772882_EN.pdf

7. Obligations under International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law to Conduct Impartial Investigations & Ensure Accountability

- **Rule:** Allegations of arbitrary returns, use of force, or complicity require prompt, independent and effective investigations and accountability for perpetrators.
- **How a pushback violates it:** Persistent impunity and lack of effective domestic investigation — as documented in NGO and EU findings — breach State duties to investigate and provide remedies. ECtHR rulings underscore the need for effective domestic avenues.²⁰

VII. Conclusion & Recommendations

This case exemplifies the severe vulnerability of **Alawite refugees** fleeing persecution and the **urgent necessity for international intervention** to uphold refugee protection norms in Turkey.

Immediate action is required to ensure the **safety, education, legal access, and humane treatment** of these individuals and to end the practice of prolonged arbitrary detention under inadequate conditions.

The **United Nations** and **European Union** are urged to monitor developments closely, to provide humanitarian support, and to engage with the Turkish government to secure compliance with international law and fundamental human rights.

The evidence demonstrates:

- The **Greek authorities' pushback** placed refugees, including children, in mortal danger.
- **Turkish detention conditions** and **procedural irregularities** violate domestic and international standards.
- **Some refugees remain detained for over a year**, with children deprived of education.
- **Legal practitioners** face obstruction in performing professional duties.

Recommendations

1. **Immediate suspension of deportation proceedings** for all affected individuals.
2. **Independent monitoring** by UNHCR and the Turkish Human Rights and Equality Institution of the Harran Center.
3. **Prompt release or transfer** of detainees held longer than legally permitted.
4. **Immediate educational access** for all children and psychosocial support programs for minors.
5. **Provision of medical and psychological care** for those exhibiting trauma or suicidal tendencies.
6. **Full protection of attorney rights**, and an investigation into violations of **Article 58 of the Attorney Act**.
7. **Accountability measures and training** for private security and administrative staff.
8. **Increased international support**, financial, legal, and logistical, for NGOs and lawyers providing assistance.
9. **Public transparency and international oversight** regarding pushback operations and detention conditions.

²⁰ <https://www.ecchr.eu/en/case/greece-before-the-european-court-of-human-rights/>

Specific Recommendations Regarding Pushbacks by Greece and Frontex

1. **Independent International Investigation:**
 - The **United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants** and the **Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights** should initiate a **joint inquiry** into the systemic use of pushbacks by **Greek border forces**, including documented coordination with **Frontex**.
 - Findings should be referred to the **European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)** and **EU Ombudsman** for accountability measures.
2. **Immediate Suspension of Frontex Operations in Greece:**
 - In line with Article 46 of **Regulation 2019/1896**, the **Frontex Executive Director** should **suspend or terminate operations** where persistent and serious fundamental-rights violations occur.
 - The **European Parliament's LIBE Committee** should review Frontex's activities pending reforms to its Fundamental Rights Office.
3. **Establishment of an Independent Monitoring Mechanism:**
 - Greece should implement an **independent border monitoring body** under **Article 26 of the EU Asylum Procedures Directive**, composed of **UNHCR, national ombudspersons, and civil-society representatives**, to ensure transparency in border-control practices.
4. **Guarantee of Access to Asylum Procedures:**
 - Greece must ensure **immediate registration and assessment** of all asylum claims at border points in accordance with **Article 18 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights** and **Directive 2013/32/EU**.
 - Refugees intercepted at sea must be disembarked to safe EU territory rather than expelled.
5. **Accountability and Reparations:**
 - Greece should **prosecute and discipline officials** involved in unlawful expulsions.
 - **Frontex** and Greek authorities should **provide restitution and compensation** to victims of pushbacks, in accordance with **Article 41 of the EU Charter** and **ECHR jurisprudence**.
6. **Policy Alignment with Humanitarian Law:**
 - EU institutions and member states must reaffirm that **migration management cannot override human-rights obligations**, ensuring compliance with:
 - **Article 3 and 13 of the ECHR,**
 - **Article 33 of the 1951 Refugee Convention,**
 - **Articles 18–19 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights,** and
 - **The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) duty to rescue** at sea.

VIII. Authors and Contributors

Report Written and Prepared upon the Request of the IDHRV -ARMIL by:

Aytekin AKTAŞ

Lawyer registered with the İzmir Bar Association

Member of the Migration and Asylum Commission, İzmir Branch of the Progressive Lawyers' Association (ÇHD – Çağdaş Hukukçular Derneği)

Attorney Aytekin Aktaş specializes in refugee law, migration policy, and the protection of vulnerable groups under international human-rights instruments. In his capacity as a member of the Progressive Lawyers' Association, he has participated in national and regional monitoring missions documenting violations of the principle of non-refoulement, arbitrary detention, and pushback practices at the Turkish–Greek border. His contributions include direct legal support to asylum seekers, coordination with bar associations, and preparation of advocacy materials for submission to domestic and international bodies, including UNHCR and the Council of Europe.

Salim TAŞ

ICBC-Corps Ambassador, Divisional Commander-in-Charge, Coordinator for Crisis Regions in the Middle East, and representative to the UN (New York, Geneva, Vienna)

Sworn and Authorized Translator of the Justice Commission of Ordinary Jurisdiction of First Instance in Hatay (Republic of Turkey)

Ambassador Salim Taş has been actively engaged in field monitoring, legal documentation, and humanitarian coordination across crisis regions in the Middle East. As a certified translator and humanitarian coordinator, he has provided sworn translations and verified reports for judicial and humanitarian mechanisms, including local bar associations, justice commissions, and international human-rights organizations. His professional focus lies in the protection of persecuted minorities, refugees, and displaced persons under international humanitarian and refugee law, and in ensuring adherence to principles of justice, due process, and human dignity.

Jens KREINATH

Dr. phil. | Associate Professor of Cultural Anthropology (Wichita)

Former President of the Association of Human Rights in Syria and Founder and Director of the Institute for the Documentation of Human Rights Violations against Religious Minorities in the Levant (IDHRV-ARMIL)

Professor Jens Kreinath conducts research and documentation focused on atrocities and crimes against humanity perpetrated against religious, ethnic, and other minority communities in the Levant. His work centers on collecting material evidence and corroborated witness testimonies to support independent, verifiable accounts of these violations. He is currently developing an audiovisual database to archive this documentation, with the aim of providing impartial, accessible resources for the investigation and recognition of crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing, and other grave human rights violations in the region.

Contact: admin@idhrv.org | Website: www.idhrv.org

The Institute for the Documentation of Human Rights Violations against Religious Minorities in the Levant (IDHRV-ARMIL) is an independent and tax exempt 501(c)(3) non-profit organization registered and incorporated on July 24, 2025, with the Secretary of State in Kansas. Place of Jurisdiction: Wichita U.S. Courthouse for the United States District Court for the District of Kansas, 401 N Market St, Room 204, Wichita, KS 67202, U.S.A. +1-316-315-4200.