

LATVIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE (F.I.D.H.)

REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FRAMEWORK CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NATIONAL MINORITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA

**RIGA
2002**

Compiled by:

© Tatyana Bogushevitch, 2002

© Alexei Dimitrov, 2002

© Yuri Dubrovsky, 2002

© Boris Koltchanov, 2002

© Leonid Raihman, 2002

Edited by Alexei Dimitrov and Boris Koltchanov

All rights reserved. Full acknowledgement of author, publisher and source must be given.

PART I

1. Introduction

Since the restoration of independence, human rights have been high on Latvia's agenda, as the country strived to break away from its totalitarian past, embrace western values and standards and integrate into the western political, economic and security structures. Minority rights, although being an integral part of the general European human rights framework, proved to be more difficult to implement in Latvia, taking into account concerns over the preservation of Latvian national identity and newly restored statehood - concerns, which are being constantly stirred up by certain part of Latvian political elite.

The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities was signed by Latvia on May 11, 1995. The Convention has not been ratified yet. The parliamentary opposition submitted the ratification bill for three times: in May 2000, March 2001 and September 2002, but the Saeima (Parliament) rejected it.

Main arguments against the ratification mentioned during the parliamentary debate were the following:

- the legislation of Latvia already provides sufficient protection for national minorities,
- the term "national minority" is not defined in legislation,
- ratification of this convention is not an indicator of the level of democracy and respect to human rights, as several European countries have not even signed the Convention,
- it is exclusively up to the government to decide when the ratification of the Framework Convention could be initiated.

To some extent, reluctance to ratify the Convention was aggravated by the fact that it is a “document of principles”, which leaves a broad margin of interpretation to its state parties in respect of the choice of methods of implementation of the Convention’s principles. Thus, on the one hand, the ruling parties were able to misinterpret the Convention as if the latter would require Latvia to reduce the protection of the majority language, while on the other hand, some minorities’ representatives developed unreasonable expectations as if the ratification in itself would resolve all the minority problems in Latvia.

In the nearest future, Latvia will have to ratify the Framework Convention. The Framework Convention ratification is not an official standard requirement for the candidate states and in fact France, one of the most prominent members of the European Union (EU), did not even sign the Convention and refuses to recognise the concept of minorities altogether. However, the repeated refusal to ratify the Convention might indeed endanger Latvia’s long-aspired entrance into the EU: since December 2000, when Poland ratified the Convention, Latvia is the only EU candidate state, which has not done so yet. Indeed, the latest EU Commission Annual Progress Report on Latvia clearly urges Latvia to ratify the Convention. The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe also recommended Latvia to ratify the Framework Convention as a matter of priority in its Resolution 1236 (2001) “Honouring of obligations and commitments by Latvia“ in January 2001. Most probably, the ratification will take place after the new Parliament starts to work and before Latvia enters the EU.

However, the state institutions have been reluctant to conduct any preparatory work preceding the ratification and necessary for successful implementation of the Convention’s principles. There is a lack of understanding within the society at large concerning necessary changes in Latvia’s legislation and their practical consequences should the principles of the Framework Convention to be implemented. Importantly, such lack of understanding is also present within the state bodies, which will be responsible for the implementation.

The present report is aimed to fill in this gap.

In our work, we tried to follow the outline, adopted by Committee of Ministers for state reports. Part I of this report provides general information about Latvia and its minority situation. Part II of this report takes “article by article” approach to analyse whether Latvia’s legislation and its implementation correspond to the principles, envisioned in the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities.

2. Information on the status of international law in the domestic legal order

Legal

Article 89 of the Constitution provides that the State acknowledges and protects basic human rights according to the Constitution, Laws and international agreements binding to Latvia. According to Section 13 of the Law “On International Treaties of the Republic of Latvia” (1994), if provisions of the international treaty approved by the Saeima do not comply with provisions of the acts of legislation of the Republic of Latvia, provisions of the international agreement are to be applied. Paragraph 15 of the Regulations of the Cabinet of Ministers “Regulations on the Procedure of Administrative Acts” (1995) provides that universal principles of international law and international agreements binding to Latvia and other documents of international law are to be observed when issuing and applying administrative acts. Similar provision is included into the new Administrative Proceedings Law (adopted in 2001, comes into force on July 1, 2003). Therefore provisions of international treaties binding to Latvia are to be applied in judicial and administrative procedure. International treaties take precedence over

national laws, excluding the Constitution (Section 16 para. 2 of the Law on Constitutional Court (1996)). International treaties are directly enforceable before the judicial and administrative authorities.

Implementation

In practice the courts of law refer to provisions of international human rights treaties in their judgements quite rarely. However, the Supreme Court and especially the Constitutional Court tries to change this practice. Judges and state officials have insufficient knowledge and understanding of human rights standards and their interpretation. The Centre of Judge Training is aware of the situation and holds seminars on the topic regularly.

3. Summary overview of the history.

3.1. Political history overview

The Republic of Latvia has been declared independent on 18 November 1918. Following a war for independence, Latvia has been established as a parliamentary republic, where minorities had full citizenship rights as well as enjoyed considerable protection for their cultures and languages. In May 1934, however, the democratic order has been overthrown in a bloodless coup, establishing the authoritarian dictatorship of Karlis Ulmanis, who curtailed general democratic rights and minority rights. As a result of so-called Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, Latvia was illegally incorporated into the USSR in 1940. Latvia declared its independence again on 4 May 1990, and regained independence de-facto in August 1991 following an abruptive coup d'état in Moscow. In October 1991 Latvian Parliament adopted a resolution, which denied automatic citizenship rights to about one-third of its voters, mostly ethnic non-Latvians. [1](#)

3.2. Demographic history overview

Latvia has historically been an ethnically heterogeneous country. In 1914, ethnically non-Latvian population constituted 40% of the total population of 2.6 million [2](#). Especially strong was minority presence in urban areas: in the second largest town, Daugavpils, only 2% were ethnic Latvians by the end of XIX century [3](#). During the World War I many residents, especially urban ones, were forced to flee the country; the total population has declined to 1.6 million and its ethnic composition has also been changed considerably. The total population has grown to almost 2 million by 1935 and the share of minorities remained relatively large (24%).

Latvia lost much of its population during the World War II, when many have been executed, deported or forced to flee into exile. German minority had to repatriate to the Nazi Germany on the doorstep of the war, while the Jewish and Roma minorities had suffered physical extermination during the Nazi occupation. Other groups, including Latvians and Russians were also subject to the Nazi atrocities during the war and to the Soviet repressions during the forties and the fifties.

During the Soviet era, a mass in-migration from other republics of the USSR took place, resulting, by 1989, in the share of ethnic non-Latvians increasing to 48 percent of the total population (2.7 million). This trend made ethnic Latvians fear possible minoritisation within Latvia. Restoration of independence reversed this trend, and the share of ethnic Latvians within the total population has been growing ever since 1990. Another aspect of the Soviet rule in Latvia was that Russian language was assigned the role of lingua franca. State financed education in Latvian language at all levels has been preserved, however all the non-Russian minority schools have been liquidated. Schools with Latvian language of instruction also

provided a good training in Russian language, while the schools with Russian language of instruction provided mandatory, but formal and ineffective training in Latvian. These measures resulted in “asymmetric bilingualism”, when majority of Latvian-speakers were also fluent in Russian, while many Russian-speakers were monolingual speakers of Russian. Another consequence of the Soviet linguistic policies was that most of non-Russian minority individuals adopted either Latvian or Russian language and became effectively assimilated into respective linguistic communities.

4. Present demographic situation

As of July 1, 2002 the population of Latvia was 2,336,818 (here and further - data of the Population Register). Of these, 1,362,466 (or 58,3%) were ethnic Latvians; 680,196 (or 29.1%) - ethnic Russians; 92,566 (or 4%) - ethnic Belarussians; 61,053 (or 2.6%) - Ukrainians; 58,165 (or 2.5%) Poles; 32,449 (or 1.4%) - Lithuanians; 10,191 (or 0.4%) - Jews, Livs (or Livonians), - an autochthonous population of areas adjacent to the Gulf of Riga, now account for only 200 individuals. Among 974,352 persons belonging to national minorities 511,357 persons (or 52.5%) are non-citizens, who do not have the citizenship of Latvia or any other state; 30,398 (or 3.1%) are citizens of foreign states. According to provisional results of the 2000 Population Census, out of 2,375,339 persons living in Latvia in 2000, 1,472,239 (or 61.9%) claimed Latvian, 864,225 (or 36.4%) - Russian and 20,396 (or 0.9%) - other language as their mother tongue.

Residents of Latvia by ethnicity and citizenship in 2002

Ethnicity	Citizens	Non-citizens	Foreigners	Total	%
Latvians	1358721	2941	804	1362466	58,3%
Russians	317542	343710	18962	680196	29,1%
Belorussians	24722	66144	1700	92566	4,0%
Ukrainians	9347	48218	3488	61053	2,6%
Poles	39959	17789	417	58165	2,5%
Lithuanians	16507	14742	1200	32449	1,4%
Jews	6442	3457	292	10191	0,4%
Estonians	1466	856	280	2602	0,1%
Others	16630	16441	4059	37130	1,6%
Total	1791336	514298	31202	2336818	100,00%

Source: Data of the Population Register as of 1 July 2002.

5. “Majority in minority” situations

In a number of localities in Latvia, the country’s majority population - ethnic Latvians, - are in numerical minority. Such localities include the capital Riga (41.2% ethnic Latvians, 43.7% ethnic Russians), second largest town, Daugavpils (16.1% ethnic Latvians, 55.1% ethnic Russians), Jurmala (49.4% ethnic Latvians, 36.9% ethnic Russians), Rezekne (42.8% ethnic Latvians, 50.4% ethnic Russians), as well as rural districts of Daugavpils (39.5% ethnic Latvians, 38% ethnic Russians) and Kraslava (48.5% ethnic Latvians, 24.4% ethnic Russians) ⁴.

It has to be noted, however, that there is no municipality where political parties representing only ethnic and / or linguistic minorities have acquired majority of seats in local self-government. In other words, in no municipality in Latvia have ethnic Latvians as a group been politically marginalized. Moreover, since the bulk of ethnic non-Latvians were denied Latvian citizenship and thus - voting rights both in parliamentary and local elections, Latvia's minorities do not enjoy political representation and influence over decision-making, commensurable with their numerical strength.

PART II

Article 1

The protection of national minorities and of the rights and freedoms of persons belonging to those minorities forms an integral part of the international protection of human rights, and as such falls within the scope of international co-operation.

The Republic of Latvia is a member state of the United Nations (since September 17, 1991), Council of Europe (since February 10, 1995), Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (since September 10, 1991) and Council of the Baltic Sea States (since March 1992). It has also applied for membership in the European Union and NATO.

Within the framework of the United Nations, Latvia is a party to a few instruments, to mention only the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights (recognised as binding on May 4, 1990; in force since July 14, 1992) and its Optional Protocol (ratified on April 28, 1994; in force since September 22, 1994) enabling an individual to submit individual communication to the Human Rights Committee, as well as the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (recognised as binding on May 4, 1990; in force since May 14, 1992) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (ratified on September 4, 1991; in force since May 15, 1992).

Within the framework of the Council of Europe, Latvia is a party to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ratified on June 4, 1997; in force since June 27, 1997) and its protocols (except the Protocol No. 12 and 13; bill on ratification of the Protocol No. 13 was forwarded to parliamentary committees on October 17, 2002). It enables an individual to submit individual application to the European Court of Human Rights. Latvia signed in 1995, but has not ratified yet, the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. The draft bill on ratification of the convention submitted by parliamentary opposition was rejected several times - in May 2000, March 2001 and September 2002. Latvia has not signed the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages.

The principle of the rule of law and equality before the law is established by the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia (article 91 and 92). Article 91 provides that human rights are to be observed without discrimination. Section 4 of the Judicial Powers Law (1992) also provides guarantees of the rule of law and equality before the law.

Article 114 of the Constitution declares that persons belonging to national minorities have the right to preserve and develop their language, ethnic and cultural distinctiveness. At the same time the Law on the Unrestricted Development and Right to Cultural Autonomy of Latvia's National and Ethnic Groups (1991) is quite out-dated, declarative and does not provide effective mechanism of judicial protection. There is no information about any case, when its provisions would be invoked in court.

Conclusions

In general, the legislation of Latvia contains a number of provisions aimed at protection of national minorities at the level of Constitution and international treaties. In the meantime, some public statements of the Latvian authorities demonstrate lack of understanding of minority rights as an integral part of human rights. Acts of legislation on the protection of minority rights are out-dated and ineffective. The following measures would contribute to better minority protection:

1. To ratify the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities without reservations and declarations.
2. To adopt the national Law on the Protection of Minority Rights based on the provisions of the Framework Convention and to establish a new state institution responsible for minority affairs.
3. To ratify as a matter of priority the Protocol No. 12 to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.
4. To take measures aimed at compliance of the domestic legislation with the EU Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin.

Article 2

The provisions of this framework Convention shall be applied in good faith, in a spirit of understanding and tolerance and in conformity with the principles of good neighbourliness, friendly relations and co-operation between States.

Latvia signed the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities in 1995, but has not ratified it. At the same time the Saeima adopted the Education Law on October 29, 1998 and the State Language Law on December 9, 1999, as well as amended the Law on Radio and Television on October 29, 1998, that limit the protection of minority rights. Some of these provisions can be treated as defeating the object and purpose of the Convention, therefore the state should refrain from adopting such acts (see Article 18 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties).

Conclusions

Latvia still fails to apply provisions of the Framework Convention in good faith. Therefore some legislative provisions adopted after the Convention had been signed are to be amended (for more information see other parts of this report).

Article 3

- 1. Every person belonging to a national minority shall have the right freely to choose to be treated or not to be treated as such and no disadvantage shall result from this choice or from the exercise of the rights which are connected to that choice.***
- 2. Persons belonging to national minorities may exercise the rights and enjoy the freedoms flowing from the principles enshrined in the present framework Convention individually as well as in community with others.***

Legal

Article 114 of the Constitution states, that persons belonging to national minorities have the right to preserve and develop their language, ethnic and cultural identity, while Article 91 notes, that all persons are equal before the law, and human rights are realised without any discrimination. The Law on the Unrestricted Development and Right to Cultural Autonomy of Latvia's National and Ethnic Groups (1991) guarantees any citizen or non-citizen of Latvia the right to declare his/her ethnicity according to his/her ethnic self-identification or background in the order prescribed by law (Section 2). No law provides a definition of national minority and no law enumerates specific groups recognised as national minorities.

One's ethnicity is recorded in the state database - Population Register (the Law on the Population Register (1998), Section 10 para. 1). Such record is mandatory, even for newborn babies - their ethnicity record is the same as one of their parents. If the parents have different ethnicity registered, they can choose one for their baby. The Personal Data Protection Law (2000), however, qualifies information about one's ethnicity as sensitive data (Section 2) and imposes certain restrictions for access to such information.

On May 23, 2002 the Saeima adopted the new Law on IDs that came into force on July 1, 2002. According to the new law, the registration of one's ethnicity in the documents is not compulsory. Before that every ID contained the record about its holder's ethnicity.

The Law on Change of Name, Surname and Ethnicity Record (1994) establishes the "blood" principle of ethnic determination, whereby ethnicity is traced back to an individual's predecessors. Individuals seeking to change their ethnicity record are required to provide evidence that an ancestor was of the desired ethnicity (Section 11 para. 1). When changing to Latvian ethnicity, the applicant must also prove his/her command of the state language (Section 11 para. 2).

Implementation

Mandatory ethnicity record remains in the legislation of Latvia since the Soviet period. Person's ethnicity is recorded into citizens' and non-citizens' passports issued according to governmental regulations on passports previously in force. Recommendation of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities expressed in November 1996 concerning voluntary inclusion of information on ethnicity was implemented only in 2002. However, information about one's ethnicity is still popular in CVs and different questionnaires.

Citizenship problem provides an additional source of controversy over the notion of minority in Latvia. Among those individuals, who identify themselves as ethnic non-Latvians about half are stateless and most of the latter part are Soviet era arrivals and their descendants. Nationalistic politicians tend to capitalise on this fact and insist minority rights should not be granted to Latvia's stateless persons. Refusal to recognise Latvia's stateless permanent residents as persons belonging to minorities might have a negative effect on the implementation of the Framework Convention provisions, particularly those referring to "substantial numbers" of such persons and "sufficient demand" made by them.

Factual

In October 1999 the Minister for Justice was asked by one of the parliamentary factions about the ethnicity record in the CVs of the candidates to the judge positions. According to the law, all judges are approved by Saeima, and in all CVs submitted to the Saeima the candidates' ethnicity (practically only 'ethnic Latvian') was mentioned.

According to the reply, mentioning ethnicity in judge candidates' CV was not made mandatory by any of the official regulations, yet, the Ministry of Justice simply "used to pass on MPs all data the candidate decides to mention him/herself". [5](#)

Certain controversy surrounds identity of population of Latgale (Latgola, a region of Eastern Latvia). Latgalian is a Baltic language closely related to Latvian and Lithuanian, although the exact nature of this "closeness" is under debate: some Latgalian language activists claim it is a separate, independent language, while many Latvian linguists claim it is a regional dialect of Latvian. The language dates back to the 12th century, and at the beginning of the XX century, Latgalian, just like Latvian itself, did not have an official status, although books and periodicals were published in both languages. During the first parliamentary era (1920-1934), Latgalian functioned alongside Latvian in Latgale, taught at schools there, used in publications. During the dictatorship of Karlis Ulmanis (1934-1940) Latgalian lost its status and Latgalians were expected to completely assimilate into the mainstream Latvian culture. At the beginning of the Soviet rule Latgalian was recognised as one of the Baltic languages and used in regional newspapers, but since the sixties was completely abandoned in favour of Latvian. Currently, Latgalian has a dubious legal status: while the state does not accept this language in public administration or as a mean of instruction in schools, Latgalian written language is acknowledged as a "historical form of Latvian language" and state support to its preservation and development has been declared (Section 3 para. 4 of the State Language Law). About 150,000 individuals still speak Latgalian as mother tongue. Part of the Latgalian population also claims to have a separate ethnic identity, different from Latvian. However, these claims are dismissed by the state and since independence no individual has been registered as an ethnic Latgalian.

Conclusions

The Constitution and Law on the Unrestricted Development and Right to Cultural Autonomy of Latvia's National and Ethnic Groups provide for ethnic determination based on ethnic identity for any citizen or non-citizen of Latvia. In the meantime, the right freely to choose to be treated or not to be treated as person belonging to national minority is limited by other acts of legislation, which maintain "blood" principle of ethnic determination and mandatory ethnicity record. The following measures would contribute to better minority protection:

1. To effectively provide an opportunity to be treated as a person belonging to national minority for any citizen and non-citizen of Latvia on the basis of his/her ethnic self-identification.
2. To exclude provisions concerning mandatory ethnicity record from all acts of legislation; to obtain data on ethnic structure of the population only by the population census.

Article 4

- 1. The Parties undertake to guarantee to persons belonging to national minorities the right of equality before the law and of equal protection of the law. In this respect, any discrimination based on belonging to a national minority shall be prohibited.***
- 2. The Parties undertake to adopt, where necessary, adequate measures in order to promote, in all areas of economic, social, political and cultural life, full and effective equality between persons belonging to a national minority and those belonging to the majority. In this respect, they shall take due account of the specific conditions of the persons belonging to national minorities.***
- 3. The measures adopted in accordance with paragraph 2 shall not be considered to be an act of discrimination.***

Paragraph 1

Legal

Article 91 of the Constitution contains a general equality clause stating that all persons in Latvia shall be equal before the law and the courts; human rights shall be observed without discrimination of any kind.

This principle is further elaborated in a number of laws. For example, Section 7 of the new Labour Law (adopted in 2001, came into force on June 1, 2002) provides that everyone has equal rights to employment, fair, safe and healthy working conditions, as well as to fair remuneration for work; these rights have to be ensured without any direct or indirect discrimination based on person's race, colour, gender, age, disability, religious, political or other opinions, national (ethnic) or social origin, property and family status and other circumstances.

Section 3 of the Education Law (1998) provides that every citizen of the Republic of Latvia and every person who has the right to a passport of non-citizen issued by Latvia, person to whom a permanent residence permit has been issued, as well as citizens of the European Union states to whom temporary residence permits have been issued, and their children have equal rights to receive education regardless of property and social status, race, ethnicity, gender, religious or political opinions, health condition, occupation and place of residence.

Section 4 para. 2 of the Judicial Powers Law (1992) provides that judgements shall be delivered by the court irrespective of person's origin, social or property status, race and ethnicity, gender, education, language, religious affiliation, type and nature of occupation, place of residence, political or other views.

The Law on the Unrestricted Development and Right to Cultural Autonomy of Latvia's National and Ethnic Groups (1991) declares that the residents of the Republic of Latvia are guaranteed, regardless of their national (ethnic) origin, equal human rights which correspond to international standards (Section 1). Section 3 of the law specifically provides for equality in the employment sphere.

It should be mentioned that the data on, inter alia, person's race and ethnic origin, are regarded as sensitive data by the Personal Data Protection Law (2000), which prohibits the processing of sensitive personal data except with the consent of the data subject and for limited other purposes (e.g. for protection of one's life or health, court proceedings etc) (Section 11).

There are some specific grounds on which a person cannot be discriminated against mentioned in different acts of legislation. Importantly, with the exception of the out-dated Law on the Unrestricted Development and Right to Cultural Autonomy of Latvia's National and Ethnic Groups, that contains rather declarative provisions and does not provide for an enforcement mechanism, there are no laws targeting specifically discrimination on the basis of racial or ethnic origin, or nationality. However, all laws and subordinate acts have to conform with the equality clause of Article 91 of the Constitution as the highest legal norm, lest they be unconstitutional. [6](#)

Implementation

Different acts of legislation require a person to be the citizen of Latvia and/or to have the state language proficiency certificate for employment, participation in public life etc. A big part of persons belonging to national minorities do not fulfil these requirements. According to data of the Population Register (as of July 1, 2002), 541,755 persons (55.6%) out of 974,352 persons

belonging to national minorities do not have the citizenship of the Republic of Latvia. Most of these individuals (511,357) do not have the citizenship of any state, but they are not recognised by Latvian authorities as stateless. Adoption of the Law on the Status of Former Citizens of the USSR who are not Citizens of Latvia or Any Other State in April 1995 provided them with a unique form of legal status, that of “non-citizen”, thus legalising their permanent adobe in Latvia. A number of legal acts reserve certain rights and opportunities to citizens only, including political (e.g. the right to participate in national and local elections and to form political parties), social and economic rights (e.g. property rights, the right to work in a number of professions, both in the state and the private sector, and the right to receive some benefits) [7](#). An analysis of these restrictions, conducted by the National Human Rights Office in 1996 concluded that ten of them were contrary to both the Constitution and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Five of the restrictions have been abolished since then, while, some new restrictions have been introduced. The last one - the restriction for non-citizens to work as firemen - was re-introduced on October 24, 2002, adopting the new Fire Safety and Fire-Fighting Law. Similar provision concerning the citizenship requirement for firemen was included into the Law on Fire Safety previously in force in December 1994. However, this provision was abolished in January 1997, following persistent recommendations of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, as well as conclusions of the National Human Rights Office.

International standards do not provide a clear-cut evaluation of this situation. For example, the International Convention on Elimination of Racial Discrimination stipulates that differences in rights of citizens and non-citizens are not covered by the Convention. On the other hand, legislative distinctions that result in unjustifiable, indirect discrimination on grounds of race, ethnicity or language breach international norms. [8](#) The European Commission also criticised these differences in rights [9](#)

Factual

Survey data suggests the problem of discrimination and human rights violations may be widespread. A survey conducted in 2000 showed 24% of all respondents (or 18% of ethnic Latvians and 31% of non-Latvians, 20% Latvian citizens and 33% non-citizens, 25% men and 22% women) believe they experienced discrimination in the last three years. [10](#) Among those respondents who acknowledged violation of their rights, the largest group (28%) indicated ethnic origin as the basis for the violations of their rights (11% of Latvians and 40% of non-Latvians, 17% of Latvian citizens and 43% of non-citizens). The second most usual basis for human rights violations (indicated by 24% of respondents) was language (7% of Latvians and 40% of non-Latvians, 15% of Latvian citizens and 37% non-citizens). Existence of the problem was further confirmed by another survey carried out in 2001. The survey revealed 3% of citizens and 46% of non-citizens consider citizenship to be the main cause for violations of their human rights, 7% of citizens and 39% of non-citizens see language as the basis for human rights violations and 6% of citizens and 31% of non-citizens consider ethnic origin as the basis for violations of their rights. [11](#)

At the same time there is no information about any case in court concerning discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin. It shows that it is necessary to inform the residents about the existing legal mechanisms for the protection of their rights in the case of discrimination and to establish more effective system of protection.

See also relevant information under Article 15.

In February 2002 the Russian-language daily "Vesti Segodnya" ("The News Today") reported about the next case when the protectionist (or discriminatory on the basis of language) taxation

rules are applied. The Latvian Law on VAT (value added tax) stipulated that the publications of original literary works in the Latvian language were exempted from VAT, while original books published in the minority languages were subject to 18% VAT (Section 6, para. 1 subpara. 20 of the Law on VAT). This provision is in force till December 31, 2002.

Paragraph 2

No specific measures designed to promote full equality or compensate for the disadvantages linked with ethnic origin currently exist in Latvia. The government is not considering adopting such measures. ¹² In October 2002 the Saeima (Parliament) rejected a draft law providing tax exemptions for business enterprises employing Roma, submitted by one of the parliamentary factions.

Paragraph 3

No measures are adopted in accordance with paragraph 2.

Conclusions

The legislation of Latvia does not provide an effective mechanism for the protection from discrimination based on belonging to a national minority, although the Constitution and a few laws contain anti-discrimination clauses. The following measures would contribute to better minority protection:

1. To adopt a national Anti-Discrimination Law, which would prohibit, inter alia, discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin, language and citizenship status and establish a state institution responsible for anti-discrimination activities.
2. To review acts of legislation providing citizenship and/or state language proficiency requirements in different spheres in order to comply with anti-discrimination law, taking into account legitimate public interests and the principle of proportionality.

Article 5

- 1. The Parties undertake to promote the conditions necessary for persons belonging to national minorities to maintain and develop their culture, and to preserve the essential elements of their identity, namely their religion, language, traditions and cultural heritage.*
- 2. Without prejudice to measures taken in pursuance of their general integration policy, the Parties shall refrain from policies or practices aimed at assimilation of persons belonging to national minorities against their will and shall protect these persons from any action aimed at such assimilation.*

Paragraph 1

Legal

Article 114 of the Constitution states, that persons belonging to national minorities have the right to preserve and develop their language, ethnic and cultural identity. The Law on the Unrestricted Development and Right to Cultural Autonomy of Latvia's National and Ethnic Groups (1991) guarantees Latvia's national minorities the right to celebrate their national holidays, use national symbols and preserve their traditions (Section 8). Besides that, state institutions have an

obligation to promote development of education, language and culture of national and ethnic groups living in Latvia (Section 10 para. 1).

The State Language Law (1999) considers all minority languages (except for the Liv language) to be “foreign”. At the same time, the Law does not regulate language usage in “unofficial communication among individuals, internal communication of ethnic and national groups and language usage in religious activities” (Section 2 para. 3).

According to the Education Law (1998), state-supported university education is provided only in the state language since September 1, 1999 (para. 9 subpara. 1 of the Transitional Provisions). The Law stipulates that since September 1, 2004 at 10th grades of the state and municipal general secondary schools instruction will be provided only in the state language (para. 9 subpara. 3 of the Transitional Provisions). In the meantime, the General Education Law (1999) contains a provision mentioning minority education programmes, including teaching minority languages and subjects related to minority identity, also for secondary schools (Section 42 para. 2), although nothing is said there about the language in which these programmes are to be implemented. Existing primary minority schools will be transformed into bilingual schools. All these measures could lead to lesser use of minority languages in Latvia.

Implementation

Main efforts of the state aimed at promoting culture of national minorities are concentrated on modest financial support for cultural associations and minority NGOs. Such support is provided by the state budget, as well as by the Society Integration Foundation (within the framework of implementation of the Society Integration Programme).

Factual

In 2002 the Latvian authorities allocated 14,490 Lats (approx. EUR 25,880) for support of different national cultural associations. This money is distributed by the Department on Minority Affairs of the Naturalisation Board. Besides that 10,000 Lats (approx. EUR 17,860) were allocated as a subsidy for the Association of National Cultural Associations; 45,000 Lats (approx. EUR 80,360) were allocated as a subsidy for the National Cultural Association of Roma. The state also allocated 12,000 Lats (approx. EUR 21,430) for establishing of the museum “Jews in Latvia” and 2300 Lats (approx. EUR 4110) for holding of the World summit of Latgilians.

The Society Integration Foundation (state foundation responsible for allocation of money for projects in the field of integration of the society) in 2002 received 282,000 Lats (approx. EUR 503,580) as a subsidy from the state budget and 165,000 Lats (approx. EUR 294,650) as a part of foreign financial aid.

In February 2002 the Society Integration Foundation announced the first projects’ competition in different fields. There were 2 relevant programs in the field of ethnic integration:

- the program of support for NGOs’ projects in the field of ethnic integration (the total funds for the program were 10,000 Lats (approx. EUR 17,800); NGOs, education bodies and cultural organisations could apply);
- the program of support for minority cultural associations (the total funds were 15,000 Lats (approx. EUR 26,700); minority cultural associations and education bodies could apply).

In July 2002 the Society Integration Foundation announced the second projects’ competition in different fields. There were 2 relevant programs in the field of ethnic integration:

- the program of support for NGOs' projects in the field of ethnic integration (the total funds for the program were 5000 Lats (approx. EUR 8930));
- the program of support for minority cultural associations (the total funds were 5,000 Lats (approx. EUR 8930)).

Paragraph 2

The Society Integration Programme (adopted on February 6, 2001) declares that integration in Latvia is not connected to assimilation and should not result in assimilation. At the same time some legislative acts contain provisions, which could be treated as "soft-assimilative". For example, the Education Law (1998), the State Language Law (1999) and the Law on Radio and Television (1995) impose the usage of the state language beyond the limit set by legitimate public interest and curtail the usage of all other, including minority languages (refer to information provided under articles 9-15 of the report). This way, the native speakers of other languages are at an increased risk of marginalization, because their opportunities are being limited by law in the spheres of education, employment, mass media, and in communication with public authorities. While the legislation does not directly require minorities to abandon their identity, in practice it affects minorities' decisions concerning choice of language at home and in schooling, thus furthering assimilation. The acts of legislation do not prohibit use of minority languages, but put minority languages into disadvantaged position; under pressure of the legislation and practice the choice of language cannot be considered really free.

Conclusions

Although the right to preserve and develop minority language, ethnic and cultural identity is declared, it is not ensured by legislation and practice, especially in the field of language use and education. The following measures would contribute to better minority protection:

1. To review the Society Integration Programme in order to make the principle of non-discrimination and respect to minority rights cornerstones of the Programme, so that to guarantee the integration of the society on the basis of common values and respect to minority rights.
2. To increase direct financial support from the state budget for promotion of minorities' activities aimed at preserving their culture, religion, language and education and to increase the state's subsidies for the Society Integration Foundation.
3. To establish transparent and effective mechanism of allocation of the state financial support for national minorities within the framework of the state institution responsible for minority affairs.

Article 6

- 1. The Parties shall encourage a spirit of tolerance and intercultural dialogue and take effective measures to promote mutual respect and understanding and co-operation among all persons living on their territory, irrespective of those persons' ethnic, cultural, linguistic or religious identity, in particular in the fields of education, culture and the media.***
- 2. The Parties undertake to take appropriate measures to protect persons who may be subject to threats or acts of discrimination, hostility or violence as a result of their ethnic, cultural, linguistic or religious identity.***

Paragraph 1

Legal

The Law on the Unrestricted Development and Right to Cultural Autonomy of Latvia's National and Ethnic Groups (1991) states that any activity, aimed at national (ethnic) discrimination, as well as propagation of national (ethnic) superiority and national (ethnic) hatred is punishable in accordance with existing laws (Section 16).

The Law on Radio and Television (1995) mentions about "national order", which includes creation of TV-programs about life and culture of minorities, living in Latvia (Section 54 para. 5). Programmes, which are created within the framework of the national order, are financially supported by the state.

Implementation

In February 2002 the Society Integration Foundation announced the first projects' competition in different fields. There were 2 different relevant programs in the field of ethnic integration:

- the program for schoolchildren's exchange and co-operation (the total funds are 10,000 Lats (approx. EUR 17,800); education bodies could apply);
- the program of support for media promoting unity of the society (the total funds are 10,000 Lats (approx. EUR 17,800); PR companies could apply).

In July 2002 the Society Integration Foundation announced the second projects' competition in different fields. There were 2 relevant programs in the field of ethnic integration:

- the program of support for media promoting unity of the society (the total funds were 10,000 Lats (approx. EUR 17,800));
- the program of support for TV programs about integration issues (the total funds were 16,000 Lats (approx. EUR 28,580));

Paragraph 2

Legal

Section 78 of the Criminal Law (1998) provides for punishment of actions that intentionally limit - directly or indirectly - a person's economic, political or social rights or create direct or indirect advantages because of a person's race or ethnicity. It does not qualify the crime as "discrimination", although the title of the article speaks about "violation of ethnic and racial equality". Section 156 of the Criminal Law provides for punishment in cases of intentional violation of person's dignity or degrading her orally, in writing or by action. Offences based on the ethnic or racial origin of the person could be subsumed under this Section. [13](#) The same considerations apply also to Section 157 of the Criminal Law dealing with cases of intentional defamation, and Section 158 covering violation of person's dignity and defamation if done by using mass media.

Article 2352a of the Civil Law (1937) provides that everybody has the right before the court to revoke information offending his/her honour and reputation unless the distributor of the information proves that the information is true. It is not clear whether an individual could use this provision in cases when he/she feels offended by discriminatory remarks. The crucial question here is, whether e.g. insulting a person because of his/her ethnic origin could be qualified as dissemination of false information about the person. [14](#)

Implementation

Currently a number of remedies are available to persons who consider themselves wronged by differential treatment; however, none of them is specifically aimed at ensuring equal treatment. The institutions to which such persons can turn to are:

- 1) the same public institution that has treated the person differently, or a higher institution, or public prosecutor's office;
- 2) the State Labour Inspection;
- 3) the National Human Rights Office;
- 4) courts of general jurisdiction
- 5) the Constitutional Court. [15](#)

There is almost no case law related to discrimination on the basis of one's racial or ethnic origin. The main reasons of it are the lack of information about possible measures to be taken, the long and expensive procedure, as well as the problems regarding the burden of proof. It is hard to prove person's intent in criminal procedure. The victim of the act of discrimination, hostility or violence has to prove himself/herself that such act took place in civil or administrative procedure (Section 93 of the Civil Proceedings Law) There are some exceptions from this general rule:

- 1) Section 29 para. 5 of the new Labour Law (came into force on June 1, 2002) puts the burden of proof on the employer in the cases concerning differential treatment on the grounds, inter alia, of race and ethnic origin;
- 2) the new Administrative Proceedings Law (comes into force on July 1, 2003) envisages the principle of objective investigation in the administrative procedure (Section 103). It should be mentioned that the abovementioned provisions of the Labour Law cannot be applied by persons engaged at the state civil service, as the State Civil Service Law (2000) does not provide it.

Factual

In 1999 a member of militia (*Zemessardze*), which forms part of the National Military Forces, hired by an owner of a private cafe to perform security functions, denied access to a cafe to a young person of Roma origin. The militiaman had stated that the owner of the cafe had ordered that Roma should not be allowed to enter. Later he denied that the reason for not allowing entrance to the cafe was ethnic origin. The militia leadership declared that the militiaman acted in accordance with internal regulations made by the owner of a cafe so the latter bore all the responsibility. A file for a criminal case was not opened.

In another case in 2000, the national TV news programme showed a fragment about a woman swindler, Roma by ethnic origin, who had wheedled family jewels out of 17-years-old girl. Authors of the fragment called "not to look into eyes of the Roma" in order not to be hypnotized. In the end of the program a police officer called all the Roma in Latvia to return the jewels. The Cultural Association of Roma and the Parliamentary Commission on Human Rights and Public Affairs protested actively against this fragment. Again a file for a criminal case was not opened.

In August 2000 the monthly business magazine "Kapitals" ("Capital") defined the subject of its issue No. 8, 2000 as "Jews rule the world". In the article with the same name, as well as in the commentary by the editor-in-chief Guntis Rozenbergs, Jews were named "Zhids" - a word traditionally used in Latvian language, along with "Ebrejs" which came into Latvian later. However, the former name is perceived as insulting by many Jews. Jewish NGOs, as well as Israeli and American embassies in Latvia, voiced protests against this publication. The magazine's editor-in-chief had to resign immediately.

In spring 2001 the director of a private publishing house Aivars Garda, announced a competition of essays on topics containing ideas of building ethnically clean Latvian state and encouraging repatriation of "colonists", i.e., Russians. The competition resulted in a publication of a book

containing a spirit and remarks offending the honour primarily of persons of Russian ethnic origin. Two members of the Parliament from the ruling coalition right wing party "For Fatherland and Freedom" participated in the presentation of the book. A file for a criminal case was not opened in relation to Garda's activities, as the law enforcement authorities did not find that Garda acted with a purpose of inciting racial hatred. ¹⁶ In August 2002 Aivars Garda was registered as a MP candidate and leader of the electoral list of the (Ethnic) Latvians' Party. The party has not received any seat at the parliamentary elections of 2002.

In December 2001 the magazine "Rigas laiks" ("Riga's Time") published the interview with the ex-mayor of Riga Andris Argalis. Mr Argalis told, "While a Russian is created for thievery and laziness genetically, a Latvian is absolutely cowardly thief... Not qualitative, he has big problems". After the Prosecutor's Office was asked to start the investigation, Mr Argalis claimed that he just quoted Russian literature classic Leo Tolstoy and Lenin speaking about their nation.

In May 2000 the Riga Regional Court delivered a judgement in a case where 9 members of a pro-nazi organisation "Perkonkrusts" were convicted of a number of offences (e.g. blowing up a water main, attempting to blow up a monument, assault), including incitement of ethnic hatred. It took the form of printing and distributing leaflets of anti-Semitic character and urging the establishment of an ethnically pure state. All suspects were sentenced to imprisonment from 1 to 3 years; four of them received suspended sentences. In addition, they were ordered to pay the damages of approx. EUR 40,000. In January 2001 the Supreme Court reduced the punishment to some members of the group due to misclassification of their offences and also revoked the order to pay damages for approx. EUR 35,000 because of the lack of proof.

The leader of this group Juris Recs was tried separately as he managed to avoid the arrest for two years. In December 2000 a court found him guilty on six accounts, including incitement of ethnic hatred as he was proved to be the organiser of the printing and distributing the above-mentioned leaflets. He was sentenced to 3 years in prison.

In January 2001, Guntars Landmanis, editor of the newsletter "Patriots" was convicted to 8 months in prison by the Liepaja Court. He had published three editions of the newsletter all of which contained anti-Semitic and racist material. He is the first person to be convicted of incitement to ethnic and racial hatred solely under Section 78 of the Criminal Law since the restoration of independence in 1990. ¹⁷

Conclusions

The abovementioned cases demonstrate clearly that there is a lack of state efforts aimed at preventing and punishing acts of discrimination, hostility or violence against persons belonging to national minorities. The following measures would contribute to better minority protection:

1. To take appropriate measures in order to promote tolerance in the society, especially in education and within the framework of the Society Integration Programme.
2. To establish criminal liability for both intentional and unintentional acts of discrimination, hostility and violence based on the victim's ethnic origin, culture, language or religion.
3. To establish civil liability for any act of discrimination, hostility and violence based on the victim's ethnic origin, culture, language or religion.
4. To include legal provisions aimed at preventing of discrimination into acts regulating the state civil service.

5. To introduce a reverse burden of proof in all civil and administrative cases concerning alleged discrimination based on the victim's ethnic origin, culture, language or religion.

6. To grant the state institution responsible for anti-discrimination activities the authority to represent the victim's interests in any case concerning discrimination.

Article 7

The Parties shall ensure respect for the right of every person belonging to a national minority to freedom of peaceful assembly, freedom of association, freedom of expression, and freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

Legal

In Latvia the freedom of peaceful assembly, freedom of association, freedom of expression and freedom of thought, conscience and religion are guaranteed by the Constitution.

The right of peaceful assembly in Latvia is provided by Article 103 of the Constitution of Latvia - "The State shall protect the freedom of previously announced peaceful meetings, street processions, and pickets".

The right of association in Latvia is provided by Article 102 of The Constitution - "Everyone has the right to form and join associations, political parties and other public organisations"

The right to freedom of expression is provided by Article 100 of the Constitution - "Everyone has the right to freedom of expression, which includes the right to freely receive, keep and distribute information and to express their views. Censorship is prohibited."

The right of freedom of thought, conscience and religion is provided by Article 99 of the Constitution - "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. The church shall be separate from the State."

At the same time in the Article 116 of the Constitution is pointed "The rights of persons set out in Articles ..., one hundred, one hundred and two, one hundred and three, ... of the Constitution may be subject to restrictions in circumstances provided for by law in order to protect the rights of other people, the democratic structure of the State, and public safety, welfare and morals. On the basis of the conditions set forth in this Article, restrictions may also be imposed on the expression of religious beliefs."

Implementation

The abovementioned constitutional provisions are implemented, using provisions of other acts of legislation (e.g. the Law on Radio and Television, Law on Religious Organisations etc.), therefore relevant information is available under corresponding articles of the Convention (in particular, Articles 8, 9, 17).

Section 11 para. 4 of the State Language Law (1999) stipulates that use of languages in meetings, marches and pickets is provided by the Law on Meetings, Marches and Pickets (1997). The latter Law establishes freedom of use of languages in meetings, marches and pickets (Section 19).

Article 8

The Parties undertake to recognise that every person belonging to a national minority has the right to manifest his or her religion or belief and to establish religious institutions, organisations and associations.

Legal

The Constitution of Latvia (Article 99) and the Law on Religious Organisations (1995) declare separation of the Church from the state and recognise the right to free manifestation of religion as well as the right to establish religious institutions, organisations and associations. The Law on Religious Organisations stipulates that only one Church can be registered by each confession.

None of the existing religions is official in Latvia. However, the Lutheran and Catholic religious holidays (Christmas and Easter) are celebrated as official holidays (the Law on Holidays, Commemoration Days and Celebratory Days (1990), Section 1 para. 1). Section 1 para. 2 provides that Orthodox, Old believers and believers belonging to other confessions celebrate Christmas and Easter on the days established by the corresponding confession. However, employer does not pay for such holidays.

The State Language Law does not restrict using of languages other than state (Latvian) in religious ritual (Section 2 para. 3), though states that everyone has a right to file applications and communicate in the state language at religious organisations (Section 3 para. 2).

Implementation

Although there is no valid official statistics of how many people belong to the confessions and available data are very approximate, the correlation between one's ethnic origin and belief in Latvia is strong. Overwhelmingly those of Latvian ethnic origin are either Lutheran or Catholic. According to unofficial statistics, there are more than 280,000 Orthodox believers in Latvia, and this Church is the third prevalent in the country. Still, the Cabinet of Ministers disclaimed proclamation of the Orthodox Christmas an official holiday in Latvia, arguing that "the Orthodox religion is not an official religion and so there is no reason to make an exception for it".

Factual

In 1997 Mr Eglitis, director of Balozi primary school was fired for granting a day off to the Russian stream of the school to celebrate the Russian Orthodox Christmas. Director had given this day off upon the requests of the pupils, their parents and the teachers. Municipality had warned Mr Eglitis for granting these holidays. After Mr Eglitis disagreed with the warning and protested against it, the municipality dismissed him.

Conclusions

There is no distinction between persons belonging to majority and national minorities concerning the right to manifest religion or belief and to establish religious institutions. In the meantime, the state officially recognises religious holidays of denominations, most widespread among the majority group (Lutheran and Catholic), but refuses to do the same in respect of denominations, most widespread among the minorities (Orthodox and Old believers), a practice considered as unwillingness to recognise holidays of persons belonging to national minorities. The following measures would contribute to better minority protection:

1. To guarantee the opportunity to celebrate religious holidays for any believer, providing a certain number of days off per year, which are to be paid for by employer.

Article 9

- 1. The Parties undertake to recognise that the right to freedom of expression of every person belonging to a national minority includes freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas in the minority language, without interference by public authorities and regardless of frontiers. The Parties shall ensure, within the framework of their legal systems, that persons belonging to a national minority are not discriminated against in their access to the media.*
- 2. Paragraph 1 shall not prevent Parties from requiring the licensing, without discrimination and based on objective criteria, of sound radio and television broadcasting, or cinema enterprises.*
- 3. The Parties shall not hinder the creation and the use of printed media by persons belonging to national minorities. In the legal framework of sound radio and television broadcasting, they shall ensure, as far as possible, and taking into account the provisions of paragraph 1, that persons belonging to national minorities are granted the possibility of creating and using their own media.*
- 4. In the framework of their legal systems, the Parties shall adopt adequate measures in order to facilitate access to the media for persons belonging to national minorities and in order to promote tolerance and permit cultural pluralism.*

Legal

Article 100 of the Constitution states “Everyone has the right to freedom of expression, which includes the right to freely receive, keep and distribute information and to express their views. Censorship is prohibited.”

The usage of minority languages in printed media is not limited by the Law on Press and Other Mass Media (1990).

Section 62 para. 2 and 3 of the Law on Radio and Television (1995) states that:

”(2) Latvian Radio and Latvian Television shall produce their programmes for the first distribution network as national programmes in the state language.

(3) Latvian Radio and Latvian Television programmes at the second distribution network shall be primarily in the state language. Of the annual broadcasting time, 20% may be allocated to broadcasts in the languages of ethnic minorities, including in such broadcasting time also films and theatrical performances sub-titled in the state language”.

Private electronic media are also subject to language restrictions: the airtime for broadcasting in ‘foreign’ (including minority) languages cannot exceed 25% of the total broadcasting time (Section 19 para. 5 of the Law on Radio and Television).

Licensing of radio and TV operators is within the powers of the National Council on Radio and Television (NCRT). NCRT issues broadcasting and re-transmission permits (either according to the results of invitations to tender or on the basis of a request), as well as special permits (licences) for cable television and cable radio (radio transmission) operation (the Law on Radio and Television, Section 46 para. 6). According to Section 42 of the Law on Radio and Television NCRT ”shall be established by the Saeima, electing nine members to it”.

Implementation

Printed media in Latvia is divided into Latvian- and Russian-language outlets, differing significantly in terms of content, tone, viewpoints, arguments and information sources. The

leading Latvian-language press has a tendency to ignore the minorities and rarely presents their anxieties and opinions. In the meantime, Russian-language press has a tendency to sharply criticise the authorities, especially regarding the issues most sensitive for minorities, including citizenship, language and education policies. Historical questions, especially those related to WWII are also sometimes viewed differently in Latvian- and Russian-language press.

Within the framework of broadcasts in the languages of ethnic minorities the great majority of time is given to Russian-language productions, but 30 min. radio broadcasts in languages of other minorities (Armenian, Azeri, Belarussian, Estonian, Georgian, German, Greek, Jewish, Lithuanian, Polish, Tatar and Ukrainian) are aired almost every day.

A few private radio and TV channels (e.g. LNT, Radio Pik) were punished by NCRT for exceeding "language quotas". Broadcasting of TV Riga, for example, was temporarily suspended four times in 1998-1999. According to statistics of NCRT, since 1996 the Council registered 62 complaints and imposed 38 sanctions when private TV and radio companies did not observe the language restrictions, i.e.: 21 warnings were issued to the broadcasters, 8 administrative sanctions were imposed, 8 decisions about suspension the operations of the broadcasting organisations were adopted, 1 lawsuit was brought in court in order to terminate the operation of TV Riga. ¹⁸ It should be mentioned that no member of the Russian-speaking minority has ever been elected to the Council. As a rule, persons representing parties of the ruling coalition were elected to the Council.

Factual

Until the end of 1999 the newspaper "Diena" ("The Day") was the only nation-wide newspaper published both in Latvian and Russian. Russian edition of the newspaper was also most actively and consistently promoting the idea of integration. The Russian-language outlet of "Diena" was closed mainly due to financial reasons, and their Russian readers were offered to read Latvian-language outlet. Since the beginning of 2000 there is not any nation-wide bilingual newspaper.

While the official point of view is that the language restrictions for electronic media should promote the state language as a factor of society integration, practical impact of such restrictions is the opposite. Denied an opportunity to receive Latvia-made broadcasts in their native tongue, Russian-speakers embrace the modestly priced cable channels originating in Russia (ORT, RTR, etc.). This way, the informational, cultural and political gap between the two major linguistic communities is likely to grow.

One case of "language quotas" in audiovisual media has been brought before the Constitutional Court. In August 2001 Mr Gurov, owner of the private media holding "Bizness & Baltija", brought a lawsuit in the Constitutional Court of Latvia, asking the Court to declare Section 19 para. 5 of the Law on Radio and Television unconstitutional. Mr Gurov's radio broadcasts in Russian had allegedly exceeded the legally permissible time. The plaintiff claimed that Section 19 (5) violates a number of articles of the Latvian Constitution, as well as Article 10 and 14 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and Article 19 and 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. However, consideration on the merits did not take place, because "other remedies were not exhausted" (i.e. Mr Gurov had not applied to courts of general jurisdiction before the Constitutional Court).

Conclusions

The legislative provisions do not establish restrictions for persons belonging to national minorities for access to printed media. In the meantime, the state policy concerning private

electronic media runs counter to the Framework Convention. In fact, one cannot establish electronic media broadcasting in minority language. The following measures would contribute to better minority protection:

1. To cancel language restrictions for broadcasting of private radio and TV channels.
2. Instead of a limit not to be exceeded for programmes in languages other than Latvian at Latvian Radio and Latvian Television, 20% of time at the second distribution network could be considered as a share to be compulsorily allocated to such programmes.
3. To review composition and principles of election of the National Council on Radio and Television in order to promote representation of national minorities in the Council.

Article 10

- 1. The Parties undertake to recognise that every person belonging to a national minority has the right to use freely and without interference his or her minority language, in private and in public, orally and in writing.*
- 2. In areas inhabited by persons belonging to national minorities traditionally or in substantial numbers, if those persons so request and where such a request corresponds to a real need, the Parties shall endeavour to ensure, as far as possible, the conditions which would make it possible to use the minority language in relations between those persons and the administrative authorities.*
- 3. The Parties undertake to guarantee the right of every person belonging to a national minority to be informed promptly, in a language which he or she understands, of the reasons for his or her arrest, and of the nature and cause of any accusation against him or her, and to defend himself or herself in this language, if necessary with the free assistance of an interpreter.*

Paragraph 1

Legal

The Latvian language is the sole state language in the country. Language legislation consolidates the role of Latvian and limits the usage of other languages in education, electronic mass media, state service, and in communications with public administrative bodies. In October 1998 the Saeima (Parliament) included the provision that “the state language of the Republic of Latvia is the Latvian language” into the Constitution of Latvia (Article 4). In April 2002 the Constitution was supplemented by a few provisions aimed at strengthening status of the Latvian language. Article 18 provides that every MP is obliged to swear or to give a promise “to be loyal towards Latvia, strengthen its sovereignty and the Latvian language as the sole state language”; Article 21 provides that the sole working language at the Saeima is Latvian; Article 101 provides that the working language of local governments is Latvian. Article 104 (provides the right to address submissions to State or local government institutions and to receive an answer to the point of fact) was supplemented with the provision that “everybody has the right to receive answer in Latvian”.

The first Law on Languages was adopted in May 1989. It was amended substantially in March 1992. The present State Language Law (1999) came into force on September 1, 2000. Except for the Liv language (language of Latvia’s autochthonous population consisting of approx. 200 individuals), the law declares all other minority languages as “foreign”. The Law does not make

distinctions between areas with different ethnic compositions; its provisions are the same even for areas, where the majority of population are persons belonging to national minorities.

The Law recognises the right of minorities to use any language in private (Section 1 para. 4), but limits it: the Law envisages state intervention into the use of languages in the private sphere to a degree determined by a “legitimate public interest”, such as matters affecting public health, public safety and public order, and taking into account the principle of proportionality (Section 2 para. 2). At the same time, the Law does not regulate language usage in “unofficial communication among individuals, internal communication of ethnic and national groups and language usage in religious activities” (Section 2 para. 3).

Section 6 of the State Language Law provides that persons employed in the state and municipal bodies, institutions and enterprises must know and use the state language. Persons employed in private organisations and enterprises must know and use the state language, if their activities concern “legitimate public interest” or they execute public functions. The governmental regulations "Requirements on Proficiency Degree in the State Language Required for Performance of Professional and Positional Duties and the Procedure of Language Proficiency Tests" determine the level of state language proficiency necessary for such persons and the procedure of examinations of those individuals, who received their education in a language other than Latvian.

The abovementioned regulations envisage 6 categories of the state language proficiency. The "3 B" category (the highest one) is necessary, for example, for heads of the state institutions, lawyers, psychologists, secretaries. It requires ability to "hold a conversation in different styles", to use different "means of linguistic expression".

In private sphere an employer determines the necessary level of the state language knowledge for employees in his/her business enterprise. In November 2000 the Cabinet of Ministers adopted amendments to the "Requirements on Proficiency Degree in the State Language Required for Performance of Professional and Positional Duties and the Procedure of Language Proficiency Tests" (2000) - a list specifying the required language proficiency in the private sector connected with a legitimate public interest. According to the adopted list, "3B" category is required for lawyers, barristers, notaries, insurance agents, psychologists, teachers of the Latvian language and literature, journalists working with texts in Latvian.

Before 2002 every deputy candidate at parliamentary and municipal elections had to submit a copy of the state language proficiency certificate of the highest level of proficiency, if he/she did not receive school education in the Latvian language. In May 2002 the Saeima cancelled the state language requirements for deputy candidates. The amendments followed the views adopted by the UN HR Committee in the case *Ignatane v. Latvia* [19](#) and the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in the case *Podkolzina v. Latvia* [20](#); both institutions found a violation of human rights in the cases. After the law is amended, each deputy candidate will evaluate his/her level of the state language proficiency himself/herself.

Section 11 of the State Language Law provides that public events organised by private persons and private organisations can be held in other languages than the state one. The governmental regulations determine exceptions from this general rule. Private persons, enterprises or associations, international institutions, when organising public events, must translate into the state language the information which relates to legitimate public interest, as well as information about the event.

Administrative liability for violations of legislative acts concerning use of languages is established in Latvia's legislation since 1992. In June 2001 the Saeima (Parliament) adopted amendments to the Code of Administrative Violations. Some of the amendments concern administrative violations in the field of language use and establish fines for violations of the new State Language Law and Regulations on its implementation, which came into force on September 1, 2001. 12 different types of language violations are mentioned in the Code of Administrative Violations. The fine for them is up to Ls 250 (approx. EUR 400). One of the violations is "the obvious disrespect towards the state language" (fine up to Ls 250).

Implementation

The main state institution responsible for the state language policy is the State Language Centre. It controls observance of the State Language Law and other legislative acts concerning the language policy.

According to the Statute of the State Language Centre, its officials have the right to visit state and municipal institutions, private business enterprises; to require elimination of "language violations"; to summon persons to the Centre if violations of the State Language Law or other acts are discovered; to inspect authenticity of the state language proficiency certificate.

Before November 2001 officials of the State Language Centre had the right "to take out and inspect state language proficiency certificates". This provision was implemented as the right to conduct additional examinations to holders of the state language proficiency certificates. The amendments to the "Requirements on Proficiency Degree in the State Language Required for Performance of Professional and Positional Duties and the Procedure of Language Proficiency Tests" followed the views adopted by the UN HR Committee in the case *Ignatane v. Latvia*: since November 2001 additional examinations cannot be conducted.

Paragraph 2

Legal

Article 104 of the Constitution establishes that "everyone has the right to address the state or local government institutions with applications and receive an answer to the points of fact". Since April 2002 this article was supplemented with the provision that everybody has the right to receive an answer in Latvian.

The State Language Law prohibits state, municipal and judicial institutions to accept written applications, statements and complaints from private persons in any language other than Latvian except for some emergency situations (calls for emergency medical help, cases of criminal violations or other violations of law, calls for emergency help in cases of fire, crash or other accidents) (Section 10 para. 2). Documents in "foreign languages" can be accepted only when a certified translation into the state language is attached (Section 10 para. 3). Translation and certification are costly procedures, and the provision in fact deprives many persons belonging to minorities of the opportunity to protect their rights in the state institutions (e.g. prisoners or population of the poorest region of Latgale).

The Civil Proceedings Law (adopted in 1998, came into force on March 1, 1999) establishes that legal proceedings are conducted in the state language. Documents in foreign languages are submitted by the parties as being attached with a duly certified translation into the state language (Section 13).

Implementation

There is a different practice of implementation of the above-mentioned legislative provisions. In fact some local governments have engaged translators, who translate private persons' applications from minority languages into the Latvian language. In the meantime, other institutions follow the Law strictly and do not communicate with population in languages other than Latvian.

Factual

In 2000 the courts, the Department of Citizenship and Migration Affairs and other official bodies systematically returned correspondence to prisoners who had written letters in Russian. Around 2/3 of Latvia's prison population is Russian-speaking and the state does not provide free language training or translation services. Thus, in Central Prison prisoners sent around 12,000 petitions, complaints and requests in 2000. Of those, only 1/3 were in Latvian. [21](#)

In May 2001 the leading Latvian-language daily "Diena" published information about how the Riga City Council treats incoming mail in different languages. According to the newspaper, the mail board of the Riga City Council does not register letters in Russian and send them back with request to write in the state language. Heads of the Council's committees can consider applications or complaints written in foreign languages, but in this case they must register these letters themselves. However, letters written in English, German or French are translated by the Council's translators. There were no translators from Russian among the Council's staff then. In Riga 43.8% of the residents are ethnic Russians and even more people indicate Russian as their native language.

The City Council of Daugavpils employs a translator, who helps the residents of the city to translate their documents being handed in to the Council from Russian into Latvian. However, only those residents, whose income does not exceed minimum established by the City Council, are eligible for this free service.

A person applied to the National Human Rights Office (NHRO) of Latvia, because her appeal had been rejected by court. The reason of rejection was that the appeal was written in the Russian language. The NHRO noted that such regulations of national legislation could interfere with person's free access to the court, especially taking into account high prices of translations and service of notaries. It refers to article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights and some articles of the Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities and makes a conclusion that the state and municipal institutions, as well as courts, should accept documents about violation of rights in the Russian language from persons, who cannot translate the documents into Latvian, but "the current legislation does not provide it". [22](#)

Paragraph 3

Legal

The Criminal Proceedings Code establishes that legal proceedings in criminal matters are conducted in the state language, but the court, the judge, the prosecutor and the investigation service can allow to conduct the proceedings also in other languages, if the parties agree to it. In any case, a person, who participates in the proceedings, but does not know the language of the proceedings, is entitled to submit applications, give evidence, submit petitions, get acquainted with documents and speak in court in the language he or she understands, and to use assistance of an interpreter. All documents, which are to be issued to such person, must be translated into a

language, which he/she understands (Section 16). According to the State Language Law all documents must be submitted to court or the Prosecutor's Office in the state language

Factual

In December 2001 the Ministry of Interior proposed to the Cabinet of Ministers to submit amendments to the State Language Law with the aim to allow the police and border guards to send the evidence/testimonies without translation to the Prosecutor's Office or to court till January 1, 2004. Otherwise, the police would need approx. 1,620,000 Lats (EUR 2,613,000) for translation in 2002. Nevertheless, the proposal was rejected.

Conclusions

Lack of legal status for minority languages, excessive interference of the state into use of languages in private sphere and lack of possibility to communicate with the state authorities create a serious risk of incompliance of Latvia's acts of legislation with the Framework Convention. The following measures would contribute to better minority protection:

1. To establish a legal status for minority languages in national legislation.
2. To review obligations to know and use the state language in both public and private sphere, taking into account the principle of proportionality.
3. To review sanctions for violations of legislative acts concerning use of languages, taking into account the principle of proportionality.
4. To establish the right to communicate orally and in writing in minority languages with the state, municipal and judicial institutions in municipalities inhabited by persons belonging to national minorities in substantial numbers.

Article 11

- 1. The Parties undertake to recognise that every person belonging to a national minority has the right to use his or her surname (patronym) and first names in the minority language and the right to official recognition of them, according to modalities provided for in their legal system.***
- 2. The Parties undertake to recognise that every person belonging to a national minority has the right to display in his or her minority language signs, inscriptions and other information of a private nature visible to the public.***
- 3. In areas traditionally inhabited by substantial numbers of persons belonging to a national minority, the Parties shall endeavour, in the framework of their legal system, including, where appropriate, agreements with other States, and taking into account their specific conditions, to display traditional local names, street names and other topographical indications intended for the public also in the minority language when there is a sufficient demand for such indications.***

Paragraph 1

Legal

Section 19 of the State Language Law (1999) states:

“(1) Personal names shall be reproduced in accordance with the Latvian language traditions and shall be transliterated according to the accepted norms of the literary language while observing the requirements of paragraph 2 of this Section.

(2) In a person’s passport or birth certificate, the person’s name and surname reproduced in accordance with Latvian language norms may be supplemented by the historical form of the person’s surname or the original form of the person’s name in another language transliterated in the Latin alphabet if the person or the parents of a minor so desire and can provide verifying documents.

(3) The spelling and the identification of names and surnames, as well as the spelling and use in the Latvian language for personal names from other languages, shall be prescribed by the Cabinet of Ministers regulations”.

These provisions are implemented according to the Regulations of the Cabinet of Ministers "On Writing and Identification of Names and Surnames" (2000).

On May 23, 2002 the Saeima adopted the new Law on IDs that came into force on July 1, 2002. The new law, as well as the legislation in force before, provides that personal names and surnames must be written in documents according to the grammar of the Latvian language. The original form of the personal name in Latin transliteration can be written on page 4 of passport (page 14 according to the legislation in force before). The original form will not be recorded in identification cards.

Implementation

The Latvian language grammar rules are particularly demanding (special endings must be added, different for male and female's names, some double letters are prohibited, application of diacritical signs when transliterating minority and foreign names is controversial, etc.). This general problem of proper application of the right of persons belonging to minorities to "official recognition of their names in minority language" enshrined, in particular, in the Framework Convention, is particularly complicated in Latvia because of large-scale exchange of personal IDs: in Soviet passports issued in Latvia, names in both Russian and Latvian were written, while the USSR passports issued outside Latvia contained records either only in Russian or in Russian and the language of the corresponding "Soviet national republic". Meanwhile, officially recognised spelling in Latvian citizens' and non-citizens' passports are only in Latvian.

Factual

In April 1999 Mrs. and Mr. S. won their trial against the Latvian Citizenship and Immigration Board (CIB) in the Supreme Court of Latvia. Spelling of their names as recorded in their IDs (the so-called non-citizens' passports issued to former USSR citizens who have neither Latvian nor other state's citizenship) was the subject of the complaint. Their Slavic surname, originally in Cyrillic script, transliterated in Latvian and transcribed into English, sounded incorrectly and clearly insulting (similar to well-known obscene word). It has to be noted that Mr. Zitars, the Head of the CIB, challenging the decision of the regional court, asserted: "if the positive decision will be taken for Mrs. and Mr. S, 400,000 non-citizens' passports issued before might be considered as invalid". The Supreme Court confirmed the decision of the regional court that commissioned the CIB to exchange their passports and put down their proper surnames. However, since Supreme Court's decision the passports have not been issued because of bureaucratic obstacles. Finally, Mrs. and Mr. S have applied to European Court of Human Rights; their application was declared inadmissible.

In July 2001 the Constitutional Court admitted the first case regarding the issue of personal names spelling. Mrs. Mentzen, Latvian by ethnic origin, whose husband is German, considered that the Regulations "On Writing and Identification of Names and Surnames" and the corresponding section of the State Language Law run counter to the Constitution of Latvia. Her new surname is "Latvianized" as "Mencena" in her Latvian IDs. All other court instances rejected her complaint.

The Constitutional Court recognized that the practice of "Latvianization" of personal names and surnames is in compliance with the Constitution. The privacy of personal life in this case is "limited in order to protect the right of other residents of Latvia to use the Latvian language within the whole territory of the country and to protect the democratic system of the state". In the meantime, the Court recognised the so-called "equalisation" (changing the personal name according to modern grammar of the Latvian language) unconstitutional, if a person does not wish it. The legislation provides that "equalisation" can be used even if the personal name is already "Latvianized" and written in the passport. In fact, the Court decided that the personal name can be "Latvianized" only once.

The Court also recognised the provision determining the place where the original form of the personal name in Latin transliteration is recorded in citizens' passports unconstitutional, and declared it invalid since July 1, 2002 (the day, when the new Law on IDs entered into force).

A similar case on the minority name spelling was registered in the European Court of Human Rights in July 2001 (Kuharec v. Latvia).

Mr. Russkih, whose son was born in the March 2001, was issued the son's birth certificate, where the surname was written as "Ruskihs", i.e. with one "s" in the middle (since consonants cannot be duplicated in Latvian). In the father's ID issued prior to the adoption of the Regulations, his surname is spelled as "Russkihs" - i.e. with added mandatory Latvian ending "s" but still with duplicated "s" in the middle. Thus, the son's name was distorted further. In response to the complaint addressed to the State Language Centre, a relevant expert institution, the plaintiff was notified that "his own surname was recorded in wrong spelling in his passport". Instead of fixing the problem with his son's name, he was invited to come to the passport office to change his own and his wife's name records in their IDs. The case is particularly sensitive, because the surname in question is ancient and directly related to the person's identity - it means "Russian" in the Russian language, with traditional ending widespread in Siberia. Mr. Russkih declared he was not satisfied with the opportunity to have his original name only "in brackets" on some back page in his and his son's ID, and will contest this decision of the administrative authorities in court. The court of the first instance has dismissed Mr. Russkih's claim.

Mrs. Joffe has met a similar problem after passing through naturalization. In September 2000, Mrs. Joffe, a naturalised Latvian citizen, was issued a passport where her surname was written as "Jofe", i.e. with one "f". The State Language Consultative Service ruled that letter "f" cannot be duplicated in Latvian, but the historical form of the surname "Joffe" can be written in the passport's section "Special Marks", in order "to prevent possible mistakes and complications".

Paragraph 2

Legal

The legislation currently in force does not prohibit to display inscriptions and other information of a private nature visible to the public in minority languages.

The requirements prescribed by the Section 21 of the State Language Law (1999) for private business are the following:

“(7) If a foreign language is used along with the state language in information, the text in the state language shall be in the foreground and shall not be smaller in size or less complete in content than the text in the foreign language.”

At the same time “information intended for the public provided by state and municipal institutions, courts and agencies belonging to the judicial system, state and municipal enterprises and companies in which the state or a municipality holds the largest share of the capital shall be only in the state language”. This rule has some exceptions, for example in the cases of international events, emergency situations, epidemics or dangerous infectious diseases, etc.

Implementation / factual

It should be mentioned that the previous (1992) language legislation explicitly prohibited the use of minority languages in public displays throughout the country. The gradual return of minority language inscriptions started in October 2000, following the adoption of the legislation currently in force.

One of the most popular Russian-language dailies offered free advertising to enterprises, which display information on signboards in the languages of national minorities. The daily's campaign was aimed at encouraging private entrepreneurs to make use of the rights provided by law. However, some politicians and state officials sharply criticized this action (for example, former Head of the State Language Centre Mrs Dzintra Hirsā). They did not deny that the action complies with the State Language Law, but maintain that it is "a sign of disloyalty" and "can hinder the integration of the society". [23](#)

In April 2002 one of the factions in the Riga City Council had drafted amendments to the municipal regulations stipulating that all signboards and posters in Riga must be only in the Latvian language except for international events, events held by minority cultural associations and religious confessions, and circumstances, where translation into other languages is necessary for safety reasons. The Riga City Council adopted these regulations in 1997, in accordance with the legislation in force at that time. The faction suggested that the provisions should be amended in conformity with the current State Language Law and the Regulations on Usage of the State Language in Information. However, the Riga City Council's Development department did not support the amendments.

Paragraph 3

Legal

The current legislation provides for all place names, street names and other topographical indications to be in the state language only. The only exception is given to the so-called “Liv coast”, where the usage of Liv place names can be used alongside Latvian ones.

This way, Section 18 of the State Language Law (1999) envisages that “in the Republic of Latvia, place names shall be created and used in the state language.” Regulations of the Cabinet of Ministers “On creating, spelling and usage of place names, names of institutions, non-governmental organizations, companies (enterprises) and titles of events” (issued in August 2000 in accordance with Section 18 of the State Language Law) state that: “(2) Place names in the Republic of Latvia shall be created and used in the Latvian language, but on the territory of the

Liv coast they can be created and used also in the Liv language. (3) Each administrative territory, populated place, street and real estate can have only one official name.“

Conclusions

Latvian legislation allows displaying information visible to the public in minority languages, thus partially fulfilling the requirement set forth in paragraph 2. However, Latvia does not comply with the rest of the principles set out in the Article 11, since its legislation and practice does not recognise individuals' right to use names in minority languages and the right to their official recognition (paragraph 1), and, albeit few exceptions, prohibits public bodies and enterprises from displaying information visible to the public in minority languages (paragraph 2), including topographical indications intended for the public also in minority languages. The following measures would contribute to better minority protection:

1. To recognise individual's right to use officially his/her personal name and surname in the spelling form he or she prefers; envision a streamlined procedure for restoration of desired spelling of individual's personal name and surname.
2. To amend the State Language Law so as to allow for general public displays provided by public (state and municipal) bodies and enterprises to be made also in minority languages.
3. To amend the State Language Law so as to ensure for traditional local names, street names and other topographical indications intended for the public to be displayed also in minority languages, and set clear criteria determining what demand is sufficient for minority language to be used in such indications.

Article 12

1. The Parties shall, where appropriate, take measures in the fields of education and research to foster knowledge of the cultures, history, language and religion of their national minorities and of the majority.

2. In this context the Parties shall inter alia provide adequate opportunities for teacher training and access to textbooks, and facilitate contacts among students and teachers of different communities.

3. The Parties undertake to promote equal opportunities for access to education at all levels for persons belonging to national minorities.

Paragraph 1

Legal

Language legislation in Latvia aims at safeguarding the status and role within the society of the state, i.e. - Latvian, language. Fostering the knowledge of the cultures, history, language and religion of Latvia's national minorities is officially not a priority and Latvia lacks state-supported programs and initiatives aimed at fostering such knowledge. Teaching subjects related to minority identity (such as minority culture, language, history) is allowed within "minority education programmes" meant for pupils of minority schools (Section 41 para. 2 of the Education Law (1998)).

Implementation

The main body engaged in fostering the learning of the majority language is the National Programme for Latvian Language Training. The Program was elaborated with active participation of the UNDP Office in Latvia and was approved by the Cabinet of Ministers in late 1995. The main task of the Program has been to teach Latvian to minority schools' teachers so as to enable them to teach minority pupils in the state language. The Program also teaches Latvian to adults, develops language study materials for non-Latvians, elaborates examination standards and promotes Latvian in the media. 10,367 schoolteachers and 6,902 others (police, medical, railway workers and some other categories) had participated in the courses by the year 2000 ²⁴. The program also organised summer integration camps and events in the media with the aim to promote dialogue and cooperation between ethnic Latvians and minorities. During 1999-2000, the program was to prepare teaching materials for about 12,000 minority schoolteachers "so that they will be ready to teach their subjects in Latvian." ²⁵ From the start, mainly foreign donors supplied the program's budget (approximately EUR 23,9 million), while the Latvian share of funding was to increase gradually.

However, assistance in Latvian language learning offered by this programme is limited to a very narrow audience and is not available to the great majority of individuals, whose native language is not Latvian. Neither does the programme support the learning of the cultures, history, language and religion of Latvia's national minorities.

Factual

In 2002 the National Programme for Latvian Language Training is allocated 425,932 Lats (approx. EUR 760,590).

In July 2002 the Society Integration Foundation announced the second projects' competition in different fields. There was one relevant program in the field of ethnic integration - the program for creation of a model of the Latvian language training for adults (the total funds for the program was 2000 Lats (approx. EUR 3570))

The Head of the Naturalisation Board Mrs Aldermane informed in mid-September, 2001, that 2000 non-citizens, who did not speak the Latvian language, would have a possibility to attend the Latvian language courses free of charge. The programme was financed by the governments of the USA, Sweden and Norway (total budget approx. EUR 235,000).

Paragraph 2

Latvia does not provide specific teacher training for minority schools. Students of minority origin are not prevented from training as teachers within the mainstream teacher training in Latvian language. However, this training is conducted according to programs, designed for the majority schools and classes, and generally does not take into consideration peculiarities of teaching in minority schools and classes. One group of students (approximately 30 persons) is prepared annually at the Slavonic philology department in the University of Latvia. Training of Latvian language teachers for minority schools practically ceased in the early 1990s, and in the autumn of 2000, 536 pupils in minority schools were not taught Latvian language at all, because of a lack of teachers. ²⁶ According to current legislation, teachers in all public schools, including minority ones, are required to speak the state language at the highest level of proficiency. The State Language Law (1999) requires that all staff meetings in public (also minority) schools must be conducted in the state language (Section 7).

Paragraph 3

Legal

Section 3 of the Education Law (1998) declares equal rights to education regardless of race, ethnic origin and religious persuasion. However, Latvia lacks legislation and specific programs aimed at securing equal opportunities for access to education for persons belonging to minorities.

Implementation / factual

The Society Integration Programme (the main governmental initiative, aimed at building inclusive society) does not consider minority educational situation from the minority rights and anti-discrimination perspective and does not deal with the problem of securing equal access to education at all levels for minority members.

In practice, minorities tend to be underrepresented within education system, both within schools and within the state-funded university education institutions.

Within the body of pupils of elementary, primary and secondary schools the share of minorities is slightly smaller than the share of respective groups within the school-age population (5 to 19 years of age). Ethnic Latvians are slightly over represented within the body of pupils of elementary, primary and secondary schools. Probably, one of the reasons for minorities' children under-representation in schools is unfavourable social and economic situation minority parents find themselves in (refer to the information provided under the articles 4 and 15). However, a further research is necessary so as to find the causes of minorities' under representation in schools.

Table: School-age population compared to the body of pupils

Ethnic origin	Population 5 to 19 (2000)		Pupils (2001/02)	
	Absolute numbers	Percent distribution	Absolute numbers	Percent distribution
Latvians	329031	64.69	229034	67.97
Russians	133511	26.25	83686	24.84
Belorussians	11635	2.29	6464	1.92
Ukrainians	9172	1.80	4690	1.39
Poles	10583	2.08	5742	1.70
Lithuanians	5102	1.00	2649	0.79
Others	9555	1.88	4676	1.39
Total	508589	99.99	336941	100.00

Sources: Data on population of 5 to 19 years of age: Results of the 2000 Population and Housing Census in Latvia. Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia. Riga, 2002, pp.61, 165, 166. Data on pupils of daytime elementary, primary and secondary schools, academic year 2001/2002: Statistics Department of the Ministry of education and Science.

According to a recent study on ethnic representation in Latvia [27](#), the share of minorities among teaching staff of the thirteen surveyed state-funded universities tends to be around 17%, although two of surveyed state universities employed no minorities among its staff at all (Riga School of Economics and Vidzeme University College), while one university (situated in the city of

Daugavpils, where minorities constitute 84% of the population) employed 54.5% of minorities among its staff [28](#) . Although far fewer data were available regarding the composition of the student body, study results suggest that minorities also tend to be under-represented among the students of state-funded university education establishments: generally around 14%, although in one university (Vidzeme University College) minorities constituted only 1.6%, while in only one surveyed state university (Latvian Maritime Academy) the share of minorities within the student body is 40,0%, thus approaching minorities' share of the country's overall population. [29](#)

As the state-funded establishments apparently do not ensure adequate opportunities for minority university-level education, many minority members turned to private universities. Accordingly, the share of minorities within the staff of six surveyed private universities is around 45%, although in one university (Riga Teacher Training and Education Management Academy) minorities' share is only 8.5%, while at another (Institute of Transportation and Communications) it reaches 91% [30](#) . The study's data on private universities' student body was insufficient, because out of six surveyed only two universities provided information on ethnic break-up of their student bodies: 84 and 83.7% were minority representatives. Unlike other private universities surveyed, these two universities provided instruction only in Russian; therefore these data cannot characterise the situation in the private universities in general.

Table: Minority representation within the staff and the student body of universities

Status	Title	Minorities within staff (%)	Minorities within the student body (%)	
State	J.Vitols Latvian Academy of Music	11.4	6.7	
	Latvian Maritime Academy	21.0	40.0	
	Latvian Academy of Art	4.0	NA	
	Latvian Police Academy	NA	14.0	
	Latvian Academy of Sports Education	23.5	NA	
	Latvian Academy of Pedagogy	11.9	NA	
	Riga School of Economics	0.0	NA	
	Riga Technical University	30	NA	
	Vidzeme University College	0.0	1.6	
	Latvian University of Agriculture	14.9	8.0	
	Latvian Academy of Culture	17.0	NA	
	Latvian Academy of Medicine	16.2	NA	
	Daugavpils Pedagogical University	54.5	NA	
	Private	Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Christian Academy	13.0	NA
		Riga Institute of Aeronautics	85.0	84.0
Riga Teacher Training and Education Management Academy		8.5	NA	
Institute of Transportation and Communications		91.0	83.7	
RIMPAK Livonija		49.0	NA	

	School of Banking	25.0	NA
--	-------------------	------	----

Data source: Pabriks A. Occupational Representation and Ethnic Discrimination in Latvia. Riga, 2002, p.36.

Conclusions

Latvia's current legislation promotes the status of the majority language. Latvia does not provide specific teacher training for minority schools. Latvia lacks measures promoting equal opportunities for minorities' access to education, and minorities are underrepresented in the state-funded institutions of university education, both within the staff and the student body. The following measures would contribute to better minority protection:

1. To support research and education projects to promote knowledge of cultures, history, languages and religions of Latvia's minorities among the minority population itself and among the majority; ensure that minorities have equal opportunities and are adequately participating in these programs.
2. To develop a system of teachers training specific for minority schools, addressing both the need for subject matter teachers and Latvian language teachers in minority schools.
3. To ensure adequate minority representation within the staff of state-funded universities through hiring and promotion policies; ensure that school graduation exams and university entry exams allow for minority representatives to use their mother tongue as a medium; envision special programmes, including grant schemes, for minority groups (particularly Roma) with significantly lower average education levels and inadequate representation within the student body.

Article 13

1. Within the framework of their education systems, the Parties shall recognise that persons belonging to a national minority have the right to set up and to manage their own private educational and training establishments.

2. The exercise of this right shall not entail any financial obligation for the Parties.

Paragraph 1

Legal

The right to establish and manage private education and training establishments is recognised in Latvian legislation: the Education Law (1998) entitles private physical and legal persons to found private schools (Section 23 para. 3). The Law also determines that education in languages other than Latvian can be conducted in private education establishments (Section 10 para. 2).

Implementation / factual

A number of private (also minority) education and training establishments have been set up since 1991.

Table:

Number of private schools and pupils in private schools, 2001/2002 academic year (including elementary, basic and secondary schools)

	Language of instruction:							
	Latvian		Russian		Bilingual		Total	
	Schools	Pupils	Schools	Pupils	Schools	Pupils	Schools	Pupils
Cesis r.d.*	2	33	0	0	0	0	2	33
Liepaja r.d.	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	10
Madona r.d.	1	59	0	0	0	0	1	59
Ogre r.d.	1	65	0	0	0	0	1	65
Preili r.d.	1	38	0	0	0	0	1	38
Riga r.d.	2	217	0	0	0	0	2	217
Talsi r.d.	2	168	0	0	0	0	2	168
Jelgava	1	89	1	19	0	0	2	108
Liepaja	2	19	1	25	0	0	3	44
Ventspils	0	0	0	0	1	35	1	35
Riga	8	714	17	1035	3	232	28	1981
Total	21	1412	19	1079	4	267	44	2758

*r.d. = rural district

Paragraph 2

Legal

The Education Law (1998) allows for public funding to be provided to private schools. However, the same law prescribes discrimination against private minority schools: Section 59 para. 2 stipulates that the “State and municipalities may participate in financing of private education institutions if these institutions implement state accredited education programs in the state language.” Thus, private schools where minority language is used as a medium of instruction are banned from receiving public funding.

Although Article 13(2) of the FCNM explicitly relieves Latvia from an obligation to provide funding to minority private schools, this provision of Latvian legislation contradicts the general principle of equality of treatment. In particular, it violates Article 4(1) of the FCNM, which prohibits “any discrimination based on belonging to a national minority”.

Implementation / factual

No private minority school has yet publicly challenged this provision in the court.

Conclusions

The right to establish and to manage private educational institutions is recognised in Latvia. However, private schools with minority language of instruction are banned from receiving public funding. The following measures would contribute to better minority protection:

1. To abolish discriminatory provision of Section 59 para. 2 of the Education Law.
2. To ensure that private schools with instruction in minority languages can apply for and receive adequate share of public funding granted to private schools in general.

Article 14

- 1. The Parties undertake to recognise that every person belonging to a national minority has the right to learn his or her minority language.*
- 2. In areas inhabited by persons belonging to national minorities traditionally or in substantial numbers, if there is sufficient demand, the Parties shall endeavour to ensure, as far as possible and within the framework of their education systems, that persons belonging to those minorities have adequate opportunities for being taught the minority language or for receiving instruction in this language.*
- 3. Paragraph 2 of this article shall be implemented without prejudice to the learning of the official language or the teaching in this language.*

Paragraph 1

Legal

The legislation, in principle, recognises the right of persons belonging to minorities to learn his or her minority language: Article 114 of the Constitution stipulates that “persons belonging to ethnic minorities have the right to preserve and develop their language and their ethnic and cultural identity.”

Paragraph 2

Legal

Recent changes to Latvia’s education system significantly curtail “opportunities for being taught the minority language or for receiving instruction in this language”, compared with opportunities, which existed when Latvia signed the Framework Convention.

During the independence movement in the late 80s and the early 90s, as well as in the early years of independence Latvia has developed a system of state-funded minority language education: most of the state-funded schools with Russian language of instruction were preserved, while support has been given to the creation of schools or classes for seven other minorities (e.g. Polish, Ukrainian, Estonian, Jewish, Roma, Lithuanian, Belarussian).

However, according to the Education Law (1998), after 2004 all public secondary and vocational education must be in the state language only (Paragraph 9, sub-paragraph 3 of Transitional Provisions of the Education Law), while existing primary minority schools have to be transformed into bilingual schools. In practice this means that already existing state-financed minority language secondary and vocational schools have to switch to instruction in Latvian only.

The Education Law permits, but does not guarantee, education in minority languages in two instances - in private schools (currently attended by less than 1% of students) and in state and municipal education establishments where 'minority education programmes' are being implemented (Section 9 para. 2 of the Education Law). The latter programmes are stipulated but not defined in the law. The Ministry of Education is authorised to determine the subjects within minority education programmes to be taught in the state language (Section 9 para. 2 and Section 41 para. 3 of the Education Law). A separate General Education Law (1999) allows for general secondary education programmes to be combined with "minority education programmes, including teaching minority languages and subjects related to the identity of the minority and the integration of the society of Latvia" (Section 42 para. 2). However, this provision leaves the matter of education in minority languages at the discretion of officials of the Ministry of Education.

The Minister for Education Karlis Greiskalns pointed out in his letter to one of the parliamentary factions that the collision between the Education Law and General Education Law exists. He mentioned that the Education Law contains more general norms, but the General Education Law contains less general norms. According to the collision norm ("one may apply a more general norm only in cases not covered by an incompatible less general norm") the General Education Law is to be applied in the case. However, the Minister does not intend to solve the collision by submitting amendments to the Education Law, as the collision norm can be used.

FCNM Explanatory Report makes it explicitly clear that teaching of minority language should not be seen as a substitute for teaching in that language, therefore "teaching minority languages" (permitted by the Law on General Education) in secondary schools should not prevent the state from ensuring opportunity to study in minority languages in secondary schools [31](#). However, "[o]pportunities for being taught the minority language or for receiving instruction in this language" envisioned in the Convention are conditioned to (1) "sufficient demand" from persons belonging to minorities as well as to (2) "as far as possible and within the framework of their [States Parties] education systems". It can be argued that both requirements are fulfilled in Latvia (for information concerning demand see below under "Implementation / factual" headline). As for the second requirement, in 1995 (when Latvia has signed the Convention), Latvia's state-funded education system included secondary and vocational education in Russian language; thus, opportunities to study in minority language have already been available. Thus, if the FCNM is to be complied with, the state should ensure teaching in minority language.

It needs to be especially emphasised, that the envisioned liquidation of state-supported minority education is also questionable from the legal point of view. Although Latvia has not ratified the Framework Convention, its norms are legally binding for Latvia. As the Council of Europe's Report has noted in 2001, "Although the Latvian parliament has not yet ratified [FCNM], the current situation is covered by the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, to which Latvia became party on 4 May 1993. According to this Convention, a State is obliged to refrain from acts which would defeat the object and purpose of a treaty when it signed that treaty" [32](#). Crucially, the state-funded education system featured secondary and vocational education in minority language when Latvia has signed the Convention, and the demand for such education has not disappeared since then. Envisioned liquidation of education in minority language will therefore violate Latvia's international obligations.

The Education Law (1998) requires local governments to assume responsibility for pre-school, primary and secondary education, but does not require local governments to establish and/or maintain minority schools/classes if minority parents so request. Moreover, about a half of persons belonging to minorities do not have voting rights in local elections, and therefore do not

have any influence over decisions taken by local governments, including the decisions concerning education of minority children.

The Education Law stipulates that orphans shall receive education in the state language (Section 56 para. 2). In practice this means that orphaned children whose education began in a different language must also be transferred to a Latvian-language school, regardless of grade or age.

Implementation / factual

The envisioned elimination of state-funded minority secondary and vocational education and the transformation of primary schools into bilingual schools has been put forward ostensibly in order to “level the playing field” for minority pupils. However, this move is continuously opposed by representatives of minority organisations as well as criticised by minority parents for putting minority children at an educational disadvantage [33](#). According to survey data “Our Values”, 75% of minority parents wish their children to receive education in their mother tongue [34](#). The latest research on the problem revealed that while many support the envisioned move, most of the minority schools’ teachers, pupils and their parents oppose the elimination of minority secondary education [35](#).

Language is an important identity factor for the Russian linguistic minority youth: according to a research, 77% of respondents consider language as the basis for identity, ahead of ethnic origin (54%) [36](#). It is feared elimination of Russian minority education will seriously endanger minority’s identity [37](#). Traditionally, Latvian-language stream of education [38](#) emphasises Latvian folk culture, traditions and history. Inclusion of “minority cultural component” into Latvian-language curricula is unlikely to offset this tendency. The research data shows that while all respondents agree the greatest benefit of the envisioned move will be that students will learn Latvian, most of minority schools’ principals, teachers and pupils’ parents believe the elimination of minority education will have negative effect on minority pupils’ ability to learn the content of certain subject matter and their psychological feelings [39](#). Principals and teachers also stated that proficiency in native language will suffer as a result [40](#).

The research data [41](#) also points out at serious practical failures by the Ministry of Education and Science in preparing for the envisioned liquidation of minority secondary education, i.e. - in preparation of teachers, study manuals, teaching techniques etc. With just two years left before the deadline of 2004 approaches, only 16% of minority schools are “fairly well prepared” to switch from minority language to Latvian [42](#). Estimated level of readiness of minority schools’ pupils is rather low: only 10% of the schools’ principals, 6% of teachers, 15% of pupils and 25% of their parents stated that the pupils are “definitely will be able to” study in Latvian in secondary school [43](#).

Partly because of demographic changes (emigration, a falling birth rate) and parental choices (some minority parents send their children to Latvian language schools), the Latvian authorities have closed a number of Russian-language schools. In several cases, these decisions were made despite the apparent viability of these schools - i.e. sufficient number of students and qualified staff. The closure of two Russian language schools in Riga (No. 26 in July 1994 and No. 9 in July 1996) affected 1,633 students and 128 teachers. School No. 26 was closed in July 1994 despite mass protests and hunger strikes by teachers, a petition signed by 2,300 individuals and a letter signed by 450 parents. The closure of school No. 3 in Talsi in June 1996 affected 100 pupils and 15 teachers. Another recent closure was in Jekabpils, where the City Council decided in 1999 to merge a Russian secondary school with another situated at the far end of the city. In April 2001, the primary school in Jelgava was transferred into a former kindergarten building, vacating the original building for Latvian language classes. The move took place despite

vociferous protests lodged by parents of the school's pupils; the Jelgava section of the Russian Society; LASHOR (Latvian Association for the Support of Schools with Russian Language of Instruction); the parents of pupils at Valmiera 2nd (Russian) school; the Archbishop of the Orthodox Church; the Embassy of the Russian Federation; Novaja Gazeta (a local Russian language newspaper), some political organisations. Responding to a protest letter from parents, the head of the Parliamentary Commission on Education and Culture Dzintars Abikis said the move was "legally correct" and their appeal to international human rights organisations is "naive and worthless." Russian-language secondary schools in Jelgava had already been downgraded from secondary to primary school status in 1995.

In 2002, 8 children were denied an opportunity to study in Russian in Kalnciems school. Their parents timely applied for a 1st year class with the Russian language of instruction to be opened. In the meantime, parents of other 11 children applied for a 1st year class with the Latvian language of instruction to be opened. According to the Order No.313 of the Ministry of Education and Science, the minimum number of pupils in a class should be 12, although in special circumstances and upon a written request of a school's authorities a class with a lesser number of pupils can be opened. Responding to this provision, parents of the 8 children collected 300 signatures in support of their demand. The school's authorities and the local government ignored the demand of the minority parents and opened only a 1st year class with the Latvian language of instruction [44](#).

The controversy and protests evoked by such actions suggest the need to set firm standards requiring local governments to open/maintain minority schools/classes if there is sufficient minority demand.

Factual

Table: Number of schools and pupils by language of instruction
(Including daytime and evening (shift) schools)

Academic year	Schools by language of instruction				Total No of schools	Pupils by language of instruction**			Total No of pupils**	% study in Latvian
	Latvian	Russian	Mixed*	Other		Latvian	Russian	Other		
1991/1992	585	219	178	4	986	183266	154736	208	338210	54.19
1992/1993	623	223	179	4	1029	181875	146457	328	328660	55.34
1993/1994	652	216	175	5	2015	191517	143904	461	335882	57.02
1994/1995	679	209	176	7	1071	199146	138002	727	337875	58.94
1995/1996	699	207	182	6	1094	209947	136740	854	347541	60.41
1996/1997	719	205	182	6	1112	219684	133882	908	354474	61.97
1997/1998	728	200	176	6	1110	228059	130912	1043	360014	63.35
1998/1999	738	196	171	6	1111	234476	126073	1173	361722	64.87
1999/2000	737	190	160	7	1095	239163	120925	1344	361432	66.17
2000/2001	734	179	154	7	1074	242475	116009	1334	359818	67.39

*Mixed schools include two separate streams of education: Latvian and Russian.

**Data on pupils in evening (shift) schools in 1991/1992 and 1992/1993 were not included.

Table: Pupils in schools with language of instruction other than Latvian or Russian, 2001/2002 academic year*

	Riga	Daugavpils	Jekabpils r.d.**	Kraslava r.d.	Total:
Polish	371	430	97	80	978
Ukranian	306	0	0	0	306
Belorussian	68	0	0	0	68
Total	745	430	97	80	1352

*According to the Ministry of Education and Science, schools and classes of other minorities (Estonian, Jewish, Lithuanian, Roma) use predominantly Latvian or Russian as a language of instruction. Accordingly, data on pupils of such schools and classes is included into data on schools and classes with Latvian or Russian language of instruction.

**r.d. = rural district

Paragraph 3

Legal

The right to receive education in the state language is guaranteed by the State Language Law (Section 14) and the Education Law (Section 9 para.1). Learning the state language and taking examinations of the state language is mandatory for anyone seeking to acquire primary or secondary education (Section 9, para.3 of the Education Law), while examinations for professional qualification, research papers necessary for qualifying for a degree (BA, MA and PhD) are to be in Latvian (Section 9 para. 4, 5 of the Education Law).

Conclusions

Taking into account a real situation in Latvia, as well as the fact that the system of state-supported secondary education in minority languages exists, scheduled reform of school education could lead to incompliance with provisions of the Framework Convention. The following measures would contribute to better minority protection:

1. To abolish the requirement for state and municipal secondary and vocational schools to switch to teaching in the state language only (Paragraph 9, sub-paragraph 3 of Transitional Provisions of the Education Law).
2. To amend the Education Law so that secondary and vocational education in minority languages is guaranteed, if there is a demand for such education.
3. To determine in the Education Law firm criteria that would mandate the state and municipal authorities to establish and/or maintain schools and/or classes if parents representing a certain minimum number of potential pupils request so. Such criteria and their implementation should not discriminate against requests for schools and classes with minority languages of instruction.
4. To ensure minorities' participation in the process of decision-making and implementation concerning issues of minority education.

Article 15

The Parties shall create the conditions necessary for the effective participation of persons belonging to national minorities in cultural, social and economic life and in public affairs, in particular those affecting them.

Legal

Latvian legislation does not provide instruments ensuring minorities' effective participation in cultural, social and economic life and in public affairs. In the meantime, Latvian legislation impedes minorities' participation by reserving certain political and social-economic rights to citizens only (for further details concerning citizenship legislation and differences between the rights of citizens and non-citizens, please, refer to information provided under Article 4). Certain provisions of Latvian language legislation also impede minorities' participation by banning the usage of minority languages in communication between individuals and the state/municipal institutions, imposing language proficiency requirements in public and private employment and restricting the usage of minority languages in TV and radio broadcasts (refer to information provided under Articles 9 and 10).

Implementation

The main governmental initiative, aimed at building inclusive society is the Society Integration Programme. The programme covers a broad range of issues, including dialogue between an individual and the State, encouragement of naturalisation, development of the NGO sector and NGO involvement in decision-making, assistance to ethnic Latvians willing to repatriate and to ethnic minorities wishing to emigrate, measures to promote employment, reduce poverty, facilitate regional integration, transition to bilingual education for minorities, measures to strengthen Latvian language and communication, development of culture and intercultural dialogue, improvement of information sphere. However, the programme does include minority rights and anti-discrimination issues and does address the problem of minorities' participation in cultural, social and economic life and in public affairs, including those affecting them.

Factual

Social and economic life

Generally, minorities are actively participating in the social economic life and are well represented in the private sector of economy. However, a recent study on ethnic representation in Latvia hints at segregation tendencies in the private sector: out of 17 surveyed large private companies 5 employed either no or very few (2-3%) minority employees, and 9 companies had no minorities within their top (5-7 persons) management [45](#).

In the meantime, minorities in Latvia are continuously exposed to greater unemployment than ethnic Latvians.

Official unemployment data suggests that ethnic Latvians are slightly less and minorities slightly more affected by unemployment. For example, in 2000 ethnic Latvians constituted 57.7% within the total population and 49.8% within the body of unemployed registered with the State Employment Service, while ethnic Russians - 29.6 and 35.9% accordingly, ethnic Belarussians - 4.1 and 5.1%, ethnic Ukrainians - 2.7 and 2.9%, ethnic Poles - 2.5 and 3%.

However, the real picture might differ significantly, because the official figures represent only those individuals, who approached the State Employment Service and have been officially registered as unemployed. Those de-facto unemployed, who either failed to approach the

Service, or were denied the registration, do not appear in the official figures. In 1997 the knowledge of Latvian was a necessary condition for a jobless person to be officially registered as unemployed. Such measure not only distorted official unemployment figures of the time, but probably also left psychological effect on some minority unemployed, discouraging them from approaching the Employment Service ever since. Besides, the State Employment Service does not provide vocation training for unemployed in Russian, nor does it ensure Latvian language training for non-native speakers.

Survey data suggest even higher rates of minority unemployment. In 1996, 26% of surveyed non-Latvians claimed to be unemployed, comparing to 14% of ethnic Latvians [46](#) . A research conducted in 1999 showed unemployment level among ethnic Russians (18%) and other minorities (17%) to be much higher than among ethnic Latvians (10 %), while among the working age population, 14% of ethnic Russians, 12% of other minorities and 7% of ethnic Latvians were unemployed [47](#) .

Some sources claim unemployment rate among the Roma population in Latvia could be up to 80% [48](#) . A draft bill proposed in October 2002 envisioned a reduced tax for enterprises which employ persons belonging to Roma minority: the tax exemption would correspond to the proportion of employed Roma. The bill was rejected.

While citizenship legislation axes off half of Latvia's minority population from opportunity to compete for governmental jobs, weak Latvian language skills is another factor limiting job opportunities of many non-Latvians. According to a 2000 survey, among those individuals, whose mother tongue was not Latvian, 38% of non-citizens and 22% of citizens could not work in a job requiring Latvian language knowledge [49](#) . However, the state does not provide adult minority population with adequate opportunities to learn the state language (refer to information provided under Article 12).

Table: Individuals registered at the State Employment Service (1995-2000)

Ethnic origin	Thousand of individuals						Per cent distribution						Pop. 2000, per cent
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	
Latvians	39.3	44.9	45.6	55.2	53.6	46.5	47.3	49.4	53.7	49.6	49.0	49.8	57.7
Russians	32.2	33.3	28.4	40.7	40.2	33.5	38.6	36.7	33.5	36.5	36.7	35.9	29.6
Belorussians	4.5	4.8	4.1	5.5	5.5	4.7	5.3	5.4	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.1	4.1
Ukrainians	2.3	2.5	2.1	3.4	3.3	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.7
Poles	2.5	2.7	2.4	3.2	3.3	2.8	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.0	2.5
Lithuanians	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4
Jews	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4
Others	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.6
Total	83.2	90.8	84.9	111.4	109.5	93.3	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Statistical Yearbook of Latvia, 2001. Riga, 2002

Lack of citizenship and, to a certain extent - language requirements, lead to a significant under-representation of minorities in public affairs, including composition of the Parliament and the municipal (local) councils, state institutions, courts and municipal (local) administration. For the most part, opinions of minorities are being ignored in the process of policy making and implementation, especially in affairs directly affecting minorities. For example, - a number of schools with Russian language of instruction has been closed down by local authorities despite the schools' apparent viability (sufficient number of pupils and qualified staff). Also, Latvia's Education Law (1998) foresees elimination of state-funded minority secondary and vocational education. The Law was adopted despite minorities' protests and is being carried out despite clear opposition of minorities' organisations and despite the fact that most of the pupils, their parents and teachers of minority schools oppose the move [50](#) (see information provided under Article 14).

Parliament

Only 17 MPs out of 100 are ethnic non-Latvians (14 Russians, 1 Pole, 1 Jew, 1 Karelian). 4 MPs do not determine their ethnic origin in documents. 20 out of 21 MP, who consider themselves as belonging to national minorities or do not determine their ethnic origin, represent only one party in the Saeima - the coalition "For Human Rights in United Latvia", which explicitly claims to represent the interests of minorities. The first ethnic Russian cabinet member since 1993 was appointed in 2000, a member of the nationalist-conservative alliance "For Fatherland and Freedom".

Ministries

Minorities are significantly underrepresented within state institutions. According to the New Baltic Barometer of 1996, 31% of employed Latvians work in the "non-market" sector (i.e. state and municipal bureaucracy, military, state health sector, education etc.), comparing to only 12% of employed minorities [51](#). A research data shows that ethnic Latvians constitute 92% of the staff of Latvia's ministries [52](#). In the contrast, all other ethnic groups are significantly under-represented within Latvia's ministries: the share of all six largest minority groups within the ministries' staff is several times smaller than their share both within the total population and within the citizenry. Only in one ministry - the Ministry of Interior, the share of minorities among the staff (28.3%) [53](#) is close to minorities' share within the citizenry, though still falling far below their share within the total population.

Table: Representation in Latvia's ministries, 2001.

Ethnic origin	Per cent distribution		
	Population (%)	Citizenry (%)	Ministries (%)
Latvians	58.8	76.3	92.1
Russians	28.8	17.4	5.7
Belorussians	4.0	1.3	0.3
Ukrainians	2.5	0.4	0.17
Poles	2.5	2.2	0.65
Lithuanians	1.4	0.9	0.6
Jews	0.4	0.9	0.6
Total	99.8	99.7	99.85

Source: Pabriks A. Occupational Representation and Ethnic Discrimination in Latvia. Riga, 2002, pp. 13, 25.

Courts, police and prisons

Minorities are also continuously underrepresented in courts. In early 1994, out of 152 judges in Latvia, 142 were ethnic Latvians, nine were ethnic Russian and one was Polish [54](#). Only one non-Latvian was approved to the position of judge by the Parliament in 1999 (48 judges were approved in total), and only ethnic Latvians are among the members of Latvia’s highest judicial body, the Supreme Court (“Augstaka Tiesa”), and of the Constitutional Court (“Satversmes Tiesa”) [55](#). In 2001, of 307 judges working in 35 surveyed courts, only 23 (or 7.49%) were of minority origin (18 Russians, 3 Polish and 2 Belarussian) [56](#).

At the same time, minorities are fairly well represented in the State Police (34.2% of employees) [57](#) and even over represented in the Prison Administration (63.1% of employees) [58](#).

Table: Representation in courts, the State Police and the Prison Administration, 2001.

Ethnic origin	Per cent distribution				
	Population (%)	Citizenry (%)	Surveyed courts (%)	Police (%)	Prison Adm. (%)
Latvians	58.8	76.3	92.51	65.8	36.9
Russians	28.8	17.4	5.86	25.0	45.9
Belorussians	4.0	1.3	0.65	3.0	5.5
Ukrainians	2.5	0.4	0	2.1	4.2
Poles	2.5	2.2	0.98	2.0	5.0
Others	3.2	2.1	0	1.8	2.1
Total	99.8	99.7	100	99.7	99.6

Source: Pabriks A. Occupational Representation and Ethnic Discrimination in Latvia. Riga, 2002, pp. 13, 26, 28, 30.

Municipalities (councils, administration)

Minorities are underrepresented in the local government bodies - both in self-government councils and in administration. According to a recent research [59](#), in rural districts minorities constitute 6% of the councils’ members and 12% of the administration staff, while in cities minorities constitute 12% of the councils members and 11% of the administration staff. Thus, the research found that in most cases, minority representation within the councils and administration is smaller than their share within population, or does not exist at all [60](#).

Table: Representation in municipal bodies (surveyed municipalities)

Ethnic origin	Absolute numbers			Per cent distribution		
	Residents	Municipal council members	Municipal employees	Residents	Municipal council members	Municipal employees

Latvians	935288	575	1594	65.12	91.41	89.5
Russians	336587	39	122	23.44	6.2	6.85
Belorussians	53016	1	16	3.69	0.16	0.29
Ukrainians	27106	1	12	1.89	0.16	0.67
Poles	40881	10	25	2.85	1.59	1.40
Lithuanians	22617	2	7	1.57	0.32	0.39
Others	20640	1	5	1.44	0.16	0.29
Total	1436135	629	1781	100	100	100

Sources: Data on residents of surveyed municipalities: Statistical Yearbook of Latvia, 2001. Riga, 2002. Data on council members and employees: Pabriks A. Occupational Representation and Ethnic Discrimination in Latvia. Riga, 2002, p. 53.

Conclusions

Latvia lacks legislation or other measures to ensure minorities' effective participation, while citizenship and language legislation, as well as recruitment and promotion practices impede their participation. Available data suggest that minorities are underrepresented within the staff of the government ministries, courts, municipal councils and administration. Research data suggest minorities are well represented in private sector of economy, the State Police and over represented in the Prison Administration. According to available data, unemployment rates among minorities are higher than among ethnic Latvians. The following measures would contribute to better minority protection:

1. To facilitate further naturalisation of non-citizens, including adequate funding for preparatory training for applicants, easing naturalisation requirements for certain groups (i.e. - elderly, disabled persons), abolishing naturalisation fees for low-income applicants, further developing information campaigns in the media. Grant automatic citizenship upon request to those stateless permanent residents, who were born in Latvia.
2. To grant Latvia's permanent resident non-citizens voting rights at municipal (local government) elections; abolish all existing restrictions of "non-political" rights of these non-citizens.
3. To implement long-term hiring and promotion programs aimed at increasing minorities' representation within the staff of Latvia' ministries, courts and other state institutions.
4. To provide adequate state funding to meet the need for Latvian language learning among adult non-native speakers, especially unemployed; ensure Roma professional training; ensure an opportunity for minority unemployed to receive professional training also in minority language; allow for minority languages to be used for communication with public authorities; abolish language restrictions in TV and radio broadcasts; abolish excessive language restrictions and requirements in education, private and public employment.

Article 16

The Parties shall refrain from measures which alter the proportions of the population in areas inhabited by persons belonging to national minorities and are aimed at restricting the rights

***and freedoms flowing from the principles enshrined in the present framework Convention.
Legal***

Latvia has ratified the European Charter of Local Self-Government, and according to the Law on the European Charter of Local Self-Government (1996), Latvia accepts Article 5 and 10 of the Charter, forbidding the change of borders without consultations with the local government and allowing local governments to unite.

Implementation / factual

Latvia's minorities are dispersed throughout the territory of the state, with largest concentration in the east of the country (Latgale) and in urban areas, forming majority in large cities. Envisioned administrative reform will result in a merger of traditional small rural districts (pagasti) into greater local administrative units. The reform is not aimed at restricting the rights and freedoms of minorities and is conducted on voluntary basis through negotiation between the local governments. However, ethnic composition of population is not taken into consideration and no popular vote is envisioned on the issue. Until the beginning of 2002, 14 united municipalities had been created. Eventually, this process will alter ethnic proportions of some areas. For example, Pededze (Zaiceva) pagasts, historically populated mainly by ethnic Russians, will possibly be integrated into a new, greater administrative unit (Aluksne), where Russians will be a tiny minority.

Article 17

- 1. The Parties undertake not to interfere with the right of persons belonging to national minorities to establish and maintain free and peaceful contacts across frontiers with persons lawfully staying in other States, in particular those with whom they share an ethnic, cultural, linguistic or religious identity, or a common cultural heritage.***
- 2. The Parties undertake not to interfere with the right of persons belonging to national minorities to participate in the activities of non-governmental organisations, both at the national and international levels. Legal***

The legislation in force does not prohibit establishing and maintaining free and peaceful contacts across frontiers.

The Law on Non-Governmental Organizations and their Associations (1992) does not limit the right of persons belonging to national minorities to participate in the activities of non-governmental organisations. However, only citizens of Latvia (not less than 200 citizens) have the right to found political parties (Section 43). Also only those political parties can be registered, where at least half of the members are citizens of Latvia (Section 45 para. 3).

Implementation/factual

In July 2002 the Society Integration Foundation announced the second projects' competition in different fields. There was one relevant program in the field of ethnic integration - the program for support of repatriation, migration and co-operation with compatriots abroad (the total funds for the program was 15,000 Lats (approx. EUR 26,785)).

Article 18

- 1. The Parties shall endeavour to conclude, where necessary, bilateral and multilateral agreements with other States, in particular neighbouring States, in order to ensure the***

protection of persons belonging to the national minorities concerned.

2. Where relevant, the Parties shall take measures to encourage transfrontier co-operation.

Legal

Latvia concluded bilateral treaties on friendship and cooperation with all the neighbouring countries. Yet, only the Agreement between the Republic of Latvia and the Republic of Poland on Friendship and Co-operation comprises a provision directly concerning national minorities. The Agreement stipulates that both sides would support arrangements necessary to protect minority rights, especially the right to learn and to get instruction, as well as to receive and share information in the mother tongue. Besides, it anticipates that the names and surnames of persons of the other state's ethnic origin would be used, keeping the original spelling and orthography. However, the domestic legislation has precedence in implementing these provisions.

Implementation / factual

Latvia neither encourages nor impedes transfrontier co-operation in order to ensure the protection of persons belonging to the national minorities.

PART III

Conclusions and recommendations

Respect to minority rights is declared both in the Constitution of Latvia (Article 114) and in a number of international instruments, ratified by Latvia. However, the legislation of Latvia lacks understanding of protection of national minorities as an integral part of the international protection of human rights, based on the principle of non-discrimination and aimed at achieving full and effective equality between persons belonging to national minorities and those belonging to majority.

Latvia's only piece of minority-specific legislation (the Law on the Unrestricted Development and Right to Cultural Autonomy of Latvia's National and Ethnic Groups) was adopted in 1991 and is declarative and outdated. No new minority law has been adopted since, although a draft law on minority rights is pending at the Ministry of Justice since 2000.

The main barrier to successful implementation of the Convention's principles are certain provisions of the Language Law and the Education Law, in particular the prohibition to use minority languages in state and municipal institutions, as well as the envisaged elimination of the state-supported secondary and vocational education in minority languages scheduled for 2004-2006.

Principles of some articles of the Framework Convention are already being implemented in Latvia quite successfully, such as articles 7 (the right of peaceful assembly and association) and 17 (the right to peaceful contacts across frontiers and non-governmental activities). However, there are more articles of the Convention, which are not being fully implemented in Latvia, even though certain progress can be seen (articles 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 16 and 18). Latvian legislation, related to the implementation of these articles, will have to be streamlined. Latvian legislation, related to the implementation of articles 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 14 and 15 will have to be seriously re-considered and amended to make them comply with the Framework Convention.

In particular, we recommend the following changes to be made to Latvian policies, legislation and its implementation:

1. To ratify the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities without reservations and declarations.
2. To adopt the national Law on the Protection of Minority Rights based on the provisions of the Framework Convention and recognising stateless permanent residents as entitled to minority rights granted to citizens; grant a legal status for minority languages and establish a new state institution responsible for minority affairs.
3. To review legislative provisions of the Republic of Latvia (especially ones of the Education Law and State Language Law) in order to comply with the provisions of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities.
4. To establish the right to communicate orally and in writing in minority languages with the state, municipal and judicial institutions in municipalities inhabited by persons belonging to national minorities in substantial numbers.
5. To allow for general public displays provided by public (state and municipal) bodies and enterprises to be made also in minority languages, ensure that traditional local names, street names and other topographical indications intended for the public to be displayed also in minority languages, and set clear criteria determining minimal sufficient demand for minority language to be used in such indications.
6. To abolish discriminatory provision of Section 59 para.2 of the Education Law and to ensure that private schools with instruction in minority languages can apply for and receive adequate share of public funding granted to private schools in general.
7. To abolish the requirement for state and municipal secondary and vocational schools to switch to teaching in the state language only (Paragraph 9, sub-paragraph 3 of Transitional Provisions of the Education Law).
8. To amend the Education Law so that secondary and vocational education in minority languages is guaranteed, provided there is a demand for such education; determine in the Education Law firm criteria that would mandate the state and municipal authorities to establish and/or maintain schools and/or classes if parents representing a certain minimum number of potential pupils request so. Such criteria and their implementation should not discriminate against requests for schools and classes with minority languages of instruction.
9. To ensure minorities' participation in the process of decision-making and implementation concerning issues of minority education.
10. To develop a system of teachers training specific for minority schools, addressing both the need for subject matter teachers and Latvian language teachers in minority schools.
11. Through hiring and promotion policies, ensure adequate minority representation within the staff of state-funded universities; ensure that school graduation exams and university entry exams allow for minority representatives to use their mother tongue as a medium; envision special programmes, including grant schemes, for minority groups (particularly Roma) with significantly lower average education levels and inadequate representation within the student body.

12. To abolish provisions concerning mandatory ethnicity record from all acts of legislation and to effectively provide an opportunity to be treated or not to be treated as a person belonging to national minority for any citizen and non-citizen of Latvia on the basis of his/her ethnic identity.
13. To recognise individual's right to officially use his or her personal name and surname in the spelling form he or she prefers and envision a streamlined procedure for restoration of desired spelling of individual's personal name and surname.
14. To adopt a national Anti-Discrimination Law, which would prohibit, inter alia, discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin, language and identity and establish a state institution responsible for anti-discrimination activities.
15. In order to comply with anti-discrimination law, and taking into account the principle of proportionality to review acts of legislation, which set forth citizenship and/or state language proficiency requirements in public and private spheres.
16. To establish criminal liability for both intentional and unintentional acts of discrimination, hostility and violence based on the victim's ethnic origin, culture, language or religion.
17. To establish civil liability for any act of discrimination, hostility and violence based on the victim's ethnic origin, culture, language or religion.
18. To introduce a reversed burden of proof in all civil and administrative cases concerning alleged discrimination based on the victim's ethnic origin, culture, language or religion.
19. To grant the state institution responsible for anti-discrimination activities the authority to represent the victim's interests in any case concerning discrimination.
20. To provide adequate state funding to meet the need for Latvian language learning among adult non-native speakers, especially unemployed; ensure Roma professional training; ensure an opportunity for minority unemployed to receive professional training also in minority language.
21. To implement long-term hiring and promotion programs aimed at increasing minorities' representation within the staff of Latvia' ministries, courts and other state institutions.
22. To facilitate further naturalisation of non-citizens, including adequate funding for preparatory training for applicants, easing naturalisation requirements for certain groups (i.e. - elderly, disabled persons), abolishing naturalisation fees for low-income applicants, further developing information campaigns in the media. Grant automatic citizenship upon request to those permanent residents without any citizenship, who were born in Latvia.
23. To grant Latvia's permanent resident non-citizens (subjects of the Law on the Status of Former Citizens of the USSR) voting rights at municipal (local government) elections; abolish all existing restrictions of "non-political" rights of these non-citizens.
24. To cancel language restrictions for broadcasting of private radio and TV channels and to review composition and principles of election of the National Council on Radio and Television in order to promote representation of national minorities in the Council; instead of a limit not to be exceeded for programmes in languages other than Latvian at Latvian Radio and Latvian Television, to consider 20% of time at the second distribution network as a share to be compulsorily allocated to such programmes.

25. To review the Society Integration Programme in order to make the principle of non-discrimination and respect to minority rights cornerstones of the Programme, so that to guarantee the integration of the society on the basis of common values and respect to minority rights, and take appropriate measures in order to promote tolerance in the society, especially in education and within the framework of the Programme.

26. To establish transparent and effective mechanism of allocation of the state financial support for national minorities within the framework of the state institution responsible for minority affairs and increase direct financial support from the state budget for facilitating minorities' activities aimed at promotion of knowledge about and preservation of their culture, religion, language and education among minorities and among the majority, and ensure that minorities have equal opportunities and are adequately participating in such programs.

27. To guarantee the opportunity to celebrate religious holidays for any believer, providing a certain number of days off per year, which are to be paid for by employer.

Additional information	
<u>1</u>	Resolution On The Renewal of the Rights of Citizens of the Republic of Latvia and Fundamental Principles of Naturalisation, adopted on October 15, 1991. The Resolution was based on the strictest reading of the concept of legal continuity whereby only citizens of the pre-WWII independent Latvia and their descendants had their Latvian citizenship rights restored, while all the other permanent residents were denied automatic citizenship. It is difficult to determine the exact number of Latvia's residents denied citizenship at the time of passage of the Resolution. At the beginning of 1994, when the registration of citizens was practically completed, 1,720,300 persons permanently residing in Latvia were registered as citizens. This amounted to 67.04% of total population in 1994 (2,566,200). However, Latvia's population has declined dramatically since 1990, due largely to emigration. According to the National Statistics Committee of the Republic of Latvia, 2,667,900 inhabitants resided in Latvia in 1991. Thus, about 35% of Latvia's residents, or more than 900,000 were denied Latvian citizenship at the time the Resolution was passed, as the 1,720,300 persons registered as citizens by 1994 constituted 64.48% of Latvia's residents in 1991. See Vebers E. (ed.), The Ethnic Situation in Latvia (Facts and Commentary), Riga, 1994.
<u>2</u>	Balodis A. Latvijas un latviesu tautas vesture, "Kabata" gramatu apgads, Riga, 1991.
<u>3</u>	Ibid.
<u>4</u>	Statistical Yearbook of Latvia, 2001. Riga, 2002, p.41.
<u>5</u>	Minority issues in Latvia, No. 9, http://racon.riga.lv/minelres/archive//10171999-15:16:57-19120.html
<u>6</u>	Feldhune G., Mits M. Implementing European anti-discrimination law: Latvia. Riga, 2001. See at http://www.humanrights.lv/frames_e.htm?menu/hri_e.htm
<u>7</u>	For the full list of differences between the rights of citizens and non-citizens, please refer to . For further comments to the list, please refer to .
<u>8</u>	2001 CERD report on Latvia registers "[c]oncern [...] about reports that there are still unjustified differences of treatment between citizens and non-citizens, mostly members of minorities, in the enjoyment of the rights provided for in article 5 (e) of the Convention [concerning discrimination in employment]." CERD/C/304/ADD.79, 2001, para. 14.
<u>9</u>	The Commission noted, "Several other elements limit the integration of non-citizens in the economic sphere. Non-citizens continue to be excluded from some professions (lawyers,

	armed security guards and private detectives) on the grounds of state security.” 2002 Regular Report, p. 34.
10	Baltic Data House, January 2000
11	Report on the public survey "On the Way to a Civic Society - 2000", the Baltic Institute of Social Sciences, Riga, 2001
12	Feldhune G., Mits M. Implementing European anti-discrimination law: Latvia. Riga, 2001. See at http://www.humanrights.lv/frames_e.htm?menu/hri_e.htm
13	Feldhune G., Mits M. Implementing European anti-discrimination law: Latvia. Riga, 2001. See at http://www.humanrights.lv/frames_e.htm?menu/hri_e.htm
14	Ibid.
15	Ibid.
16	Ibid.
17	Ibid.
18	Martisune S. Electronic media and integration of society in Latvia (policy paper funded by the Soros Foundation - Latvia, not published yet)
19	http://www.minelres.lv/un/cases/UNHRC_Ignatane_2001.html
20	http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/Hudoc1doc2/HFJUD/200208/podkolzina%20-%2046726jv.chb4%2009042002f.doc (in French only)
21	Human Rights in Latvia in 2000. Latvian Centre for Human Rights and Ethnic Studies, Riga, 2001. See: http://www.minelres.lv/count/latvia/hrlatvia2000final.htm
22	Minority issues in Latvia, No. 28, http://racoon.riga.lv/minelres/archive//04192001-10:03:24-19071.html
23	Minority issues in Latvia, No.30, http://racoon.riga.lv/minelres/archive//05282001-20:42:14-22328.html
24	The National Programme for Latvian Language Training 1996-2000. Promotion of the Integration of Society: Impact Report by Artis Pabriks.
25	‘What is National Programme for Latvian Language Training Doing?’” NPLLT info Nr.2/98-99
26	Izglitiba un Kultura (Education and Culture), Riga, September 2000.
27	Pabriks A. Occupational Representation and Ethnic Discrimination in Latvia. Riga, 2002, p.36.
28	Ibid
29	Ibid
30	Ibid
31	Explanatory Report of the FCNM, para. 77: “The alternatives referred to in this paragraph - “opportunities for being taught the minority language or for receiving instruction in this language” - are not mutually exclusive. Even though Article 14, paragraph 2, imposes no obligation upon States to do both, its wording does not prevent the States Parties from implementing the teaching of the minority language as well as the instruction in the minority language”
32	Honouring of obligations and commitments by Latvia, Committee on the Honouring of Obligations and Commitments by Member States of the Council of Europe Report, Doc. 8924 (10 January 2001), para. 21.
33	These concerns were repeatedly expressed at the conferences of parents of minority school’s

	pupils, organised annually since 2000.
<u>34</u>	Buhvalov V.A., Pliner J.G. Problems and perspectives of integration into Latvia's society of national minorities schools' pupils. Riga, 2000, pp. 42-45
<u>35</u>	Baltic Institute of Social Sciences, "Analysis of the implementation of bilingual education". Riga, 2002, p.42.
<u>36</u>	Volkovs V. Krievvalodigas jaunatnes dzimtas valodas vieta integrācijas procesa Latvija (The Place of the Native Language of the Russian-speaking Youth in the Integration Process in Latvia), paper presented at the international conference "Ethnopolitics on the Road to Civil Society", October 15-16, 1998, Riga.
<u>37</u>	Concerns expressed at the conferences of parents of minority school's pupils.
<u>38</u>	Schools and classes where Latvian language is used as a medium of instruction.
<u>39</u>	Baltic Institute of Social Sciences, "Analysis of the implementation of bilingual education". Riga, 2002, p.56.
<u>40</u>	Ibid, p.56
<u>41</u>	Baltic Institute of Social Sciences, "Analysis of the implementation of bilingual education". Riga, 2002
<u>42</u>	Ibid, p.46.
<u>43</u>	Ibid, p.43.
<u>44</u>	Newspaper Chas, September 4, 2002. See: http://www.chas-daily.com/win/2002/09/04/g_013.html
<u>45</u>	Pabriks A. Occupational Representation and Ethnic Discrimination in Latvia. Riga, 2002, pp. 40-42.
<u>46</u>	Rose Richard, New Baltic Barometer III: A Survey Study, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow: 1997, p. 1.
<u>47</u>	Aasland Aadne, Ethnicity and Poverty in Latvia. Riga: 2000.
<u>48</u>	Minority issues in Latvia, No.57, http://lists.delfi.lv/pipermail/minelres/2002-October/002356.html
<u>49</u>	Baltic Social Sciences Institute, Latvian Naturalisation Board, Cēla uz pilsonisku sabiedrību, Latvijas iedzīvotāju aptauja 2000. gada novembris ("On the Road to a Civil Society, Opinion poll of Latvia's Inhabitants in November 2000") Riga, 2001, p. 99.
<u>50</u>	Baltic Institute of Social Sciences, "Analysis of the implementation of bilingual education". Riga, 2002, p. 42.
<u>51</u>	R. Rose, New Baltic Barometer III: A Survey Study, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow: 1997. p. 3.
<u>52</u>	A. Pabriks, 2002, p. 25.
<u>53</u>	A. Pabriks, 2002, p. 26.
<u>54</u>	"Latvijas Vestnesis" ("The Latvian Herald"), 29 January 1994
<u>55</u>	Open Society Institute, EU Accession Monitoring Programme, Monitoring the EU Accession Process: Minority Protection 2001, Budapest.
<u>56</u>	A. Pabriks, 2002, p. 26.
<u>57</u>	A. Pabriks, 2002, p. 28.
<u>58</u>	A. Pabriks, 2002, p. 30.
<u>59</u>	A. Pabriks, 2002, pp. 17-24.

