

ETHNICITY

Ethnic Minorities in Political Reality

**2 (11)
2014**

THE CHIEF EDITOR:
Vladislav Volkov, PhD, Senior Researcher (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology,
University of Latvia)

MANAGING EDITOR:
Inese Runce, PhD, Senior Researcher (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology/
Faculty of Humanities University of Latvia)

THE EDITORIAL BOARD:
Ekaterina Anastasova, Ph.D., Associate Professor, (Institute of Ethnology and Folklore
Studies with the Ethnographic Museum at the Bulgarian Acad-
emy of Sciences, Bulgaria)

Petr Bednařík, PhD, Professor (Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University,
Czech Republic)

Svetlana Bogojavlenska, PhD, Researcher (The Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz,
Germany)

Bill Bowring, PhD, Professor (University of London, the Great Britain)

Leokadia Drobizheva, PhD, Professor (Institute of Sociology of Russian Academy of
Sciences, Russia);

Deniss Hanovs, PhD, Associated Professor (Riga Stradins University, Latvia)

István Horváth, PhD, Senior Researcher (Babes-Bolyai University, Romanian In-
stitute for Research on National Minorities, Romania)

Maija Kūle, PhD, Professor (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Univer-
sity of Latvia);

Jacek Kurczewski, PhD, Professor (Warsaw University, Poland);

Vladimir Mukomel, PhD, Professor (Institute of Sociology of Russian Academy of
Sciences, Russia)

Helena Noskova, PhD, CSc., Senior Researcher (Institute of Contemporary His-
tory Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic);

Paolo Ruspini, PhD, Senior Researcher (Universita della Svizzera italiana, Fac-
ulty of Communication Sciences, Switzerland)

David J. Smith, Professor (University of Glasgow, the Great Britain)

Anastassia Zabrodskaja, PhD, Professor of Estonian as a Second Language Institute of
Estonian Language and Culture Tallinn University, Estonia

Anele Vosyliute, PhD, Senior Researcher (Institute for Social Research, Lithu-
ania)

Ethnicity – a peer-reviewed journal was established by the Institute of Philosophy and
Sociology (University of Latvia). The journal publishes original works about ethnicity in
different fields of knowl-edge – sociology, history, social linguistics, social psychology, law,
political science.

Knowledge Base Social Sciences Eastern Europe ([http://www.ceesocialscience.net/ jour-
nals/index.asp?stock=journals&select=Latvia](http://www.ceesocialscience.net/journals/index.asp?stock=journals&select=Latvia))

This issue is supported by the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Latvia

ETHNICITY 2014/11

Ethnic Minorities in Political Reality

CONTENTS

<i>Pascal Bonnard</i>	UNPACT THE EUROPEAN MINORITY PROTECTION TOOLBOX AND ITS EFFECTS IN THE CANDIDATE COUNTRIES: A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE	4
<i>Vladislav Volkov</i>	THE IDENTITY OF ETHNIC MINORITIES IN LATVIA: SOCIO-POLITICAL AND SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSES IN THE PERIOD 1991-2014	20
<i>Ivans Jānis Mihailovs</i>	DEFINITION OF AN ETHNIC MINORITY IN LATVIA'S NORMATIVE ACTS.	51
<i>Signe Grūbe</i>	THE APPREHENSION OF LATVIAN PAINTERS ON THE VALUE OF NATIONAL IDENTITY AND RESOURCES IN CREATING IT.	66
Book review		
<i>Ishgaley Ishmuhametov</i>	ON ETHNIC IDENTITY IN THE CONTEXT OF TOLERANCE	85
A publication ethics and publication malpractice statement		90
The guidelines for authors		91

Pascal Bonnard

**UNPACK THE EUROPEAN MINORITY PROTECTION TOOLBOX AND
ITS EFFECTS IN THE CANDIDATE COUNTRIES: A SOCIOLOGICAL
PERSPECTIVE**

After the collapse of the communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe, European institutions strived to diffuse in the region new norms and practices on minorities that were aimed at preventing conflicts and enhancing social cohesion. These demands and their effects on domestic legislations are well documented. Unlike the majority of this literature, that is characterised by a juridical or a strong institutional perspective, this article pleads for endorsing a sociological perspective. By paying attention to the design of the European minority toolbox and to the modalities of its diffusion, this article points out some of the reasons why these norms became a political issue and altered the symbolic struggles over the definition of majority and minorities and their relationship.

Key words: European Union, European organisations, Central Europe, minorities, minority rights, sociological perspective

After the collapse of the communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe at the beginning of the 1990s, many Western analysts and policy-makers feared that a sharpening of ethnic tensions or, possibly, an outburst of ethnic conflicts would prove inevitable. Later on, when (some of) these countries became candidates for membership in European organisations, their ethnic diversity, allegedly higher than in Western Europe, was seen as a potential source of instability that had to be prevented. A range of institutions and actors such as European organisations but also political foundations, academic networks therefore intervened striving to diffuse new norms and practices on minorities that were aimed at de-escalating or preventing conflicts and enhancing social cohesion.

The demands that the European institutions made in the field of minority policies on the governments of the countries from the former Communist bloc that were applying for membership and the effects of these demands on domestic legislations are well documented. Unlike the majority of this literature that is characterised by a juridical or a strong institutional perspective, this article however pleads for endorsing a sociological perspective when analysing the action of European organisations in the field of minority rights. Norms are not only legal instruments. As demonstrated by Pierre Bourdieu, law entails and conveys power relations (Bourdieu 1987, p. 814–853.). This will be exemplified by the analysis of the circulation of the European approach towards minorities which, indeed, does not engage only juridical logics and does have extra-juridical effects. The goal is therefore not to add a new piece to the abundant literature dedicated to the European minority protection system and to the monitoring of minority situations in the candidate countries, but to account for the reasons and modalities why the diffusion of European minority norms throughout Central and Eastern Europe became a political issue and altered the symbolic struggles over the definition of majority and minorities and their relationship.

This analysis requires to scrutinize firstly, how the European minority monitoring focuses and secondly, what this minority protection toolbox consists in. I will then stress that in order to better understand how the European monitoring process works and may be effective, an analysis of the context of the introduction of these norms is needed. Through a focus on the Latvian case, I will finally point out that the European approach towards minorities has been mobilised in political struggles in candidate countries with the aim of redefining the status and the position of ethnic minorities.

Pascal Bonnard,

PhD, Research associate at the Centre for international studies and research (Paris, France),
Associated member of the Institute for social sciences of politics (Nanterre, France)

The European monitoring of minority protection: A mosaic of institutions and of logics of action

The concerns of European organisations for minority issues did not as much result from a genuine interest in the fate of these populations as from the fear that ethnic and social tensions in the accessing states might undermine their security and stability after the enlargement. The dominant understanding of minorities in Europe is that they intrinsically jeopardize the security and stability of states (Feldman 2005, 676–694). The elaboration and extension of minority rights by European organisations were therefore mainly motivated by the objective to prevent the former communist countries from “importing” their “problems” when becoming members.

The process of constitution of the European toolbox of minority rights highlights it. As an international platform aimed at promoting human rights and democracy on the European continent, the Council of Europe was the first organisation to get involved in rights in the post WW2 Europe. Its action mainly consisted in elaborating new normative texts. The CoE notably issued the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages in 1992 and, in 1995, the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. The organisation also played a role in the post-communist region by sending delegations and by issuing recommendations. Though the respect of minorities was mentioned in the final Act of the Helsinki conference in 1975, the competence of the Organisation for Cooperation and Security in Europe was far less obvious, its initial mandate being to ensure security and prosperity in Europe. Thanks to his frequent visits on the field and to his “quiet diplomacy”, the High-Commissar on the National Minorities however played a key role in the monitoring of minority issues by Western international organisations (Dorodnova 2003; Kemp 2001; Zaagman 1999). Worth to be mentioned are also the Missions that the organisation settled in some of the transition countries (notably in Latvia). The fact that the OSCE became a central actor of the management of minorities in the transition countries, through the prism of “prevention of ethnic conflicts”, testifies that European organisations endorsed a security approach towards minorities.

The interest of the EU for minority issues is recent (De Witte 2002, p. 137–159). The observance of minority rights was made compulsory in the Copenhagen Summit that opened up the possibility of a membership to the former communist countries in 1993. Due to a lack of consensus among the member-states (in some of them the existence of minorities on

their territory is not recognised and international convention on minority protection have not been ratified), the EU Commission did not have a clear competence in the field of minority rights. It therefore had to rely on the normative framework elaborated by the CoE and on the field expertise of the OSCE. The European monitoring of ethnic minorities therefore involved different organisations, the CoE being the producer of norms, the OSCE delivering the field expertise and the EU providing the most effective incentive to impulse changes (through its conditionality policy) (Galbreath 2003, p. 35–53; Grabbe 2003, p. 303–327; Kelley 2004; Sasse 2005; Schimmelfennig, Engert & Knobel 2003, p. 495–518)

The involvement of several organisations led also to an articulation of diverse interests and modalities of action. This refers both to the motivations of European organisation in addressing minority issues and to how they chose to deal with them. The fact that Russian authorities lean towards a politicization of the issue of the Russian-speaking populations in the Baltic states is often pointed out. This has been observed at the occasion of the NATO enlargement: the Kremlin visibly adopted a more assertive tone when the former Baltic countries were about to join the NATO, using this momentum as a political leverage in the negotiation with its Western partners (Braun 2000, p. 135). Similar moves could be observed during the EU enlargement. The timing of the criticisms voiced by Russian officials, the choice to address regional or international organisations (notably the EU, the CoE or the OSCE) rather than the Baltic governments testify the aim to politicize the issue (Dorodnova 2000, p. 8–13). But such political calculations can also be traced in the way European organisations addressed minority issues in the candidate countries. The seemingly pure judicial approach of European organisation to minorities did in fact entail political motivations. According to James Hughes and Gwendolyn Sasse, the somewhat inconsistent attitude of the European Commission, the priority given to certain minority issues over others, the setting of its agenda reveal “that the EU is more concerned with its external relations with its most powerful neighbour and main energy supplier, and own narrow soft security migration problems, than with minority protection as a norm per se” (Hughes 2003, p. 16). This explains for example why the EU delivered sometimes variable and, to so some extent, contradictory assessments of the situation of the Russian-speaking populations in the Baltics: it had both to please Moscow, and therefore to give assurances of its intention to further prevent minorities from possible discriminations, and to reassure the Baltic capitals that were about to join the organisation.

The articulation of political and juridical logics in the minority policies of European organisations is however not limited to the goals assigned to these policies; it also refers at the instruments they mobilised and at their governance. Since the European Commission had (at least initially) no legal instruments at its disposition to tackle *judicially* minority issues and had to resort to the expertise of the OSCE and CoE, it had to focus on their *political* aspects. This task-sharing between European organisations enabled to combine various levers (political and juridical) and to embrace different dimensions of the conflicts over minorities (Neumayer 2007, p. 247–260). More than to account for its efficiency, the observation that the European monitoring of minority protection associated different organisations, legal expertise and (geo)political logics deserves to be mentioned here to explain why the European toolbox of minority rights is not only a legal matter and produced effects that are by far not limited to the legal sphere.

The European minority protection system: A composite toolbox

Involving a range of organisations and articulating different logics, the European monitoring of minority issues also mixed up various sources. Unlike other chapters of the *acquis communautaire*, there was not a straightforward list where the candidate countries could find the rules and norms that had to be respected; there were several legal documents to be found and some of the demands were not written. The candidate countries were notably expected to ratify different normative texts (like the Framework convention on national minorities), to offer political and cultural rights to minorities, to enforce anti-discrimination legislation, to create a position of Ombudsman, etc (Heidbreder 2004, p. 473–483). The European minority toolbox therefore consisted in a collection of norms. These norms besides resorted to various repertoires: protection of diversity, promotion of multiculturalism, fight against discriminations, etc.

EU management of ethnic and cultural diversity historically mainly aimed at promoting the “integration” of “immigrants”. Minority standards of the EU were therefore predominantly elaborated in preparation for the enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe and minority standards remained for a long time only valid for the candidate countries, leading to the criticism of a “double standard” policy (Henrard 2010; Johns 2003, p. 682–695). However, as noticed by Jorg Swiebel, “the process of Eastern enlargement of the EU has raised awareness about the situation of minorities and the issue of diversity in Europe.” (Swiebel 2009, p. 24)

Representatives from new member-states indeed introduced in the EU institutions new concerns and the experience of monitoring minority issues in the candidate countries has been used by Western actors and European officials to prompt a systematisation of the European minority protection regime. As early as 2002, the OSCE’s High Commissioner on National Minorities, Rolf Ekeus, underscored the existence of an imbalance in terms of the standards applied to the countries that applied to the EU and to Member States and the need for an harmonisation (Ekeus 2004; Anon 2004). An institutionalisation of minority policy in the EU therefore occurred recently (Galbreath & McEvoy 2012; Heidbreder 2011, chap. 5; Toggenburg 2004; Topidi 2010, chap. 7).

While elaborating this nascent minority rights regime, European officials retained a specific conception of minorities. While the Copenhagen European Council urged the accession states to achieve the “respect for and protection of minorities”, it is stated in the 2004 Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe and in the 2007 Lisbon Treaty that “the Union is founded on the [...] respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities.” The current minority discourse of the EU therefore targets the individuals, not the groups. This preference for a liberal approach (that advocates *individual* rights to *persons*) over a culturalist approach (that foresees *collective* rights to *groups*) has several roots (Fernández 2013, p. 52–72). It can firstly be explained by the decline of multicultural ideas in Europe. Though primarily developed in Northern America, the multicultural scheme had been accommodated for Europe and had inspired European academics (Kymlicka & Opalski 2001) The multiculturalism of Kymlicka is slightly specific since it consists in an attempt to reconcile liberal approach and culturalism.

Multicultural theories however faced recently a series of scientific and political criticisms and the concept “multicultural” was never extensively used in European legal and judicial spheres (Taras 2013). The dismissal of a collective rights approach has secondly been motivated by the convergence with other norms that were more deeply rooted and more developed in the EU minority toolbox: measures related to anti-discrimination legislation. Though these norms existed previously in the member states, the emergence of this policy at the European level goes back to the adoption of the Racial Equality Directive in 2000 (Geddes & Guiraudon 2005, p. 67–86). Further steps were later on taken: a substantial number of rulings were issued by the Court of Justice of the European Union; various action plans in favour of the integration of minorities and Roma populations were adopted; etc.

As pointed out by Jorg Swiebel, “it has had a both narrowing and broadening effect. On the one hand, the approach has become narrower: it focuses mainly on non-discrimination and participation in economic life. The protection of minority identities has become less important. On the other hand, the EU non-discrimination discourse has a much broader scope than ethnic minorities only; it is beginning to develop into a diversity policy, for old and new members alike.” (Swiebel, 2009, p. 34). The Europeanization of anti-discrimination policies indeed sanctions the preference given to a liberal approach. This emerging European minority protection regime is often encapsulated by the label “diversity policy”. Thanks to its looseness and consensual flavour, the term “diversity” successfully entered the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights and it often pops up in the communication of the European Commission (Guiraudon, 2009, p. 67–85). The design of this policy made it possible to elaborate a theoretical and practical toolbox able to embrace all forms of cultural pluralism (ethnic or sexual minorities, immigrants, etc.) and thereby, also to overcome the dichotomy between so-called old and new member-states.

This analysis of the content of the European minority toolbox had a specific aim: providing with some explanations for the reasons why it could easily be politicized. The inclusion of the norms on ethnic minorities in a broader scheme that merges several repertoires (promotion of multiculturalism, fight against discriminations, protection of diversity, etc.) and embraces many different populations (ethnic minorities but also migrants or other minorities) made it easier to be used as tools in symbolic struggles over ethnic minorities and their status.

Unveiling the modalities and dynamics of the transfer of European minority norms

Due to the usually juridical or institutional approach retained, academic publications scrutinizing the European monitoring of minority protection tend to omit to scrutinize the context in which these norms were introduced and the actors involved. This prism hampers a thorough understanding of how the transfer of European norms took place and why it produced effects.

Aside the figure of the OSCE’s High Commissioner on National Minorities to whom a substantial attention is dedicated in publications on the transfer of norm in candidate countries, the concrete landscape of actors involved, especially from the domestic arenas, usually remains in a

grey area. Highlighting the process of transfer yet requires to identify the actors in domestic arenas who take over the norms and promote them, to explore their motivations, the possible competitions between them, etc. Though the European minority toolbox has a predominantly juridical form, it does not engage only lawyers. Politicians, academics also import and use it in their own fields. MPs refer at European standards to support or undermine a law initiative, NGO or party leaders make use of them to put forward their agenda¹, sociologists or political scientists introduce Western understandings and notions and popularize them in academic discussions (Apine 2012, p. 41–61; Volkov 2008, p. 95–105). The dynamics of circulation of the European minority protection toolbox therefore have to be studied in various fields: legal, political, and academic. Embracing these different fields is all the more required as the circulation of norms usually takes place at the interface of several social spheres. The figure of the “practitioner-scholar”, who combines political action and academic legitimacy, and who is at the crossroads of domestic and international scales, is reputed to be of special importance. Understanding the action of these specific figures goes through an analysis of their professional and social activities, their strategies being “shaped and determined by their positions in their respective national fields.” (Dezalay & Garth 2002, p. 34). Their trajectories determine their willingness and capacity to interpret and to use the norms and discourses that circulate and, consequently, the probability of these to later produce effects². Putting under the scrutiny their motivations helps to understand why actors belonging to various fields may get interested in new norms and concepts, decide to engage in their diffusion, etc³.

Understanding how norms are transferred to a field implies secondly to pay attention to the context, *i.e.* to how this field functions.

1 In Latvia, MPs from the opposition for example invoked European norms to resist the claims of nationally oriented politicians that the proportion of the courses taught in native language in schools should be reduced. Symmetrically, government representatives referred at the decision of the OSCE to close its mission in order to dismiss the accusations made by minority representatives concerning alleged discriminations.

2 See the auto-analysis given by Muiznieks N. (2009) A Political Scientist’s Experience in the Real World of Politics. – *European Political Science* 8(1), March, p. 68–78.

3 This subjective dimension is explored in Schulze J. L. (2010) Estonia caught between East and West: EU conditionality, Russia’s activism and minority integration. – *Nationalities Papers* 38(3). p. 361–392.

This issue has been more researched than the role and motivations of actors but some of its aspects would deserve a more in-depth analysis. The analysts do take into account the political context of the introduction of European norms in the candidate countries: The political course, the timing of elections, the composition of government coalitions are given to explain why international demands are met positively, or negatively, by the government or by political parties. Domestic events and processes however tend to be examined only inasmuch as they may explain why international actions may be effective, which might alter the understanding of the dynamics at stake. This analysis besides tends to be restricted to the electoral context while other variables are to be taken into account. A reflection on ethnic diversity was pursued and instruments for minority management had been developed in Central and Eastern Europe before the Western conception of minorities and the European minority toolbox were introduced in these countries. A proper understanding of the transfer of these new notions and norms and of its effects therefore requires to analyse how they match, overlap, contradict the previous minority regime. The existence of continuities, the legacy of the Soviet nationalities policy clearly stand out (Cordell, Agarín & Osipov 2013; Wolczuk & Yemelianova 2008, p. 177–195). Paying attention to the weight of pre-existing scientific and political ways of thinking and acting also help to understand how various fields are intertwined in the diffusion of the European minority protection toolbox.

Grasping the diverse effects of the circulation of the European minority protection system

As stressed previously, the circulation of the European minority protection system is not solely a juridical process. Embracing also non juridical dynamics make it possible to deliver a more comprehensive assessment of the effects of the European minority protection toolbox in the domestic contexts where it was introduced.

The exclusive focus on the technical transposition of legal norms present in many publications explains why they did not anticipate the return to more exclusive policies in the post-communist countries, once they joined the EU. Surveys indicate that the conversion of elites from the candidate countries to Western demands was to a great extent instrumental (a liberalisation of the minorities policies was agreed only inasmuch as it conditioned the membership to Western organisations) and their socialisation to these new norms was rather weak. Therefore,

when the Commission monitoring ended with the accession to the EU and international pressure faded, tendencies towards a reversal are to be noticed: in Latvia, minority protection became under attack even by prominent politicians, language legislation became more restrictive (the list of professions for which the command of the state language is tested was extended, funding for language trainings for minorities was reduced), and social integration programmes were stopped (the Secretariat of the Special Assignments Minister for Social Integration was notably closed in 2008) (Malloy 2012; Muiznieks 2008; Pridham 2009, p. 77ff.; Schulze 2008).

Paying attention to other dimensions than the sole legal aspects of the circulation of the European minority toolbox, with only legislative changes being investigated, helps to grasp other effects. Apart from contributing to a liberalisation of citizenship and language legislation and practices in the candidate countries, the European conditionality also altered symbolic struggles over minority populations – regarding the definition of their status and of their position in the Latvian nation. Pierre Bourdieu reminds us that “law is the quintessential form of the symbolic power of naming that creates the things named, and creates social groups in particular.” (Bourdieu 1987, p. 838) Norms on minority protection are also instruments in political and symbolic struggles, notably in the struggles for representation aiming “to impose the legitimate definition of the divisions of the social world and, thereby, to *make and unmake groups*.” (Bourdieu 1991, p. 221) The debates on the rights minorities have or that should be given to them are therefore not just about issuing a *juridical* assessment of their situation, but also about making *political* statements on the symbolic status to recognize to them (*i.e.* on their status and position in the nation). As a result of the circulation of the European minority protection system, both the form and the content of these struggles changed.

As to the form, it is to notice that mobilisations increasingly take place at the international level and that legalistic arguments are used more frequently. This internationalisation appears in the use of international and European institutions as arenas for expressing claims on minorities in Latvia, in the amount of petitions submitted to European organisations

or of appeals taken to European courts⁴. The emergence of this new arena of mobilisation also modifies how actors mobilise in the domestic arena. Recommendations and reports of European organisations are extensively discussed in debates and used in the political competition; some actors benefit from this internationalisation to gain additional visibility (the experience of collaborating with European organisations may be a source of legitimacy for politicians or experts; NGO leaders obtain representative functions in committees that are set up by the government to establish a social dialogue with minorities, as requested by European organisations). The introduction of the European minority toolbox besides triggers a juridicization of the claims on minorities, though groups and individuals continue to take actions outside of the formal judicial process with rigour. As it appears from the examples and references cited previously, the international institutions targeted are often juridical institutions; domestic political debates on the situation and status of minorities often revolve around the adoption or interpretation of juridical texts, the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities in Latvia being a good example of this trend.

The content of the struggles for representation of minorities also changed as a result of the circulation of the European minority protection system. This can be highlighted by the analysis of the positions expressed by the deputies of the Latvian Parliament during the debates on the ratification of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (finally achieved in 2005). Deputies from the governing coalition were extremely reluctant to sign the text. Their support could only be gained by reducing the scope of the population entitled to benefit from the rights provided by the Convention. Different possible criteria were proposed –

4 The European Parliament so hosted two exhibitions on Latvia's minorities: one organised in 2006 by the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs that aimed at showing the "development of the traditional minorities of Latvia" and stressed the role of the Soviet occupation in changing the ethnic composition of the country, a second one organised in 2008 by the Latvian MEP Tatjana Ždanoka that insisted on the ancient history of the Russian minority in Latvia and minimized the Soviet period. Between 1999 and 2011, 124 cases against Latvia have been judged by the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg, out of which 34 followed complaints lodged by an applicant designated as "non-citizen", "Russian-speaking", "of Russian origin" (<http://echn.ketse.com/>). On the battles in the UN, the COE and at the ECHR, see also Muižnieks 2011, p. 219–238; Reire 2008, p. 58–86; Rostoks 2011, p. 191–218; Van Elsuwe 2004.

deputies for example argued that only "native" populations deserve to be regarded as "ethnic minorities" (Livs), or only those who are deprived from a fatherland outside of Latvia (Livs and Roma). A consensus was finally reached on the criterion of "ancestry": the text shall refer to "citizens of Latvia who differ from Latvians in terms of culture, religion or language, who have been traditionally living in Latvia for generations." The debates did hence not as much aim at determining the rights to be granted to minorities (no new rights were introduced and in practice it would be impossible to distinguish between the minorities who are covered by the Convention and those who are excluded), as at (in Bourdieu's words) "mak[ing] people see and believe, [getting] them to know and recognize" who is legitimate to live in Latvia and who is not. The populations, who settled on the Latvian soil during the Soviet period, are still labelled as "foreigner" but interestingly, the terms used to address them and the policies devoted to them changed: It is no longer a *management of post-colonial populations* but an issue of *integration of immigrants*. Riga's authorities endorsed the wording of foreign organisations to reshape existing policies run towards minority populations and made them in line with international standards, the global orientation of these policies remaining untouched. Paradoxically enough, the introduction of the European minority protection toolbox helped to legitimize the hierarchy existing between minorities in Latvia.

In this article I aimed at indicating some research directions that could shed additional light on how the European minority protection toolbox has been developed and transferred in the states that applied for membership in the EU, and on its various effects. Questioning the rationales of the organisations and actors who diffused (Western) European conceptions and tools of minority protection to the candidate countries and *in* these countries highlights that this process intertwined political and legal motives, at the level both of European organisations and of domestic actors. In order to be able to properly grasp what comes out of the introduction of the European minority protection system in the candidate countries, one shall pay attention to the local context: prior legal and scientific cultures, competing interests in legal, but also political or academic fields determine to a great extent the willingness of domestic actors to endorse a new regime and the meaning this minority protection regime takes. The various uses made of this toolbox in the domestic fields besides show that minority protection is not a purely legal matter, though it is mainly framed in legal terms. The looseness of the European framework of minority protection leaves room for different and sometimes divergent interpretations; its combination of different discourses (multicultural, anti-discrimination, diversity) allows a

convergence of policies towards ethnic minorities with policies designed for other populations (immigrants, Roma populations, sexual minorities, etc.) and may, hence, create a competition between them. The European minority standards therefore fuelled the symbolic struggles over the definition of majority and minorities and their relationship. This article therefore argues for a sociological perspective in analysing the European minority protection system and its application to the candidate countries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anon (2004) *The Bolzano/Bozen Declaration on the Protection of Minorities in the Enlarged European Union*. Bolzano / Bozen / Bulsan.
- Apine I. (2012) Researchers of social processes in Latvia about political nation and national identity in 1995-2010. *Ethnicity* 6.
- Bourdieu P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. [(1980) *L'identité et la représentation. Éléments pour une réflexion critique sur l'idée de région*. In: *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* (35), November. p. 63-72.]
- Bourdieu P. (1987) The force of law: toward a sociology of the juridical field. *Hastings Law Journal* (38), p. 814-853. [(1986) La force du droit. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* (64), September, p. 3-19.]
- Braun A. (2000) All quiet on the Russian Front? Russia, Its Neighbors, and the Russian Diaspora. In: Mandelbaum M., ed. *The New European Diasporas: National Minorities and Conflict in Eastern Europe*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations.
- Cordell K. Agarin T. & Osipov A. eds. (2013) *Institutional legacies of communism: change and continuities in minority protection*. Milton Park Abingdon Oxon: Routledge.
- De Witte B. (2002) Politics Versus Law in the EU's Approach to Ethnic Minorities. In: Zielonka J., ed. *Europe unbound: enlarging and reshaping the boundaries of the European Union*. New York: Routledge. p. 137-159.
- Dezalay Y. & Garth B.G. (2002) *The Internationalization of Palace Wars: Lawyers, Economists, and the Contest to transform Latin American States*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- Dorodnova J. (2003) *Challenging Ethnic Democracy: Implementation of the*

- Recommendations of the High Commissar on the National Minorities 1993-2001*. Hamburg: Centre for OSCE Research.
- Dorodnova J. (2000) *EU Concerns in Estonia and Latvia: Implications of Enlargement for Russia's Behaviour Towards the Russian-speaking Minorities*. San Domenico di Fiesole: European University Institute.
- Ekeus R. (2002) From the Copenhagen Criteria to the Copenhagen Summit: The Protection of National Minorities in an Enlarging Europe. Copenhagen: Conference "National Minorities in the Enlarged European Union". November 5.
- Van Elsuwege P. (2004) *Russian-speaking minorities in Estonia and Latvia: Problems of integration at the threshold of the European Union*. Flensburg: European Centre for Minority Issues.
- Feldman G. (2005) Culture, state, and security in Europe: The case of citizenship and integration policy in Estonia. *American Ethnologist* 32(4), November.
- Fernández C. (2013) The Challenge of Multiculturalism: Political Philosophy and the Question of Diversity. In: Taras R.C., ed. *Challenging multiculturalism: European models of diversity*. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Edinburgh University Press.
- Galbreath D. J. (2003) The Politics of European Integration and Minority Rights in Estonia and Latvia. *Perspectives on European Politics & Society* 4(1), May.
- Galbreath D. J. & McEvoy J. (2012) *The European Minority Rights Regime: Towards a Theory of Regime Effectiveness*. Aberdeen, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Geddes A. & Guiraudon V. (2005) La construction d'un paradigme européen de lutte contre les discriminations ethniques à partir de modèles nationaux contrastés: une comparaison franco-britannique. In: Arnaud L., ed. *Les minorités ethniques dans l'Union européenne*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Grabbe H. (2003) Europeanization Goes East: Power and Uncertainty in the EU Accession Process. In: Featherstone K. & Radaelli C.M., eds. *The Politics of Europeanization*. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Guiraudon V. (2009) La diversité en Europe: une évidence? *Raisons politiques* 35(3).
- Heidbreder E.G. (2004) Minderheitenschutz in der neuen EU: Beitrittskri-

- terien nach dem Beitritt. In: *Osteuropa* 54, May.
- Heidbreder E.G. (2011) *The Impact of Expansion on European Union Institutions: The Eastern Touch on Brussels*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Henrard K. ed. (2010) *Double standards pertaining to minority protection*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Hughes J. & Sasse G. (2003) Monitoring the Monitors: EU Enlargement Conditionality and Minority Protection in the CEECs. *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* (1).
- Johns M. (2003) "Do As I Say, Not As I Do": The European Union, Eastern Europe, and Minority Rights. *East European Politics and Societies* 17(14).
- Kelley J.G. (2004) *Ethnic Politics in Europe: the Power of Norms and Incentives*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kemp W.A. (2001) *Quiet diplomacy in action: the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities*. Boston: Kluwer Law International.
- Kymlicka W. & Opalski M. eds. (2001) *Can Liberal Pluralism be Exported? Western Political Theory and Ethnic Relations in Eastern Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Malloy T.H. (2012) *The re-politicization of European minority protection: Six cases from the FCNM monitoring process*. In: *ECMI Study* (7), April.
- Muiznieks N. (2009) A Political Scientist's Experience in the Real World of Politics. *European Political Science* 8(1), March.
- Muiznieks N. (2008) Latvia after Conditionality: Political Backsliding? University of Latvia, Riga: ECPR – Fourth Pan-European Conference on EU Politics. September 25.
- Muiznieks N. (2011) Latvian-Russian Memory Battles at the European Court of Human Rights. In: Muiznieks N., ed. *The Geopolitics of History in Latvian-Russian Relations*. s.l.: Academic Press of the University of Latvia.
- Neumayer L. (2007) Les institutions européennes comme acteurs de la réconciliation en Europe centrale: une médiation entre droit et politique. In: Mink G. & Neumayer L., eds. *L'Europe et ses passés douloureux*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Pridham G. (2009) Securing the Only Game in Town: The EU's Political Conditionality and Democratic Consolidation in Post-Soviet Latvia. In: *Europe-Asia Studies* 61(1), January.

- Reire G. (2008) Latvia and Russia in the United Nations: The Human Rights Card. In: Ozoliņa Ž., ed. *Latvia-Russia-X*. Riga: Zinātne.
- Rostoks T. (2011) Debating 20th Century History in Europe: The European Parliament and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe Compared. In: Muiznieks N., ed. *The Geopolitics of History in Latvian-Russian Relations*. s.l.: Academic Press of the University of Latvia.
- Sasse G. (2005) *EU Conditionality and Minority Rights: Translating the Copenhagen Criterion into Policy*. San Domenico di Fiesole: European University Institute.
- Schimmelfennig F. Engert S. & Knobel H. (2003) Costs, Commitment and Compliance: The Impact of EU Democratic Conditionality on Latvia, Slovakia and Turkey. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 41(3).
- Schulze J.L. (2010) Estonia caught between East and West: EU conditionality, Russia's activism and minority integration. *Nationalities Papers* 38(3).
- Schulze J.L. (2008) Integration and Nation-building in Estonia and Latvia: Elite Discourses after EU Accession. Columbia University, New York: 14th Annual Conference of the ASN. April 23.
- Swiebel J. (2009) The European Union's Policies to Safeguard and Promote Diversity. In: Prügl E. & Thiel M., eds. *Diversity in the European Union*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Taras R.C. ed. (2013) *Challenging multiculturalism: European models of diversity*. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Edinburgh University Press.
- Toggenburg G.N. ed. (2004) *Minority Protection and the Enlarged European Union: The Way Forward*. Budapest: Open Society Institute.
- Topidi K. (2010) *EU law, Minorities and Enlargement*. Anvers: Intersentia.
- Volkov V. (2008) Content Evolution of the concept "ethnic minority" in Latvian sociology in the period 1991-2007. *Proceedings of the Institute for European Studies International University Audentes* 4, December.
- Wolczuk K. & Yemelianova G. (2008) When the West Meets the East: Exploring Ethnic Diversity in Eastern Europe. *Nationalities Papers* 36(2), May.
- Zaagman R. (1999) Conflict Prevention in the Baltic States: The OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. In: *ECMI Monograph* (1), April.

Vladislav Volkov

**THE IDENTITY OF ETHNIC MINORITIES IN LATVIA:
SOCIO-POLITICAL AND SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSES
IN THE PERIOD 1991-2014**

The article dwells upon the main peculiarities of the attitude to ethnic minority identities in the socio-political and scientific discourses in modern Latvia. The author demonstrated that this attitude is directly influenced by the concept of Latvia as a European nation state. It leads to the situation when, on the one hand, the individual right of a personality to the preservation of their ethno-cultural identity is recognized at the political and legal level. On the other hand, at the level of political awareness as well as scientific research there is no clear understanding of how individual rights to preservation of ethno-cultural identity can be realized in the society where there is a strong demand for the reproduction of its own collective identity from the side of the ethno-national majority as well as the state's largest ethnic minority - Russians. The author shows that in the sphere of modern sociological research to a greater extent than it happens in political life, there are emerging approaches to liberal multiculturalism which is the only acceptable methodological basis for a democratic version of interrelations between ethnic minority and ethno-national majority identities.

Key words: ethnic minority identities, collective identity, individual rights, ethno-national majority, Russians, liberal multiculturalism

The Concept “Ethnic Minority” in the Legal Domain and Socio-Political Discourse

Latvia traditionally is a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural state. According to the data by the Citizenship and Migration Affairs Department as of the middle of 2013 the country's population of 2.188 million, Latvians comprised 1.304 million (59.6 % of the population), Russians – 590 thousand (27.0%), Belarussians – 75 thousand (3.4%), Ukrainians – 53 thousand (2.4%), Poles – 49 thousand (2.2%), Lithuanians 28 thousand (1.3%), Jews – 6 thousand (0.4%), Roma – 8 thousand (0.4%), Germans – 5 thousand (0.2%). The share of ethnic minorities is especially large in the biggest cities of the state. In the capital city Riga representatives of ethnic minorities comprise more than a half of the population (57%), in the second biggest city Daugavpils – more than 80%, in Liepāja – 47%, in Jelgava – 41%, in Jūrmala – 49% (Etniskais sastāvs... 2014; Iedzīvotāju skaits... 2014; Rīga 2014; Daugavpils 2014; Liepāja 2014; Jelgava 2014; Jūrmala 2014).

Moreover, the structure of this ethnic diversity itself possesses the significant peculiarities related to the fact that the share of the largest ethnic minority – Russians – more than twice exceeds the number of other ethnic minorities in Latvia in total. Russians in Latvia differ from other ethnic minorities in number and in qualitative factors of organizing their own socio-cultural infrastructure which involves a wide spread of the Russian language in the sphere of Latvian business, the system of private education (including higher education), the entertainment sphere, and mass media. Russian is a mother tongue for a vast majority of Latvia's Belarussians, Ukrainians, Poles, and Jews. A part of professional culture in Latvia functions in the Russian language (the oldest outside Russia Mikhail Chekhov Riga Russian Theatre, scientific works are published, etc). Close interpersonal as well as informational connections with Russia, its culture, history, and political and information fields significantly influence the reproduction of the Russian cultural environment. The preservation of social functions of the Russian language in public life in Latvia has become the aim of the Social Democratic party “Harmony”, the party “The Latvian Russian Union”, and the party “For the Native Language!” (Центр Сogласия 2014; Русский союз Латвии 2014; Пять пунктов партии... 2014). These factors objectively form the demand of Latvia's Russians for articulation of their linguistic and ethnic identities in the public sphere in Latvia. The fact that the ethnic identity of Russians possesses a strongly pronounced collective character in the public life in Latvia, and it also strives for its reproduction, largely determines modern legal and political views as well as scientific be-

Vladislav Volkov,

PhD, Senior Researcher

Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, University of Latvia

lief on ethnic minority identities in general in Latvia. The dominant socio-political as well as scientific thought in Latvia when assessing the place of ethnic minority identities in the state relies upon two basic statements which in one or another form were realized in the legislation regulating the forms of demonstration of ethnic minority identities. Firstly, it is the recognition of Latvia as “the nation state of the Latvian nation” and “the Latvian nation” (these concepts are included in the Preamble to the Constitution (Satversme) in 2014). This idea is supported by the majority of conservatively and nationalistically orientated politicians, public persons and intellectuals, as well as by the Latvian liberals. The politicians from “Harmony” the most influential political alliance among the ethnic minorities are striving for finding a compromise with these political and legal definitions. Secondly, it is the recognition of the individual right of people who belong to ethnic minorities to the preservation of their identity. This principle is also included in the Constitution whose Article 114 stipulates the right of ethnic minorities “to maintain and develop their own language and ethnic and cultural originality” as a manifestation of essential human rights (Latvijas Republikas Satversme 2014). Latvian liberals who support the idea of national identity which originates from the values of a nation state, in their presentations, unlike the nationalists, emphasize the necessity for respect for the right of ethnic minorities to preserve and develop their identities.

Taking into consideration a real ethno-linguistic and ethno-political situation, the issue of determining the optimal identifiers of the concept “ethnic minority” has always been extremely important for modern Latvia. Debates on this issue were held from 1991 to the middle of the 2000s. Ethno-cultural differences from the ethno-national majority (Dribins 2004, p. 11), long-term relations with the country of residence (Apine 1995, p. 66), the necessity for political participation of the representatives of these groups alongside the ethno-national majority in the development of the Latvian statehood (Apine, Vēbers 1992, p. 1), the development of the cultural life were named as such identifiers (Apine 1995, p. 66). The motivation of these insights was determined not only by the refusal from the Soviet experience of organizing the ethno-cultural differences and the general orientation to a nation state model; the main methodological and ideological problem was the search for identifiers for Latvia’s Russians and Russian-speakers. A lot of researchers considering the high proportion of Russians in the structure of Latvia’s population as well as their characteristic differences from Latvians in value-cultural preferences were speaking about artificiality of the identification of Russians as “ethnic minority” (Ezera, Zvidriņš 1994, p. 32-34; Laķis 2000, p. 387; Zepa 1992, p. 22, 26; Zepa, Kārklīņa 1995, p.177-179).

At the same time the vast majority of Latvian scientists refused to recognize the Russian population as an independent community (Birkavs 1994, p. 5; Dribins 1995, p. 39; Pabriks 1998, p.104.-105; Vēbers 1997, p.8).

The adoption of the Law on “The Convention for the Protection of National Minorities” (2005) which contains the definition of an ethnic minority has become the milestone in these debates at a political and legal level. Under this law any person in Latvia, a citizen of the state as well as its permanent resident whose ethno-cultural identity differs from Latvians’ identity possesses the right to be recognized as a representative of one or another group of ethnic minorities (Par Vispārējo konvenciju... 2014). “Framework Convention for Protection of National Minorities” itself was already signed by Latvia in 1995, but it was ratified by the Saeima only in 2005. In fact, Latvia was the only one among all states that joined the European Union in 2004 which did not ratify the Convention (Latvijas Republikas 8. Saeimas... 2014). However, even now national-radical politicians and commentators argue against the recognition of Russians as the ethnic minority, supposing that this term legitimizes the consequences of Soviet policy on moving to Latvia a large number of “colonists” (Briedīte 2014). All this implies a serious internal battle in Latvia on the issue of the recognition of legitimacy of ethnic minority identity within the framework of the national identity.

Furthermore, some provisions of the Convention have not been adopted in Latvia. It refers to the 2nd part of Article 10 which says that in areas inhabited by persons belonging to national minorities traditionally or in substantial numbers there is a possibility to use the minority language in relations between those persons and the administrative authorities. The 3rd part of Article 11 which says “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” has not been adopted either (Framework Convention... 2014).

The Latvian law contained the recognition of the ethnic minority right to preserve their ethno-cultural identity as one of the human rights even before the adoption of the Convention for Protection of National Minorities. If we speak about collective identity then the state undertakes to protect its general national and civil form as well as the collective identity of ethno-national majority – Latvians. The collective identity of the Livs as the object of legal protection is recognized in some legislative acts. Although, the Livs are recognized as “the ancient indigenous nationality” but not as the ethnic minority (Par Latvijas nacionālo... 2014). In Latvian legislation there is no place for the regulation on ethnic minority collective rights. The

dominant socio-political discourse is negatively inclined towards this idea.

The approach which considers ethnic minority identities exceptionally as a manifestation of people's individual identity was established in the very beginning of the 1990s when Latvia was still technically within the structure of the USSR. In the Law from March 19, 1991 "On the Unrestricted Development and Right to Cultural Autonomy of Latvia's Nationalities and Ethnic Groups" the right of ethnic groups to the development of "*their education, language and culture*" was recognized as a human's individual right to the preservation of their identity (Par Latvijas nacionālo... 2014). All proposals by the most politically active part of ethnic minorities – Latvia's Russians – to legislate their collective rights in the sphere of education or use of the native language in the state's public environment turned out to be beyond the legal domain.

The legal norm of the realization of ethnic minority linguistic identity can be found in the "Law on Education" (1998). Representatives of ethnic minorities possess the right to obtain education in their native language in private educational establishments as well as in state and municipal educational establishments where study programmes for these minorities are implemented (Izglītības likums 2014). Ethnic minorities' right to preservation of their linguistic identity applies only to the sphere of unofficial life. According to the "State Language Law" (1999), this Law "*does not apply to the use of language in unofficial communications of the inhabitants of Latvia, in internal communications of national and ethnic groups, or in services, ceremonies, rituals and other kinds of religious activity of religious organisations*" (Valsts valodas... 2014).

Latvian legislation uses various terms to characterize ethnic minorities' languages. So, in the State Language Law there are two terms referring to the languages of Latvia's ethnic minorities: "*ethnic minorities' native language*" and "*foreign languages*" (Valsts valodas... 2014). The term "*ethnic minorities' languages*" was used in the Law on Radio and Television which operated in the period 1995-2010 (Radio un televīzijas... 2014). However, in the Law on Electronic Mass Media replaced this law in 2010 alongside the term "*Latvian language*" the term "*foreign languages*" is used (Elektronisko plašsaziņas... 2014).

Emphasizing the Ethnic Identity in the Programmes of Political Parties and Alliances

In 2011 shortly before the elections to the 11th Saeima political parties and alliances presented their vision of interaction between national-civic and linguistic identities of Latvia's people in their programmes. We shall

quote the extracts from pre-election programmes of the parties which received places in the parliament.

The alliance of political parties "Harmony Centre" (the previous name of the Social Democratic Party "Harmony") which is traditionally supported by the vast majority of ethnic minorities' representatives won the greatest voters' support. (the alliance received 31 seats out of 100 in the parliament). Their programme contains the concept "*interests of Latvians and ethnic minorities*". However, the political programme of the alliance does not demand the official status for the Russian language in Latvia or preservation of Russian schools. The programme finds "*the education in traditional Latvia's national minorities' languages within the system of education*" and "*the use of ethnic minorities' languages in areas inhabited by persons belonging to national minorities traditionally or in substantial numbers in relations between those persons and the administrative authorities*" important. The programme of "Zatlers' Reform Party" does not mention Latvia as a nation state but it does not say anything about ethnic minorities either. At the same time this party stands against "*exaggeration of ethnic differences in the Latvian society*" and "*against manifestations of any forms of hatred*". (The Party forms the ruling coalition; 22 seats in the parliament). The right-liberal party "Unity" does not refer to the existence of ethnic minorities in Latvia emphasizing the necessity for "*forming the nation European and democratic state*" and enhancement of the positions of "*the Latvian language as the only state and official language in Latvia*". (The Party forms the ruling coalition; it has 20 seats in the parliament). The programme of the National Alliance "All for Latvia! – For Fatherland and Freedom/LNNK" contains the concept "*Latvian state*" encouraging a gradual conversion of the system of education, starting from kindergartens, to the Latvian language as the only language of instruction. It is possible to teach ethnic minorities' "*history and culture*" in their native language. (The party belongs to the ruling coalition; 14 seats in the parliament). The programme of "The Union of Greens and Farmers" says nothing about Latvia's ethnic minorities but it has no reference to the concept "*nation state*" either. The Party supports "*the Latvian cultural environment*" which is revealed in the necessity for "*enhancement of the role of the Latvian language as a state language and its use in all public spheres*". (13 seats in the parliament). The Party "For Human Rights in a United Latvia" (now – "The Latvian Russian Union"), which did not get into the parliament, in their pre-election programme promoted itself as "*a party of the Russian community in Latvia*" which supports the Russian language as the official language (Программа Социал-демократической... 2014; Latvijas Republikas 11. Saeimas... 2014).

Apparently, the concept “ethnic minority” itself is one of the basic ones in the Latvian legislation regulating the issues on the ethno-policy, but it possesses features of the marker which divides Latvian political parties and public political rhetoric on the purely ethnic principle within the political processes. In the Government Declaration of 2014 the state policy in relation to ethnic minorities is only considered as the “*support for ethnic minorities’ non-governmental organizations*” (Laimdotas Straujumas... 2014).

The most comprehensive views on the position of right parties referring to the place of ethnic minorities’ collective identity within the structure of the national identity can be found in “Guidelines on National Identity, Civil Society and Integration Policy (2012-2018)” ratified by the Cabinet of Ministers in 2011. According to this document, ethnic minorities’ languages and cultures appear in the nation state but “*nearby*” the Latvian cultural values. Moreover, it is stated that “*national minority schools with Russian language as the language of instruction reproduces the segregation, estrangement and inter-group prejudices*” and the document says about “*the self-sufficiency of the Russian language in the public space*”. It also states that “*a large proportion of Russian-speakers do not wish to recognize Latvian culture as the unifying element of the Latvian cultural space and the Nation State of Latvia*” (Nacionālās identitātes, pilsoniskās sabiedrības... 2011, p. 5-6, 13, 15, 1).

The lack of interest of the parties which comprise the ruling coalition towards a serious representation of the Russians’ identity in the political system is also revealed, for example, in the fact that these parties are organized on the basis of the strongest influence of a mono-national principle. This fact can be clearly observed in the national identity of the present members of the Parliament who belong to these parties as well as the candidates in the election list for the Parliament election in October 2014. So, Latvians comprise 83.5%, the ones who do not denote their nationality – 11.3%, Russians – 3.5% among the candidates to Member of the Parliament seats from the Party “Unity”. “Zatlers’ Reform Party” joined this party too. In the National Alliance “All for Latvia! - For Fatherland and Freedom/LNNK”: Latvians – 96.5%, the ones who do not denote their nationality – 2.6%. In the “Union of Greens and Farmers”: Latvians – 84.3%, the ones who do not denote their nationality – 14.8%, Russians – 0.9% (2014. gada 4. oktobra... 2014).

Apparently, about a half of the present electorate of “Latvian” parties openly opposes the presence of articulated ethnic minority collective identity, Russian first of all, in the public space in Latvia. The fact that this part of voters actively supports those political parties which openly proclaim

the enhancement of the “nation state” or “Latvian Latvia” is a proof of this. The protection of the values of a nation state in itself can be placed in a liberal-democratic context. Although, the emphasis on these values without considering the real existence of a significant share of ethnic minorities in the state as well as the Latvian legislation obliging the state to protect the ethnic minorities’ right to preservation and development of their identity, emasculates a liberal-democratic meaning of a modern interpretation of the idea of a nation state. At the same time, in the Latvian environment there are some liberal forces which find it important to involve ethnic minorities in the political participation. Riga Regional Party “Honour to Serve Riga” which constitutes the ruling coalition with “Harmony Centre” in the Riga City Council for the second time since 2009 has been created by these liberal forces (Programma 2014).

The well-known representatives of Latvian liberal intelligentsia criticize severely the deliberate neglecting of the issues on protection of ethnic minority identities in Latvia by the ruling parties. First of all it refers to the fact that the bearers of this identity are not really involved in the sphere of executive authority and political participation (Apine 2003; Brands-Kehre, Pūce 2005, p. 27-28; Muižnieks 2010, p. 282; Rozenvalds 2010, p. 35, 39, 45, 53-54).

Ilga Apine, Professor of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology believes that this is the fault of distinct elements of ethnic democracy within Latvia’s political system (Apine 2006, p. 28). “Ethno-nationalism” has become a basis for Latvia’s ethnic policy in relation to ethnic minorities (Apine 2008, p. 11). A. Janelsiņa-Priedīte, Dr Phil, encourages refusing from a mere copying of the experience in a pre-war Latvia in relation to ethnic minorities, which results in the validation of authoritarian methods in modern Latvian ethnic policy (Janelsiņa-Priedīte 1998, p. 166-168).

Juris Rozenvalds, Professor of the University of Latvia, explains a virtually complete absence of Russians in the bodies of government in Latvia by the fact that the ruling political class sees them exclusively as the object for manipulation: “... *since the beginning of the 1990s in the Latvian political elite the idea that only Latvian politicians know what Russians in Latvia should desire has been dominant. This leads to a belief that Russian-speaking citizens have to accept the set conditions without any reservations*” (Rozenvalds 2010, p. 35, 45).

The provisions of the State Language Law which confine the status of the Russian Language in Latvia as a foreign language have been also criticized. When assessing the Law on Education and numerous amendments to it the attention is drawn to what extent the system of education allows

ethnic minorities to preserve their linguistic and cultural identities (Rozenvalds 2010, p. 41-48). Thereby, the most prominent representatives of the Latvian liberal intelligentsia supported the reproduction of collective identity of Russian minority in which the Russian language plays the most significant role.

Evolution of Russian-Speaking Population's Views on the Issue of Political Recognition of Their Collective Identity

The orientation to the political alliance "Harmony Centre" (now Social Democratic Party "Harmony") which tries to minimize emphasizing Latvia's Russians' collective identity, but to realize the protection of ethnic minority identity on the basis of consistent and without waiver implementation of the Latvian law and international legal acts which protect the right to ethnic identity as one of the universal human rights has been the leading trend of a Russian and Russian-speaking voter for the last decade. So, Latvia's Russians have considerably corrected their political behaviour as compared to the period from the beginning of 1990s to the middle of the 2000s when the task was to achieve from the state the recognition of well-pronounced interests of the Russian community in the sphere of education and functioning of national minority languages.

This evolution affected the development of ideas on ethnic minority identity as a form of people's individual choice as well as the ideas on collective nature of this identity and its interaction with the identity of ethno-national majority. These processes are most vividly reflected in the programmes of political parties and alliances which orientate to the protection of interests of Latvia's Russians and ethnic minorities in general.

From the beginning of the 1990s to the middle of the 2000s the programmes of political parties and alliances which were mainly voted for by representatives of ethnic minorities, and which were represented in the Parliament of Latvia contained either the demand for the allocation of the official status to the Russian language or "*recognition of the official status of minorities' languages and use of these languages in areas inhabited by persons belonging to ethnic and linguistic minorities traditionally or in substantial numbers*". The majority of Russians and Russian-speaking voters supported these demands. As a result, the ratio of "Russian" parties in the Parliament was steadily increasing. In the 5th Saeima (1993-1995) the Party "Equal Rights" possessed 7 seats (out of 100). In the 6th Saeima (1995-1998) the National Harmony Party – 8. In the 7th (1998-2002) the National Harmony Party – 16. In the 8th (2002-2006) the alliance of political parties "For Human Rights in a United Latvia" (ForHRUL) which united the Party

of National Harmony, Equal Rights, Socialist Party and Russian Party – 25 (Программа партии Равноправие 2014; Tautas Saskaņas partijas programma 2014; Tautas saskaņas partijas politiskā... 2014; Par cilvēka tiesībām vienotā Latvijā... 2014).

However, the alliance of various political forces mainly based on Russian-speaking voters was not able to elaborate a consistent political attitude towards mass protests of 2003-2004 against government's plans to transfer ethnic minority schools to the Latvian language of instruction. As a result, in the 9th Saeima (2006-2010) there were two "Russian" political forces with different attitudes to the status of the Russian language in Latvia. "Harmony Centre" which occupied 17 seats in the Parliament refused the demand for the official status of the Russian language and supported the development of "*cultural and linguistic diversity in Latvia*", "*recognition of the Latgalian language*" and "*free choice of the language of instruction in education*". The alliance "For Human Rights in a United Latvia" which supported the necessity for allocation the official status to the Russian language and which saw itself as the "*party of Russian community in Latvia*" possessed only 6 seats in the Parliament (Kandidātu saraksti un programmas... 2014). ForHRUL did not manage to receive any seats in the 10th (2010-2011) and 11th (2011-2014) Saeima. But "Harmony Centre" succeeded: in the 10th Saeima they possessed 29 seats, and in the 11th – 31. The programme of the "Harmony Centre" before the election to the 11th Saeima did not mention the issue on the freedom of choice of the language of instruction at all. At the same time "The Harmony Centre" encouraged "*to impose a moratorium on any legislative initiatives related to sensitive national and historic issues until the end of the 11th Saeima's authority*" (11. Saeimas vēlēšanām reģistrēto partiju... 2014). The Harmony Centre maintained this position not just in their legislative initiatives. Its politicians have even been avoiding any presentations in the Latvian mass media on the ethno-political issues for a long time already, while the leading politicians from the Latvian parties "Unity" and "National alliance" regularly express their attitude towards the ethno-political issues. The party's present pre-election programme does not contain any references to ethnic minority problems. "Harmony" is the only party in the Parliament which rejects a mono-national principle in its structure. In the list of candidates to the 12th Saeima elections Latvians comprise 32.2%, Russians – 24.3%, the ones who do not denote their nationality – 30.40% (2014. gada 4. Oktobra... 2014).

This standpoint of "Harmony Centre" was determined by their desire to enter the Government by means of attracting the preferences of Latvian

voters. However, the government structure has never been formed with Russian parties in the modern history of the Republic of Latvia since 1991 as well as in the period 1918-1940. Furthermore, since 1991 until the present the Latvian Government has never had any Minister of a Russian origin within its structure. And only in 2013 Vjaceslavs Dombrovskis became the first minister of a Russian origin (first, he became a Minister of Education and Science, then later a Minister of Economics) from “Zatlers’ Reform Party” (Vjačeslavs Dombrovskis 2014).

However, Russian-speaking citizens themselves as well as part of the leaders of “Harmony Centre” did not abandon the idea of articulation of their collective identity which was expressed in the enhancement of the Russian language status in Latvia. In 2011 the Riga Mayor and the leader of “Harmony Centre” N. Ushakov appealed to the party members to sign for the referendum in support for the Russian language as a second state language (Ушаков призвал... 2011). But “Harmony Centre” officially did not support the idea of the referendum which was initiated by the party “For the Native Language!”. The idea of making the Russian language the second state language at the referendum in 2012 was supported by more than 273 thousand Latvian citizens, which is about a quarter of the voters (2012. gada referendumus... 2014).

The Understanding of Ethnic Minority Identities in Modern Ethno-Sociology

In social science ethnic minority identity is analysed within the framework of two scientific traditions which despite being very close to one another and their periodic interaction, adhere to different perspectives of scrutiny. Firstly, this tradition of study of ethno-cultural differences in society is one of the accompanying factors for the study of the phenomenon of nation and nationalism. In this sense, identities on non-dominant ethno-cultural groups are viewed on the basis whether they promote the consolidation of national solidarity of the citizens of the same nation state, notwithstanding their social-class, ethno-cultural and religious differences (See: Armstrong 1982, p. 127, 241-282; Berry 1997, p. 6, 13; Breuilly 1982, p. 3, 300-332; Кон 2010, p. 35-36; Кедури 2010, p. 88-108; Смит 2004, p. 25; Хобсбаум 1998, p.25-73).

This tradition appeared in the epoch of the rise in European nations and nationalisms in the 19th century and it still cultivates in public consciousness the idea that ethnic minority identities are a combination of the values of national identity and those elements of ethnic culture which differentiate ethnic minorities from the representatives of ethno-national majority.

However, the emphasis is on the fact that national identity possesses the imperative power in relation to ethno-cultural elements of identity (Calhoun 1993, p. 214-219, 221-222). A prominent researcher on nationalism Ernest Gellener finds ethnic minority identities interesting so far as they are successful on the way to modernization based on “*general, standardized, and typical culture*” (Геллнер 1991, с. 27-76, 89-128, 132-140, 210-253). This tradition stimulates many scientists to investigate ethnic minority identities as the object of the policy of national integration exclusively.

In the perspective of general sociology this tradition relies on various versions of functionalism and structural functionalism (E. Durkheim, T. Parsons). T. Parsons believed that only one normative culture is legitimate in society, but the bearers of other cultural traditions have to be loyal towards a dominant culture. So, identities of non-dominant cultural groups are perceived as subordinate in relation to a dominant normative culture (Парсонс, 2000, с. 335-337, 359, 366, 452; Minority group 2005).

The ideas of structural functionalism were a basis for the first, within the framework of sociology, definition of ethnic minority proposed in the middle of the 1940s by L. Wirth which to one extent or another can be encountered in modern dictionaries on sociology (Scott, Marshall 2005, p. 197). According to Wirth, ethnic minority identity is characterized not only by idiosyncratic “*physical and cultural characteristics*” but it also reflects a discriminated position of this group in society (Wirth 1956, p. 237-238).

Secondly, this is a humanistic tradition of studying social identity of a personality as an integral phenomenon, which developed long before the epoch of the golden age of nations, in the period of the Renaissance and Enlightenment. This tradition proclaims ideas of human equal rights to social choice and also to cultural, including ethno-cultural, ways of making this choice. It means that subordination of values which is imperatively imposed on a personality by society, or on minority by majority is out of the question (Hall 1996, p. 596 – 611). Ethnic minority identities are not limited to universal and national values, as the representatives of liberalism and libertarianism were inclined to think (Barry 2005, p. 205, 208, 213; Rawls 2005, p. 7-12). They are dual, and only because of this a fully-fledged integration of ethnic minorities is possible (Baysu, Phalet, Brown 2011, p. 121-143; Manning, Roy 2007, p. 3-5; Martinovic, Verkuyten 2014; Sam, Berry 2010, p. 472-81). These identities are also integral, culture mediated and include the values without which representatives of ethnic minorities cannot imagine the integrity of their identity and their “*unique lifestyle*” (Уолцер 2000, с. 17, 22, 41-42, 57; Хёффе 2007, с. 140; Kurczewski 2009, p. 634; Taylor 1994, p. 25- 42, 58-59).

Within the framework of modern sociological science, liberal multiculturalism in the understanding identities of ethnic minorities as the content of one of universal human rights inherits ideas on the integrity of identities of ethnic and other social minorities (Kelly 2005, p. 5-13; Смит 2004, с. 362-368). Here, a general national identity is already viewed within the framework of “differentiated citizenship” (Karolewski 2010, p. 23, 34, 81, 88-99; Кимлика 2010, с. 271, 288, 424-462). In particular, it means not only the recognition by the society of an individual right of minorities to chose their identity but also the recognition of legitimacy of collective products of this choice if it is made in accordance with the principles of liberal democracy, and thereby the recognition of the value of a collective identity of these minorities (Tully 2005, p. 417-418; Young 1999, p. 415-421; Хабермас, 2001, С. 332-334).

Modern ideas of a liberal line of multiculturalism about ethnic minority identities in overall agree that if ethnic minorities follow liberal values in their behaviour, recognize the constitutional order within the state, their identity should not be opposed to a national identity. Moreover, in this case ethnic minority identity is one of legitimate and recognized by society forms of manifestation of a national identity. However, scientific and socio-political beliefs acknowledging libertarian as well as nationalistic ideas doubt the value of ethnic minority identities as a form of manifestation and reproduction of a national identity. The issue on the necessity for subordinating ethnic minority identities in relation to a national identity, their localization mainly in private life or some fragments of the public sphere which refer only to the reproduction of ethnographic peculiarities of these ethnic groups of population is reviewed within the frameworks of libertarianism and nationalism. The identity of ethno-national majority is confirmed under the guise of a general national identity.

According to W. Kymlicka, the logic of the research on ethnic minority identities in terms of a historic perspective just involves the enhancement of the interest to cultural pluralism of civil societies and rights of social groups. Kymlicka points out that the criticism of the understanding of an original ethnic minority identity which fully dissolves it in a national identity on the basis of considerations of “national integration”, which does not protect ethnic minorities against marginalization and stigmatization in real life, is becoming more acute in the modern social science. It is important to achieve a dual aim within the framework of modern liberal democracies: on the one hand to recognize the value of nation-building, and the value of ethnic minority rights as one of the human rights on the other (Кимлика 2010, p. 413-460).

International norms for the protection of ethnic minorities and their identity which refer to the sphere of universal human rights support this viewpoint on the ethnic minority identity as one of the possible types of manifestation of a national identity (Declaration on the Rights... 2012). Although, a lot of well-known lawyers highlight that the existing legal culture in some countries cannot fully accept the ideas about the equivalence between the identity of a majority and ethnic minorities (Eide 2001, p. 7-11; Khan, Rahman 2012, p. 1-16; Šmihula 2008, p. 51-52, 60, 71).

Research into Ethnic Minority Identities in Latvian Social Sciences.

Research into ethnic minority identities in an independent Latvia started in the 1990s. For the authors of political and sociological research it is really important to show to what extent national and civil values are revealed in the consciousness of ethnic minority representatives in Latvia. The researchers found in this the factors of political, civic and linguistic integration of ethnic minorities within the Latvian society, and, consequently, the level of inter-ethnic distance, including the interpretation of the 20th century history of Latvia. The character of ethno-cultural diversity of various sectors of social and economic life, public political space, state and municipal government, cultural, educational and information space, political culture in use, was simultaneously demonstrated. The most urgent issue for sociologists and political scientists was the question to what extent the process of naturalization for Latvia's non-citizens was successful, what the value of the Latvian citizenship and the feeling of belonging to Latvia among ethnic minorities was. In general, the ideas that ethnic minority identities should be integrated into the national identity which is based on the Latvian language and culture, occupy the most considerable place among all research into ethnic minorities in Latvia. This approach was dominant in the 1990s, and it is still relevant (See: Rungule 1992, Zepa 1992, Vēbers E., Kārklīņa 1995, Vēbers 1998, Zepa 1998, Djačkova 2000, Pabriks 2000, Indans 2000; Zepa, Šūpule, Peņķe, Kļave, Krišāne 2001, p. 43, 77; Ījabs, Golubeva 2009, p. 1-2; Golubeva, Kažoka, Rastrigina 2011, p. 14; Zepa, Šūpule, Krastiņa, Ķešāne, Grīviņš, Bebriša, Ieviņa 2006, p. 29; Apine, Boldāne, Dribins, Gaugere, Šņitņikovs, Vēbers 2006, p. 6; Brands-Kehre, Pūce 2005, p. 27; Dribins 2006, p. 33).

The demand for this approach is stimulated by Latvians' concerns that the enhancement of the collective identity of Latvia's Russians might threaten the national identity and does not promote inter-ethnic solidarity but an ethno-political conflict. These ideas are especially common in the

research which analyse the part of Latvia's education system functioning in the Russian language of instruction (Curika 2008/2009, p. 2-17; Čekse et al. 2013, p. 15-21). Considerable differences in ethno-symbolic behaviour of Latvians and Russians (high level of ethno-political mobilization at the elections to the state and municipal governments, oppositely directed political and ideological discourses of "Latvian" and "Russian" mass media, vividly expressed opposition of anonymous comments on the Internet, etc) also encourage the researchers to consider the subordination of ethnic minority identities in relation to the identity of the ethno-national majority as a normal phenomenon (Broks 2013, p. 21; Tabuns 2007, p. 93; Zepa, Kļave 2011, p. 22-27).

The influence of a structural functionalist interpretation of identities of social and ethnic minorities is clearly revealed in this research. Especially, when it comes to the substantiation of the necessity for subordination between ethnic and linguistic constituents of minority identities in relation to a national identity and even the opposition between them (Levits 1998, p.79). Some authors in the 1990s admitted the possibility for ethnic minority assimilation (Pabriks 1995, p. 122-133). This interpretation of the ethnic minority identity was also cultivated by the fact that the activism of Russian-speaking population at that time had not yet been revealed visibly in the public space (Apine 1998, p. 252).

However, in the 1990s a number of Latvian researchers relied upon the ideas of multiculturalism while studying connections between ethnic minority and national identities. For example, there were attempts to consider the Latvian society as an alliance of two ethnic communities – Latvians and Russians, which placed in question the libertarian view on limiting non-dominant ethnic group identities to the private sphere exclusively and the necessity for considering interests of every ethnic community (Keniņš, Bārņovs, Baņkovska 1995, p.15).

In the middle of the 1990s, Professor I. Apine believed that it is quite normal for a nation state when the ethnic minority identity is realized in creating their own elite, intelligentsia, a well-developed system of national and cultural societies, educational establishments, mass media, regular functioning of the sphere of culture, etc. The ethnic minority integration into the society is possible in such a capacity (Apine 1995, p. 66-78). Although, this broad understanding of the ethnic minority identity was quite rarely encountered in sociological research.

A diversion from a structural-functional paradigm in the research on ethnic minority identity which considered them as subordinate in relation to the identity of an ethno-national majority was concerned with the neces-

sity to look at these groups as "individual" ethnic communities which independently construct their identity in the context of the restored statehood. The most comprehensive approach was presented in the historic-sociological works by the researchers who themselves belonged to ethnic minorities (See: Абызов 1990/1991; Гаврилин 1999; Инфантьев 2007; Ковальчук 1998; Никонов 2008; Пазухина 2005; Подмазов 2010; Фейгмане 2000).

In the last decade ideas of liberal multiculturalism are becoming more popular among certain Latvian scientists. The understanding of the ethnic minority identity is characterized by the absence of any dominant paradigm. Furthermore, the variety of theoretical approaches is seen as an absolute value. The main ideas which underlie the sociological analysis of ethnic minority identity are the following:

1. The substantiation of the significance of a multicultural approach to the understanding of ethnic minority identities happens within the context of the interest to a post-modernist research discourse which supposes to scrutinize identities as "changing, fragmented, and processual", while modernism is connected to the nationalistic ideas on a nation tied by "*one language and common culture*". At the same time ethnic minority identity is considered as a socio-cultural form of a person's individual subjectivity, and society as open to cultural diversity, including the public sphere (e.g. in the system of education) (Austers et al. 2007, p. 2 – 19; Kļave et al. 2012, p. 10 – 21; Šņitņikovs 2013, p. 67 – 70).

2. Important methodological conclusions about the necessity for re-considering the understanding of the integration of ethnic minorities into the frame of national identity inspired by Durkheim and Parsons, whose ideas became a methodological basis for substantiation of assimilation of ethno-cultural differences, are drawn (Muižnieks 2010, p. 15-20, 25, 29). Some Latvian sociologists admit the schematics of dominated stereotypes, partially even in the scientific environment, that a national identity fully coincides with the identity of the ethno-national majority exclusively. The inner inconsistency of the concept "nation state" which presupposes a virtually unrealistic congruence of ethnic and territorial-political principles but which at the same time is a basis for the majority of widely-spread ideas of Latvian national identity, is recognized (Zepa, Šūpule, Krastiņa, Kešāne, Grīviņš, Bebrīša, Ieviņa 2006, p. 4-10).

3. The criticism of the ideas on national identity as a culturally homogeneous formation which are rooted in the concepts of the representatives of the German "historic school" of the 19th century, as well as the criticism of the reduction of a human individual identity, and its diverse socio-economic practices to an ethno-group identity exclusively (Крук 2012, p.

33 – 44; Rozenvalds 2013, p. 56 – 58; Šūlmane, Kruks 2006, p. 4 – 86). Similar ideas penetrate into some research into a collective linguistic identity of ethnic groups in Latgale, a historic-cultural region in Eastern Latvia. I. Šuplinska and S. Lazdiņa reckon that the adequate study of ethnic diversity of Latgale and Latvia on the whole is only possible if to consider people's civic and national identities as involving ethnic groups identities: “*The peculiarity of Latvia and Latgale is that ... the national identity is formed by two constituent parts – the Latvian identity with the state and the existence of ethnic minorities*” (Šuplinska, Lazdiņa 2009, p. 57, 116, 387–401). It is also important that the idea of a normative subordination between languages and linguistic identities in Latgale was not used as a basis for the research methodology.

4. The criticism of the influential ethno-political discourse in Latvia which is orientated to power technologies, diminution of the value of individual rights as compared to collective rights of a nation, “*excluding political culture*” in relation to ethnic minorities and the discourse of hatred spread towards them. The criticism of opposition of ethnic minority identities and national identity as the only normative (“*correct*”) identity (Hanovs 2012, p. 7 – 20; Golubeva et al. 2007, p. 3 – 47; Rodins 2005, p. 41– 55). The researchers point out a widespread anxiety of ethnic minorities over their rights, the problematization of their identity in Latvian society (Pētījums par cilvēktiesībām Latvijā 2006, p. 7-11). The necessity for the principles of equality in political participation of the representatives of ethno-national majority and ethnic minorities is given attention (Brands-Kehre 2010, p. 95-102).

5. Emphasizing a positive role of ethnic minorities as fully-fledged subjects in the formation of modern civic society in Latvia (Makarovs et al. 2005, p. 6 – 20; Rungule et al. 2006, p. 25 – 44; Šūpule 2007, p. 34 – 41; Zepa et al. 2011, p. 12, 28). The general civil value of ethnic minority identities in the political space in Latvia is observed by those researchers who find it significant to approve of liberal principles in Latvia's political life and who are critical towards politicians' nationalistic rhetoric (Golubeva, Kažoka et al. 2010, p. 60). This researches concern mainly the study into the possibility for manifestation of ethnic minorities' independent political discourse and the level of tolerance towards it from right-wing parties and mass media close to them (Golubeva, Rožukalne et al. 2008, p. 2, 10, 59). Liberal multicultural ideas in perception of ethnic minority identities are revealed in the research where the value of a relative autonomy of Latvia's information and cultural environment which functions in the Russian language is recognized as well as a significant role of ethnic minorities in stimulating the

dynamism of modern political environment (Zepa, Šūpule et al. 2005, p. 16–19; Šūpule 2007, p.10). The concept “large linguistic community” which like Latvian linguistic community forms its own ethno-political discourse is more often used to refer to the Russian ethnic minority (Muižnieks, Tabuns 2007, p.19). It is also said that Latvia's Russians during the years of independence managed to create a far-reaching system of mass media, infrastructures of culture and education which the whole society has to consider (Šūlmane, 2010, p. 227). But politicians and civic society should proceed from a simple fact that the identity of Latvia's Russians and Russians in general is realized in the understanding of their specific collective interests which are institutionalized in significant fragments of Latvian civic society functioning in the Russian language (Ījabs, Golubeva 2009, p.1-2).

The Evaluation of the Research into Ethnic Minority Identities by Latvian Scientists.

From August 2013 – January 2014 the author of the article interviewed Latvian scientists who professionally deal with the research into inter-ethnic relations. The aim of the study was to find out how the respondents evaluate the research into ethnic minorities carried out in Latvia, its main achievements and existing problems. At the same time the task was to understand what theoretical approaches to ethnic minority research the respondents prefer. The author selected 20 respondents, well known in Latvia as specialists, 10 of whom are researchers-Latvians, 10 – ethnic minority representatives. 18 respondents are Doctors of Science, 10 of whom are Professors and Associated Professors. The respondents' specialization reflected the diversity of social and humanitarian sciences which investigate the issues of national and ethnic identities (2 sociologists, 3 political scientists, 2 philosophers, 5 historians, 4 specialists in social communication, 2 psychologists, 1 culture specialist and 1 linguist). (the symbols used: the first symbol: L – respondents-Latvians, EM – respondents-representatives of ethnic minorities; the second symbol: S – sociologist, P – political scientist, PH – philosopher, H – historian, SC – specialist in social communication, C – culture specialist, L – linguist)

If we briefly summarize the respondents' statements, we can say that the structural-functionalist model of the understanding of the ethnic minority identity is losing its popularity. It is replaced by social-constructivist, multicultural versions, as well as methodological approaches of a critical theory of neo-Marxism and personalism. For the Latvian researchers especially for the ones who belong to ethnic minorities themselves, the distancing from

the structural- functionalist version of the ethnic minority identity is also accompanied by the criticism of its ideologized version which is revealed in the nationalistic discourse. These respondents intend to understand the ethnic minority identity to a greater extent not just as a structural element within the frame of national identity, but as a form of realization of a social identity of a person belonging to one of the state's ethnic minorities.

The relevance of the structural-functionalist paradigm for the research into ethnic minorities. The necessity for the application of this approach was revealed in the answers provided mainly by the Latvian respondents, and the representatives of ethnic minorities who were dealing with the research and organizational work within the framework of the policy of integration of Latvia's society for a long time. They find it extremely important to emphasize the necessity for subordination of a minority identity in relation to a national identity and Latvian culture (L, PH; L, H; L, SC). On the other hand, the critics of Latvian ethno-policy insist on the fact that the collective identity of ethnic minorities should be permanently articulated and protected.

One of the respondents thinks that the behaviour of Latvia's Russians differs from the behaviour of other ethnic minorities: *"The minority does not feel like conceptualizing itself in the public space as a minority. It wants to be an equal partner. This creates a number of problems, as this model is only possible in a federal state, and it also causes serious concerns on the part of the majority"* (EM, SC).

In its turn, the respondent who is critical towards Latvian ethno-policy specially articulates the term *"Russian linguistic community in Latvia"*:

"The ruling political elite do not recognize the status of national minority of the Russian community. Latvian official science believes that in Latvia there is no Russian community at all" (EM, H).

The criticism of the ideas on ethnic minorities as subordinated groups. This criticism, as a rule, was expressed in the statements by the respondents belonging to ethnic minorities as well as in the interviews of those Latvian researchers who find it important to build a dialogue between the Latvians and ethnic minorities. As the alternative to the structural-functionalist approach which legitimizes a subordinate status of ethnic minorities the respondents chose various versions of social constructivism (EM, C; EM, PH), action theory (EM, SC; EM, P), personalism (EM, SC; L, L), critical theory (EM, SC; L, S), liberal version of multiculturalism (EM, SC; L, H; L, P; L, H) and neo-Marxism (L, P).

A number of the scientists interviewed admitted that when speaking about Latvia's Russians the term "ethnic minority", which refers to the idea of ethnic stratification and subordination, is not used. Therefore, these researchers use the more neutral terms such as "an ethno-linguistic group" (L,S) or "a small nation" (L, H). For some respondents the problem of categorization into "national majority" and "ethnic minority" itself does not seem to be difficult since it can be easily interpreted statistically. The main difficulty is the understanding of a minority as a bearer of ethnicity. Thus, the structuralists' approach to ethnic minority identity as incomplete and subordinate to a civic identity and the identity of ethno-national majority is devaluated (L, PH).

However, the most rejection of categorization of ethnic space into "majority" and "minority" is observed among the Russian respondents, who also consider this categorization as a political constituent. One of the respondents, a professional researcher into the history and intellectual culture of Latvia's Russians highlighted the excessive politicization of the concepts which describe relations between ethnic minorities and the state of Latvia:

"I just did not want to use in the auditorium the aggressiveness (political) of the terms ethnic minority, nation, political nation ... , which I often heard from the colleagues at my university" (EM, PH).

However, the issue on categorization of ethnic minorities in Latvia is closely related to the interpretations of the state's political history by the respondents. Some respondents are especially critical of such categorization of ethnic minorities in Latvia which is expressed in their separation into "traditional" and "non-traditional":

"When everything has been mixed up in the society. Everybody who moved to Latvia after 1945 – are not traditional yet? They buried their parents here. Their third generation has lived here. They are not traditional, are they? This is a creation of artificial barriers" (L, P).

These statements are close to the opinions of those respondents who reckon that a subordinate approach to ethnic minority identities provokes the attitude towards them as "alien" identities:

"The political culture in Latvia at the moment (does not matter which side) is not able to accept „the Other” in its political landscape... We do not understand him... I do not expect it from the scientific space either because we do not possess resources in order to create an independent scientific space with its critical voice" (EM, SC).

Several respondents, specialists in social communication, believe that this is connected with a widespread understanding of identities of ethno-national majority and ethnic minorities within the symbolic-cultural

sphere exclusively, ignoring the social-economic sphere (EM, SC; EM, SC; EM, SC):

“the agenda for minority research itself in Latvia is different from the situation in other countries in Europe because here political and symbolic-cultural problems of interaction “nation - minorities” are mainly analysed but not social-economic ones. There is an explanation to it: the active use of a concept of a nation state motivates the researchers to address the potential of a possible conflict” (EM, SC)

However, the viewpoints spread among the Latvian respondents explains that the priority interest in ethnic identity research towards their cultural-symbolic manifestations is not just the result of a voluntaristic imposing by researchers of their worldview. In fact, the ethno-social reality in Latvia is that cultural and symbolic features of ethnic identities appear to the utmost in public life as compared to social-economic differences between Latvians and Russians in Latvia (L, S).

(Re)construction of Latvia's Russians' identity. The majority of the respondents think that the identity of Latvia's Russians do not fit into accustomed “ethnic minority” schemes: *“Russians in Latvia are a relatively large, self-sufficient group of people. The self-sufficiency is revealed quantitatively, there is technical as well as humanities intelligentsia, newspapers, magazines, mass media, universities, schools. It is a drama and farce when the Russian language remains in the status of a foreign language. It requires at least the status of a national minority language”* (L, P)

This issue is also a form of self-reflection to Russian researchers:

“As a person born in Latvia and having an inherited but not acquired citizenship, it shocks the ear when I am numbered with ethnic minority. I consider myself (but others do not) a Russian Latvian who knows the language, culture and traditions of this state. To squeeze into one phrase “ethnic minority” Russians, Jews – national groups diverse in their structure and historic origins in this state – is a task from evil” (EM, PH).

The Conclusion

Sociological tradition, also in modern Latvia, less often considers ethnic minority identities in the paradigm of structural functionalism, which inevitably results in their evaluation as subordinate in relation to the identity of ethno-national majority. The intellectual resource of structural functionalism in the analysis of ethnic minority identities is most requested in the period of historic transformations of a national identity, when there is an urgent problem of integration of ethno-cultural differences within the

space with a dominant national culture. In the sphere of politics this scientific paradigm is tightly interrelated with a nationalistic discourse as well as with those varieties of libertarianism which deliberately ignore a social-cultural content of the rights of people who belong to ethnic minorities. However, since the second half of the 20th century when the tasks of nation-building were fulfilled in general, the protection of rights and identity of people whose identity is different from the identity of ethno-national majority seems to be very important. Under these conditions, the sociological thought elaborates the approaches which would allow to present the identities of non-dominant social groups, ethnic minorities, if they are based on the common national values as equal to the identity of the ethno-national majority. In this case, the ethnic minority identity has a chance to become one of the forms of social self-identification of a person but not to remain a marker of belonging to a group inside the ethno-social stratification.

The ideas of liberal multiculturalism on the necessity for the recognition not only of the person's individual right to the choice of their ethno-cultural identity but also the collective products of realization of this right by ethnic minorities in the context of civic society are becoming popular in the Latvian research into ethnic minority identities. But it should be taken into account that in the modern Latvian social science only now there appear scientific debates on the acceptability of multicultural models for the socio-political structure of the Latvian nation state. However, the influence of these ideas on the society is limited by the dominance of nationalistic practices in the political process which strive to constrict the frames of the presence of collective identities of ethnic minorities in the public space in Latvia. As experience shows, Latvian society is more open to the ideas of liberal multiculturalism when it realizes the seriousness of the interest of ethnic minorities themselves to cultivating their collective identity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apine I. (2006) Etnopolitikas analīze. In: Dribins L., Šņitņikovs A., ed. Pretestība sabiedrības integrācijai: cēloņi un pārvarēšanas iespējas (etnicitātes, valsts un pilsoniskās sabiedrības mijiedarbības analīze). Rīga: Latvijas Universitātes Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts, LU aģentūra.

Apine I. (2008) Latvijas etnopolitiskā attīstība neatkarības gados. In: Dribins L., ed. Sabiedrības integrācijas tendences un pretendences: Latvijas un Igaunas pieredze. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais Apgāds.

- Apine I. (1998) Latvijas minoritāšu apziņa ceļa uz politisko nāciju. In: Vēbers E. (ed.) *Pilsoniska apziņa*. Rīga: LU FSI.
- Apine I. (1995) Latvijas minoritātes integrācijas procesa kontekstā. In: Vēbers E., Kārklīņa R., eds. *Nacionālā politika Baltijas valstīs*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Apine I. (2003) Politkorektums. <http://politika.lv/article/politkorektums> (04.02.2003)
- Apine I., Vēbers E. (1992) Demokrātija un etnopolitika. *Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis*. Nr.10
- Armstrong J.A. (1982) *Nations before Nationalism*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- Austers I., Golubeva M., Strode I. (2007) *Skolotāju tolerances barometrs*. Rīga: PROVIDUS.
- Barry B. (2005) Second Thoughts – and Some First Thoughts Revived. In: Kelly P., ed. *Multiculturalism Reconsidered. Culture and Equality and its Critics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Baysu G., K., Brown R. (2011) Dual Identity as a Two-Edged Sword Identity Threat and Minority School Performance. *Social Psychology Quarterly*. Nr. 74 (2).
- Berry J. W. (1997) Immigration, Acculturation, and Adaptation. *Applied Psychology. An International Review*. Nr. 46 (1).
- Birkavs V. (1995) The Government and Society: the Problem of Legitimacy in the Context of Transition. In: Semanis E., ed. *Ceļā uz demokrātiju: Latvija un pasaules pieredze*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.
- Brands-Kehre I. (2010) Pilsonība, līdzdalība un pārstāvniecība. In: Muižnieks N., ed. *Cik integrēta ir Latvijas sabiedrība? Sasniegumu, neieviešamību un izaicinājumu audits*. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds.
- Briedīte V. (2014) Okupācijas sekas – Latvijas lielā sāpe. <http://www.nacionalaapvieniba.lv/aktualitate/latvijas-liela-sape/> (05.04.2014)
- Brands-Kehre I., Pūce I. (2005) Politiskā nācija un pilsonība. In: Rozenvalds J., ed. *Cik demokrātiska ir Latvija*. Demokrātijas audits. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds.
- Breuilly J. (1982) *Nationalism and the State*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Broks J. (2013) Nacionālā identitāte: vispārējie modeļi un Latvijas gadījums. *Akadēmiskā dzīve*. 49. rakstu krājums. Rīga: LU.
- Calhoun C. (1993) Nationalism and Ethnicity. *Annual Review of Sociology*. Vol. 19.
- Curika L. (2008/2009) *Dalīta izglītība – dalīti pilsoņi?* Rīga: PROVIDUS.
- Čekse I., Geske A., Grīnfelds A., Kangro A. (2013) Skolēnu valstiskā un Eiropas piederības apziņa, dzīvojot multikulturālā sabiedrībā: Igaunijas un Latvijas salīdzinošais piemērs. *LU raksti. Izglītības vadība*. Nr. 792.
- Daugavpils. (2014) <http://lv.wikipedia.org/wiki/Daugavpils> (23.09.2014)
- Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities. (2012) United Nations General Assembly. <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/47/a47r135.htm> (15.12.2012).
2014. gada 4. oktobra 12. Saeimas vēlēšanu deputātu kandidātu saraksti. (2014) <http://sv2014.cvk.lv/saraksti/aaceb3ec20.html> (26.09.2014)
2012. gada referendums par grozījumiem Satversmē. (2014) (6.09.2014)
- Djačkova S. (2000) *Valodas loma reģiona attīstībā*. Rīga: LU Socioloģijas katedrā.
- Dribins L. (2004) *Etniskās un nacionālās minoritātes Eiropā*. Rīga: Eiropas Padomes informācijas birojs.
- Dribins L. (2006) Latvijas vēstures faktors sabiedrības integrācijas procesā. In: Dribins L., Šņitņikovs A., eds. *Pretestība sabiedrības integrācijai: cēloņi un pārvarēšanas iespējas (etnicitātes, valsts un pilsoniskās sabiedrības mijiedarbībasanalīze)*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitātes Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts, LU aģentūra.
- Dribins L. (1995) Nacionālās valsts un minoritātes kā Eiropas un arī Latvijas problēma. *Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis*. Nr.5/6.
- Eide A. (2001) Mazākumtiesību vesture un vieta starptautiskajās tiesībās. In: Ziemele I., ed. *Mazākumgrupu (minoritāšu) integrācijas aspekti Latvijā*. Rīga: LU Juridiskās fakultātes Cilvēktiesību institūts.
- Elektronisko plašsaziņas līdzekļu likums. (2014) <http://www.likumi.lv> (6.09.2014)

Etniskais sastāvs un mazākumtautību kultūras identitātes veicināšana. (2014) <http://www.mfa.gov.lv/lv> (6.09.2014)

Ezera L., Zvidriņš P. (1994) Etniskās asimilācijas izpēte Latvijā. *Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis*. Nr.11/12.

Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. (2014) <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/html/157.htm> (6.09.2014)

Golubeva M., Kažoka I., Pentikäinen M., Malloy T.H., Plasseraud Y., Daskalovski Z., Rajevska F., Curika L., Kirss L., Gould R., Vetik R. (2010) *Inclusion Unaffordable? The Uncertain Fate of Integration Policies in Europe*. Rīga: PROVIDUS.

Golubeva M., Rožukalne A., Kažoka I., Curika L., Ārnesta I., Herca M., Buševa T., Jermaks M., Mardaņa Ļ. (2008) *Izaicinājums pilsoniskajai līdzdalībai. 2008.gada gala ziņojums*. Rīga: PROVIDUS.

Hall S. (1996) The Question of Cultural Identity. In: Hall S., Held D., Hubert D., Thompson K., eds. *Modernity. Introduction to Modern Societies*. Blackwell Publishers.

Hanovs D. (2012) Kā pētīt “nepareizas” atmiņas Latvijā? *Letonica. Humanitāro zinātņu žurnāls*. Nr. 2 (23) Rīga: LU Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts.

Iedzīvotāju skaits un galvenie demogrāfiskie rādītāji. (2014) <http://www.csb.gov.lv/statistikas-temas/metodologija/iedzivotaju-skaits-un-galvenie-demografiskie-raditaji-36803.html> (23.09.2014)

Indāns I., Kalniņš V. (2000) *Sabiedrības integrācijas institucionālās politikas analīze*. Rīga: Latvijas Ārpolitikas institūts.

Izglītības likums. (2014) <http://www.likumi.lv> (6.09.2014)

Ījabs I., Golubeva M. (2009) *Konsolidējot pilsoniskās sabiedrības dienaskārtību*. Rīga: PROVIDUS.

Janelsiņa-Priedīte A. (1998) Latviešu valodas apguves valsts programmas nozīme sabiedrības integrācijā. In: Vēbers E., ed. *Pilsoniskā apziņa*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitātes Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts, Etnisko pētījumu centrs.

Jelgava. (2014) <http://lv.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jelgava> (23.09.2014)

Jūrmala. (2014) <http://lv.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jurmala> (23.09.2014)

Kandidātu saraksti un programmas audio versija. (2014) <http://cvk.lv/pub/public/28712.html> (6.09.2014)

Karolewski I. P. (2010) *Citizenship and Collective Identity in Europe*. London, New York: Routledge.

Kelly P. (2005) Introduction: Between Culture and Equality. In: Kelly P., ed. *Multiculturalism Reconsidered. Culture and Equality and its Critics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Khan B. U., Rahman M. M. (2012) *Protection of Minorities: Regimes, Norms and Issues in South Asia*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Kļave E., Zepa B. (2012) Modernisma un postmodernisma nacionālisma diskursi nacionālās identitātes skaidrojumā. In: Bela B., Zepa B., eds. *Identitātes. Kopienas. Diskursi*. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgads.

Kurczewski J. (2009) Poles in Latgale: marking their identity in multicultural everyday life. *Ethnicity*. Nr. 2.

Ķeniņš G.J. (Kings), Bārnovs Dž., Baņkovska S. (1995) *Krievvalodīgo vadošo darbinieku individuālās vērtības Latvijā*. *Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis*. Nr.1/2

Laimdotas Straujumas topošās valdības deklarācijas pilns teksts. (2014) <http://www.delfi.lv/news/national/politics/laimdotas-straujumas-toposas-valdibas-deklaracijas-pilns-teksts.d?id=44060321> (6.09.2014)

Laķis P. (2000) Nacionālās kultūras identitāte un multikultūras sabiedrība. In: Vēbers E., ed. *Integrācija un etnopolitika*. Rīga: LU Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts.

Latvijas Republikas Satversme. (2014) <http://likumi.lv> (6.09.2014)

Latvijas Republikas 8.Saeimas pavasara sesijas astotā sēde 2005.gada 26.maijā. (2014) http://www.saeima.lv/steno/2002_8/st_050526/st2605.htm#s2 (6.09.2014)

Latvijas Republikas 11.Saeimas vēlēšanas. <http://www.cvk.lv/cgi-bin/wdb-cgiw/base/komisijas2010.cvkan11.sak> (6.09.2014)

Levits E. (1998) Valstnācija un kultūrnācija – franču un vācu nācijas vēsturiskie modeļi. In: Vēbers E., ed. *Pilsoniskā apziņa*. Rīga: LU Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts, Etnisko pētījumu centrs.

Liepāja. (2014) <http://lv.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liepaja> (23.09.2014)

Makarovs V., Strode I. (2005) *Uzskati par starpetniskajām attiecībām Latvijā. 2005. gada augusts. Latvijas iedzīvotāju aptaujas rezultātu apkopojums*. Rīga: SKDS.

Manning A., Roy S. (2007) Culture clash or culture club? National identity in Britain. *CEP Discussion Paper*. Nr. 790. April.

Martinovic B., Verkuyten M. (2014) The political downside of dual identity: Group identifications and religious political mobilization of Muslim minorities. *The British Psychological Society*. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24571398>

Minority group. (2005) *A Dictionary of Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Muižnieks N. (2010) Secinājumi. In: Muižnieks N., ed. *Cik integrēta ir Latvijas sabiedrība? Sasniegumu, neveiksmju un izaicinājumu audits*. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds.

Muižnieks N., Tabuns A. (eds.) (2007) *Nacionālo minoritāšu konvencija – diskriminācijas novēršana un identitātes saglabāšana Latvijā*. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds.

Nacionālās identitātes, pilsoniskās sabiedrības un integrācijas politikas pamatnostādnes (2012– 2018). (2011) Rīga: Latvijas Republikas Kultūras ministrija.

Pabriks A. (1998) Komunitārisma un individuālisma vērtību ietekme uz politiskās nācijas veidošanos Latvijā. In: Vēbers E., ed. *Pilsoniskā apziņa*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitātes Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts, Etnisko pētījumu centrs.

Pabriks A. (1995) Latvijas pilsonība: etnopolitikas mērķis vai līdzeklis. In: Vēbers E., Kārklīņa R., eds. *Nacionālā politika Baltijas valstīs*. Rīga: Zinātne.

Pabriks A., Vēbers E., Āboltiņš R. (2000) *Atsvešinātības pārvarēšana: sabiedrības integrācija*. Rīga: Sorosa fonds – Latvija.

Par cilvēka tiesībām vienotā Latvijā priekšvēlēšanu programma. (2014) <http://cvk.lv/pub/public/27454.html> (6.09.2014)

Par Latvijas nacionālo un etnisko grupu brīvu attīstību un tiesībām uz kultūras autonomiju. (2014) <http://likumi.lv> (6.09.2014)

Par Vispārējo konvenciju par nacionālo minoritāšu aizsardzību. (2014)

<http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=109252> (24.09.2014)

Pētījums par cilvēktiesībām Latvijā. (2006) Grafiku atskaite. 2006. gada septembris. Rīga: Sociālo zinātņu institūts

Programma. (2014) [http://www.godskalpotrigai.lv/programma/\(6.09.2014\)](http://www.godskalpotrigai.lv/programma/(6.09.2014))

Radio un televīzijas likums. (2014) <http://www.likumi.lv> (6.09.2014)

Rīga. (2014) <http://lv.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rīga> (23.09.2014)

Rodins M. (2005) National Identity and Democratic Integration in Latvia in the Middle of the 90s. *LU raksti*. 686. sēj. Politikas zinātne.

Rozenvalds J. (2013) Ilgtspējīga nācija un sabiedrības integrācija. In: Bela B., ed. *Latvija. Pārskats par tautas attīstību 2012/2013. Ilgtspējīga nācija*. Rīga: LU SPPI.

Rozenvalds J. (2010) Padomju mantojums un integrācijas politikas attīstība kopš neatkarības atjaunošanas. In: Muižnieks N., ed. *Cik integrēta ir Latvijas sabiedrība? Sasniegumu, neveiksmju un izaicinājumu audits*. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds.

Rungule R. (1992) Olaines dažādu tautību iedzīvotāju attieksme pret dzīvesveidi savā pilsētā. *Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis*. Nr.10.

Rungule R., Koroļeva I., Šņikere S. (2006) Jauniešu iekļaušanās analīze identitātes un līdzdalības diskursu kontekstā. In: Dribins L., ed. *Sabiedrības integrācijas tendences Latvijā: īpatnības un kopīgās iezīmes salīdzinājumā ar citām Eiropas Savienības valstīm*. Etnisko attiecību aspekts. Rīga: LU FSI.

Sam D. L., Berry J.W. (2010) Acculturation: When Individuals and Groups of Different Cultural Backgrounds Meet. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. Nr. 5(4).

Scott J., Marshall G., eds. (2005) *A Dictionary of Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Šmihula D. (2005) National Minorities in the Law of the EC/EU. *Romanian Journal of European Affairs*. Vol. 8. Nr. 3.

Šņitņikovs A. (2013) Nacionālās identitātes subjektu veidošanās īpatnības Latvijā 21. gadsimtā. *Akadēmiskā dzīve*. 49. rakstu krāj. Rīga: LU.

Šulmane I. (2010) Mediji un integrācija. In: Muižnieks N., ed. *Cik integrēta*

ir Latvijas sabiedrība? Sasniegumu, neveiksmju un izaicinājumu audits. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds.

Šūlmane I., Kruks S. (2006) Neiecietības izpausmes un iecietības veicināšana Latvijā. Laikrakstu publikāciju. URL: C:\Users\User\Desktop\neiec_laikr.pdf (15.12.2006).

Šuplinska I., Lazdiņa S., eds. (2009) *Languages in the Eastern Latvia: the data and results of the research. Via Latgalica: humanitāro zinātņu žurnāla pielikums. 1.* Rēzekne: Rēzeknes Augstskola.

Šūpule I. (2007) Etniskās attiecības un akulturācijas procesi Latvijā: iedzīvotāju attieksmes pret dažādām akulturācijas stratēģijām. *LU raksti. Socioloģija.* 714. sēj.

Tabuns A. (2007) Nacionālā identitāte un integrācija (1995-2003). In: Tabuns A., ed. *Drošība un tiesiskums Latvijā.* Rīga: LU FSI.

Tautas saskaņas partijas politiskā platforma 7. Saeimas vēlēšanām. (2014) <http://cvk.lv/pub/public/27719.html> (6.09.2014)

Tautas Saskaņas partijas programma. (2014) <http://cvk.lv/pub/public/27752.html>. (6.09.2014)

Taylor C. (1994) *The Politics of Recognition.* In: Gutmann A., ed. *Multiculturalism. Examining the Politics of Recognition.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Tully J. (2005) *Strange Multiplicity.* In: Festenstein M., Kenny M., eds. *Political ideologies. A Reader and Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Young I. M. (1999) *Ruling Norms and the Politics of Difference: A Comment on Seyla Benhabib.* *The Yale Journal of Criticism.* Nr. 12.2.

Valsts valodas likums. (2014) www.likumi.lv (6.09.2014)

Vēbers E. (1997) *Latvijas valsts un etniskās minoritātes.* Rīga: LZA Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts.

Vēbers E. (ed.) (1998) *Pilsoniskā apziņa.* Rīga: Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts, Etnisko pētījumu centrs.

Vēbers E., Kārklīņa R., eds. (1995) *Nacionālā politika Baltijas valstīs.* Rīga: Zinātne.

11. Saeimas vēlēšanām reģistrēto partiju un partiju apvienību kandidātu sarakstu un programmu audioieraksti. (2014) <http://cvk.lv/pub/public/30158.html> (6.09.2014)

Vjačeslavs Dombrovskis. (2014) http://lv.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vja%C4%8Dslavs_Dombrovskis. (6.09.2014)

Wirth L. (1956) *The problem of minority groups.* In: *Community life and social policy: Selected papers by Louis Wirth.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zepa B. (1992) *Sabiedriskā doma pārējas periodā Latvijā: latviešu un cittautiešu uzskatu dinamika (1989-1992).* *Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis.* Nr.10.

Zepa B., Kārklīņa R. (1995) *Latvija un Eiropa: konkurējošas un saskanīgas identitātes.* In: Vēbers E., Kārklīņa R., eds. *Nacionālā politika Baltijas valstīs.* Rīga: Zinātne.

Zepa B., Kļave E. (eds.) (2011) *Pārskats par tautas attīstību, 2010/2011: Nacionālā identitātes, mobilitāte un ricībaspēja.* Rīga: LU SPPI.

Zepa B., Ozoliņa I., Čaplinska L. (1998) *Ceļā uz pilsonisku sabiedrību.* Rīga: Baltijas Datu nams.

Zepa B., Šūpule I., Krastiņa L., Ķešāne I., Grīviņš M., Bebrīša I., Ieviņa I. (2006) *Integrācijas prakse un perspektīvas.* Rīga: Baltijas sociālo zinātņu institūts.

Абызов Ю. (1990/1991) *Русское печатное слово в Латвии. 1917-1944 гг.* Stanford.

Гаврилин А. (1999) *Очерки истории Рижской епархии (19 век).* Рига: Филокалия.

Геллнер Э. (1991) *Нации и национализм.* Москва: Прогресс.

Инфантьев Б. (2007) *Балто-славянские культурные связи. Лексика, мифология, фольклор.* Рига: Веди.

Кедури Э. (2010) *Национализм.* СанктПетербург: Алетея.

Кимлика У. (2010) *Современная политическая философия. Введение.* Москва: Издательский дом ГУ– ВШЕ.

Ковальчук С. (1998) *«Взыскую истину».* Рига: Институт философии и социологии Латвийского университета.

Кон Х. (2010) *Идея национализма.* In: Герасимов И., Могильнер М., Семёнов А., eds. *Мифы и заблуждения в изучении империи и национализма.* Москва: Новое издательство.

Крук С. (2012) Критика концепции интеграции латвийского общества. *Балтийский акцент*. №1.

Никонов В. (2008) *Староверие Латгалии*. Резекне: Издание Резекненской кладбищенской и старообрядческой общины.

Пазухина Н. (2005) Культурные традиции латвийских староверов в 20-30 гг. XX века. In: *Староверие Латвии*. Рига.

Подмазов А. (2010) *Рижские староверы*. Рига: Институт философии и социологии Латвийского университета.

Программа партии Равноправие. (2014) [http://www.pctvl.lv/index.php?lang=ru &mode=party&submode=program&page_id=544](http://www.pctvl.lv/index.php?lang=ru&mode=party&submode=program&page_id=544) (6.09.2014)

Программа Социал-демократической партии «Согласие». (2014) <http://saskanascents.lv/ru/programma/programma-social-demokraticheskoj-partii-soglasie/?view=2> (6.09.2014)

Парсонс Т. (2000) *О структуре социального действия*. Москва: Академический проект.

Пять пунктов партии «За родной язык!» (2014) <http://zarya.lv> (6.09.2014)

Русский союз Латвии. (2014) [http://www.pctvl.lv/index.php?lang=ru&mode=party &submode=program](http://www.pctvl.lv/index.php?lang=ru&mode=party&submode=program) (6.09.2014)

Смит Э. (2004) *Национализм и модернизм*. Москва: Праксис.

Уолцер М. (2000) *О терпимости*. Москва: Идея-Пресс.

Ушаков призвал всех членов ЦС подписаться за русский язык. (2011) <http://www.mixnews.lv/ru/society/news> (19.11.2011)

Фейгмане Т. (2000) *Русские в довоенной Латвии*. Рига: Балтийский русский институт.

Хабермас Ю. (2001) *Вовлечение другого. Очерки политической теории*. Санкт-Петербург: Наука.

Хёффе О. (2007) *Справедливость*. Москва: Праксис.

Хобсбаум Э. (1998) *Нации и национализм после 1780 года*. Санкт-Петербург: Алетейя.

Центр Согласия. (2014) <http://www.saskanascents.lv/ru/> (6.09.2014)

Ivans Jānis Mihailovs

DEFINITION OF AN ETHNIC MINORITY IN LATVIA'S NORMATIVE ACTS

One of the most urgent issues of the legal policy and legislation after the restoration of the independence of the state is related to the understanding and definition, status, rights and duties of the term ethnic minority, as well as its recognition in Latvia's normative acts. Nevertheless, it should be noted that up to now the agreement on the definition of ethnic minorities has not been achieved in the normative acts, so the aim of this article is to observe the diversity of definitions of ethnic minorities in Latvia's normative acts showing that there are differences in understanding the term "ethnic minorities" at the legislative level which consequently influence the practice of the implementation of law.

Key words: definitions of ethnic minority, ethnic minority protection normative acts, educational programme

The society in Latvia has already not been mono-ethnic for many centuries as the representatives of ethnic minorities have been quite actively participating in Latvia's political, economic and cultural life. Therefore, the research into ethnic minorities, including the understanding of this concept, has been actively carried out by a number of social sciences. For example, some research on the interpretation of the concept ethnic minority (national minority) in Latvia in sociology

Ivans Jānis Mihailovs,

Dr. iur, Docent

Rīga Stradins University (Latvia)

(Volkovs 2008; Volkovs; 2011), in political science (Boguševiča 2009) and in legal studies (Treļš 2014; Comments on the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia. Part VIII. Fundamental Human Rights 2011⁵) have been published recently.

Ēriks Treļš in his PhD thesis defended in September 2014, which, in terms of time, is the latest really significant and comprehensive research in the sphere of national minorities in the field of legal studies in Latvia, points out: "As the analysis of various literary resources shows, in Latvia for describing the research subject – a national minority – a rather varied number of terms are used. The terms "national minorities", "foreigners", and "ethnic minorities" have been used. The Saeima (The Parliament) used the term "national minorities" when it ratified the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities of the Council of Europe (On the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, 2005), therefore this term has been used in the framework of the PhD thesis, notwithstanding the fact that from the viewpoint of the formal discourse the term "ethnic minority" should be used (Cilvēktiesību Žurnāls, 1998, Nr.7/8)." (Treļš 2014). It should be noted that in the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia the term "ethnic minorities" is used. Taking into account the above mentioned, the author of the article will use the term "ethnic minorities" within the framework of the article.

It is possible to conclude that one of the most urgent issues of the legal policy and legislation after the restoration of the independence of the state is related to the understanding and definition, status, rights and duties of the term ethnic minority, as well as its recognition in Latvia's normative acts. Nevertheless, it should be noted that up to now the agreement on the definition of ethnic minorities has not been achieved in the normative acts, so the aim of this article is to observe the diversity of definitions of ethnic minorities in Latvia's normative acts showing that there are differences in understanding the term "ethnic minorities" at the legislative level which consequently influence the practice of the implementation of law.

The most significant active legislative acts (mainly the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia and the current versions of the laws) which influence ethnic minorities have been analysed within the framework of the article. The normative acts have been examined in their chronological order, i.e. observing the time of their adoption.

⁵ The comments on ethnic minorities are done by Professor Ineta Ziemele.

One of the first and at the same time the oldest laws acting in Latvia which defines the guarantees for various ethnic minorities (national and ethnic groups) residing in the Republic of Latvia is the Law "On the Unrestricted Development and Right to Cultural Autonomy of Latvia's Nationalities and Ethnic Groups" of March 19, 1991, which states that "within the Republic of Latvia live the Latvian nation, the ancient indigenous nationality, the Livs, as well as other nationalities and ethnic groups", respectively ensuring the right to cultural autonomy and self-determination of their culture to all national and ethnic groups, as well as defining the right to establish their own national societies, associations and organizations, to observe their own national traditions, to use their national symbols, to establish national educational institutions, to freely maintain contacts with their fellow countrymen in their historic homeland and in other countries, to develop their own professional and amateur artistic expressions, to use government mass media resources, etc. (Law "On the Unrestricted Development and Right to Cultural Autonomy of Latvia's Nationalities and Ethnic Groups").

Notwithstanding the fact that this law contains a number of norms of a declarative character, and it does not define the institution of cultural autonomy, as well as it does not explain what the term "national and ethnic groups" imply, Articles 5 and 10 seems to be very important as they oblige the Latvian state to finance national societies and promote ethnic minorities: Article 5 says: "All permanent residents of the Republic of Latvia are guaranteed the right to establish their own national societies, associations and organizations. The government's responsibility is to promote their activity and material provisions"; Article 10 says: "The government's institutions of the republic of Latvia should promote the creation of material conditions for the development of the education, language and culture of the nationalities and ethnic groups residing within Latvia's territory, foreseeing defined sums from the government's budget for such purposes." (The Law "On the Unrestricted Development and Right to Cultural Autonomy of Latvia's Nationalities and Ethnic Groups").

A declarative character of this law, which in fact makes its direct implementation impossible, a lack of the implementation mechanism, not clearly defined connection with other laws on ethnic minority protection, as well as the opinions (which are still relevant) about the necessity to replace it by a new, more detailed normative act expressed among the specialists (Apine, Dribins, Jansons, Vēbers, Volkovs, Zankovska 2001, 27. – 28.lpp.), were probably the reasons for not mentioning this law as

a significant instrument for protection of ethnic minority rights today when providing comments to Article 114 on the ethnic minority rights of the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia.

At the same time in the comments on the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia it is stated that the content of cultural autonomy in Latvia is not clear: "At the moment the associations of ethnic minorities act in accordance with the laws which regulate non-governmental organizations. Nevertheless, this model is not adequate for realization of ethnic minority special rights even if we recognize that the state provides financial support to ethnic minority NGOs. The real lack of cultural autonomy in Latvia does not promote the enhancement of ethnic minority identities which historically found themselves in a rather difficult situation (...), meanwhile the lack of this mechanism is not any trouble for the Russian ethnic minority which is completely self-sufficient. (...). The creation of a cultural model corresponding to the Latvian reality, keeping in mind that Latvia has already had some experience of how ethnic minority cultural autonomy acts, would be one of the basic forms of preservation and enhancement of ethnic minority identities" (Comments on the Republic of Latvia Constitution. Part VIII. Fundamental Human Rights 2011, pp. 715).

It should be emphasized that in the Constitutional Law of December 10, 1991 "On Rights and Responsibilities of a Person and a Citizen" (which was replaced by a new and separate Part VIII on "Fundamental Human Rights" of the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia on November 6, 1998) there was no separate article which would guarantee the rights of ethnic minorities. However, in Article 12 of this Law the equality of all people before the law was stated and any discrimination on the grounds of nationality and origin was considered illegal (the Constitutional Law "On Rights and Responsibilities of a Person and a Citizen").

The Repatriation Law adopted on September 21, 1995 should be mentioned as the next significant normative act. Its preamble says: "Now when independent Latvia has been restored, the Republic of Latvia supports the reunion of the Latvian people and invites Latvians and Livs who have a sense of belonging to Latvia to return to their ethnic homeland" (Repatriation Law), consequently, for example, ignoring these ethnic minorities and their descendants who used to hold Latvian citizenship before 1940. The author of the article finds this wording obsolete and liable to criticism, especially if compared to the action plan for repatriation confirmed on July 30, 2013 whose aim is "to deter-

mine the supportive measures for the citizens of Latvia and members of their families residing abroad who are considering the possibility or have already decided to return and work in Latvia or are willing to start their own business or to develop business ties with Latvia" (Re-emigration Action Plan 2013-2016), as well as observing the freedom of entry of ethnicity (nationality) in some countries, including the Republic of Latvia. Moreover, in the Citizenship Law adopted on June 22, 1994, it is initially defined that "a Latvian citizen is a person who was a Latvian citizen on 17 June 1940, as well as a descendant of such person", as well as it is defined that Latvian citizens have equal rights and obligations irrespective of the manner in which citizenship has been acquired" and broad opportunities for naturalisation are stipulated (Citizenship Law).

At the same time it should be noted that in accordance with the Civil Status Documents Law adopted on November 29, 2012, in Chapter 5, Section 32 it is stated that "the ethnicity of the child, in accordance with an agreement between the parents, need not be entered" (Civil Status Documents Law). The ethnicity of the person need not be entered in the passport either (Cabinet Regulation No 134 of February 21, 2012 „Regulations on Personal Identification Documents"). Moreover, in accordance with Section 3 of the Law on the Change of a Given Name, Surname and Nationality Record adopted on April 8, 2009 „a person who is a citizen or non-citizen of Latvia or who has been granted the status of a stateless person in the Republic of Latvia, is entitled to change the nationality record once to the direct ascending line thereof within the limits of two generations, if he or she has reached the age of 15 years and can prove kinship with the persons referred to.

A person whose nationality record has been changed prior to reaching legal age is also entitled to change the nationality record after reaching legal age" (the Law on the Change of a Given Name, Surname and Nationality Record).

These conditions are essential and they make identification of a person's precise nationality significantly difficult (i.e. a legal belonging to Latvians or ethnic minorities) (for more detail see also Roma).

Section 38 of the Education Law adopted on October 29, 1998, which was amended several times, at present stipulates that educational programmes for ethnic minorities are a specific type of educational programmes. In its turn Section 41 of the present Law stipulates that "educational programmes for ethnic minorities shall be developed by educational institutions in accordance with the guidelines for the State

pre-school education or State educational standards on the basis of general educational programme models approved by the Ministry of Education and Science. Educational programmes for ethnic minorities shall include content necessary for acquisition of the relevant ethnic culture and for integration of ethnic minorities in Latvia” (Education Law).

The term „ethnic minority” has not been explained within the framework of this law. Nevertheless in accordance with Section 9 of the Education Law in the Republic of Latvia education shall be acquired in the official language or in another language, as well as the state guidelines principles for pre-school education and educational standards stipulate only educational programmes in the official language or educational programmes for ethnic minorities. But in practice of education there is a situation when educational programmes which are implemented, for example, in the English or French languages (apparently, these languages are not ethnic minority languages in the Republic of Latvia) are licensed as educational programmes (basic or secondary) for ethnic minorities. Therefore, at least in the sphere of education, the term “educational programme for ethnic minorities” means any educational programmes whose language of implementation is not only the official (Latvian) language.

Nevertheless, in accordance with the Cabinet Regulation No 1510 „Regulation Regarding Procedures for State Examinations” of December 17, 2013 in Section 20 it is stated that at present „A Grade 9 educatee, who obtains an ethnic minority educational programme, is entitled to choose the language for the State examination material – Latvian or Russian (except State examinations in language studies subjects) (Cabinet Regulation No 1510 „Regulation Regarding Procedures for State Examinations” of December 17, 2013), in other words, the possibility to take examinations in other ethnic minority languages is not stipulated (in fact, this fact puts the Russian language and persons who obtain education in this language in a privileged position in relation to other ethnic minorities from Ukrainian, Polish, Lithuanian, Estonian as well as English and French educational institutions) (see also the research “Bilingual Education” 2014)

In Section 1 of the Official Language Law adopted on December 9, 1999 it is stated that the Latvian language is the official language in the Republic of Latvia at the same time ensuring “the integration of members of ethnic minorities into the society of Latvia, while observing their rights to use their native language or other languages” (Official Language

Law). A similar wording is also used in Section 2 of the Electronic Mass Media Law adopted on July 7, 2010 envisaging the right to use languages of minorities and other languages in the electronic mass media (Electronic Mass Media Law). The content of the term “ethnic minorities” has not been revealed in the framework of these laws either.

On October 15, 1998 Chapter VIII “Fundamental Human Rights” of the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia was adopted. Article 114 states: “Persons who belong to minority nationalities have the right to maintain and develop their own language and ethnic and cultural originality” (Constitution of the Republic of Latvia).

As it is fairly noted in the comments to the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia „ the role of Article 114 ... is to provide the identity of ethnic minorities or what differs ethnic minorities from the majority population of the state, if an ethnic minority claims for it” ensuring ethnic minorities the collective rights for preservation of the basic elements of their originality (Comments to the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia. Part VIII. Fundamental Human Rights. 2011, pp.703, 714). In other words, guarantees for the ethnic minority rights make sense only if national-cultural identity of ethnic minorities differs from national-cultural identity of the state, which is Latvian (Comments to the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia. Introduction. Part I. General Provisions. 2014, pp.111, 224; Levits 2014, p.21).

In its turn the fundamental human rights for individual equality regardless existing difference including nationality or origin are stated in Article 91 of the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia: “All persons within Latvia are equal before the law and the courts. Human rights shall be implemented without any discrimination” (Constitution of the Republic of Latvia).

It can be seen, that the definition of ethnic minorities or criteria for its identification were not included in the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia. Therefore, the Law on “Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities” adopted on May 25, 2005 which ratified the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities of February 1, 1995 is more significant for the understanding of ethnic minorities. Article 2 of this law states: “Since the term ‘national minorities’ is not defined in the Convention, the Parliament (Saeima) came to an agreement that under the Convention this term refers to those citizens of Latvia who differ from Latvians in terms of culture, religion or language, who have been traditionally living in Latvia for generations, who consider themselves as belonging to the state of Latvia and the Latvian

community, and who would like to preserve and develop their culture, religion and language. Persons who are not citizens of Latvia or another country but have been residing in Latvia permanently and legally, and do not belong to a national minority based on the definition of the term by the Framework Convention, but who identify themselves with a national minority corresponding to the said definition, are entitled to the rights determined by the Framework Convention unless the law stipulates otherwise” (Law on “Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities”).⁶ As the bill of the law testifies the terms “national minority” and “ethnic minority” are understood as synonyms (Annotation on the bill on “Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities”).

Therefore, as it is stated in the text of the law those citizens of Latvia who differ from Latvians, who consider themselves as belonging to Latvia, who have been traditionally living in this territory for generations (according to Professor Ineta Ziemele, the longevity criteria in practice approaches the reference point of two generations) (Comments on the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia. Part VIII. Fundamental Human Rights 2011, p.712)) and would like to preserve their originality. At the same time, other persons who are not citizens of Latvia or another country and do not belong to a national minority are entitled to the rights of national minorities. “Any person permanently residing in Latvia can express a wish to belong to the existing national minority. The formation of new national minorities will depend on whether the group will consolidate on the territory of Latvia and its members will obtain Latvian citizenship” (Comments on the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia. Part VIII. Fundamental Human Rights 2011, p.715).

Despite the fact that the author of the article positively evaluates this definition, in some respects it ignores at least two groups of Latvia’s people and their rights (consequently creating the grounds for debates):

- 1) For example, citizens of Latvia who differ from Latvians in terms of culture, religion and language and who have not been traditionally living in Latvia for generations (for example, newly-nat-

⁶ A similar wording is also accepted in Estonia: “Those citizens of Estonia who have been residing in its territory, maintain long-term, tight connections with Estonia, differ from Estonians in terms of ethnicity, culture, religion or language, who are motivated by a common necessity to preserve their culture, religion and language which form the basis for their common identity are considered as ethnic minority” (Āraja, 2005).

uralized citizens) and who consider themselves as belonging to Latvia and Latvian community, and who would like to preserve and develop their culture, religion or language;

- 2) Persons who are citizens of another state (i.e. they are not yet citizens or non-citizens of Latvia) but they have been living permanently and legally in the Republic of Latvia for several years (here we should agree with Professor I. Ziemele’s opinion that “a certain longevity and a certain legal connection to Latvia are necessary, otherwise it is impossible to obtain a non-citizen or permanent resident status in order to start to assess whether a person belongs to an ethnic minority or not”. At the same time, „in order for immigrants have a possibility to use ethnic minority rights, in the state there should be the ethnic minority which these separate immigrants could join, if this certain group accepts them, though” (Comments on the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia. Part VIII. Fundamental Human Rights 2011, pp.709, 712).

Ē. Treļš in his turn defines national minorities as a group of the state’s residents (i.e. both citizens and non-citizens) „which permanently resides in the state and differs from the rest of the population in terms of ethnicity, religion, and language which they would like to preserve and develop. As a rule, this group is not large in terms of number and does not occupy a dominant position” (Treļš, 2014), therefore, excluding the aspects of citizenship and long-term (for generations) residence from the definition of national minorities. That is why his definition can be considered as the most broad one at the moment (at least from the viewpoint of legal studies).

In contrast to this, in the document “Guidelines on National Identity, Civil Society and Integration Policy 2012 – 2018” the term “ethnic minority” is explained in a narrow sense: “Latvian citizens differing from Latvians in terms of language and culture having traditionally lived in Latvia for generations and belonging to the State of Latvia and the Latvian society but simultaneously wishing to preserve and develop their culture and language”, in fact, “forgetting” about other groups who could use national minority rights (Guidelines on National Identity, Civil Society and Integration Policy 2012 – 2018).

The Preamble to the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia adopted on June 19, 2014 states that: „As a democratic, law-based, socially responsible and national state, Latvia is founded upon the dignity and freedom of its people, and it recognises and protects human rights, including the

rights of minorities. The people of Latvia safeguard their sovereignty, independence, territory and democratic form of government of the state of Latvia.

The identity of Latvia in the European cultural space has been shaped by Latvian and Liv traditions, Latvian folk wisdom, the Latvian language, universal human and Christian values” (Constitution of the Republic of Latvia). In the Preamble to the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia, the state nation – Latvian - is emphasized, ensuring protection and development of the Latvian culture and language but at the same time demonstrating the respect towards ethnic minorities.

As the Supreme Court of the Republic of Latvia states that „the state can actually politically take the decision to change the circle of citizens. Nevertheless, the circle of citizens should not be manipulated. First of all, it should preserve its identity as it is a significant constituent of a constitutional identity of the state. This can be provided only by an individual naturalization where a degree of integration into the already existing circle of citizens, loyalty towards the state of Latvia and an individual wish to belong to the Latvians who include the citizens of Latvia as well as persons who belong to the state nation of Latvia of a corresponding candidate is assessed. (see also: *Opinion of the Constitutional Rights Commission about the constitutional foundations of the Latvian State and inviolable core of Constitution of the Republic of Latvia, Riga: Latvijas Vēstnesis, 2012, points 295-297*)” (Case No A420577912 SA-1/2014 of February 12, 2014, Supreme Court of the Republic of Latvia Department of Administrative Cases).

At the same time it should be highlighted that according to the words written in Article 2 of the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia: “The sovereign power of the State of Latvia is vested in the people of Latvia”, “people” is understood as a political concept, i.e. including all citizens of Latvia regardless of their nationality – Latvians as well as representatives of ethnic minorities. “All citizens of Latvia belong to the people of Latvia – the fully legitimate ones as well as the ones who do not have political rights (children, under-age, the ones who lost their rights pursuant to court order, etc.)” (Comments on the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia. Introduction. Part I. General Provisions 2014, pp. 249, 252).

Not rejecting the Preamble to the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia and the significance of its content – legal, ideological, awareness-raising as well as political (Balodis 2014, pp. 295 – 310; (Comments on

the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia. Introduction. Part I. General Provisions 2014, pp. 91-135), nowadays there are opinions that the adoption procedure of the Preamble, ignoring the opposition which also represented the interest of ethnic minorities, as well as exclusion of the general public from the procedure of its adoption, in fact, do not really correspond to the statements declared in Article 1 and 2 of the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia (Cielava 2014). Therefore, in the author’s opinion, the debates about the significance of the Preamble to the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia, about the possibilities of its application and influence on the legislative system, including regulation of ethnic minorities should have been continued, as well as the discussions about the issues on understanding ethnic minorities, their definition, and rights, but the most important – about the possibilities of their realization and provision.

Assessing in general, the regulation of ethnic minority protection in the Republic of Latvia meets the worldwide standards accepted in this sphere. However, it should be acknowledged that at present in Latvia’s normative act the terms „national and ethnic groups”, „ethnic minority” and „national minority” have been used as synonymous, and at least four understandings of the term „ethnic minority” can be observed (see Table).

Table. The concept of ethnic minority in Latvia's normative acts

Law "On the Unrestricted Development and Right to Cultural Autonomy of Latvia's Nationalities and Ethnic Groups"	National and ethnic groups – all residents who do not belong to the Latvian nation and ancient indigenous nationality - Livs.
Education Law	Ethnic minority educational programme – educational programme implemented in the state (Latvian) language and other (ethnic minority) language. Ethnic minorities have not been defined.
Constitution of the Republic of Latvia	Latvian people – all citizens, regardless of their ethnicity as well as those who belong to the state Latvian nation. Latvian people as the total of citizens. Ethnic minorities – the emphasized belonging of a person (optional), without criteria and mechanisms of belonging.
Law on "Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities"	National minorities – citizens of Latvia who differ from Latvians in terms of culture, religion or language, who have been traditionally living in Latvia for generations, who consider themselves as belonging to the state of Latvia and the Latvian community, and who would like to preserve and develop their culture, religion and language.
Electronic Mass Media Law	Electronic mass media use the state language, at the same time the law envisages the right to use languages of minorities and other languages in the electronic mass media. The concept ethnic minority has not been defined.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apine I., Dribins L., Jansons A., Vēbers E., Volkovs V., Zankovska S. (2001) *Etnopolitika Latvijā. Pārskats par etnopolitisko stāvokli Latvijā un tā ietekme uz sabiedrības integrāciju*. Rīga: Elpa.

Āraja D. (2005) Definēta mazākumtautība In: Diena, 18.maijs.

Balodis R. (2014) Konstitūcijas sastāvdaļa – preambula: tās loma un nozīme mūsdienu konstitucionālismā In: Tiesību efektīvas piemērošanas problemātika. Latvijas Universitātes 72. zinātniskās konferences rakstu krājums. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.

Boguševiča T. (2009) *Mazākumtautību protesta kustību rašanās: Latvijas krievvalodīgās minoritātes gadījuma analīze. Promocijas darbs izstrādāts politikas zinātnes doktora (Dr.sc.pol.) zinātniskā grāda iegūšanai politikas zinātnes nozarē, salīdzināmās politikas apakšnozarē*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.

Cielava V. (2014) Preambula: Satversmes metamorfozes In: Jurista vārds. Nr.46 (848).

Čigāne L. Par tautības ierakstu pasē. <http://www.delfi.lv/news/comment/comment/lolita-cigane-par-tautibas-ierakstu-pase.d?id=42828130> (2014.22.11).

Latvijas Republikas Satversmes komentāri. Ievads. I nodaļa. Vispārējie noteikumi (2014) Rīga: Latvijas Vēstnesis.

Latvijas Republikas Satversmes komentāri. VIII nodaļa. Cilvēka pamattiesības (2011) Rīga: Latvijas Vēstnesis.

Levits E. (2014) Latviešu nācija, Latvijas tauta, Latvijas valsts. In: Latvieši un Latvija. Atjaunotā Latvijas valsts. III sējums. Rīga: Latvijas Zinātņu akadēmija.

Pētījums. Bilingvālā izglītība (2014) <http://www.tiesibsargs.lv/sakumlapa/saeimas-izglitibas-kulturas-un-zinatnes-komisija-iepazisies-ar-tiesibsarga-biroja-petijumu-bilingvala-izglitiba> (2014.22.11).

Trešs E. (2014) *Pret nacionālajām minoritātēm vērstie likumpārskatījumi un to novēršanas problēmas policijas darbībā. Promocijas darbs*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.

Volkovs V. (2008) Jēdziena "etniskā minoritāte" satura evolūcija Latvijas socioloģijā 1991.–2007. gadā. In: Socioloģija. Socioloģijai Latvijā – 40. Latvijas Universitātes raksti. Nr.736. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.

Volkovs V. (2011) Concept "Ethnic Minority" in Latvian Sociology: Changes in the Period 1991-2009 In: Sabiedrība un kultūra. Liepāja. LiePA.

Normative acts

Latvijas Republikas Satversme. <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=57980> (2014.22.11).

Konstitucionālais likums „Cilvēka un pilsoņa tiesības un pienākumi”. <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=72346> (2014.22.11).

Civiltāvokļa aktu reģistrācijas likums. <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=253442> (2014.22.11).

Elektronisko plašsaziņas līdzekļu likums. <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=214039> (2014.22.11).

Izglītības likums. <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=50759> (2014.22.11).

Likums „Par Latvijas nacionālo un etnisko grupu brīvu attīstību un tiesībām uz kultūras autonomiju”. <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=65772> (2014.22.11).

Likums „Par Vispārējo konvenciju par nacionālo minoritāšu aizsardzību”. <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=109252> (2014.22.11).

Pilsonības likums. <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=57512> (2014.22.11).

Repatriācijas likums. <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=37187> (2014.22.11).

Valsts valodas likums. <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=14740> (2014.22.11).

Vārda, uzvārda un tautības ieraksta maiņas likums. <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=191209> (2014.22.11).

Ministru kabineta 2012.gada 21.februāra noteikumi Nr.134 „Personu apliecinošu dokumentu noteikumi”. <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=244720> (2014.22.11).

Ministru kabineta 2013.gada 17.decembra noteikumi Nr.1510 „Valsts pārbaudījumu norises kārtība”. <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=263462> (2014.22.11).

Other documents un judgments

Latvijas Republikas Augstākās tiesas Administratīvo lietu departamenta 2014.gada 12.februāra SPRIEDUMS Lieta Nr.A420577912 SA-1/2014. <http://www.l2d.lv/v.php?i=46118> (2014.22.11).

Likumprojekta “Par Vispārējo konvenciju par nacionālo minoritāšu aizsardzību” anotācija. http://helios-web.saeima.lv/bi8/lasa?dd=LP1225_0 (2014.22.11).

Reemigrācijas atbalsta pasākumu plāns 2013. – 2016.gadam. <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=258715> (2014.22.11).

Nacionālās identitātes, pilsoniskās sabiedrības un integrācijas politikas pamatnostādnes 2012. – 2018.gadam. <http://polsis.mk.gov.lv/view.do?id=3782> (2014.22.11).

Signe Grūbe

**THE APPREHENSION OF LATVIAN PAINTERS
ON THE VALUE OF NATIONAL IDENTITY
AND RESOURCES IN CREATING IT**

The theme has been chosen with a purpose to show how painters in the field of art influence the formation of national identity and an interpretation of content by participating in the creation of national art. The activity of artists within a given period of time can be viewed as conditional social relations in several aspects: joint terms in the field of arts, activity of patrons, sponsors and art markets, the process of recognition of popular taste, so the proposed approach of relational research by Pierre Bourdieu is suitable. The study used data from twenty-eight interviews with Latvian painters made for the doctoral theses in 2007.

Key words: national identity, painter, art

Through the art the nation's contour is being given a recognizable content, with which the public can identify (Smith 2009, Hutchinson 2001). Each nation's understanding of questions of art's content and form have originated in certain geographical and historical circumstances, it constantly changes and evolves, influenced by cultures of the world, while preserving its roots and peculiar vision. The visual perception of art works shapes the perspective of the awareness of the word, provokes emotions without the need of interpretation of information and takes up

Signe Grūbe,

Mg. pol.sc., PhD student

Rīga Stradins University, Latvia

an important place in memory. The set of tools in the perception of art, what individual part of the society applies to the value of art does not depend on each individual's will and consciousness (Berger 2008, Lynton 2003). Art work as a symbolic value is acquired when a specific individual is able to give substance to it. The representatives of nations decipher art works easier with their characterizing elements, which can be expressed both in the choice of means of expression and content (Leoussi 2004, Facos 2003). Art helps to construct a self-awareness of the society by offering a socially recognizable characters and feelings.

Theoretical framework. Approaches within the understanding of national identity

In order to determine the transformation processes in the social space and in authority of Latvian art, as well as the historical and institutional framework of national art and its functional/structural influence on painters, you have to pay a special attention to the beginning of nation's formation period, the current social processes in the time of Latvian State establishing and national art institutions that maintain the symbolic capital. Painters' participation in the construction of national identity and in the processes of content interpretation can be identified through interviews, where it is shown how the painters' personality factors and his *habitus* affects the tenable position in the field of arts and how being in different positions, the painters' interaction with national art institutions is formed. By analyzing the activities of painters in the field of arts in interaction with national art institutions, which are essential culture and symbolic capital holders, the boundaries of field of arts can be determined and how the painters' involvement and position in field of arts identifies their participation in the creation of national identity and in the interpretation of the content (Bourdieu 1996).

The autonomous meaning of national art and the symbolic significance of art works can be identified by analyzing what is the painters' position in assessment of the subjective and objective processes of national identity, what are their vision and individual skills in creating the national identity and how the characteristic feature projection of national identity in painting is formed.

In the field of research of nationalism, issues like nation-building, phenomenon of political leaders, social movements, liberation battles, national identity, comparison of forming elements of various nations in time and space, including issues of ethnic policy are touched, while the field of culture and arts covers only a small part. Nation-building and existence

is related to the cultural factors, only the cultural role and significance, regardless whether it is a background or instrument, changes depending on the research areas of nationalism. Taking into account the opinions of primordialists, modernists and ethno-symbolists on the role of culture in the identification of nations and national identity and interpretations of the content, as well as thoughts of ethno-symbolists Anthony Smith and John Hutchinson on artists as moral innovators, who internally restores nation's foundation, promoting a high level of local cultural, educational and political organizations, it can be concluded that the artists have selected and interpreted the basic elements of national heritage, disguising them in a visual language to a clearly defined audience (Hutchinson 1999, Smith 2009). This means that the concept of nations applies to the whole social space and depends on the authority, and on how powerful the subfield of arts "art for art" is.

Sociology of art. The approach of Pierre Bourdieu on relational research

In order to address the issue on why the art becomes a separate category of cultural production in Western society, art sociologists use the classical concepts developed by sociologists. For example, Max Weber explores the subjective meaning of human behaviour, which is related to the other human activities (conception of understanding). It becomes necessary to explain the objectivity of social phenomena. Not only does the society is the product of culture, but also a human is creation of culture (Weber 1978). The activity of artists within a given period of time can be viewed as conditional social relations in several aspects: joint terms in the field of arts, activity of patrons, sponsors and art markets, the process of recognition of popular taste, so the proposed approach of relational research by Pierre Bourdieu is suitable, which includes the identification of social life rather than through a substance, but through relationships in the field of arts (Bourdieu 2000). Pierre Bourdieu explains that the taste and abilities forms depending on the participants' position in the social area. There are three basic concepts in the relations approach – position, filled position, disposition (*habitus*). Painters hold a certain position in the social area, which is determined by education, occupation or location in the locality of power. The preference of position for painters is symbolically signalled to others with a certain clothing habits, respect of certain art or literature direction. Pierre Bourdieu believes that there is no direct correlation between the position and filled position. If the position is associated with a management of particular skills, then the filled position does not necessary imply the existence of these particular skills.

The *habitus* is required as an intermediary between the position and filled position, and interacts with structure and skills. The painter must have the proper education (possible exceptions) and the painter must be familiar with terms of social space in order to fill the necessary position in the field of arts. In turn, the public has an irreducible symbolic dimension (semiotic battle space), where the winners are those who can convert their taste into a cultural capital. Painters are not independent, they are affected by economic and social space, and they are related to the collective structure, series of processes and institutions, starting with the first materializing idea of art work until the moment the work has been handed over to the public for viewing (Bourdieu 1993). Bourdieu links artists with the world by asking them whether they are connected with any other fields, institutions, discourses and practices, what are the conditions that make an artist to take a certain social position, which can be accepted by the rest of the society (Bourdieu 1996). Bourdieu appeals to the artists, who are not orthodox and free from forced social norms, but that does not mean that they are agents of social and political change. For example, the exchange of thought of Pierre Bourdieu and artist Hans Haacke is identified as, firstly, the artist's *habitus* is the characteristic of the art work as an expression of political or social awareness, and, secondly, it is not easy to organize artists and get them involved in political movements (Bourdieu 1995), because "good art" and "good artist" is presented as "disinterested". On the one hand, the artists' *habitus* challenges society, but on the other hand the aesthetic part of the work is accented rather than political nature.

It is not possible to rely only on classical sociology in analyzing the position of a contemporary artist in the field of arts. Exactly the trends of postmodernism are close to the world of art and it has also been observed in Latvia, the painters participating in the construction of national identity. The essential part of the research of national identity is the methods of art sociology.

Artists' activity can be viewed as conditional social relations in several aspects: in conditions of the artistic field, patrons, sponsors and the art markets, society's tastes and in recognition processes. It can be explained why artists created certain type of works in a given period of time by identifying the circumstances in sociology. Sociology helps to determine how the reputation of artists is formed: from "genius" talent or from skills and ambitions (Harrington 2004). In turn, works of Howard Becker have influenced cultural sociologist studies on the structure of social relations, creating art genres, trends and determining the classification, as well as the difference of status between "high" and "low" culture. He believes that art world consists of people whose activities are necessary in creating art works, which would

be recognized as such (Beker 2008). Both H. Becker and P. Bourdieu believe that the aesthetic conventions and ideologies belonging to the art world are created by the participants and the existing ideology makes the art and art world possible (Alexander 2003). P. Bourdieu emphasizes relations of authority and the ideas in the art are socially constructed (Bourdieu 1993). It is possible to draw parallels with E. Hobsbawm's knowledge of inventions of traditions as a necessary process of formalization and ritualization as a reference to the past and continual repetition and E.D. Smith's and G. Hutchinson's acknowledgment that artists participate in the concept of nation-building (Smith 2004).

P. Bourdieu studies of art perception and identification of artistic behaviour in the field of arts (Bourdieu 1996) proves the confidence of artists that they do not follow certain laws and they are not mechanical service providers, because they see themselves as violators of borders and makers of the law only known to them. He researched the 19th century French artists' aesthetic autonomy setting and concluded that these laws, which the artists believe to break or spontaneously form, in fact, they are socially reproduced, which are structurally regulated by certain production fields (competition in obtaining the opportunities for trade and public authorities). Artists sacrifice the aesthetic integrity in fight for the favour of public authorities, recognizing the personal dilemma and intractable choice between public acclaim and commercial success, on the other hand, the aesthetic authenticity, bohemian opposition and material poverty (Bourdieu 1996). By destroying the romantic idea of artists, P. Bourdieu claims that belief in the artist as a creator is associated with existing concealment of information on the commercial side of the art world.

According to P. Bourdieu, artistic autonomy of the field can be studied on the basis of the artist's view on the economic and symbolic capital of mutual relations and observing effect of surrounding field on the dynamic of the art field. Rural territory allows interpreting works of different artists from sociology's point of view. You can see how artists whose habitus is not in accordance with the commercial estimations, gets into the wrong world where the commercial "losers" win prizes and where their habitus participates in the creation of new rules to get the reputation of peers. The skill of operating in the habitus and social fields allows accumulating different capitals (economic, social, culture, symbolic, political), combining and obtaining better social positions and gives life a "complete form" with cultural and artistic resources.

P. Bourdieu argues that museums like schools and universities are symbolic sites of violence – they impose an arbitrary definition of cultural val-

ues. People with proper education feel free in certain environments. Thus, they stand by the ethnocentrism, which could be called a class centrism and regards it as a natural and self-evident perception in which the education path is obtained. This type of perception can be general or specific, intentional or unintentional, academic or loose. Contrary – less experienced viewer, faced with the academic culture, ends up in strange place and time. The disorientation and cultural blindness of less educated people is a reminder of the objective truth that the perception of art is a mediated process of encryption. If the encoded data of works exceeds the viewer's decryption capabilities, he believes that they do not contain any deeper meaning or structure and organization, because he is unable to decode and reduce it to an understandable form. Any decryption requires a simple or complex code management (Bourdieu 1993). An art work can reveal different levels of importance, depending on the applied encryption techniques. That means, what is perceived at the first sight, is completely different from the meaning that is a part of the whole art work or part of the overall artistic experience, which embodies the deeper levels of meaning.

The readability of the art work (in a certain time and society) varies depending on the shift that is formed between the code, which under certain circumstances is required by the art work, and the code as a historically created institution. Individual's ability to read an art work varies within the limits of simple or complex codes including expertise of social learning level, which is measured by managed set of means; they are interpretation schemes, which are not needed to capture the artistic capital in a given time offered to specific society (Bourdieu 2000). P. Bourdieu emphasizes that relationships are significant, which increases the value of artwork rather than the artwork itself. Each nation's development period combines artwork, which meets its classification system – both included by other periods and excluded. An individual is hard to imagine variation outside the available classification systems. Art codes, as representation of possible categories of law system, are base of each social institution (Bourdieu 1993). As a historically-based system, established in a social reality, perception toolbox, which separates the part of society and applies to artistic values (also to cultural values), does not depend on human will and consciousness, but effect individuals, defining characteristics, which will be typical to them.

Painter and the creation of national identity

According to the previously identified approaches of nationalism research, it can be argued that the art as an instrument that combines or splits the society play an important role in shaping and strengthening the nation.

Art, which arose as a protest against existing system or art, which was created as a new form of expression and in search for forms, is characteristics of nation. National art is important not only because it is created by professional artists. It has confused its creators with the same questions faced by the contemporary artists, who face the modernist canons (Bourdeu 2000, Facos 2003). Perceptual mechanism of artwork can form in the context of G. Hutchinson's cultural theories and E. Hobsbawm "invented" traditions. Interpretation schemes of social code learning level viewed in P. Bourdieu's work, Athena S. Leoussi's references of aspects used that are essential to the creation of national identity and in the context of content's interpretation (Leoussi 2004). Her work "The Ethno-cultural Roots of National" focuses on nationalisms influence on painting subject and form over the last hundred years – each nations ethno symbol repertoire's nationalization. Nationalism expands the existing topics and introduces new ones. It is necessary for the nation, in order to be visible and not abstract, to have an art and artists, which make it accessible, tangible and understandable, so the artists refer to a historically political archaeology of nationalism, aesthetic forms and ethno symbolical content of national ideal (Smith 2004). Athena S. Leoussi represents the view of E.D. Smith that the nation portrayed in the visual arts has been a very important guide of cultural nationalism.

Artists' participation in the formulation of ethno-culture and identity, crystallisation and glorification has contributed to the transition to a modern society. The development of national arts is linked to the development of modern arts. The modernism approach emphasizes the role of artwork to achieve the objectives. Athena S. Leoussi points to aspects that are essential to the creation of national identity and in the context of content interpretation.

1. Visual arts are the potential tool of national ideas.
2. The artwork is accepted as national, if it represents the views of cultural society (not just elites).
3. Artists, who are overtaken by the cultural spirits, provide the modernization of society, for example, ethnical identity and solidarity, the transformation of national identity and solidarity.
4. The transformation of ethno cultural experience in arts converts this experience into positive and a central national experience.

The study used data from twenty-eight interviews with Latvian painters made for the doctoral theses in 2007. Using the conceptual interview (Kvale 2009), the answers were looked to the question, how the interviewees perceive one or the other event, how they evaluate what is happening and how they see certain concepts of the total structure. Three interrelated blocks of

questions have been created: "National identity and Latvia", "Artists", "The field of arts and cultural policy in Latvia".

National identity is "double structured" (both objective and subjective)

Artists indicated in the interviews that the national identity is based on the influence of historical events that have created symbol of national identity – freedom fights, national flag, the Freedom Monument and the contours of Latvian borer. In turn, the artist's personality factor is formed in the process of social influences. "*Patriotically physical love for homeland*" (11) (Hereinafter the figure in brackets will denote a code assigned to an interview.) "*Of course, it was upbringing of that time that the key is to be Latvian – it was more of the Neo-Latvian times... it was still the Russian time and then it was something people considered to be cool, sort of being idealistic Latvian*" (1), "*More the spirit of Latvian Riflemen*" (10), "*There was a theme of Latvian Riflemen. We all romanticize the theme of Latvian Riflemen, for all it was with a sad shade. There these folk songs: "Two doves bolted into the blue", "When I went off to war". Mom always sang sad lullabies. For me the riflemen have been meant deeply national and that was for everyone*" (21), "*In my opinion the flag is the most beautiful. I am excited about the flag. [...] I am against any kind of mocking of national symbols and using them for a humour. This is something important*" (11), "*From state symbols – with the flag, the Freedom Monument.*" (7), "*Of course with the flag. More with the configuration of maps*" (25), "*If a fight for freedom in different periods is a symbol, then first – it. I have seen different time, change in authority, war. I have always wanted for Latvia to be good, to survive. I am glad that the Latvian flag currently represents the country officially*" (5).

Artists want to separate the sphere associated with the place of origin from the state. "*I want to separate the state from the land. Father, mother, brothers, and sisters – we do not think too much about them – we just have them. It is the same with Latvia – it is simply mine. Our land is so green and humane, proportionate to the people, its beauty hides in the nature's tenderness. The advantage of our land is the seasons and its constant change, which is interesting for artists*" (12), "*It is the same land with hills, leafy oaks and lime trees. Sun and fog. Old fishing vessel. Boulder. Cumin cheese*" (10), "*With a beautiful nature, with a long sea border, with very good food, with many other good things... I do not identify Latvia with bad things – I feel uncomfortable about what is now happening in Latvia, but in my opinion it is temporary phenomenon*" (15), "*The symbol of Latvia is its countryside, country houses and that driving out of the capital for ten kilometres and it is*

completely different world that in fact it is probably rare for that time... it is exclusive thing" (2), "Daugava, a beautiful mountainous landscape, haystack, rye-bread with a crust, white trees with a layer of snow, the thoroughness of Latvian ornaments, folk songs – these are those flags" (4), "With nature, rivers, with our ethnography and folk songs. Latvian people are hard working, hardy and enjoy singing" (26), "With nature, antiquity and folk songs. But not with the symbols of Ulmana time. [...] If you do not invest in it, then with symbols of Ulmana time, but deep down – with nature, rituals, solstice" (18), "Earth, nature. I see opportunities by seeing the tidiness, which is everywhere." (21) "From materials it is wood and linen. The connection with nature is characteristic for Latvians" (18) "It is a global question for everyone. It is a geographical place, which also creates some kind of cultural geography. [...] The next is European, the world's man or inhabitant of the Earth and in general a person. The most important and essential thing is what kind of person you are" (3), "Latvian identity would likely create in the environment of traditional roots. The creator of work has to love his land. If the author has grown up here, in his activity, no matter how different it may be, he represents his land" (12).

Painters are critical of national identity which is linked only to the objective characteristics. The multinational society of Latvia implements and consumes the common values. Painters perceive national identity flair as a present for artist and dependent on the artists belonging of consciousness to his nation rather on the nationality or place of residence. "It is a healthy tendency. There is not a single symbol. It is not just a visual symbol, but an internal feeling. Childhood, sea, forests, people smiles. In my scale of value, Open-air museum is a great place with the ethnical, aesthetic and Latvian farmer environment. Like riflemen – collective beauty. Perfect, good sense of proportion, colouring sense that Latvians really have, moderation, where they do not have to measure anything, because there is some kind of golden cut, which is placed in the cradle." (24).

According to P. Bourdieu, objectives make up the social world as a show for an observer, who has an "opinion" on the activities and who brings their attitude to the project (Bourdieu 2004). The responses of painters highlight both the national identity's objective and subjective factors, as well as preservation of traditions in difficult political circumstances. Positioning the national identity through the Latvian identity as the phenomenon of people perception, the artists stand for its preservation and improvement. "I have lived abroad and I have noticed a few things that I miss. These are the scents that are specific only to the nature, fields and forests of Baltic region. It is the specific Northern light, which is in autumn or early in the morning. And other

thing is that there is no overpopulation. Elsewhere in the world it is possible to get tired from the crowd" (6), "We always try to artificially tell what it is being a Latvian. Here we come to the identity, if we put some kind of Latvian symbol in the work. [...] It is the pretence of identity. Identity has to come to some subconscious vibration level." (1), "It is the consciousness of its people. Big nations do not think about it, but those who do not live permanently in the country and little nations always think about it" (14), "Awareness for your identity, each person's compliance with the environment in which one lives, mentality, cognition of your culture and nature, preservation of traditions, despite the fact that times dictates other rules" (15), "In order to talk about it, is to understand the difference between the mentality of Latvians, which has developed historically from other nations. I am not all Latvian, but a half Estonian. I have absorbed all by living here. It is difficult to tell in words, but while working I have thought about it all my life" (5) "You are born here, grown up here, this the environment where you have developed, schooled, surrounded by people, culture, home, traditions. Even if you have been influenced by outside world, you cannot escape it, it is in you and you cannot hide it – it will appear sooner or later" (11), "It is also the perception of colours, which, however, is different from everyone else" (2), "Being a Latvian is the totality of characteristics that have formed over the centuries – character of the nation, sense of proportion, distinctive seeing of colour, your attitude towards something different, different world. Being a Latvian is not only a visual expression, ornament. It is a perception and what we fell ourselves in our codes" (25), "It is our mentality. My whole family, ancestors are Latvians. Our nature, antiquity ethnography – it is all being a Latvian. I recognize myself as a Latvian; cosmopolitan thinking is alienating to me." (26). "I think that if you live here, you do not think about the symbols. Rather, at that time when you get somewhere you are in other context... I think that people, who have not travelled outside Latvia, would not have any association and symbols. [...] Nations can begin to form some sort of associations only in the context of other places" (3).

National identity created by painters has its own unique features, unlike other areas

National art is part of national identity, it is not just only the aesthetic, but symbolic and its symbolism determines the importance of social environment and understanding of the foundation of social order. It helps to construct a public self-awareness, offering a socially recognizable images and feelings. Painters emphasize the complexity of national identity, variability and the devel-

opment of meaning from Latvian folk songs (Dainas), through the freedom fights, being influenced by the political background of all times. Maybe, the diversity and multiplicity of Latvian nation, which is linked with its historical development, is its strength. Some painters state that the national identity is not important for the artist and confirm the multilayered nation and the influence of different cultures. *“But we can view it from all sorts of ways, for example, what is the biology of being a Latvian, through genes, they are variety of hostile cultures, that is why we are fighting with each other, because of some kind of the Cours, the Latgalls, the Zemgalians... that flag, that red-white-red, which came into being a Latvian flag in Cesis with the legend that the blood streak remained, it was a battle when the Zemgalians fought against the Latgalls, not against Germans or Russians- they were fighting amongst themselves. And these genes we have together, all the hostile”* (1), *“21st century Latvian is the result of all ages that we have been through – he is associated with nature, a little poetic. There is the layer of the Soviet era, the first independence, German and Swedish time – those all are layers that make up the overall patina”* (23), *“We have to separate the contradiction between a Latvian now and in the past. Latvian now or 100 years ago? It is the concept that changes. And in this world of globalization. [...] Rather, it is one of the feelings of the people in the world. [...] I have no prejudice against the Russians. I have never identified with the Soviet, which was in the Russian language with Russian people, culture, literature, which is another thing. Everything happens as a result of external factors. [...] Latvian is a complex phenomenon”* (24). *“I have thought about the Cossack, how Latvian is he? He is thematically Latvian, but Grosvalds, who does generally bring in the Western painting? Then the Riga group developed and now we learn what the Latvian school of painting is.”* (16), *“Identity – something indescribable. Not the categories – ribbon and folk song (Pūt vējiņi)”* (10).

P. Bourdieu studies of identification of perception of art and artistic behaviour in the field of arts (Bourdieu 1996) shows artist's belief that they do not follow certain rules and they are not mechanical service providers, because they see themselves as violators of borders and as creators of the laws known to them. Laws, which artists believe break or spontaneously forms, in fact, are socially reproduced and are structurally regulated by certain production fields (in obtaining the competition opportunities for trade and public authority). Artists in fight for the favour of authority sacrifice the aesthetic integrity, recognizing the personal dilemma and intractable choice between public acclaim and commercial success, on the other hand, aesthetic authenticity, bohemian opposition and material poverty. The artist's creative autonomy is essential not only from the perspective of

sociology, but also from a culture policy, which allows examining the circumstances which have influenced artists to create autonomous metaphors. Autonomy of the field of arts can be studied on the basis of the artist's views of relations between the economics and symbolic capital and noticing the effect of surrounding field on the dynamic of the field of arts. Habitus or operating skills in the social fields allows accumulation, combination and use of different capitals (economics, social, culture, symbolic, political), to better social position and give the life “complete form” with resources of culture and art.

National identity created by painters has its own unique features, unlike other areas

It is necessary to recognize the individual artist's vision of national identity in creating it. The artist's autonomous status is not completely dependent on the work, but on its essence, because the artists do not look for ideas or forms of expression outside themselves and their own perception. According to P. Bourdieu's ideas, art is the part of national identity, which is not only aesthetic, but also symbolic; it shows the importance of social environment and an understanding of the basics of social order. Even though painters are convinced that the specificity of national identity they have created is an important contribution to the country, some Latvian painters consider themselves to be European or global artists. The answers of these painters show both total and partial detachment of Latvian art life, which is contributed by the lack of support from country to the creative processes. *“In my enthusiasm, yes, but I do not feel that it would be necessary from the Latvian state”* (9), *“In particular, I now do not feel that the country needs what I do, create, because it is not manufacturing. People consume more movies, concerts and other forms of entertainment than visual arts, painting. Maybe artists in the Soviet times were better, there were orders from the state, there was Artists' union, but now everything is on the verge of dissolution, and there are no state orders. It is an extravagance – to raise, to school, and unconsumed. There is also no group of experts, who could think and evaluate what the state needs”* (8), *“It does not depend on me. At the moment behaviour of the government is obscure. It is painful to feel on your skin as well. When I paint I constantly think whether it is necessary”* (5), *“I really love this land, but the formation of the state is not familiar to me. In today's situation I see myself two paths – either I quit everything and go to fight with this country, go in to the politics, or I am aware that there are things that I can do much better and indirectly can make my life here better and I disassociate from politics, including – cultural policy. I just*

do my artist's work, which in my opinion is a hundred times better than the entire politician's work as a whole." (18).

Connecting P. Bourdieu field analysis, in conjunction with the painter's habitus, with the analysis of trends, which in turn binds the relationship between a specific field and authority, it can be concluded that creating the national identity is important to the painter's personality and his views on the importance of painting. It is not essential to know how a particular painter has become what he is, because that kind of study may be subject to reconstructed liability of retrospective illusion. It is more important to understand how the artist uses his background and available capital, except a specific position in the fields of arts and manages the current position to consolidate his work in the social space. The artist by choosing to be Latvian emphasizes the education obtained in Latvia. *"Yes, now I am Latvian artist, but I do not know how it will be in time. Here I went to school and I am grateful to masters from whom I had the opportunity to learn"* (8), *"Yes, entirely. The environment determines what you see, for example, colour"* (13), *"It is clear that I have to represent my country in which I live and which I understand and whose wealth I would be able to increase"* (5), *"I have not had any other option to make any choice. Then the answer is – I recognize myself as a representative of Latvian arts"* (14), *"Coming into an international art scene, you can face it. A shelf and box system forms – a "box" is from European countries, which also includes Latvia, there is also Argentina and China. Each box has its place"* (23), *"Maybe it sounds loud and pathetic, but it is like that. I consider myself a part of this land and society"* (12).

Painters are confident in the resources of visual arts to independently implement values of national identity

Painters are confident in the resources of visual arts to independently implement values of national identity. The emotional experience caused by paintings affect the viewer, the encoded information allows finding and creating your own concept of the theme and painters have sufficient art resources to independently of any outside influence implement values of national identity. Artists emphasize the unique role of painting in this process. *"The painting in terms of perception is the most capacious and universal. It has been like that at all times. [...] Painting in its own way can be as a symbol of art"* (10), *"One can say that the appropriate education and training is needed, but there can be an individual who feels the painting. I think that painting is the art of arts"* (27), *"In contrast to the conceptual art, the story of painting, what is overgrown in the work, can change with time or even be forgotten, but the main thing remains – does this work as a whole has a value*

or not. For example, encoded stories in medieval paintings cannot be read; we read their artistic value or emotional message. That is the effect of painting. [...] If the conceptual art without a story is difficult, then in painting they can be invented as much as you like, the work still lives its own life through the time" (14), *"Painting on wall can have a greater impact than big art processes, exhibitions, although modern person does not want to admit it. Curators, art historians, professors create the opinion, but they cannot get close to the art works in the private room and they cannot discuss them, they have no power over them"* (6). The emphasis of the painting's special status is characteristic to all painters, regardless of the position which they occupy in the field of arts, regardless of the age and degree of recognition.

The features of national identity in the works of artists can be estimated from content and formal features. Some principles repeat in the works of Latvian painters, from the beginning of Latvian painting (mid-19th century) to the present day. They show the conservative views on ethnical and aesthetic values, which have set in the consciousness. The basic values of Latvian people (for example, sense of duty, and love for nature) can be seen as symbols, poetic images and ambiguous explanations of common things in the art. Visualizing the world, Latvian is concise – there is clarity of forms and proportions, monumentality, Latvian ornaments shape nature forms into simplified and abstracted signs. The colours are applied to the choice of the specific purpose; Latvian sense of colour has formed under the influence of climate conditions – emphasis on single-tone nuances.

Painters who are aware of the social significance of the painting, primarily looks for its essence in the content of the painting, choosing easy to understand means of expression. Both the artists, who believe that the specifics of painting does not allow a literary statements and those, who pay a greater attention to the featured story, agree that the interpretation of national identity in paintings can be found not only in the content, in certain symbols, but also in means of expression – composition (form, proportion, lines and interplay of colour space). A discussion on the content and forms of proportion in art works is still relevant to the painters. Since the changes in the creation process inevitably requires also changes in the perception of the art, but it is a long and complicated process related to the dissolution of competence and creation of a new one (Bourdieu 1993), then the national arts institutions are essential, helping in times of change to strengthen new translations of paintings. *"I think that Latvian artists enjoy more the form than its content. [...] Maybe it is not bad, but if the art starts to dominate in that way, it becomes empty and not reflective"* (13), *"The art is trapped in its internal reproduction. I do not have high perception of contemporary art*

capabilities. It is the product of long-term crisis. [...] If you want to put in a serious content in the art form and in a new way, do not copy the existing” (24). The content of the painting is passed to the viewer through a prism of sense and the viewer can compare it in the level of sense with their own individual experience. The specific properties of the painting can be lost by emphasizing the content of the work – to express an idea with means of painting, but the artist will increase the possibility to access the widest possible audience and integrate in the easiest to understand and translation category of art.

Conclusions

The author of the article concludes that the painters in the field of Latvian arts participating in the creation of national identity influence the construction of national identity and the interpretation of the content. The national arts formed and developed not only in displaying the past ethnic tradition and symbols, but also getting directly inspired by the events in Latvia and art movements in the world.

Following the idea of P. Bourdieu, the answers of Latvian painters clearly indicate that the national identity does not depend on the objective processes and social structures. The answers of the painters highlight both the objective of national identity and subjective factors, as well as preservation of traditions in difficult political circumstances. Painters are confident that national identity requires to continuously improving.

The national identity constructed by the painters has its own unique features, unlike other areas. National art is part of the culture that needs a support of the country in order to offer high quality products and diversity of expressions. The diversity of art directions allows selecting the most characteristic elements of the created national identity. Latvian painters are aware that they provide new directions for the development of society, by selecting, interpreting and distributing the visual symbols that are comprehensible to the public. If the painters, recognizing the importance of citizenship and the artist’s unique role in the social space, still wants to distance them from the state, it shows the lack of state structure evaluation of culture and art.

The rating of the painter for the cooperation with national arts institutions reveals the problematic issues, which are related to the organization of art environment and the weak interaction of artists with the national arts institutions. Institutions, which administrate the funding for artists, are directly able to influence the movement of national arts, especially when the funding is limited. Painter can choose whether to follow the setup or seek

other forms of cooperation, including participating in the administration of funds. The individual position of the artist in the field of arts is very important, his habitus.

The interaction between the art institutions and artists contribute to the process of creating the art, if both parties agree on the idea of the content of national arts. Painters see the positive side of the interaction not only in the material support and provision of creative environment, but also in the development of Latvia cultural policy, the art, the consumer and the representative of arts field have to be professional. The support is not affected by the criticism of cultural policy, perhaps there are other factors, which make the artist to be aware of himself as the representative of a particular nation and creates a desire to participate.

Painter’s contribution in the identification of national identity and the interpretation of the content affects his symbolic cultural heritage. Positions of the painters are directly related to the content and form of national arts. Painters highlight the importance of means of expression in the painting and consider it a comprehensive art form, see the artist’s role in the distribution of positivism in the society or in a message, informing/warning the society about the existence of substantial values or vulnerability. It proves that the unique abilities of artists form a distinctive subculture, which is associated with social processes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander D. V. (2003). *Sociology of the Arts: Exploring Fine and Popular Forms*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Anderson B. (2003). *Imagined Communities*. London, New York: Verso.
- Becker S. H. (2008). *Art Worlds*. University of California Press.
- Berger J. (2008). *Ways of Seeing*. London: British Broadcasting Cooperation, Penguin Books.
- Bourdieu P. (1993). *The Fields of Cultural Production*. UK, Cambridge: Polity Press Ltd.
- Bourdieu P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Polity Press.
- Bourdieu P. (1996). *The Rules of Art. Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu P. (2000). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*.

Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu P., Haacke H. (1995). *Free Exchange*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Brubaker R. (1996). *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burdjē P. (2004). *Praktiskā jēga*. Rīga: Omnia Mea.

Facos M., Hirsh S. L., eds. (2003). *Art, Culture, and National Identity in Fin de Siècle Europe*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gellner E. (2006, 1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. London: Blackwell Publishing.

Harrington A. (2004). *Art and Social Theory. Sociological Arguments in Aesthetics*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Hobsbawm E. (1992) *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hobsbawm E. (2005). Comments on Steve Grosby: The Primordial, Kinship and Nationality. In: Atsuko I., Uzelac G., eds. *When is the Nation? Towards understanding of theories of nationalism*. London: Routledge Taylor&Francis Group.

Hutchinson J. (1994). *Modern Nationalism*. London: Fontana Press.

Hutchinson J. (1999). Re-interpreting Cultural Nationalism. *Australian Journal of Politics and History*. 45(3).

Hutchinson J. (2001). Nations and Culture. In: M. Guibernau, J. Hutchinson, eds. *Understanding Nationalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hutchinson J. (2004). Myth Against Myth: The Nation as Ethnic Overlay. *Nations and Nationalism*. 10 (1/2). London: ASEN.

Kvale S., Brinkmann S. (2009). *Interviews. Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London: Sage.

Leoussi A. S. (2004). The Ethno-cultural Roots of National Art. *Nations and Nationalism*. 10 (1/2). London: ASEN.

Lynton, N. (2003). *The Story of Modern Art*. London: Phaidon Press.

Merlo-Ponti M. (2007). *Acs un Gars*. Rīga: Laikmetīgās mākslas centrs.

Smith A. D. (2004). History and National Destiny: Responses and Clarifica-

tions. *Nations and Nationalism*. 10 (1/2). London: ASEN.

Smith A. D. (2009). *Ethno-symbolism and Nationalism. A Cultural Approach*. London: Routledge.

Wacquant L. J. D. (1989). Toward a Reflexive Sociology: A Workshop with Pierre Bourdieu. *Sociological Theory*. 7 (1).

Weber. M. (1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. New York: Bedminster Press.

Appendix. A code assigned to an interview.

1 – man, 53 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

2 – woman, 40 years old, painter, pedagogue; hasn't regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

3 – man, 41 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad

4 – man, 66 years old, painter, pedagogue; hasn't regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

5 – man, 74 years old, painter, pedagogue; regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

6 – man, 34 years old, painter, pedagogue; regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

7 – woman, 38 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

8 – woman, 43 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, hasn't regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

9 - woman, 40 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, hasn't regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

10 – man, 64 years old, painter, pedagogue; regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

11 – woman, 61 painter, isn't pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

12 – man, 75 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

13 – man, 33 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

14 – woman, 52 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

15 – man, 47 years old, painter, pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

16 – man, 52 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, hasn't regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

17 – woman, 38 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

18 – man, 39 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

19 – woman, 29 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

20 – man, 38 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

21 – woman, 84 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

22 – woman, 47 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, hasn't regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

23 – woman, 32 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

24 – man, 57 years old, painter, isn't pedagogue, hasn't regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

25 – woman 63 years old, painter, pedagogue, regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

26 – man, 72 years old, painter, pedagogue, hasn't regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad;

27 – man, 65 years old, painter, pedagogue, hasn't regular exhibition in Latvia and abroad.

Ishgaley Ishmuhametov

ON ETHNIC IDENTITY IN THE CONTEXT OF TOLERANCE

In our opinion, interethnic issues have always been and will always be a key topic for debate at the level of state structures as well as numerous social groups for many years. Interethnic relations are becoming an adverse aspect of social reality. Powerful social movements are starting to acquire an ambivalent ethno-political and ethno-cultural tone. There is an increased interest of sociologists, psychologists as well as participants of social networks, political parties, and society in general to ethnicity and ethnic identity. This interest is determined by enhanced political and economic instability and need for social ties – identity, solidarity, consolidation, and protection. In conditions of acute social instability, an ethnos often acts as an emergency support group, and we frequently exaggerate a positive distinctiveness of our own community from other ones.

Outcomes of the research and experience of other countries, including the multinational state of Russia are acquiring special significance for Latvian researchers and politicians who are interested in the issues of interethnic relations. From time to time in Latvia there arise discussions which touch upon the sacrosanct principle, according to politics and state, of ethnic and linguistic diversity. However, it does not make

Ishgaley Ishmuhametov,

Dr. psych., Assistant Professor

The Head of the Chair of Social Sciences and Law

Transport and Telecommunication Institute

Riga, Latvia

the problem any clearer. Therefore, in our opinion, the outcomes of the research which prove that the use of ethnic mobilization as a resource for formation of national and civic solidarity and national identity can be of real interest. The monograph "Ethnic Identity in the Context of Tolerance" by S. Ryzhova (*Рыжова С.В., 2011*), a researcher of the Centre of Ethnic Sociology of the Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, presents the results of the many-years research into the properties of ethnic identity, its involvement in the processes of establishing national-civic identity, formation of the bases of civic consciousness such as social responsibility, legal policies, desire to be of service to one's country, to participate in construction of the common environment of civil peace and concord, as well as primordial feelings of emotional attachment to one's nation and homeland. Preconditions for research into ethnic identity, conceptual approaches to establishing ethnic and ethno-confessional identity on the basis of broad empiric material are also analysed in the book.

However, the monograph by S. Ryzhova can be interesting to us, first of all, by its conclusion that an actualized ethnic identity which is reproduced and supported by ethno-national discourse can be included in the processes of establishing civil solidarity, under the condition, if the bearers of such an identity possess the necessary reserve of inter-ethnic tolerance, are targeted at the potential of civil concord, accept intercultural differences and are able to exist in the pluralistic system of worldview.

S. Ryzhova considers ethnic identity as a significant element of social identity, as the most subjective mobile marker of political and socio-economic changes. It is defined as a foundation, a mobilizing and inspiring beginning for national-civil consolidation, thus proving C. Calhoun's point of view (*Калхун, 2006*) on ethnic identity as a means of transmitting culture and basis for action. At the same time, the actualized ethnic identity is related mainly to activist social policies. The author of the monograph writes that during her research into the process of actualization and transformation of ethnic identity she relies on the social identity theory by H. Tajfel and J. Turner, and F. Barth's theory of cultural boundaries which is very close to it, as well as motivational approaches represented in the traditions of humanistic psychology (A. Maslow, C. Rogers) (*Рыжова 2011, p. 19, 24, 25*).

In order to better understand S. Ryzhova's viewpoint it would be appropriate to consider H. Tajfel and J. Turner's concept in more detail, as it is created in the context of studying intergroup relations and intergroup comparison, therefore, in our opinion, it is perceived with caution and

certain criticism. H. Tajfel (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) starts the substantiation of social identity from the elaboration of the theory of intergroup discrimination, for which it is enough to establish differences between groups in favour of one's own group, even when the personal interests of a person are not involved at all. In his cognitivist scheme there are: 1) social categorization, 2) social identification, 3) social comparison, 4) social discrimination. According to H. Tajfel, social categorization or cognitive consequence of division into social groups can cause external group hostility without a manifested interethnic opposition. This is confirmed by the presence in the ethnic consciousness of internal group favouritism and ethnic stereotypes, simplistic, schematized, emotionally-coloured and extremely stable images of an ethnic group which are easily applied to all its representatives. At the same time ethnic auto-stereotypes are characterized by a significantly higher degree of positiveness than ethnic hetero-stereotypes. Tajfel (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) distinguishes two opposite aspects of interaction: the interpersonal one based on personal characteristics and which is not influenced by belonging to different social categories, and the intergroup one which is completely determined by a group membership and which is not influenced by individual relations and characteristics. These two forms often appear simultaneously in a real-life interaction; they constitute a cognitive "self-concept". Personal and social types of identity are revealed depending on the conditions of interaction, at the same time the striving for a positive self-concept is typical of an individual. Social identity is comprised of those aspects of "self" image which appear from the perception of ambient social reality from the viewpoint of belonging to a group, to perceive oneself and other members of one's group as having common, typical characteristics which identify the group as a whole.

J. Turner's analysis (Turner, 1981, 1985) of determinants which influence the formation of a group: solidarity, cooperative interrelations, social influence, is also of great interest, as well as his explanation for weakening a conflict between the groups in M. Sherif's experiments not because of the development of cooperative ties but because of dissolving of intergroup boundaries and then formation of a large unifying group. J. Turner's main idea (Turner, Oakes, 1989) of interethnic behaviour as a result but not a reason of self-perception is also worth noticing. This introduces the process of formation of social identity into the frames of the process of self-categorization. Unlike Tajfel's initial definition of social identity as an aspect of "self-concept" derived from and based on a group membership, the new understanding results directly from social catego-

rization of oneself and it is viewed as a casual base of group processes. J. Turner, developing Tajfel's views, specially emphasizes the situatedness of manifestation of social identity, he also pays special attention to the concepts of self-categorization. In S. Ryzhova's monograph we can also read that ethnic identity is not a static entity. It is situational and labile, it quickly reacts to social, cultural and political processes (Рыжова, 2011, p. 46).

Application of cognitivist theories of ethnic identity allows the author within this monograph to observe the mechanisms of formation and reproduction of ethnic and ethno-confessional identities in conjunction with civil policies which are able to provide and support an adequate level of interethnic tolerance in the society together with other elements of culture, and ethnic identity can be actively involved into the processes of social reforms.

S. Ryzhova points out that the processes of transformation of ethnic identity on the scale tolerance-intolerance are largely initiated by ethno-national discourse and they are identified by the character of interpretation of sacral-value ideologemes of ethno-national discourse which participate in the processes of categorization of ethnically-marked social environment. The author of the monograph draws special attention to considering tolerance to cultural diversity in terms of positive perception of ethno-cultural differences, in the context of a person's comprehension of their own identity. Intolerant transformation of ethnic identity is supported by the discourse of ethno-cultural and religious differences, by the search for reasons for ethnic dominance, by the attempt to create ethnically-marked environment and formation of ethno-confessional identity.

S. Ryzhova's attempt undertaken in the research to prove the idea of a well-known Russian ethnologist L. Drobizheva (Дробижева, 2002) that ethnic and civil identities do not contradict each other is interesting and significant. The practice of formation of integrating national-civil identity should ensure the participation of subjectively significant, actualized ethnic identity together with equal access to resources, observation of the balance between group (ethno-cultural, religious) and individual-personal rights, under the context of the guarantee of people's trust to the state. According to the author, the policy of interethnic tolerance as a sympathetic perception of cultural differences and cultural diversity of social environment, and a refuse from the use of force for settling social contradictions which are marked (perceived) as interethnic contradictions and conflicts are linking elements between the processes of

reinforcement of ethnic identity and establishment of national-civil and state identity.

Undoubtedly, S. Ryzhova's monograph "Ethnic Identity in the Context of Tolerance" will be interesting to many researchers and politicians, as the process of formation of national-civil identity with the involvement of ethnicity, maintenance of inter-ethnic tolerance as a basis for successful interaction is aimed at securing civil accord, acceptance of intercultural differences, trust between people and trust in the state.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Рыжова С.В. (2011) *Этническая идентичность в контексте толерантности*. Москва: Альфа-М.
- Калхун К. (2006) *Национализм*. Москва.
- Tajfel H. & Turner J. C. (1979). *An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict*. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole .
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). *The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behaviour*. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Turner J. (1981) *The Experimental Social Psychology of Intergroup Behaviour // Intergroup Behaviour/Eds J. Turner, H. Giles/ Oxford, P. 66–101.*
- Turner J. (1985) *Social Categorization and the Self-Concept: a Social Cognitive Theory of Group Behaviour//Advances in Group Processes/Ed. E. Lawer. V. 2. P. 77–121.*
- Turner J.C., Oakes P. (1989) *Self-Categorization Theory and Social Influence//The Psychology of Group Influence, 2nd ed./Ed. P. Paulus/ Hillsdale, N. Y.: Erlbaum.*

A PUBLICATION ETHICS AND PUBLICATION MALPRACTICE STATEMENT

Responsibilities of Editorial Board

1. The Editorial Board of peer reviewed edition "Ethnicity" does not tolerate plagiarism or other unethical behavior and will refuse any manuscript that does not fulfill these standards.

2. The Editorial Board must disclose any conflicts of interest.

3. The Editorial Board must evaluate manuscripts only for their intellectual content.

4. The chief Editor is responsible for forwarding of the manuscript to two reviewers for blind peer-review. Each of them will make a recommendation to accept/reject or modify the reviewed manuscript.

5. The Editorial Board is responsible for making decisions concerning publication for submitted manuscripts and certifies that any commercial revenue has no impact or influence on editorial decisions.

Responsibilities of authors

1. Authors must confirm that their manuscripts are their original work, have not previously been published and are not currently being considered for publication elsewhere. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one edition constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable. If the author and editors, however, agree to the secondary publication, the secondary publication must include a reference to the first publication.

2. If the authors have used the work of others, that this has been appropriately cited or quoted.

3. Authors must also be ready to provide all necessary additional data related with their manuscript.

Responsibilities of reviewers

1. Reviewers must certify that they are out of any conflict of interest and evaluate manuscripts only for their intellectual content.

2. Reviewers must keep information pertaining to the manuscript confidential.

3. Reviewers must bring to the attention of the chief Editor any information that may be reason to reject publication of a manuscript.

4. If the reviewer feels that it is not possible to complete the review process, he/she must inform the chief Editor immediately, so the manuscript could be send to any other reviewer.

THE GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

- The manuscript must not be previously published or submitted for publication in other scientific editions.
- The scientific quality and novelty of the submitted text will be assessed by two anonymous outside experts. The text for the evaluation will also be submitted without reference to the author's identity. The author undertakes to incorporate in the revised text all the written comments and proposals of editors and reviewers which are recognized by the author as valid.
- The manuscript may be submitted in English and provide a 5000 - characters length summary and biography;
- The Editorial Board does not pay royalties; manuscripts and diskettes (or CDs) are not given back.
- The article should be prepared in accordance with the formal requirements listed below and submitted electronically. The author should observe the following requirements: text editor – *Word*, font – *Times New Roman*, font size – 12 pt, line spacing – 1.5 lines. The title should be given in 14 pt (bold), with subheadings in 12 pt (bold).
- An article should be 30 000 to 60 000 characters in length (including spaces), with a maximum of 3 illustrations which are not included within the text volume.
- Illustrations should be submitted electronically, in *.jpg* or *.tif* format, or *Microsoft Excel*, respectively. They should be supplemented by necessary information regarding the holder of the original. For example, the author should avoid photographs, authors of which are unknown, except photographs, taken more than 70 years ago.
- When submitting the article, the author should provide a written confirmation that the author's rights of third parties to the illustrations are not infringed. The article should be prepared electronically and submitted as separate files: (1) the text of the article in English, (2) summary in English, (3) illustrations, (4) list of illustrations with all necessary information. *Articles, which have spelling mistakes, will not be accepted and reviewed.*

Requirements regarding manuscript preparation

Title

Author details

Name and surname, scientific degree, academic institution or other workplace, email address, telephone number.

List of illustrations

To be prepared as a separate text, indicating the author and title of the article. The list should include the name of the author of the illustration, or, if this is not known, the source of the illustration, i.e. the journal, book, private archive (giving the person's name) etc.

Summary

The summary describes the essence of the study and the main results. The summary should be 5000 characters in length (including spaces).

Requirements regarding manuscript preparation

- When first mentioning a person, give their first name and surname. In repeated mentions, the surname only need be given. However, if several individuals with the same surname appear in the text, then the first name should also be given in repeated mentions.
- The first line of each paragraph should be indented by 1.5 cm.
- Pages should be numbered at lower right.
- References (also to illustrations), explanations and comments should be included into a single numbering for the whole text and should be located in the bottom of each page (footnote).
- Bibliographical references should be prepared according to the following scheme: the author's surname, initials, book title, city of issue, publisher, year of issue and pages. Lists of the used or recommended literature should not be added.

Bibliography should be compiled according to the given samples:

Monographs (books, brochures):

Turner J. H. (1974) *The Structure of Sociological Theory*. Homewood (Illinois): The Dorsey Press.

Zepa B. (ed.). (2006) *Integrācijas prakse un perspektīvas*. Rīga: BISS.

Articles in collections:

Turner R. H. (1990) A Comparative Content Analysis of Biographies. In: Oyen E., ed. *Comparative Methodology: Theory and Practice in International Social Research*. London, etc.: Sage Publications.

Articles in magazines:

Masaļska J. (2005) Sabiedrības integrācija Baltijas valstīs: kopīgais un atšķirīgais. *Politikas zinātnes jautājumi*. IV. Rīga: University of Latvia.

Articles in newspapers:

Strazdiņš I. (1999) Matemātiķi pasaulē un Latvijā. *Zinātnes Vēstnesis*, 8. marts. [March 8]

Materials from the Internet:

Niessen J., Huddleston T., Citron L. (2007) Migrant Integration Policy Index.

British Council and Migration Policy Group, September. <http://www.integrationindex.eu>. p. 104-109.

Bibliography should be compiled in the alphabetic order according to the authors' names or to the titles (at the beginning – in the Latin alphabet, at the end – in the Cyrillic alphabet).

Manuscripts should be submitted to:

“Ethnicity”

Vladislav Volkov, the chief editor

Institute of Philosophy and Sociology at the University of Latvia

Vladislavs.Volkovs@inbox.lv

or

Inese Runce, the managing editor

Institute of Philosophy and Sociology at the University of Latvia

Inese.Runce@lu.lv

