

**NATIONAL INTEGRATION  
IN ESTONIA AND LATVIA:  
2000-2002**

Vadim Poleshchuk

ECMI Baltic Project  
Final Seminar

6-8 December 2002, Flensburg, Germany

ECMI Report # 46

August 2003

ECMI Report # 46

European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI)

Director: Marc Weller

ECMI gratefully acknowledges the generous financial support from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany.

© Copyright 2003 by the European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI)

Published in August 2003 by the European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI)

## CONTENTS

Introduction <i>by Priit Järve</i> .....	1
Opening of the Seminar .....	3
First session: Multiculturalism and Minority Education .....	3
Second session: Language Policy and Integration .....	8
Third session: The Social Dimension of Integration .....	13
Fourth session: Political Participation of Minorities .....	16
Fifth session: <i>Quo Vadis</i> Integration in Estonia and Latvia? .....	20
Closing session: Final Discussion .....	21
ECMI Baltic Project: Conclusions <i>by Priit Järve</i> .....	23
Appendices.....	27
A. Integration Framework: Estonia .....	27
B. Integration Framework: Latvia .....	34
C. ECMI Baltic Project: Participants of All Events .....	37



## INTRODUCTION

*By Priit Järve*

The initial seminar of the ECMI Baltic project “Accession to the EU and National Integration in Estonia and Latvia” took place from 7 to 10 December 2000 in Flensburg, Germany and Tønder, Denmark.<sup>1</sup> It was followed by five workshops organized in different Estonian and Latvian towns with minority populations in 2001 and 2002. The workshops were conducted as follows:

1. From 1 to 3 June 2001 in Narva-Jõesuu, Estonia, on “Minority Education and Multiculturalism” (29 participants)
2. From 8 to 10 June 2001 in Liepaja, Latvia, on “Language Policy in Urban Environments” (35 participants)
3. From 19 to 21 October 2001 in Pärnu, Estonia, on “Social Dimensions of Integration” (31 participants)
4. From 1 to 4 November 2001 in Daugavpils, Latvia, on “Perspectives of Minority Education in Latvia”(47 participants)
5. From 6 to 8 June 2002, in Jurmala, Latvia, on “Legal Aspects of National Integration in Estonia and Latvia” (29 participants)<sup>2</sup>

Government officials, members of parliament, local government officials and minority NGO leaders from Estonia and Latvia attended all of these events. Representatives of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Missions to Estonia and Latvia; of the Office of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities; and international experts were frequent guests at these project events. To facilitate the information exchange between Estonia and Latvia, which had

---

<sup>1</sup> See Vadim Poleshchuk, *Accession to the European Union and National Integration in Estonia and Latvia*, Tønder, Denmark, 7-10 December 2000. ECMI Report #8, February 2001.

<sup>2</sup> See the reports of these workshops: Vadim Poleshchuk, *Multiculturalism, Minority Education and Language Policy*, ECMI Workshops "Multiculturalism and Minority Education", 1-3 June 2001 Narva-Jõesuu, Estonia, and "Language Policy in Urban Environment", 8-10 June 2001, Liepaja, Latvia. ECMI Report #10, August 2001. Vadim Poleshchuk, *Social Dimension of Integration in Estonia and Minority Education in Latvia*, ECMI Workshops "Social Dimension of Integration in Estonia", 19-21 October 2001 Pärnu, Estonia, and "Prospects of Minority Education in Latvia", 1-4 November 2001, Daugavpils, Latvia. ECMI Report # 18, December 2001.. Poleshchuk, Vadim *Legal Aspects of National Integration in Estonia and Latvia*, Workshop of the ECMI Project "Accession to the EU and National Integration in Estonia and Latvia", 6-8 June 2002, Jurmala, Latvia. ECMI Report # 33, September 2002at: [http://www.ecmi.de/doc/public\\_reports.html](http://www.ecmi.de/doc/public_reports.html).

to tackle similar problems of integration, representatives of both countries took part in all events. This information exchange was highly useful. Briefing papers by external and local experts were prepared for all workshops. These papers framed the discussion and helped in drafting the ECMI conclusions.

This report reflects the concluding seminar of the project, which was held in Flensburg from 6 to 8 December 2002 under the title “National Integration in Estonia and Latvia: 2000-2002”. The seminar based its work on what had been discussed during the preceding project workshops. It summed up the results of the project, taking into consideration the changes in both countries brought about by the 2002 national elections in Latvia, the 2002 local elections in Estonia and the change of governments in both countries. Important changes had also occurred in regard to the international standing of Latvia and Estonia - the OSCE Missions to these countries had been terminated at the end of 2001, the countries were invited to join the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), and the invitation to accede to the EU was forthcoming.

The 31 participants of the final seminar included the leader of a new Latvian party (‘First Party’), which, in its capacity as a member of the governing coalition, had managed to establish a ministerial post for social integration in the new Latvian government.

The seminar demonstrated that, while the professionalism of the Baltic participants, as well as the culture of the debate had progressed considerably during the project, some principal disagreements between the representatives of majorities and minorities in Estonia and Latvia nevertheless remained, particularly over the issues of language policy in these countries and, more specifically, over minority education reform in Latvia.

ECMI takes full responsibility for the text of this report, which has not been reviewed by the seminar participants.

## **OPENING OF THE SEMINAR**

**Mr Priit Järve**, ECMI Senior Research Associate, welcomed the participants to the final seminar of the ECMI Baltic Project. The project started in 2000 with the International Seminar “Accession to the European Union and National Integration in Estonia and Latvia”. In 2001 and 2002, the European Centre for Minority Issues organized five regional workshops in Estonia and Latvia. The main purpose of these events was to bring together representatives of minority communities and authorities in order to facilitate dialogue and cooperation. Additionally, due to participation of Estonian or Latvian experts these workshops offered a unique opportunity to exchange information on good practices and the official implementation of ethnic policies pursued by Tallinn and Riga.

Over the course of project, Estonia and Latvia witnessed dramatic changes on both the national and international levels. The new quality of US/Russia and NATO/Russia relations after 11 September 2001 were favourable for the Baltic States because the closer cooperation between the Russian Federation and the West reduced political tensions and fears in Eastern Europe. Furthermore, in early 2002 the OSCE closed its permanent missions in Estonia and Latvia as a result of considerable changes in the countries’ ethnic policies. In addition, both countries were successful in their aspiration to receive invitations to join the EU and NATO. Mr Järve concluded that all of these changes improved interethnic relations in both countries because the impending EU and NATO membership made the local titular population feel more secure and gave them an incentive to look for practical and reasonable solutions to minority-related problems.

## **FIRST SESSION: MULTICULTURALISM AND MINORITY EDUCATION**

**Mr Igor Pimenov**, NGO *LAShOR* (Russian acronym for *Supporting Association for Schools with Instruction in Russian Language in Latvia*), expressed concern regarding the ongoing education reform in Latvia. In the 2000/2001 academic year, 734 schools in Latvia used Latvian as the language of instruction, 179 used Russian, and seven used other languages. 154 schools had parallel instruction in Latvian and Russian.

The same year 67.4 per cent of all pupils studied in Latvian, 32.2 per cent in Russian and only 0.37 per cent in other minority languages. However, according to the Law on Education (1998) publicly financed secondary education (starting with the 10th grade) will be in the Latvian language and publicly financed elementary education will be bilingual beginning in the 2004/2005 academic year. Furthermore, according to the official document on social integration in Latvia, involvement of minorities in the Latvian-language education system becomes a cornerstone of official integration policies.

The NGO *LASHOR* tried to persuade the authorities to amend regulations regarding minority education. Three conferences were organized in 2001 and 2002 and had 500, 1,300 and 900 participants (pupils' parents, teachers and schoolchildren) respectively. The conferences adopted resolutions with the following demands: the guarantee of education in minority languages (especially concerning general subjects); the respect for parents' free choice of a language of instruction for their children in publicly financed schools; the securing of teacher training for minority language schools; the supplementation of the introduction of bilingual education with appropriate financial and methodological support in order to avoid negative changes in pupils' knowledge of subjects.

Additionally, the conference participants called for the ratification of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and the adoption of a special law on national minorities. They emphasized the importance of relative amendments in the integration programme and education laws. They also demanded the abolition of the "2004 requirement", i.e. the planned change of the language of instruction, etc.

According to Mr Pimenov, authorities condemned the conferences organized by *LASHOR* for bringing politics into educational reform. However, sociological research by the Baltic Institute of Social Studies in 2002 revealed that 37 per cent of minority schools' teachers, 41 per cent of pupils, 34 per cent of school principals and 31 per cent of parents supported the idea of conducting minority classes in the minority language. A significant number of representatives in all these groups were worried that bilingual education would have a deleterious effect on the pupils' subject

knowledge and command of their mother tongue. One half of all minority secondary schools were not ready for the transition.

The Ministry of Education and Science is now elaborating a new regulation that will also allow teaching certain subjects in minority languages on the secondary school level. Comprehensive information on the draft proposal is not yet available. However, Mr Pimenov was sure that the new regulation would not adhere to the Law on Education. Furthermore, the average amount of subjects taught in a minority language will be very insignificant and their teaching will lack necessary technical support. Mr Pimenov called for a continuation of the dialogue of all interested parties in order to find a proper solution. The speaker concluded that it is important to pay more attention to the opinions of minority pupils' parents and to minority schools.

In response to the audience's **questions**, Mr Pimenov argued that the interest of smaller ethnic groups regarding education in their mother tongue has diminished in Latvia compared to the situation at the beginning of the 1990s. In fact, minority education is usually understood as Russian-language education since Russian is the first language of 37 per cent of the Latvian population. A Latvian participant wondered whether Mr Pimenov thought that Russian parents should decide over Latvia's official education policy. Mr Pimenov replied that more democracy is required in decision-making processes in Latvia, where both Latvian and Russian-speakers pay taxes. Minority NGOs will take active measures to this end.

**Ms Svetlana Ragrina**, Director of the Estonian Institute for Slavonic Studies and former Adviser to the Estonian Minister of Education, presented the structure of minority education in Estonia. She emphasized that multiculturalism and multilingualism are different, yet intimately connected concepts. In Estonia, the term "bilingual education" is normally understood as a synonym of the term "transition of Russian gymnasiums<sup>3</sup> to instruction in Estonian language". The concepts of multicultural and bilingual education are taken from the Estonian constitution, legal acts and the official integration programme, which all aim to promote and protect Estonian culture and language and to ensure their dominant position. According to the

---

<sup>3</sup> 'Gymnasium' is the term for secondary school in Estonia.

integration programme, educational institutions are supposed to promote the Estonian language competence and the distinct cultural identity of minorities. However, in 2000 the first priority received financial support amounting to 39,932,540 Estonian kroons (€2.576.293), while the second one received a mere 2,905,000 kroons (€187,420). The support for the two priorities has only recently become more balanced.

Today three models for the bilingual education of non-Estonians exist. The most radical variant is exemplified by the decision of some minority parents to send their children to Estonian-language schools. In the 1996/1997 academic year, Estonian was not a language spoken at home for at least 5 per cent of all pupils in Estonian-language schools. This was a source of difficulty for both educational institutions and minority pupils, mostly because the schoolchildren had insufficient proficiency in Estonian, which negatively affected their educational success. The Estonian government is concerned about giving minority pupils the opportunity to study their mother tongues. In July 2002 it issued a special decree that makes it possible for minority children to study their mother tongue in Estonian schools under certain conditions. A similar decree was enacted in December 2002 to address the problems of non-Russian minorities in Russian schools where the overwhelming majority of pupils of non-Estonian and non-Russian ethnic origin prefer to study.

The second possibility for bilingual education is 14 classes of language immersion in 7 minority schools where 328 pupils studied in the 2001/2002 academic year. The language immersion programme is experimental and based on the relevant Canadian and Finnish experience. In the 2002/2003 academic year, ten kindergartens participated in the programme. Some people in Estonia believe that such a measure was necessary to stop the inflow of Russian children into Estonian kindergartens, which could have a negative impact on the language environment in these pre-school institutions. In language immersion classes all subjects are taught in Estonian in the first school year and then the number of subjects taught in the mother tongue slightly increases. The programme of "late immersion" (in basic and secondary schools) involves five Russian schools. Since only native speakers can be tutors in such classes, many minority teachers have already lost their jobs.

The third model of bilingual education is applied in one half of all Russian-language schools. Here at least a number of subjects are taught in Estonian. A pressing problem is the absence of appropriate teacher training programmes that take into consideration the differences in teaching a subject in the mother tongue or in a foreign language. It is evident that many good minority teachers without advanced proficiency in the Estonian language will lose their jobs. At the moment the training for the teachers in the field of multicultural education is oriented mostly at Estonian-speaking teachers who must be ready to teach different subjects in Russian schools and deal with non-Estonians in Estonian schools.

The biggest (Russian-speaking) minority in Estonia has enjoyed access to all levels of education in their mother tongue for centuries. While most other minorities have to establish their educational systems from scratch, Russian speakers are worried about how to preserve the existing one. This aim is clearly expressed by local Russian intellectuals and ethnic minority parties. Nevertheless, public higher education is almost exclusively in the Estonian language. Private Russian colleges did not receive licenses for post-graduate training. A Russian-speaking professor is rather an exception in publicly financed universities. Comprehensive Russian language higher education is available only with the payment of a tuition fee in private institutions. As for the public Russian gymnasiums, from the academic year 2007/2008 onwards they are expected to work predominantly in Estonian while a prolongation of this transition to the Estonian language is now possible after a recent amendment of the law.

Education is thus a very pressing problem for Estonia's Russian-speaking population. It is also a source of tension in Estonian society, which obstructs the integration process. However, Ms Ragrina concluded her presentation with reference to some positive patterns of cooperation between Estonian authorities and the Russian government in the field of minority education.

In response to the audience's **questions**, Ms Ragrina argued that the situation in the field of minority education in Estonia is not desperate. There are still reasons to hope for some positive changes in both legislation and practical implementation in the future. According to Ms Ragrina the possible postponement of the 2007 transition

deadline concerning instruction in Estonian language for some Russian gymnasiums cannot be considered a final and ideal solution to the problem.

During the **discussion** the participants touched upon some practical issues regarding minority education in Estonia and Latvia. Participants mentioned technical problems associated with the preservation of minority schools, including the lack of teacher training and the absence of a political consensus between pro-minority and mainstream political parties.

## **SECOND SESSION: LANGUAGE POLICY AND INTEGRATION**

**Mr Vadim Poleshchuk**, Analyst of the Legal Information Centre for Human Rights, Tallinn, started his presentation by stating that the language issue is a very delicate and politicized topic in Estonia. Estonian society is anything but monolithic. Ethnic Estonians make up 67.9 per cent of the population, while the figure for Russians is 25.6 per cent. The percentage of Estonians has increased during the last 10 years. Today, 20 per cent of the Estonian population (60.5 per cent of all minorities) do not have Estonian citizenship, while 12.4 per cent are stateless. This heterogeneity of Estonian society made it reasonable to initiate official integration policies.

According to the State Programme, *Integration in Estonian Society 2000-2007*, integration means harmonizing the elements of society on the basis of Estonian language and Estonian citizenship and enabling the maintenance of ethnic differences by recognizing cultural rights. Harmonization means integration around a unifying common core, and this core's most important component is understood as the creation of a common sphere of information in an Estonian language environment. Thus, the promotion of the Estonian language is a cornerstone of the country's integration process. The most important socio-linguistic functions - to serve as the official state language and as a medium for education and public communication - are assigned to Estonian.

According to the 2000 national census, Estonian is the mother tongue for 67 per cent of the country's population and Russian for 30 per cent. 20 per cent of the Estonian population cannot speak Estonian. These figures are even higher in Tallinn and in the

cities of the Ida-Viru County (26 and 71 per cents respectively). In short, two very large linguistic communities exist in Estonia. Against such a background any justified measures to promote the official language should be accompanied by certain guarantees for the use of the minority language (the right to use the minority language in contacts with public authorities; the right to be educated in the minority language or to study the minority language; the right of unrestricted use of the minority language in private and public; etc.)

Mr Poleshchuk argued that Estonian legislation employed a restrictive approach to the above-mentioned minority rights, introducing different linguistic restrictions in the sphere of education, public information and advertising, private business, etc. All these restrictions are aimed at ensuring the unrestricted use of the Estonian language. They intend to promote official language proficiency among minorities. They are not the result of a compromise, but only reflect the attitudes prevalent in the majority community.

As a direct consequence of the rigid linguistic requirements in Estonia, the level of proficiency in the state language among ethnic Russians has increased from 15 per cent in 1989 to 40 per cent in 2000. It was even higher (59 per cent) among the youth aged between 15 and 19. However, these results are still much lower than was expected in the beginning of 1990s. As a negative impact of linguistic regulations one may note the rather modest support for the relevant laws among minorities. Thus, a sociological study conducted by the Legal Information Centre for Human Rights in Tallinn in July 2001 revealed that only 24 per cent of all naturalized citizens, 17 per cent of all citizens of Russia and 5 per cent of all stateless minority members assessed the Law on Language positively (compared to 79 per cent of all ethnic Estonians).

Mr Poleshchuk summed up his presentation as follows: Estonian language proficiency is a very important factor of integration, but it cannot be the only one (as it seems to be understood by numerous Estonian officials). A large number of those who do not have Estonian language proficiency demand a special approach. They cannot wait to get involved in Estonia's political and social life until they have reached a level of language proficiency necessary to do so because by that stage they will be further marginalized.

In response to the audience's **questions**, Mr Poleshchuk emphasized the importance of considering the opinion of non-citizens in the process of drafting ethnic policies in Estonia because non-citizens make up one fifth of the entire population. Mr Poleshchuk objected to the conjecture of some Estonian participants that recent legislative changes were sufficient to solve the most challenging minority-related problems. Thus, according to Mr Poleshchuk the 2002 amendment to the Law on Elementary School and Gymnasium only legalized the postponement of the transition of some Russian gymnasiums to Estonian as a means of instruction, but the final decision on that matter will be taken by the Estonian government. The right to receive answers from the authorities in the minority language in the areas where minorities constitute the majority is largely overlooked in practice. For the areas where Estonians are in the majority, the recent amendment to the Law on Language only elaborated on a previous right to talk with officials with the assistance of an interpreter. In December 2001, the parliament was wise enough to abolish linguistic requirements for deputies at the elections to local councils and the parliament. However, Estonian was simultaneously made the only working language of local councils: self-governments have to receive a permit from the government to translate the sessions into the minority language (not *vice versa*).

Mr Poleshchuk also confirmed that, to the best of his knowledge, the local ethnic Russian parties oppose the 2007 transition of minority gymnasiums to Estonian as the language of instruction and call for a legal and institutional framework for the preservation of secondary education in minority languages in Estonia. Mr Poleshchuk agreed that language policy must use enforcement measures to be effective. However, all enforcement measures should be judged against their possible impact on causing interethnic conflict. Mr Poleshchuk did not agree that the Estonian and Latvian languages are endangered because, according to the 1989 and 2000 national censuses, in both countries between 98 and 99 per cent of Estonians and Latvians speak Estonian and Latvian, respectively, as a mother tongue.

**Ms Aija Priedīte**, Director of the Latvian Language Programme Unit, addressed the topic of language policy and integration in Latvia. According to Ms Priedīte, initially the Latvian state officials did not appreciate her activities and services. A lack of

democratic experience and limited successes have jeopardized language policy and integration efforts in Latvia for a very long period. Subsequently, it took a long time to create a positive discursive environment for the promotion of Latvian language training.

The dynamic of Latvian language regulation was as follows. The 1992 amendments to the Law on Language (1989) made Latvian the only official (state) language in the country. In 1998, a relevant amendment was made to the constitution. The new Law on Language was adopted in 1999. In August 2000, the government issued decrees that provided guidelines for the regulation of the use of the official language and minority languages, for the protection against violations of the freedom of speech, etc. In 2002, Latvian was officially established as the only working language in parliament and local councils. The newly elected deputies now have to say in their oath that they shall strengthen Latvian as the only state language. However, the deputies belonging to minorities also have received the right to evaluate their Latvian language proficiency themselves. Thus, Ms Priedīte argued, in ten years “the Law on Language has grown from a very restricted, ambiguous and negative document to a clearly formulated and neutral law which respects the Latvian language as well as minority rights and human rights”.

As early as 1994, the Latvian government realized that some immediate action was required in the sphere of language policy and that international assistance would be necessary. In 1995, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) organized a working group of local and international experts to design the National Programme for Latvian Language Training (NPLLT). The group drafted a ten-year National Programme that addressed issues related to the educational system and adult training and set up the Latvian Language Programme Unit.

The implementation of the programme started in 1996. First of all, it was necessary to eliminate stereotypes and prejudices of both Latvians and non-Latvians regarding Latvian language, its status and acquisition. For this purpose, a campaign was started to introduce a new school subject “Latvian as a second language”.

70 per cent of all funding was allocated to teacher training and 30 per cent to the training of representatives of other professions in which the Latvian language proficiency was indispensable. The Programme used a *multiplicator effect*, that is, a core group of teachers trained in an early phase of the programme could later serve as instructors for their colleagues. According to Ms Priedīte, the argument that there are not enough teachers and training materials to teach the Latvian language is not longer true.

The 1995 amendments to the Law on Education introduced a requirement that two subjects in primary minority schools and three in secondary minority schools should be taught in Latvian. These provisions were further elaborated between 1996 and 1998. In 1999, four models of bilingual education were prepared. Beginning in 2004, the language of instruction in secondary school will be Latvian while 30 per cent of all subjects can still be taught in the minority language. According to Ms Priedīte, language policy in the education system has been introduced smoothly and gradually. Ms Priedīte rejected arguments against the 2004 transition (which could be boiled down to the statement that it is better for minorities to be taught in the Russian language because it is their mother tongue and an internationally established language). Most minority schools are ready, or will soon be ready for the transition. The postponement of the implementation of the 2004 requirement will make whole classes fail because some students' work is unsatisfactory.

Language acquisition is a means for integration and NPLLT has been working on this issue for six years. The programme tried to promote inter-community dialogue even before integration policies were officially initiated. NPLLT published informational brochures on bilingual education. Ms Priedīte concluded by noting that dramatic changes regarding attitudes toward integration could be observed.

In response to the audience's **questions**, Ms Priedīte emphasized the importance of minorities studying subjects in Latvian, not only receiving Latvian language training. She does not agree that the existing level of preparation of minority schools and the limited availability of training materials will make the 2004 transition fail. Ms Priedīte supported the idea of a competition between different schools and called on minority parents to actively participate in the education reform.

During the **discussion** the minority members referred to a much more liberal approach to minority education in pre-war Latvia and Estonia. They claimed that authorities are interested only in an increase in Latvian and Estonian language proficiency of minority children and are not concerned about their knowledge of other subjects. Many argued that the envisaged 2004 transition in Latvia would make minority children even less prepared for competition with their Latvian co-students. Minority members argued that the Soviet experience of intolerance influences the discourse about minority education in the post-Soviet states; both then and now the minorities' argument has largely been ignored. Majority representatives from Estonia and Latvia referred to large numbers of minority children in majority schools and low birth rates among minorities to illustrate the necessity for language transition in education. As one former Estonian official claimed, "Russian schools try to preserve the *status-quo*. However, these schools will die without transition".

### **THIRD SESSION: THE SOCIAL DIMENSION OF INTEGRATION**

**Mr Boris Kolchanov**, Moderator of the MINELRES, an Internet mailing list on minority issues, Riga, addressed the social aspects of integration in Latvia. The social disparities between majority and minority populations were at the centre of his presentation. Thus, among those registered as unemployed at the state employment service, minorities have always been over-represented. For instance, in 2000 49.8 per cent of all registered unemployed persons were Latvians (this is less than their share in the overall population, which stands at 57.7 per cent), 35.9 Russians (29.6 per cent), 5.1 per cent were Byelorussians (4.1 per cent), etc. In 1997, a certificate of Latvian language proficiency was necessary to register as an unemployed. As a result, the percentage of ethnic Latvians increased among the registered unemployed in the same year. According to a sociological study by the *New Baltic Barometer*, 14 per cent of all Latvians and 26 per cent of all non-Latvians were unemployed in 1996. In 1999, according to the survey *Poverty in Latvia* 10 per cent of all ethnic Latvians, 18 per cent of all Russians and 17 per cent of other minorities were unemployed.

According to a study by Mr Artis Pabriks (Latvian Centre for Human Rights and Ethnic Studies) from 2002, 92.1 per cent of the employees of Latvia's ministries are ethnic Latvians – a striking figure when compared to their share in the overall population (58.8 per cent) or citizenry (76.3 per cent). The 1996 New Baltic Barometer revealed that only 12 per cent of non-Latvians were employed in the non-market sector of the economy (compared to 31 per cent of all ethnic Latvians).

The main reasons for these disparities are citizenship and linguistic requirements for public officials. However, widespread concerns regarding minorities' loyalty to the Latvian state should also be considered. Furthermore, minorities lack informal connections that would facilitate their recruitment to certain positions. Thus, minorities are much more alienated from the state. Mr Kolchanov concluded by noting that it is unlikely that state officials would acknowledge the aforementioned disparities and take appropriate measures to eliminate them.

**Ms Jelena Helemäe**, Institute of International and Social Studies, Tallinn, presented her interpretation of the social dimension of integration in Estonia. After Estonia regained independence in 1991, non-Estonians, mainly Russians, suffered from a status decline. They were excluded from the political community because of the citizenship policy. Furthermore, different scholars (e.g. K. Hallik and V. Pettai) write about the economic inequality between Estonians and non-Estonians and the latter's dependence on the former.

According to 2000 census data, Estonians and non-Estonians have the same level of education. There was no difference between representatives of younger generations of different ethnic origin. However, in Tallinn there were very significant negative changes in the participation rate of non-Estonians aged 20 to 24 in education. From these figures one can infer that non-Estonians may lose their position in Estonia's stratum of highly educated persons.

As for the Estonian language proficiency of non-Estonians, the situation has recently improved. However, after the latest Estonian Labour Force Survey of non-Estonians aged 20 to 29, good knowledge of Estonian was predominantly a characteristic of those with higher education. Again, the university enrolment of young minority

members (24 to 29 years old) is lower than that of Estonians, which is a clear sign for plummeting labour market opportunities for the younger generations of non-Estonians. At lower levels of education, young minority members cannot compete with Estonians. According to the same survey, the unemployment rate of young non-Estonians with secondary and vocational education was twice as high as that of Estonians of the same age and level of education.

Dramatic economic changes in Estonia in the early 1990s resulted in a situation in which non-Estonians might be characterized as a social group with downward mobility and dwindling labour market opportunities. When the situation stabilized in the mid-1990s, this vertical segmentation along ethnic lines crystallized. Since 1995, the difference in the unemployment rate of Estonians and non-Estonians has been relatively stable at approximately 6 points. Non-Estonians suffered more from the economic recession from 1998 to 1999. At that time occupational disadvantages of non-Estonians were converted into manifest wage losses. Moreover, minority representatives had fewer chances than Estonians to enter the highest wage quintile.

Different explanations for the aforementioned situation in the labour market exist. Some scholars claim that the Soviet economic legacy is to blame for the fact that Russians were over-represented in those branches of the economy and large enterprises that were most hurt by the initiation of market reforms. Others stress that Russians lack the necessary cultural, human or social capital, etc. On the other hand, the lack of citizenship rights and rigid official linguistic requirements have definitely limited non-Estonians' labour market opportunities. However, the importance of this factor is a highly disputed issue in the local academic community. Non-Estonians benefited considerably less from privatization and property reform. Again, scholars cannot agree whether this was a result of deliberate official policies or not. The majority of Estonian social scientists acknowledge the economic inequality between Estonians and non-Estonians, but they argue that the reason for it is not ethnicity. Nevertheless, in a study conducted by the Legal Information Centre for Human Rights 44 per cent of Tallinn's non-Estonian respondents argued that ethnicity is the main reason for ethnic Estonians' over-representation in the higher positions of society, 39 per cent of Estonians believed that the reason for this phenomenon is citizenship.

Estonian social scientists rarely connect labour market issues to political ones, however, the issue of the impact of politics on the Estonian economy is relevant. Ms Helemäe concluded by noting that its study would help to clarify why non-Estonians seem to be economically dependent on Estonians.

In response to the audience's **questions**, Ms Helemäe said that differences in social capital could only partly explain the inequality of different social groups in the Estonian labour market.

During the **discussion** minority representatives argued that many patterns of social inequality could not be explained by references to insufficient proficiency in the official language or the lack of Estonian citizenship. A former official from Estonia argued that in the city of Narva (populated predominantly by non-Estonians) young Russian teachers proficient in the Estonian language cannot get a job, in other words, they are discriminated against by the local Russian schoolmasters. Another Estonian participant stressed the importance of third sector activities for ensuring equal opportunities in different spheres of public life.

#### **FOURTH SESSION: POLITICAL PARTICIPATION OF MINORITIES**

The topic of political participation of minorities in Estonia was addressed by **Ms Klara Hallik**, Institute of International and Social Studies, Tallinn. According to Ms Hallik, integration measures and ethnic policies in a specific country normally depend on the general attitude toward ethnic pluralism in society. Ms Hallik and her colleague Mr Vello Pettai have previously used an analytical model of ethnic control (developed by I. Lustick) to explain how ethnic Estonians' political dominance was achieved in the course of political and economic reforms without any use of consociation or inter-community negotiations. All the changes for the benefit of Estonians, as well as the relative stability of the state, were attained mainly through political segmentation, dependence and co-optation of minorities. According to Ms Hallik, the philosophy of the integration programme is institutional co-optation.

Citizenship and political participation are the key elements in the formation of common societal values that enable people to be equal members of society

irrespective of their ethnic affiliation. Estonia's citizenship policy is rooted in the principle of legal continuity of the pre-war Estonian state. It resulted in the effective exclusion of Russian-speakers from decision-making procedures and in the division of Estonians and Russians into groups with unequal legal status. While only one half of those minorities without Estonian citizenship desired to become citizens of Estonia in 1993, this percentage grew to 70 per cent by 1999 (research by I. Pettai). However, in the last decade the tempo of naturalization was relatively slow. Thus, issues of citizenship and statelessness remained a decisive problem for the further integration of Estonian society. According to Ms Hallik, the state should encourage Estonian-born children to become Estonian citizens regardless of the citizenship of their parents. At the moment, underage persons, who do not have any influence on politics, make up about 40 per cent of all of Estonia's "new citizens".

As for political participation, Ms Hallik studied the attitudes of Estonians and non-Estonians in the course of the *Integration Monitoring 2002*. As expected, the absolute majority of the polled non-Estonians favoured liberal or equal participation in politics while Estonians' attitudes were more differentiated. For instance, only one fifth of the Estonian respondents were ready to support non-Estonians' participation in governmental structures. Estonians prefer a system in which it is very difficult for non-Estonians to have access to institutions and procedures that impact the well-being of the entire society. The attitudes of Estonians to minority participation are influenced by issues of ethnicity. However, this correlation is not straightforward. Generally speaking, the public perception of minority participation reflects an exclusivist thinking along ethnic lines in order to ensure Estonians' political dominance, and not an inclusive thinking associated with multicultural or liberal democracy.

Ms Hallik emphasized that in the rhetoric about ethnic issues the notion "national threat" often is used. The myth of a threat to national stability has become part of Estonians' self-consciousness. However, ethnic and civic-oriented identities are not becoming competing elements of this identity. Non-Estonians' lack of Estonian language proficiency prompts Estonians to put actual or symbolic obstacles in non-Estonians' way to power. Nevertheless, the strongly ideological concept of a "nation state" does not preclude some rational choices.

Several tasks proclaimed in the Estonian Integration Programme have been complicated due to serious contradictions between the defined goals and the institutional means enabling political integration. The marginal status of non-Estonians, particularly their political exclusion, led to their alienation from the state and to the “deficit” of their rights. Another problem is that non-Estonians have few opportunities to communicate their problems directly to society because of their under-representation in political institutions at every level of government. If minorities are prevented from participating in the formulation and implementation of political decisions, the excluded group will not accept these decisions as fully legitimate and if possible it will try to ignore them. In such a case, compliance will have to be achieved by administrative coercion.

Estonians and other ethnic groups do not differ in their attitudes to the system of government, their willingness to participate in politics and their apolitical stance, which seems to be a common feature of local political culture. Estonians and non-Estonians do not significantly differ in their assessment of the effectiveness of the state and democracy either. A sizeable part of the population supports the involvement of non-Estonians in organs of power according to a liberal, proportional or “limited” principle. In fact, the alienation of both ethnic communities from the state may seriously destabilize the existing political order.

In response to the audience’s **questions**, Ms Hallik argued that many decisions taken in the early 1990s were a consequence of a struggle for power that could be witnessed in Estonia at that time. Since 1995 mainstream political parties did not make any major revisions in their programmes concerning their attitude to minorities, thus demonstrating that they are not taking these problems seriously. According to Ms Hallik, it is very important to give majority parties incentives to compete for the votes of minority members, not only for those of the majority. This will give a new quality to political participation.

A state official from Estonia informed the audience that the tempo of naturalization would slightly increase in Estonia in 2002 compared to recent years. Ms Hallik argued that this effect might be achieved partly by counting those who received Estonian

citizenship by mistake in the early 1990s and who were now obliged to repeat the naturalization procedure (they are mostly ethnic Estonians).

Political participation of Latvian minorities was the topic of the presentation by **Ms Svetlana Djachkova**, Latvian Centre for Human Rights and Ethnic Studies. She pointed out several delicate problems, starting with the reference to low civic participation and both Latvians' and (to greater extent) non-Latvians' alienation from the state. Alienation from the state – along with high fees, lack of information and poor knowledge of the Latvian language – is one of the major obstacles for naturalization, which is a necessary precondition for comprehensive political participation. Nevertheless, many politicians do not consider the massive lack of citizenship a serious problem for Latvia. Minorities are also under-represented in state and municipal bodies and in the judiciary. This in turn promotes an increased distrust in state institutions among less-represented groups. Additionally, Latvia urgently needs efficient mechanisms for the promotion of a dialogue between minorities and representatives of state institutions, as well as NGO participation (including minority NGOs) in the design, implementation, and monitoring of minority-oriented public policies.

To meet these objectives, Latvia has to clarify and define minority rights in those spheres that have an influence on minority participation. Latvia should facilitate the use of minority languages in public bodies; ease language restrictions for private and public electronic media; and amend the legislation in the field of education (in particular, widen the opportunities to be educated in minority languages). The adoption of a special law clarifying minority rights and the ratification of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities are also very topical problems.

The implementation of the official integration programme will provide additional incentives for political participation to minorities. However, its success will largely depend on the broader legislative context, official policies, and the level of public support for the programme. In 2002, the Foundation for Social Integration made limited funding available to minority NGOs and municipalities for projects addressing topical problems of social integration. It is important to continue the social dialogue

on integration issues and to take adequate measures in the area of political participation in the framework of the existing state programme. These measures could include the training of and support for relevant NGOs and municipal initiatives, the promotion of a more active involvement of minorities in public life, the involvement of minorities in decision-making processes and the work in public administration. Furthermore, independent monitoring in the sphere of education is important, since the ongoing educational reform seems to cause serious tensions in society.

It is a very positive sign that the recently formed Latvian government officially promised to pursue ethnic policies that take into account the interests of both Latvians and national minorities. The establishment of a post of a Minister for Integration is of great importance as well. However, Ms Djachkova was not sure whether relevant financing would increase and effective minority-state dialogue would be fostered in the near future.

During the **discussion** participants emphasized the role of consultative bodies to give minorities an opportunity to voice their concerns and aspirations and also the importance of minority members' participation in political parties. As one of the participants suggested, given that minorities have to be protected from the tyranny of the majority policies toward minorities reflect the average level of democracy in a society. Minority-majority relations should not be regarded as a 'zero-sum' game, in which one side wins everything at the expense of the other. Both the titular nationality and Russian-speakers in Estonia and Latvia will benefit from a real consensus in society.

#### **FIFTH SESSION: *QUO VADIS* INTEGRATION IN ESTONIA AND LATVIA?**

At the beginning of the fifth session **Mr Tanel Mätlik**, Project Officer of the Royal Netherlands Embassy in Tallinn and former adviser to the Estonian Minister for Population Affairs, presented his account of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats within the present integration framework in Estonia (see **Appendix I**). The same evaluation for Latvia was made by **Mr Reinis Āboltinš**, Director of the Society Integration Department of the Ministry of Justice (see **Appendix II**).

In response to the audience's **questions**, Mr Āboltinš recognized the importance of the guarantee of non-discrimination and emphasized the individual aspect of the naturalization process and called on the seminar participants to differentiate between problems of naturalization and political participation. He claimed that a review of the integration programme's priorities is desirable and also possible. According to Mr Āboltinš the main tasks of the Department of Society Integration, which he heads (and which will soon be subordinated to the Minister for Integration), are integration monitoring, media and municipal projects. Mr Mätlik on his part argued that problems of non-discrimination and minority protection are in fact two sides of the same coin. Mr Mätlik argued that Estonian minorities did not demonstrate an active interest in political participation.

## **CLOSING SESSION: FINAL DISCUSSION**

During the **final discussion** many participants addressed the problem of creating a new political culture and fostering tolerance as a starting point for a timely and comprehensive ethnic policy. A minority participant from Latvia even claimed that the moral aspect of minority-majority relations is even more important than the legal one. Another Latvian minority participant emphasized the necessity of clarifying integration documents. Integration policies should explicitly be aimed at the preservation of minority cultures, the promotion of minorities' political representation, and the cooperation between majority and minority members. Participants called for a continuation of the integration projects with Estonians and Latvians as target groups (for the moment these projects are mostly limited to media projects and public advertising campaigns). A participant from Estonia welcomed the Latvian experience where many municipalities have their own local integration programmes. Unfortunately, in Estonia a local integration programme was drafted only in Tallinn, yet even this programme failed to receive official support as a consequence of political disputes.

Minority members have repeatedly touched upon the problem of insufficient tolerance of the majority population, which is ignorant about minority problems. Participants

worried that both minorities and majorities retain their old prejudices, which create an atmosphere of estrangement and suspicion. Minority and majority participants disagreed whether the naturalization requirements are easy enough to avoid putting additional obstacles in the way of effective political participation of Russian-speakers.

At the end of the seminar, **Mr Priit Järve**, ECMI, thanked all participants of the ECMI Baltic Project. He emphasized the important role and assistance of the Ministry of Justice and the Naturalisation Board in Latvia, and the Office of the Minister for Population Affairs, the Institute of International and Social Studies and the Legal Information Centre for Human Rights in Estonia. According to Mr Järve, Estonia and Latvia have developed considerable expertise on minority and integration issues. The need for Western experts, which was pressing in 2000 when the Baltic Project started, is no longer a problem. ECMI was pleased to provide the venue for the minority-related dialogue in both countries. Now it is looking forward to some follow-up activities, presumably in the field of linguistic regulation in the Baltic states.

## **ECMI BALTIC PROJECT: CONCLUSIONS**

*By Priit Järve*

The ECMI project “Accession to the EU and National Integration in Estonia and Latvia” created a unique opportunity for majorities and minorities in Estonia and Latvia discuss and resolve their differences in dealing with national integration and minority protection. All in all, 156 people participated in the project events, including 55 from Estonia, 85 from Latvia and 16 international experts and ECMI staff members (see the list of all participants in the Appendix). A core group of 40 persons, including ministers and heads of state agencies in the field of integration, as well as other key officials and minority representatives of both countries, took part in more than one project event.

ECMI organized altogether seven project events in 2000 and 2002. It should be noted that the project activities were extended by its active participants who organized additional events in Estonia and Latvia to follow up the issues discussed at the project workshops.

On 24 May and 11 September 2002, two Latvian NGOs, “Union of Citizens and Non-Citizens” and “Civil Initiative XXI”, led by Latvian participants of the ECMI project (Mr Sokolov and Mr Vasin), organized conferences “Latvia on the way to 2022. Integration, alternatives...” as “a domestic expression and consequence” of the ECMI project. The conferences focussed on the issues of language, education, citizenship and participation of non-citizens at the municipal level.

On 14 September 2002, the Latvian Association for the Support of Schools with Russian as the Language of Instruction, led by a participant of the ECMI project (Mr Pimenov), organized a conference of parents “To Study in Mother Tongue” in Riga, which gathered over 800 participants from different parts of Latvia, including the representatives of three leading political parties. The conference adopted a widely publicized appeal to the candidates at the upcoming parliamentary election to preserve the state financed education in the minority language.

On 24-25 October 2002, the Estonian Foundation for Integration organized an international conference “Multicultural Estonia” in Tallinn, which gathered international scholars, local experts and politicians. ECMI helped the organizer, a participant of the ECMI project (Mr Mätlik), find relevant international scholars for this event.

On 15-16 November 2002, the Legal Information Centre for Human Rights in Tallinn, led by a participant of the ECMI project (Mr Semjonov), organized an international seminar “Minorities and Majorities in Estonia: Problems of Interaction within a Broader European Context”, which gathered international experts in the field of minority rights. The ECMI project leader (P. Järve) participated as a moderator and keynote speaker.

Finally, on 6-8 December 2002, in Flensburg, the concluding seminar “National Integration in Estonia and Latvia: 2000-2002” was held, the proceedings of which are summarized in this report.

The seminar offered some general conclusions about the current ethnopolitical situation in Estonia and Latvia:

- (1) In Estonia, ‘national integration’ has been generally accepted as an official policy. However, the progress in this field has been slow in recent years because non-citizens have failed to take and pass the naturalization exams in large numbers. At the same time, the debate on the protection of minorities has started to move slowly from a security discourse towards a democracy discourse as demonstrated, among other developments, by relevant amendments to legislation. Local minorities are no longer perceived by the mainstream political forces as a serious threat to state independence and Estonian culture. The invitation to join NATO has considerably eased the country’s worries over external security and has had a positive spill-over effect that diminishes the perception of minorities as an internal security concern.
- (2) In Latvia, ‘society integration’ has become an accepted official policy with some reservations repeatedly voiced by a few radical political groups. Latvia’s tempo of naturalization is comparable to that of Estonia, which leaves both countries with sizeable groups of stateless permanent residents on the eve of their accession to the EU. The Latvian debate on minority protection is still predominantly a security discourse. The mainstream political forces continue to regard a large number of Russian-speakers in the country as a serious threat to the Latvian state, as well as to the preservation of Latvian language and culture. Hence, the persistent reluctance of official Latvia to ratify the

Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, and efforts to terminate the state-provided education in the minority language, i.e. in Russian, as soon as possible. The link between external security concerns, commonly related to Russia, and internal security concerns, related to Russian-speaking minorities, seems to be relatively weak in Latvia. The invitation of Latvia to join NATO, which must have reduced external security concerns, has had little effect on the perception of minorities as an internal security problem.

The seminar offered the following major conclusions about the results of the project:

- (1) The project workshops have empowered the participating minority representatives in their dialogue with officials of both states. At the same time, the culture of minority-majority dialogue has made substantive progress and its constructiveness has evolved considerably.
- (2) In recent years the expertise of the participants of the project events on minority protection in Estonia and Latvia has significantly increased. By the end of the project the Baltic participants were able to act as experts of the issues under discussion.
- (3) Participants of the project acted as initiators and organizers of conferences in Estonia and Latvia, which followed up on the issues discussed during the project events, thereby contributing to ongoing local minority-majority dialogues and relevant national debates. Estonian members of parliament, participating in the project, prepared several amendments to minority-related laws, which were adopted by the parliament.
- (4) The project helped to transfer some Estonian solutions to the Latvian debate, such as the “60 per cent in the state language and 40 per cent in the minority language” curriculum for minority schools instead of the initially prescribed 100 per cent curriculum in the Latvian language.
- (5) While disagreements between the representatives of governments and minorities over language policy, minority education and the tempos of integration do remain, the debates on majority-minority relations in Estonia and Latvia are approaching a point at which the security discourse could be left behind and replaced by a democracy discourse. By the end of 2002, the Estonian debate had made more progress in this respect than the Latvian one.

Based on the presentations, discussions and materials distributed at the seminars and workshops of the ECMI Baltic Project, especially at the final seminar, ECMI notes that there remain several unresolved issues regarding the minority situation and integration in Estonia and Latvia. To avoid developments that could endanger the minorities as well as the majorities in the Estonia and Latvia, it is deemed necessary in the coming years:

- To continue the majority-minority dialogue regarding official ethnic and integration policies
- To motivate relevant bodies to develop projects and activities in the sphere of social and political integration; integration projects must be properly financed

short-term objectives of integration programmes are to be subjected to regular review

- To take measures to remove any artificial obstacles for those loyal non-citizens that want to acquire Estonian/Latvian citizenship
- To adopt minority-related laws that are in line with modern international standards; the restrictive definition of “national minority” in Estonia may have to be reconsidered; Latvia needs to proceed with the ratification of the Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities without any reservations incompatible with the objective and purpose of this Convention
- To support financially, institutionally and politically the activities of special institutions dealing with minority and integration issues
- To ensure a proper balance between the policies providing for the unimpeded use of official languages and those providing for the protection of minority languages
- To create favourable conditions to ensure more active political participation of minorities at all levels of government
- To reach a consensus regarding minority secondary education and to start monitoring the education reforms in order to verify their actual effect
- To promote principles of equal treatment and non-discrimination in different spheres of public life, especially in the labour market
- To support the development of a civil society with the help of financial assistance by the state and the municipalities; official bodies should pay more attention to the development of a dialogue with representatives of the third sector
- To continue the promotion of minority rights in Estonia and Latvia on the part of the international community and especially the EU by offering the countries practical assistance if required

In September 2003, the citizens of Estonia and Latvia will decide in popular referendums whether their countries will join the European Union or not. If the answers are “yes” we can be proud that we contributed to this decision by trying to clarify minority related issues during our project. If the answers are “no”, it means that we should have worked harder.

## Appendices

### A. Integration Framework: Estonia

#### SWOT

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
<p><b>Legal framework</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ State Programme “Integration in Estonian Society 2000-2007”</li> <li>§ Action plans of the State Programme for the Years 2000 to 2003</li> <li>§ Government decision to establish the Integration Foundation (IF)</li> <li>§ External assistance agreements between Estonia and EC, Canada, Nordic Countries, UK, etc.</li> <li>§ Amendments to the Citizenship Act, Language Act, Aliens Act, Basic School and Gymnasium Act, etc.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Legal framework</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Law on Cultural Autonomy does not function properly</li> <li>§ Further possible problems in the Language Act, Citizenship Act, Basic School and Gymnasium Act, etc.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Institutional framework</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Structures dealing with integration issues established: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Minister for Population Affairs</li> <li>- Integration Foundation</li> <li>- The Steering Committee of the State Programme</li> <li>- Structures in line ministries</li> <li>- Network of NGOs and local governments</li> </ul> </li> <li>§ Effective cooperation between the State, academic institutions and other experts (IF, Integration and Mass Media Monitoring)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Institutional framework</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Steering Committee and structures in line ministries do not cooperate very effectively</li> <li>§ Weak coordination and cooperation between institutions in the development of legal acts</li> <li>§ Insufficient cooperation between the State and ethnic minority NGOs in the development of systems for the protection of ethnic identity</li> </ul>
<p><b>Spheres</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ The following spheres have been defined in State Programme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Linguistic-communicative integration</li> <li>- Legal-political integration</li> <li>- Socioeconomic integration</li> </ul> </li> <li>§ Most Estonians and non-Estonians desire a clear state integration policy</li> </ul>	<p><b>Spheres</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Different understandings of “integration” among Estonians and non-Estonians</li> <li>§ Less attention has been paid to legal-political and socioeconomic integration</li> <li>§ Preservation of ethnic identity of minorities is less elaborate in government plans and strategies</li> </ul>

<p><b>Main activities:</b></p> <p>§ The following sub-programmes have been launched:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I. Sub-Programme “Education”</li> <li>- II. Sub-Programme “Education and Culture of Ethnic Minorities”</li> <li>- III. Sub-Programme “Teaching of Estonian to Adults”</li> <li>- IV. Sub-Programme “Social Competence”</li> </ul>	<p><b>Main activities:</b></p> <p>§ Only I and III Sub-Programmes have been developed fully</p> <p>§ Related State Programmes and action plans in the field of socioeconomic integration do not function properly</p>
---	---

<b>OPPORTUNITIES</b>	<b>THREATS</b>
<p><b>Legal framework</b></p> <p>§ Review the Cultural Autonomy Act with a view to making amendments to enhance implementation/adoption of new legislation on minority rights</p> <p>§ Adopt new legislation on anti-discrimination</p> <p>§ Establish the system to support the ethnic minority (Sunday) schools and cultural societies</p> <p>§ Streamline legislative and administrative mechanisms to decrease the number of non-citizens and make naturalization more accessible for stateless people</p>	<p><b>Legal framework</b></p> <p>§ Delays in the adoption of necessary changes in the legal acts concerning integration (on Citizenship Act, Language Act, etc)</p>
<p><b>Institutional framework</b></p> <p>Establish joint body for governmental and non-governmental institutions to enhance cooperation in the implementation and evaluation of the State Programme</p>	<p><b>Institutional framework</b></p> <p>§ Structures dealing with integration issues will weaken because of political decisions to abolish relevant institutions, high turnover of specialists, etc.</p>
<p><b>Spheres</b></p> <p>§ Promote the common understanding of “integration” in society</p> <p>§ Promote integration projects at the local level to stimulate the elaboration of regional and municipal sub-programmes in order to help minority groups find their niche in society at the local and community level</p> <p>§ Consider the inclusion of extensive socioeconomic (e.g., active labour market) measures in the State Programme</p>	<p><b>Spheres</b></p> <p>§ Increase of difference between Estonians and non-Estonians in understanding “integration”</p> <p>§ 2 types of understanding that:</p> <p>a) there is no need to develop further new aspects/fields of integration</p> <p>b) there is no need to deal with Estonian-language education and training anymore and resources should be reallocated to other spheres</p> <p>§ Increased marginalization among some groups of non-Estonians</p>

**Main activities:**

- § Develop Action Plans for the years 2004-2007
- § Elaborate a more comprehensive set of measures to stimulate the inclusion of non-Estonians into public life and to develop partnership relations between State and local authorities and minorities
- § Develop public awareness of racially and ethnically motivated discrimination and violence, and take measures accordingly to prevent and eliminate these phenomena

**Main activities:**

- § Incorrect/ineffective use of funds which may decrease credibility of respective projects and programmes
- § Insufficient level of funding is ensured by the State
- § Continued weak know-how among many executing institutions (state agencies, local governments, NGOs) on project application/ management may slow down the use of available funding, especially in regard to structural funds

## LINEAR MODEL

	2002	2003-2004	2007	2010
<b>Legal framework</b>	<p>§ System to support the ethnic minority (Sunday) schools and cultural societies elaborated</p> <p>§ Amendments to the Basic Schools and Gymnasium Act, Language Act, Aliens Act, etc.</p>	<p>§ Review the Cultural Autonomy Act/ adoption of new legislation on minority rights</p> <p>§ Elaborating and strengthening of non-discrimination legislation in light of the EC directive 2000/43</p> <p>§ Streamline legislative and administrative mechanisms to decrease the number of non-citizens and make naturalization more accessible for stateless people</p>	<p>§ Indicators of expected results Approx. 10% increase in graduates in non-Estonian gymnasiums passing state language medium-level test (up to 88% of all non-Estonian gymnasium graduates), compared to respective success rate in 2000 (77.8%)</p> <p>§ 8% increase in non-Estonian adults passing state language level tests (up to 70% of all applicants), compared to respective success rate in 2000 (approx. 62%)</p> <p>§ Decrease of less tolerant Estonians and radical nationalist Estonians, compared to respective % in 2002 (28% and 19%)</p>	<p><u>Indicators of expected results:</u></p> <p>§ Approx. 60% of non-Estonians are fluent in the Estonian language, compared to respective rate (38%) in 2000 (approx. 168,000 from a total number of 440,000)</p> <p>§ Number of persons with undetermined citizenship decreased by approx. 40% (up to approx. 100,000 persons), compared to respective rate in 2002 (approx. 172,000)</p> <p>§ Similar unemployment rate among Estonians and non-Estonians, compared to approx. 50% higher rate among non-Estonians in 2002 (16.9% &amp; 10.4%)</p>
<b>Institutional framework</b>		<p>§ Establish joint body for governmental and non-governmental institutions to enhance cooperation in the implementation and evaluation of the State Programme</p>		

<p><b>Spheres</b></p>	<p>§ Ongoing work for the definition of objectives and measures in the field of social integration</p>	<p>§ Promote the common understanding of “integration” in society</p> <p>§ Promote integration projects at the local level, to stimulate the elaboration of regional and municipal sub-programmes in order to help minority groups find their niche in society at the local and community level</p> <p>§ Consider the inclusion of extensive socioeconomic (e.g., active labour market) measures in the State Programme</p>		
-----------------------	--	---	--	--

<p><b>Main activities</b></p>	<p>§ Development of a new Phare 2003 IB project in the field of Estonia language training and teaching in Estonian</p>	<p>§ Develop Action Plans for the years 2004-2007</p> <p>§ Elaborate a more comprehensive set of measures to stimulate the inclusion of non-Estonians in public life and to develop partnerships between State and local authorities and minorities</p> <p>§ Develop public awareness of racially and ethnically motivated discrimination and violence and take measures accordingly to prevent and eliminate these phenomena</p>		
-------------------------------	--	---	--	--

## B. Integration Framework: Latvia

### SWOT

<b>STRENGTHS</b>	<b>WEAKNESSES</b>
<p><b>Legal framework:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>§ State Programme “Society Integration in Latvia”</li><li>§ Law on Society Integration Foundation (SIF)</li><li>§ Statutes of the (SIF)</li><li>§ Statutes of the Ministry of Justice (MoJ)</li></ul> <p><b>Institutional framework:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>§ Department of Integration of Society (SID) at MoJ</li><li>§ Society Integration Foundation</li><li>§ Structures in line ministries dealing in-depth with some of the integration issues</li><li>§ NGOs dealing with integration issues</li></ul> <p><b>Spheres:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>§ Civic participation and NGOs</li><li>§ Social and regional integration</li><li>§ Education</li><li>§ Language and culture</li><li>§ Information</li></ul> <p><b>Main activities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>§ Coordination</li><li>§ Monitoring</li><li>§ Planning</li><li>§ Priority-setting</li></ul>	<p><b>Legal framework:</b> State Programme is currently rather a declaration/wish list.</p> <p><b>Institutional framework:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>§ Responsibility for integration issues is/has been highly dispersed</li><li>§ Line ministries generally fire-fight narrow problem issues</li><li>§ Although communication channels exist, they do not always function properly</li><li>§ The interest of each involved institution does not go much beyond planning additional resources for their annual budget</li></ul> <p><b>Spheres:</b> Almost none of the spheres falls explicitly under direct and sole responsibility of the “implementing agency” (MoJ), which results in running after pieces of information to try to carry out /coordinate activities.</p> <p><i>Civic participation and NGOs</i> – all ministries and State Chancery, until recently also the Secretariat of the Special Assignments Minister for State Reforms</p> <p><i>Social and regional integration</i> – Ministry of Welfare, Board for Regional Development and Planning at the Ministry of Finance</p> <p><i>Education, language and culture</i> – Ministry of Education and Science, Ministry of Culture;</p> <p><i>Information</i> – State Chancery, ministries.</p> <p><b>Main activities:</b> Everything - however, awareness raising, informative activities dominate</p>

<b>OPPORTUNITIES</b>	<b><u>THREATS</u></b>
<p data-bbox="229 264 635 367">INTEGRATION REDEFINED INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE POLITICAL CHANGE</p> <p data-bbox="229 412 523 551">A “MINISTRY” FOR: MINORITIES NGOs DIALOGUE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="277 595 753 663">§ The new institutional framework clarifies the rules</li> <li data-bbox="277 667 699 734">§ Political support presumably increases</li> <li data-bbox="277 739 727 846">§ Further strengthening and development of the monitoring system.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="229 891 478 925"><b>Legal framework:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="277 929 727 996">§ Adoption of new legislation on minority rights</li> <li data-bbox="277 1001 785 1068">§ Ratification of the CoE Framework Convention</li> <li data-bbox="277 1072 759 1180">§ Adoption of the framework document for the development of the civil society</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="229 1225 571 1258"><b>Institutional framework:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="277 1263 785 1330">§ Optimized distribution of functions and tasks</li> <li data-bbox="277 1335 654 1402">§ Institutions redefine their responsibility</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="229 1447 351 1480"><b>Spheres:</b></p> <p data-bbox="229 1485 759 1588">All relevant issues are approached in a coordinated manner and seen as a part of one plan.</p> <p data-bbox="229 1632 443 1666"><b>Main activities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="277 1671 564 1704">§ Awareness raising</li> <li data-bbox="277 1709 730 1776">§ Tackling of non-discrimination issues</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="826 277 1362 344">Potential political/governmental changes might jeopardize implementation of plans</p> <p data-bbox="826 389 1072 423"><b>Legal framework:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="874 427 1350 461">§ Relevant conventions not ratified</li> <li data-bbox="874 465 1283 499">§ No new legislation adopted.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="826 544 1168 577"><b>Institutional framework:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="874 582 1318 685">§ Continuation of uncoordinated implementation for the achievement of narrow goals</li> <li data-bbox="874 689 1343 757">§ Negative competition among the involved actors</li> <li data-bbox="874 761 1372 828">§ Sudden changes in the institutional framework</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="826 873 944 907"><b>Spheres:</b></p> <p data-bbox="826 911 1356 978">Potential redefinition of government priorities might restrict some of the plans</p> <p data-bbox="826 1023 1037 1057"><b>Main activities:</b></p> <p data-bbox="826 1061 1369 1164">Lack of sufficient funding might hamper the implementation of plans in monitoring and non-discrimination spheres.</p>

## LINEAR MODEL

	2002 - 2004	2005 - 2007
<b>Legal framework</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ratification of CoE Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities</li> <li>- Elaboration of a law on minority rights</li> <li>- Elaboration and strengthening of non-discrimination legislation in light of the EC directive 2000/43/EC</li> <li>- Assessment of necessary changes in legislation in the context of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights</li> <li>- Amendments in the Education Law</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Possible amendments in the Election Law allowing non-citizens to vote in municipal elections</li> <li>- Amendments in the Citizenship Law and/or secondary legislation regarding citizenship issues liberalizing requirements</li> </ul>
<b>Institutional framework</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduction of a Special Assignments Minister for Integration Affairs</li> <li>- Transferred and/or redefined functions and responsibilities</li> <li>- Introduction of new consultative bodies and mechanisms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further strengthening of the Secretariat of the Special Assignments Minister for Integration Affairs especially in the non-discrimination sphere</li> <li>- Increasing role of Ombuds institution (National Human Rights Bureau)</li> <li>- Increasing role of specific rulings of the Constitutional Court regarding minority rights</li> </ul>
<b>Spheres</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Covers all possible aspects</li> <li>- Redefined priorities</li> <li>- Emphasis on minority issues, NGOs, dialogue mechanisms</li> <li>- Special attention to cooperation with municipalities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increasing attention to migration and migrant issues</li> <li>- Human rights awareness raising, especially in the light of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights possibly becoming part of the EU law</li> <li>- Strengthening of NGOs as inalienable policy actors and participants in the decision-making process</li> </ul>
<b>Main activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring, strategic planning, awareness raising, promotion of HR and minority rights, creating dialogue mechanisms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring, strategic planning, awareness raising, promotion of HR and minority rights, strengthening of dialogue mechanisms, delegation of functions to the NGO sector</li> </ul>

### C. ECMI Baltic Project: Participants of All Events

#### Participants from Estonia:

No.	Name	Position and Organization
1	Afanassjev, Gennadi (1)	Deputy Mayor, Narva city government
2	Agapova, Halida (3)	Director, Narva Center for Community Integrative Initiative
3	Aisatullin, Güzjalja (1)	Member of Union of Estonian Nationalities, Union of Estonian Nationalities
4	Averina, Julia (1)	Lawyer, Narva Centre of Integration
5	Barabaner, Hanon (1)	Rector, Sillamäe Institute of Economics and Management
6	Doroshko, Tatjana (1)	Young Moderates ( <i>Noored Mõõdukad</i> )
7	Golikova, Irina (1)	Sillamäe Centre for Community Integrative Initiative
8	Golovko, Maksim (1)	Post-Graduate student, Tallinn Pedagogical University
9	Grechkina, Elsa (2)	Chairperson of the Board, Private gymnasium "Polüloog"
10	Grigorjan, Rafik (2)	Counsellor to the Minister for Population Affairs
11	Hallik, Klara (2)	Former Minister of Interethnic Affairs, Member of Presidential Roundtable on National Minorities, Senior Researcher, Institute of International and Social Studies
12	Helemäe, Jelena (2)	Researcher, Institute of International and Social Studies
13	Ivalo, Esta (1)	Project officer, Institute of International and Social Studies
14	Ivanov, Sergei (1)	Member of Estonian Parliament
15	Jakobson, Valeria (1)	Member of the board, non-profit organization "Omos"
16	Jevgrafov, Aleksei (1)	Member of Estonian Reform Party Youth
17	Kanarik, Kristjan (1)	Member of <i>Pro Patria</i> Union Youth
18	Kissina, Taissia (1)	Chairperson of Committee, Trade union of Kreenholm Holding
20	Koroljova, Svetlana (1)	Tallinn Centre for Community Integrative Initiative
21	Kressel, Ingrid (1)	Attaché of the Human Rights Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
22	Krimpe, Jana (4)	Advisor-Secretary, Office of the President of Estonia; Project Manager, Department of Public Administration, Tallinn Pedagogical University
23	Laius, Agu (3)	Director, Jaan Tõnisson Institute
24	Liivo, Mihkel (1)	Counsellor to the Estonian Minister for Population Affairs
25	Markina, Anna (1)	Researcher, Institute of International and Social Studies
26	Medar, Martin (1)	Social affairs department, Ida-Viru county government

27	Mehisto, Peeter (1)	Manager of the Estonian-Canadian language immersion project
28	Melamed, Maksim (1)	Estonian Association of Young Jews
29	Mätlik, Tanel (4)	Project Officer, Royal Netherlands Embassy in Tallinn, former Counsellor to the Minister for Population Affairs
30	Naumov, Vladimir (1)	Narva NGO “New Bridge”
31	Nutt, Mart (1)	Member of Estonian Parliament
32	Odinets, Eduard (1)	Counsellor to the Minister for Population Affairs
33	Ohrimenko, Niina (1)	Ukrainian Community in Estonia
34	Pogrebnyak, Alla (2)	Paldiski Centre for Community Integrative Initiative
35	Poleshchuk, Vadim (7)	Legal Adviser - Analyst, Legal Information Centre For Human Rights
36	Ragrina, Svetlana (1)	Director, Estonian Institute of Slavonic Studies
37	Raidma, Leo (1)	Head of Department of Education, Ida-Viru county government
38	Raik, Katri (1)	Director of Narva College, Tartu University
39	Saar, Ellu (2)	Senior Researcher, Institute of International and Social Studies (IISS)
40	Saks, Katrin (4)	Minister for Population Affairs
41	Seelman, Eda (1)	Manager of the Nordic/UK/UNDP project, the Integration Foundation
42	Semjonov, Aleksei (3)	Director, Legal Information Centre for Human Rights
43	Semjonova, Larissa (1)	Deputy Director, Legal Information Centre for Human Rights
44	Sergejeva, Marina (1)	Student, Tallinn Euro-University
45	Shegedin, Aleksandr (1)	Political editor, Weekly <i>Vesti Nedelja Plus</i>
46	Sporykhina, Nadezhda (1)	Member of board, Roundtable of Women of Narva and Narva-Jõesuu
47	Stalnuhhin, Mihhail (1)	Member of Estonian Parliament
48	Tammekivi, Margus (1)	Deputy Mayor of Pärnu
49	Tender, Tõnu (1)	Advisor, Estonian Ministry of Education
50	Tomusk, Ilmar (1)	Director General, Estonian Language Inspection
51	Trofimov, Imants (1)	Tartu NGO “Future of the Young”
52	Velman, Vladimir (4)	Member of Estonian Parliament
53	Võlli, Kai (1)	Adviser, Ministry of Education
54	Vöormann, Rein (1)	Head of Department, Institute of International and Social Studies
55	Vybornaya, Larissa (2)	Pärnu Centre for Community Integrative Initiative

**Participants from Latvia:**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position and Organization</b>
1	Ābiķis, Dzintars (1)	Member of Parliament, Head of Standing Committee of Education and Science
2	Āboltiņš, Reinis	Ministry of Justice, Director of Society Integration Department
3	Agešins, Valērijs (1)	Teacher of Liepāja Aleksandr Pushkin Comprehensive School no.2, Member of the Employment Commission of Liepāja City Council
4	Aldermane, Eiženija (5)	Head of the Latvian Naturalization Board
5	Ancāne, Andra (1)	Journalist of newspaper “Diena”
6	Andersone, Līga (2)	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Human Rights Policy Division
7	Arāja, Dita (1)	Journalist of the national news desk “Diena” (“Day”)
8	Aršavska, Tatyana (1)	Association for Supporting Schools of Latvia with Russian as Language of Instruction (LASHOR)
9	Ate, Mārtiņš (1)	Assistant of the Head of Naturalisation Board
10	Azarevičs, Vitālijs (1)	Headmaster of Daugavpils Secondary School No. 3
11	Balaško, Aina – Edīte (1)	Latvian Naturalisation Board, Head of the National Minorities department
12	Balodis, Oskar (1)	Senior specialist of the Department of Social Integration, Ministry of Justice of Latvia
13	Bogushevitch, Tatyana (1)	Assistant of MP, Parliament of Latvia
14	Bošs, Andris (1)	Counsellor of Daugavpils City Council
15	Brandav, Aleksandr (1)	Member of Latvia’s First Party
16	Briede, Kristīne (1)	Deputy head of Liepāja Karaosta Culture and information centre “K@2”
17	Bružiks, Jānis (1)	Head of Daugavpils Regional Branch of Naturalisation Board
18	Bulaša, Irēna (1)	Head of Education Board of Daugavpils District
19	Ciršs, Vitālijs (1)	Head of Language Centre of Daugavpils
20	Dambergs, Guntis (1)	Member of Latvian Parliament
21	Deklaus, Tāivaldis (1)	Deputy of Mayor of Liepāja City Council
22	Dementjev, Aleksandr (1)	Head of the Citizenship Department of the Naturalisation Board
23	Dimitrov, Aleksei (2)	Latvian Human Rights Committee (F.I.D.H)
24	Djachkova, Svetlana (3)	Researcher, Latvian Centre for Human Rights and Ethnic Studies
25	Djačkova, Svetlana	Researcher of the Soros foundation and the Institute of Social Policy
26	Druviete, Ina (4)	Head of Department, Institute of Latvian Language, University of Latvia
27	Dukšinskis, Jānis (1)	Head of Education Centre, Education Board of Daugavpils
28	Eigims, Richards (1)	Chairperson of Daugavpils City Council

29	Elksne, Sandra (2)	Assistant of the Minister of Justice
30	Favorskaja, Tatjana (1)	Russian Society in Latvia
31	Gaigals, Jānis (1)	Parliamentary Secretary of Ministry of Justice
32	Grīnblats, Māris (1)	Member of Latvian Parliament
33	Jankovska, Līvija (3)	Deputy of Mayor of Daugavpils City Council
34	Jankovska, Līvija	First Deputy Chairperson of Daugavpils City Council
35	Jēkabsons, Ēriks (1)	Chairman of Latvia's <i>First Party</i>
36	Kadile, Dzintra (1)	The Senior Latvian language inspector of the Jelgava region
37	Kārkle, Tija (1)	National Program for Latvian Language Training
38	Kezika, Vanda (1)	Member of Parliament
39	Kolchanov, Boris (2)	Moderator of <u>MINELRES</u> <a href="http://www.minelres.lv">www.minelres.lv</a>
40	Kravčenko, Lidija (1)	Ukrainian Secondary School of Riga
41	Kuciņa, Silva (1)	National Programme for Latvian Language Training
42	Kuklis, Juris (1)	State Inspector of Education in Daugavpils, Education Board of Daugavpils
43	Labucka, Ingrīda (2)	Minister of Justice of Latvia
44	Lauskis, Valdis (1)	Member of Parliament
45	Liguta, Tatjana (2)	The Russian Language and Literature Teachers' Union
46	Lukaševič, Valentin (1)	Deputy Chairperson of Integration Commission of Daugavpils City Council
47	Martišūne, Signe (1)	Latvian Centre for Human Rights and Ethnic Studies
48	Masaļska, Gaida (1)	Director of the Latvian Folk school
49	Matjakubova, Jelena (1)	Teacher of Riga Secondary School No. 40
50	Mažeiks, Jānis (1)	Head of the International Organisations and Human Rights Policy Division of the Department of International Organisations and Humanitarian Issues, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Latvia
51	Mežs, Ilmārs (1)	International Organisation for Migration, Head of Riga office, Chancery of the President of the Republic of Latvia, member of Language Commission
52	Mitrofanov, Miroslav (3)	Member of Latvian Parliament
53	Molčanova, Ljudmila (1)	Director of Liepāja School Board
54	Novikova, Irina (1)	Researcher, Gender Studies Centre
55	Pabriks, Artis (1)	Lecturer, Vidzeme University College
56	Papule, Evija (5)	Head of the Integration Division of the Ministry of Education and Science
57	Pēkalis, Juris (1)	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Human Rights Policy Division
58	Pimenov, Igor (5)	Supporting Association for Schools with the Russian Language of Instruction in Latvia (LASHOR)
59	Prekul, Ivan (1)	Member of Daugavpils Department of Russian Community in Latvia
60	Priedīte, Aija (3)	Head of the Unit of the Latvian National State Language Training Programme
61	Prokofjeva, Elvira (1)	Deputy Head Department, and Member of Integration Commission of Daugavpils City Council
62	Ribakov, Ivan (1)	Deputy Chairperson of Rēzekne City Council
63	Rutkovskis, Vitālijs (1)	Naturalization Board, Naturalization Board

64	Sakss, Nils (1)	Society Integration Foundation
65	Savčenko, Nina (1)	Member of Latvian Parliament
66	Seiksts, Antons (1)	Member of Latvian Parliament
67	Šengeliņa, Vera (1)	Headmaster, Secondary School no. 3 of Ventspils
68	Šķiņčs, Ivars (1)	Headmaster of Daugavpils Secondary School no. 17
69	Slavinskis, Aldis (1)	Director of the Educational Department of the Ventspils City Council
70	Sokolov, Vladimir (1)	The Union of Citizens and Non-citizens
71	Stadgale, Ineta (2)	Project Co-ordinator on Society Integration Issues, Liepaja City Council
72	Stalidzāne, Ilona (1)	Naturalisation Board, Acting Head of Information Centre
73	Stepanov, Aleksandr (1)	Member of Integration Commission of Daugavpils City Council
74	Stolere, Vineta (1)	Assistant of the Speaker of the Latvian Parliament
75	Tsilevich, Boris (2)	Member of Latvian Parliament
76	Vāgnere, Kristīne (2)	Latvian Naturalisation Board
77	Vāgnere, Kristīne	Deputy Director of Society Integration Department of Ministry of Justice
78	Vasin, Vjačeslav (5)	Russian Society in Latvia
79	Vasin, Vjačeslav	Secretary of Council of the NGO "Civil initiative XXI"
80	Vēbers, Elmārs (1)	Riga City Council
81	Viņņik, Irina (2)	Program Director of the Latvian TV
82	Zepa, Brigita (1)	Baltic Institute of Social Sciences
83	Ziemele, Ineta (1)	Professor of International Law and Human Rights, Riga Graduate School of Law, Latvia; and of Raoul Wallenberg Institute, Lund, Sweden
84	Zommere, Rita (2)	Head of the Rēzekne regional branch of the Naturalization Board
85	Zvejsalnieks, Osvalds (1)	Member of Latvian Parliament

**Experts and ECMI Staff:**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position and Organization</b>
1	Birckenbach, Hanne-M (1)	Researcher, Schleswig -Holstein Institute for Peace Research, Germany
2	Boesche-Seefeldt, Ute (2)	Project Organiser, ECMI, Germany
3	Bøther, Bjarke (1)	Adviser to the Commissioner, Commissioner of the Council of the Baltic Sea States on Democratic Development, Denmark
4	Brennan, Neil J. (3)	First secretary of the OSCE Mission to Estonia
5	Domini, Mirjana (1)	Member of the Advisory Committee of the FCNM, Croatia
6	Grin, François (1)	Deputy Director, ECMI, Germany
7	Heidenhain, Stephan (1)	First secretary of the OSCE Mission to Estonia
8	Helin, Johanna (1)	First Secretary, OSCE Mission to Estonia
9	Herberts, Kjell (1)	ÅBO Academy, Finland
10	Hertrampf, Doris (1)	Head of the OSCE Mission to Estonia
11	Järve, Priit (7)	ECMI Senior Research Associate
12	Lange, Falk (3)	Senior adviser to the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, Office of the HCNM, the Netherlands
13	Sakslin, Maija (1)	Institute of International Economic Law, University of Helsinki, Finland
14	Semneby, Peter (1)	Head of the OSCE Mission to Latvia
15	Skarzinskaite, Aiste (1)	Project officer, ECMI, Germany
16	Sketekee, Frank (1)	Programme Counsellor, Directorate General of Human Rights of the Council of Europe, France