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INTRODUCTION

Why this course?
The aim of the course is to present the role of the state in dealing with the problems of various minorities and in creating civil society in the Baltic region; to analyze ethnicity and reasons for ethnic discrimination in modern society; and to give sufficient competence to explain the development of ethnic compositions in the Baltic region.

The Baltic Region in this class is defined as the Baltic Sea Region and its relation to the neighboring countries. Eric P. Kaufmann, focusing on dominant ethnicity, represents the State’s transformations and participation in the formational process of civil society. His analysis is based on liberal globalisation and multiculturalism that “have compelled nations to transform their identities from an ethnic to a civic mode. This has led, in many cases, to dominant ethnic decline, but also to its peripheral revival in the form of Far Right politics. At the same time, the growth of mass democracy and the decline of post-colonial and Cold War state unity in the developing world have opened the floodgates to assertions of ethnic dominance”. The post-Cold War period opens the way for new directions and changes in the Baltic Sea region.

This course, in the intercultural context of history and the social sciences, seeks to discuss questions such as these:

• How can we analyze the situation of ethnic minorities in the Baltic region?
• Does the definition and explanation of the traditional features of historical minorities and their existence in the modern State give us the instrumentation to start a research project?
• How can we define the State’s participation in constructing civil society and analyzing the issues of minorities? How do we analyze, discuss, and research the Baltic Region?
• How can we evaluate the complexity of political and cultural transformations of societies in the Baltic Region?
• How can we interpret political processes in the Baltic Region?

In this class we will explore national, ethnic and religious minorities around the Baltic Sea and their participation in the formation of civil societies. Also, attention will be oriented towards the State’s participation in the creation of civil society and its minority policy.

What will you learn?
At the end of the course you will be able to:

• interpret political processes in the Baltic Region;
- evaluate the complexity of political and cultural transformations of societies in the Baltic Region;
- analyze the situation of ethnic minorities in the Baltic region;
- recognize and approach the State's participation in constructing civil society and analyzing the issues of minorities;
- define and explain the traditional features of historical minorities and their existence in the modern State;
- present and discuss your research orally and in writing.

Reading materials
Main reading materials:

Secondary reading materials:

Course requirements:
This subject is designed as a reading, writing, discussion, and lecture course. To do well, a student must study the readings carefully and consistently, work on writing assignments and participate actively in class discussion.
Aim of the lecture:
The aim of the lecture is to define, analyze and discuss the role of the civil society in the Baltic Sea Region underlining the most important periods of historical development.

Lecture description:
This lecture will examine the state of “civil society” in the Baltic Sea Region. It will look at the mix of arrangements different societies and cultures use to address common concerns which are related to theory and practice, values/virtues and their implementation. It will also consider whether or not “civil society” is a universal feature of social life – and always a desirable one, and how new “social media” may – or may not – be assisting it.

Not less importantly, by scrutinizing the experience of other countries and cultures, the lecture aims to give students a greater understanding of the nature of – and possibilities for – “civil society” in the Baltic Sea Region.

Firstly, we should agree that the ‘region’ is the most fundamental concept in any attempt at regional analysis. Secondly, “once it has been noticed that regions are social, economic, and cultural entities, rather than simply political ones, the use of statistical data, which usually are reported on a provincial basis, will not represent either the extent of regional divisions or their effect on other aspects of social life”. Thirdly, since 1990, the construction of the Baltic Sea region has been strongly interconnected with the political category of regionalisation. Today this dimension is seen as the best field of cooperation in the process of the regionalisation of the Baltic Sea region. The definitions of the Baltic Sea Region are seen as the best ones in co-operative projects. I have in mind the Helsinki Commission’s (HELCOM) definition – the Baltic Sea including all sub-basins with their drainage basins; and the Council of the Baltic Sea States definition – 9 coastal states + all Nordic states including Norway and Iceland. Regional development here is seen as a spatial process not focusing on resource use, but more on the net of social contacts aspect.

We may agree that “those territories become by definition “regions” which are only slightly separated in economic, social, and political respects, in their ethnic composition, as well as in their system of values and standards, while being radically different from other territories on the border”. Defining ‘region’ as it is seen by Gert von


2 Ibid.
Pistohlkors, also we should acknowledge that “The concept “regionalism” must be deeply rooted in the everyday life of the respective “region” in order to be historically/economically useful, in order to be an object of a collective intellectual expenditure, and in order to be generally interesting”. [...] Only the intensive and concentrated pull of far-reaching historical processes in this direction would be able to strengthen general ideas of “regionalism”3. On that basis, the constructional process of the Baltic Sea Region seems to be just starting its development. Due to historical/economical/social/religious backgrounds and systems of values and standards, countries differ within the Baltic Sea Region. The best effort by all Baltic Sea Region states, with two exceptions, was made to implement the same system of values and standards. Russia in this context is mentioned as a country that seeks closer cooperation and integration acknowledging the existing system of values and standards of the Baltic Sea region states. This field today seems to be fullfilled in all categories of regionalisation: political, economic, planning and environmental. Nevertheless, even in this dimension, a lack of mutual understanding could be felt.

One of the key defining characteristics of a region, according to Ralph Matthews, “is a sense of ‘belonging together’. Thus, though it may be possible to identify numerous ways in which regions empirically differ in social organization, social behavior, and culture, a distinctive region cannot be said to exist unless the residents of a region identify themselves as belonging to such a territory, and consequently modify their actions. One of the defining and necessary characteristics of any region is that its residents have a sense of regionalism”4. So the question is, do members of society in the Baltic Sea States have a consciousness of a historical identity? Regionalism as a notion of consciousness cannot be seen as independent of the representative human group – the social group or even of one’s class, Gert von Pistohlkors reminds us.

Readings:

Keywords: civil society; Baltic States; Baltic Sea Region; minority communities; NGOs, nationalizing states

Questions to be raised:
1. How does a ‘strong civil society’ in the analytical sense lead to a ‘society that is strong and civil’ in the normative sense, and what role is played by the public sphere in promoting both? (Edwards)
2. How and, crucially, why does civil society contribute to “better” democracy? (Agarin)
3. How might the definition of civil society in the Baltic Sea Region be analyzed from the perspective of Michael Walzer?
4. Could the image of Scandinavian civil society be an example for the formation of civil society in the Baltic States?

Hypothesis:
This hypothesis has been made by Timofey Agarin. Share your thoughts: “civil society contributes to the democratization of state-society relations only if civil society mobilizes the concerns of its activists and seeks to appease all groups affected by state policies”.

Tasks:
- Construct the definition of civil society in the Baltic Sea Region.
- Confirm or disprove the hypothesis of Timofey Agarin.
- Discuss diagrams N.1, N.2 and N.3.

Diagram N.1:

Diagram N.2:

Diagram N.3:
CHAPTER 2
BALTIC REGION AND MINORITIES: THEORETICAL GUIDELINES

The aim of the lecture:
The aim of this lecture is to give a short general overview of the development of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, discussing various definitions concerning minorities. It will present the main concepts of nationalism to give the main characteristics of identity at the end of the 18th–19th centuries.

The tasks of the lecture:
Minorities existed all the time: some who were different but not powerful enough usually became a minority. The question was, what had to be done with such a group? Various periods suggested various decisions – to expel, to kill, to ignore, to accept, etc. There are various definitions for minorities:

- religious minorities;
- language minorities;
- national minorities;
- ethnic minorities;
- cultural minorities.

Using literature and other sources, find definitions of the listed minorities and give some examples. What are the main differences among them?

Using M. Hroch’s proposed diagram, apply it to the cases of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Does the diagram suit all cases? What are the main differences and similarities among these three cases? What could have caused them? Could the same pattern be adopted for other national groups as well: Poles, Baltic Germans, Jews, Russians?

What are the main narratives (epos) of Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians? When were these epos created? Why? What is the main message of these epos?

Description:
Historically otherness was not accepted for quite a long time, unless it could be useful, for example, the Jewish minority during the Middle Ages in the Muslim world lived a peaceful and prosperous life until the beginning of the 12th century, but every year the Jewish community had to pay a certain amount of money to the Muslim rulers, otherwise they would be expelled or killed. Different religions and cultures were not acceptable, but so long as it could give some benefit, it was tolerated. Of course, under such conditions everything depended on those who
were in power. At the beginning of the 12th century in the Muslim world, a more religious dynasty came to power and the life of Jewish communities changed – persecution began and it was one of the reasons why Jewish communities moved from the Muslim world to the Catholic lands.

During the Middle Ages, one of the most important identity criteria was religion; it was the main factor of distinction between us and them. There were conflicts and coexistence but it was very fragile. The situation began to change in the 18th century during the Enlightenment époque. It was realized that the individual as such is the supreme value. This change led to another one, where if an individual is the supreme value, then his religious belief is not so important, (later gender and race followed), because everyone is different and unique at the same time; the question arose – how could such diversity be managed, and at the same time maintain the ties of a group, society, or the state.

Every group has its identity and main narratives which bond group members together. As a rule, there are no groups that exist and communicate only among their own group’s members – communication and relations usually exceed a group’s limits, and that means that some common points should be found in order to achieve positive results.

Another step was made at the beginning of the 19th century, when during the process of changes of identity, nationality became increasingly important.

Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia had a different history. The First country had a tradition of statehood dominated by its own ruling class, the others had a statehood but the dominant groups did not consist of ethnic Estonians or Latvians. Of course, during different periods different parts of the mentioned countries belonged to different states – Lithuania had created a commonwealth with Poland, Belarus and part of Ukraine were parts of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Latvia was part of Livonia, Estonia had some ties with Sweden. That means historically, religiously and ethnically these countries were diverse. Not to mention that during the 19th century these three countries and their inhabitants were part of tsarist Russia, which means that they themselves were national minorities.

The three future capitals – Vilnius, Riga and Tallinn – also developed quite differently. Vilnius historically was one of the administrative centers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and later, after tsarist occupation, it became one of the most important administrative centers for tsarist authorities. Up until Vilnius University was closed by tsarist decree, the city was an intellectual center. According to modern Lithuanian mythology, the city had been founded by one of the Great Dukes – Gediminas (while hunting Gediminas stayed overnight in the vicinity and dreamt of an iron wolf, which was powerfully howling. In the morning a wizard explained that the iron wolf meant power and the howling signified that the sound and glory of the city would spread immediately, thus Lithuanians consider Vilnius as Lithuania's historical capital city).

Riga was founded by the Catholic bishop Albert von Buxhöwden, and was an administrative as well as a commercial center. Being quite an important Baltic sea
port, tsarist authorities invested into the city’s infrastructure, making Riga one of the most important economic centers in the region, and quite a large number of Lithuanian groups dwelled in the city as well. As far as its university is concerned, Riga Technical University was established in 1862 by tsarist authorities.

Tallinn was founded as a fortress but quickly became a port city, attracting the attention of its neighbors. Thus, in 1219, the city was concurred by the Danes (one of the explanations of the etymology of the city’s name is “the city of the Danes”). The Estonian intellectual center was Tartu where a university was established in 1632 by Swedish King Gustav II Adolf. So, the future capitals were as intercultural as the rest of the countries, yet at the same time it was a challenge to have capitals and towns shaped after one or another vision, and what became even more important was to create societies in accordance with these visions.

The 19th century for the Baltic region was not only a century of occupation but of national revival as well. The dominant tsarist regime was not in favor of multiculturalism at all, on the contrary, homogeneity under the Russian language, culture and the Orthodox Church was the goal, so any manifestation of national character was not accepted by tsarist authorities. But it must be mentioned that the tsarist bureaucracy used the “nationality card” in order to manage different situations, usually the old principle of *divide et impera* was applied: at a certain point, one particular national group was supported, later followed by another; for example, the Baltic Germans had established a deep and elite culture, especially in Latvia and Estonia, but that already made them different or in some respect even superior, because for a long time German was the language of education, high communication, administration and justice. But especially when Tsar Alexander III came to power in 1881, this situation began to change. Slavophile publicist Iurii Samarin in his work *Borderlands of Russia: The Russian Baltic coast* wrote that the Baltic provinces had to stop isolating themselves from Russia and had to be convinced that they were not an advanced outpost of Germany, but rather the Western maritime territories of Russia.

Another significant group in the tsarist regime’s eyes were the Poles; they, together with the Lithuanians and other national groups, had organized two uprisings, in 1830–1831 and in 1863–1864, and had quite a strong elite seeking at least an autonomous life.

A lot of attention was also paid to the Jewish community. Litvaks were a unique group of Jews living in the territory of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania (present-day Lithuania, Belarus, Ukraine) and together with the Polish Jews (the Suwalki region Jews were considered as Litvaks, as well as Latvian and Estonian Jews) at the end of the 18th century this Jewish community was the largest in Europe. After the partition of the Commonwealth of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and the occupation of Latvia’s and Estonia’s ter-

---

6 There various sources about Litvaks, one that could be used: http://www.yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Litvak
ritory, they came to be regarded as inferior in tsarist Russia. Historically, tsarist Russia was an anti-Semitic state; for a long time Jews were not allowed to live in certain places in this state, and even after the occupations which took place in the late 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century a Pale of Settlement was created for Jews where they could live in tsarist Russia, which corresponded exactly with the territories mentioned above.

Another aspect should be taken into account as well: the 19th century was not only a period of modern ideologies, society’s structures, speeding life, growth of cities and the economy, but also a period of conspiracy theories, which had different personages, ranging from Jesuits, free masons and leaders of Risorgimento to Bolsheviks and Jews. So a large Jewish community was squeezed into a relatively small territory. The future dominant groups of the independent countries of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia were not so big, and thus visible, but still suffered because of tsarist politics.

It seems that better starting positions were in Latvia and Estonia, as literacy was higher there, more Latvians and Estonians were living in cities, and their economies were developing faster than in Lithuania. This is why in the second half of the 19th century emigration from Lithuania grew markedly (another reason was compulsory military service in the tsarist army for all three countries). The process of modern identity building was not simultaneous in all these countries, but there were no major gaps between them either. For example, one of the reasons was that serfdom was abolished in 1819 in the Baltic provinces, but in Lithuania only in 1861 (that means almost two generations had grown up in different conditions in Latvia and Estonia) when free people could either stay in the countryside or move to the cities which created good conditions for the formation of a new type of peasantry-based elite. Tartu here played another important role: Tartu University was a vivid place with a mixture of languages, religions and ideas, but nevertheless, a process called the Estophile Enlightenment period started. The ideas of the Enlightenment became quite popular among Baltic Germans, but some believed that in the future Estonians could become competitors. Estophiles started to admire ancient Estonian culture and folk traditions, so this was also a period when the national awakening processes shifted from being church dominated to the public sphere. Gradually the Estonian language was taught in schools, Estonian song festivals started from 1869 and the Estonian national epos Kalevala was published in 1861 in the German and Estonian languages, but as it was mentioned, a wave of Russification started in 1889, especially against the usage of the German language (for example, Tartu University switched from using German to Russian).

In Latvia serfdom was abolished in 1818–1819, and in Latgale (part of Vitebsk Gubernia at that time) only in 1861, as in Lithuania. It should be mentioned that

---

in the beginning, the lands still belonged to the local Germans and land ownership only gradually went into the hands of the Latvian peasants. As in Estonia, a Latvian national revival also started with the activities of ethnic Latvian intellectuals calling themselves “Young Latvians”; primarily it was a cultural literary movement but later it had political implications, provoking some conflicts with Latvian Germans.

Processes in Lithuania were quite similar, but as it was mentioned, slower; one of the reasons was that after the uprising of 1863–1864, publishing in the Lithuanian language (and teaching) using the Latin alphabet was prohibited until 1904. It stopped natural processes, yet on the other hand in the neighboring territories of so-called Lithuania Minor, books and newspapers were published in Lithuanian and then illegally brought into the territory. Of the mentioned three Baltic States, the Church (Catholic) in Lithuania was the most active, then followed Latvia (Protestant) and Estonia (Protestant), but as was the case in previously mentioned societies, the Latvian and Estonian secular intelligentsia were usually of peasant origin and also played a significant role in the creation of a modern identity.

Czech historian and political scientist Miroslav Hroch identifies three phases (A, B and C) in the process of national revival, the first being scholarly interest in the nation’s past, heritage, language etc. The second phase consists of patriotic agitation in which new ideas, patterns of identity, ways of development and notions about modernization are spread among the core group of the idea followers. The final phase of identity formation requires a mass movement directed towards the widespread acceptance of these newly shared ideas. According to Hroch’s model, national movements start as cultural revivalist movements, which gradually transform themselves into political movements, followed by some political demands such as the liberalization of cultural politics, autonomy or independence. Independence is often seen as the highest goal and the most effective tool for the dominant group to preserve and develop its identity, culture, traditions, education, political traditions and system.

Russians were the dominant group but not everyone was satisfied with the tsarist authorities, and in terms of politics, there was a poorly-developed liberal

---

8 Lithuania Minor (Lithuanian: Mažoji Lietuva; German: Kleinlitauen; Polish: Litwa Mniejsza; Russian: Малая Литва) is a historical ethnographic region of Prussia, where Prussian Lithuanians or Lietuvininkai lived. Lithuania Minor enclosed the northern part of this province and got its name due to the territory’s substantial Lithuanian-speaking population. The land became depopulated to some extent during the warfare between Lithuania and the Order. The war ended with the Treaty of Melno and the land was resettled by Lithuanian newcomers, returning refugees, and the remaining indigenous Baltic peoples. With the exception of the Klaipėda Region, which became a mandated territory of the League of Nations in 1920 by the Treaty of Versailles (and was annexed to Lithuania from 1923 to 1939) the area was part of Prussia until 1945. Today a small portion of Lithuania Minor is within the borders of modern Lithuania and Poland while most of the territory is part of Kaliningrad (Russia).

wing, the Zapadniki\textsuperscript{10} movement, and their opponents the Slavophiles\textsuperscript{11}, but with time the increasingly socialist Bolshevik ideas became most popular. As a matter of fact, socialist and social-democrat ideas were quite widespread in the region among different nationalities: in 1897 part of the Lithuanian–Polish Jews created the Bundist movement – it was based on a socialist ideology, the Lithuanian social-democrat party was established in 1896, and in Latvia a loose but broad leftist movement called the “New Current” arose in the late 1880s. Led by Jānis Pliеksāns (Rainis was the pseudonym he used) and Pēteris Stučka, editors of the newspaper “Dienas Lapa”, this movement was soon influenced by Marxism and led to the creation of the Latvian Social Democratic Labour Party.

The revolts of 1904–1905 touched different places in Russia but in Latvia they had an ethnic–social background, and this period is well known for its pogroms in Russia (Kishiniev, Odessa, Kiev etc.), which also had some ethnic-social background. Usually pogroms were inspired by the Ochranka\textsuperscript{12} and were part of broader tsarist anti-Semitic politics. In Latvia mostly unwealthy Latvians had risen up against major landlords, usually of German origin: their lands were seized, their estates were overtaken or destroyed in 1905 during special punitive expeditions organized by tsarist authorities to suppress this peasant movement – more than 1,100 people were killed, more than 300 peasant homes were burned. This could serve as an example of tsarist politics – it was mentioned that Baltic Germans lost their positions at the end of the 19th century because of changes in tsarist politics, but when the Latvian peasant movement (with a socialist and national background) started to destabilize the situation, it was suppressed by tsarist authorities that not only stopped the revolts but in a way helped the German-origin landlords.

Poles were also divided into several ideological camps. Some of them were supportive of tsarist politics, some were liberals, some socialists, but one of the dominant streams was the national movement (with inner ideological divisions and vi-

\begin{itemize}
  \item Zapadniki or westernizers believed, that Russia did not have a unique history and was not somehow unique or supreme as a country, but that it was part of Europe and had to side with the Western world. Russia’s experience and development was not outstanding, according to the Zapadniki, in fact, Russia was lagging behind quite a lot of countries and should learn from them. Among the most well known Zapadniki are Pyotr Chaadayev and Alexandr Hrezen. More on the issue can be found in A. E. Senn’s books: Alfred Erich Senn, Russian revolutionary movement of the nineteenth century as contemporary history; Kennan institute for advanced Russian studies. The Woodrow Wilson center, Washington (D.C.): 1993, p. 32 or Alfred Erich Senn, Russian émigré press: from Herzen’s Kolokol to Lenin’s Iskra, Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto leidykla, 2008, p. 118.
  \item Slavophiles differently than zapadniki believed that Russia is unique country with its history, traditions and mentality, it had some unique mission and place in the world, one of the first authors of this ideology were Russian religious poet Aleksey Khomyakov and Russian literary critic Ivan Kireyevsky. Slavophiles were in favor of the tsarist regime, the Orthodox Church and Russian culture, the philosophical ideas of Vladimir Solovyov and Nikolai Berdyaev included ideology of slavophilism.
  \item The Department for Protecting the Public Security and Order usually called “guard department” (okhrannoye otdelenie) and commonly abbreviated as Okhrana or Okhranka in tsarist Russia it was a secret police force of the Russian Empire and part of the police department of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD) in the late 19th century, aided by the Special Corps of Gendarmes. It was created in 1880 to replace the Third Section of His Imperial Majesty’s Own Chancellery.
\end{itemize}
sions of course). In the western part of tsarist Russia the Poles were a group which repeatedly showed signs of national awareness, they, together with the Lithuanians, organized and participated in two uprisings, in 1830–1831 and in 1863–1864, and they were quite active in exile participating in different organizations, military campaigns (for example in fights for a Roman Republic) and were quite noticeable in European diplomacy and politics. One of the works by the world famous poet Adam Mickiewicz is viewed as representing the heights of the Polish language, so a Polish national revival had definitely started earlier and was more developed – engaged not in early newspapers and book publishing in the mother-tongue, but in serious and advanced cultural and political processes. As a matter of fact, A. Mickiewicz was invited by the College de France to chair the department for Slavonic studies, later he lived in Italy and organized the Mickiewicz Legion in order to assist the Polish uprising in 1848, but this uprising was liquidated by tsarist authorities and the legion never participated in any fighting. Finally he went to Istanbul (part of the Ottoman Empire at the time) where he started to organize legions for the liberation of Poland, including a Jewish unit, but suddenly died, most probably of cholera. A. Mickiewicz had his own vision of independent Poland and its identity; the latter should have had at least several layers. Born in present-day Belarus into a Polish-Jewish family, he graduated from Vilnius University, and is considered as one of the most famous Polish poets. A. Mickiewicz also called Lithuania his homeland, so he certainly does not fit into the narrow ethno-linguistic nationally-orientated identity; most probably he had a complex vision of independent Poland.

But besides this project, as was mentioned earlier, there were also other approaches, one of them being more nationalistic. This particular approach created a double-sided situation: from the Lithuanian perspective, the dominant project of creating a modern identity was based on nationality, language and culture. So a conflict between the two different projects – Lithuanian and Polish – was inevitable.

In some ways a similar situation occurred in Latvia and Estonia; historically in the fields of administration, governance and culture Baltic Germans were the dominant group in these two countries, and the formation of statehood in both countries was stopped due to a sequence of occupations in the 13th century. Lithuania’s case was different – it preserved its statehood tradition from the 13th to the end of the 18th century. Of course this tradition had some modifications, going from a grand duchy to a kingdom, from a kingdom back to a grand duchy, and later entering into a commonwealth union with the Kingdom of Poland until the last partition of the state in 1795. Of course, some Polish politicians and part of the Polish population were not satisfied with the idea of an independent Lithuania dominated by Lithuanians. Some Baltic Germans found themselves in an analogous situation – for hundreds of years they had been the rulers of this territory, and now the time to take a minority position was coming.

In the end, the Jewish community found itself in an even more difficult situation. After the destruction of the Second Temple by the Romans in 70 AD, Jews
felt as if they were in *galut* (exile), having to return to their homeland. That does not mean that after 70 AD the Holy Land remained without Jews. Some of them remained there, others left; the most important thing is that after the destruction of the Second Temple, Jews had lost the center of their symbolic identity and place of worship and ritual. Tradition and custom dictated that at least once a year, Jerusalem (the Holy Mount and Temple) should be visited. After the destruction of Jewish religious and social life, the Holy Land became more of a dream and a narrative than a place that actually existed\(^\text{13}\).

But changing identities touched even the Jewish world and several directions were taken. Some Jewish communities remained orthodox; they preferred a closed life, inner social and judicial regulations, and were waiting for the Messiah to come in order to be brought back to the Promised Land. Part of the Lithuanian Jewry played a significant role here. Rabbi Elijah ben Shlomo Zalman Kremer, better known as the Vilnius (Vilna) Gaon, in the middle of the 18\(^{th}\) century reformed Orthodox Judaism, pointing out that Judaism and the Torah's wisdom should be combined. He preached that Judaism would not lose its essence, on the contrary, new discoveries proved to show the power of almighty God. The Vilnius Gaon's insights were novel, but the most important thing was that he continued to adhere to the main principles of Orthodox Judaism: to be critical, rational and base everything on prayer; a rational approach, and explanations of the Holy Scriptures\(^\text{14}\). From that period, Vilnius in particular, but other places also, such as Slobodka, Telšiai (in Lithuania), and Mir (in Belarus) became world famous Orthodox Judaism study centers, cultivating a religious-based Jewish identity.

Other Jewish groups were more secular and preferred to live in the countries they had lived in for hundreds of years, they would accept the existing rules, agree to being multilingual, and at the same time request that their religion, culture and traditions would be respected. In the 18\(^{th}\) century in Germany, Moses Mendelssohn started the Haskalah movement in Jewish society. He argued that traditional Jewish life should be modernized, traditional clothing rejected, education integrated into the local integration system at least at a university level, high schools preferably also, whereas primary education and religion should be left to individuals and communities. As M. Mendelssohn put it, the best solution for fostering a modern identity is to be a man on the streets, and a Jew at home. So among Litvaks and Polish Jews this kind of identity started being formed; they would use the Yiddish language\(^\text{15}\) for inner daily communication, old Hebrew for


\(^{14}\) In the same 18th century new form of Judaism – Chasidic Judaism was created and developed in Litvak world by Rabbi Israel Baal Shem Tov, them main idea was to worship God joyfully with more emotions, in translation Chasidism means loving kindness and is usually opposed orthodox or legalistic Judaism.

\(^{15}\) A majority of Litvaks and Polish Jews perished in the Holocaust, singalling the end of their unique language and culture. Some survivors and their offspring still use Yiddish but not to such a large scale as before WW II. In Europe, those countries who have accepted the 1992 European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages have included Yiddish in the list of their recognized minority languages: for example the Netherlands (1996), Sweden (2000), Poland (2009), Romania (2008), Bosnia and Herzegovina (2010). In 2005, Ukraine did not mention Yiddish as such, but „the language(s) of the Jewish ethnic minority”.
religious affairs, and a third language for communication with the non-Jewish world. As was already mentioned, socialist ideas and movements were also quite popular among Jewish communities.

The prevailing atmosphere also contributed to the formation of modern Jewish nationalism known as Zionism. There were several reasons for this new ideology. Primarily, religious Jews were waiting for the Messiah and believed that only then would they be brought back to the Promised Land. Even those Jews who came from all over the world (but more often from Central and Eastern Europe) to create a modern state of Israel with the local Jewish community in Palestine were not accepted because they came as ordinary men, not accompanied by Messiah. On the other hand, all kinds of religions lost some of their importance and in the modern period secular ideas became dominant. In this context, the growing anti-Semitism was one of the reasons why national ideas spread among Jewish communities. The notion that the individual is the supreme value appeared in the Renaissance following époques and thinkers who developed this idea, until it was realized that communities as entities of individuals are also valuable and somehow should be protected. Step by step, the idea that the best protection for a national group is a state where the national group has all the administrative and creative power in its own hands was discovered; on the other hand, it was realized that homogeneous countries and societies could hardly exist in reality, but still a modern state was seen as the best means of protection. From the second century AD, Jews had their homeland, or more precisely, a symbolic center of attraction, because even before the Roman occupation the Holy Land had been occupied by Persians, then Alexander Macedon followed, the Hellenistic period was interrupted by the Maccabees uprising, and an independent Jewish state existed almost for a century, before being conquered by Rome. Life in exile for more than a thousand of years was marked by hatred, pogroms and an uncertain future. Growing anti-Semitism in the 19th century and the ideas described above suggested a clear idea for some Jewish activists – if Jews wanted to live a safe life, were willing to administer themselves and be responsible for their own future, they should then create their own state.

But part of Jewish society was waiting for the Messiah to come, others were already integrated into Western societies, a third group realized that going to the Promised Land would mean going into the middle of the Arab world. But Theodor Herzl, an Austrian journalist of Jewish origin, started to promote the idea of a modern Jewish state in Palestine. In 1895 he published a book called *The Jewish State* where he explained the need of a modern Jewish state. From that period on, he passionately worked on this idea until his death in 1904. In 1903, returning back from St. Petersburg, T. Herzl stopped in Vilnius and was mostly welcomed by the Jewish community.

Usually T. Herzl is associated with the creation of Zionism; of course it was the project of his life, but the thing is that in 1882 Leo Pinsker, a Jew from Odessa,
anonymously published a book in the German language called *Auto-Emancipation* where he raised ideas of Jewish national consciousness and encouraged ideas of independence. When the process gained momentum, it became clear that Jews from Central Eastern Europe, including Russia, were more supportive and active in going to Palestine, and that Jews from Western Europe supported the idea and gave some funds, but were not so eager themselves to go to Palestine. Repressions, pogroms and the politics of unification created the basis for Leo Pinsker to advocate his people and encourage national movement and self-consciousness.

**Task:** Compare the texts by Leo Pinsker and Theodore Herzl – what are the main differences and similarities? What are the causes of these differences?

In this chapter we have discussed different types of minorities and given them definitions, as well as touching on very complex, multicultural, multi-religious societies that lived in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia for centuries. The main nationalities and their changes of consciousness were presented briefly here. These were the future dominant groups in the Baltic States – Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, and other mostly significant and numerous groups: Russians, Poles, Baltic Germans, Litvaks and Polish Jews. This does not mean that there were no other national groups in the region – Belarusians were quite active at this period, and there also existed other groups, such as Karaites, Tatars, Finns, etc., but this only proves the diversity of the region and possible potential, cooperation or conflicts which will presented later on.

**Readings:**

CHAPTER 3
THE BALTIC REGION AND NEIGHBORING RUSSIA AND BELARUS

**The aim of the lecture:**
The main idea of the lecture is to discuss the role of the eastern neighborhood in the historical development of the Baltic Sea region, as well as the impact of modern Russian politics in the region. On the other hand, the impact of the Baltic Sea on Russian internal and external politics will be shown.

**The tasks of the lecture:**
1. To discuss the links between the development of the Russian state and the Baltic Sea region.
2. To analyze the politics of the Russian Empire on the Baltics.
3. To analyze the politics of the Soviet Union in the Baltics.
4. To discuss Russian politics towards the Baltic countries after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.
5. To answer the question: “Is Belarus a neighbor or an internal part of the Baltic Sea region?”

**Keywords:** Russia, Belarus, Baltic Sea, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

**Description:**
The Baltic Sea region played a crucial role in the development of the Russian state. Ever since Peter the Great (1682–1725), who before ruling the country travelled for 18 months incognito to Europe with a large diplomatic mission, Russia started to modernize playing a bigger and bigger role in European and then world politics. Since the 18th century, Russia had four main directions of territorial development: the Balkans and Black Sea (with the aim of reinstating the Christian cross on the Hagia Sophia), Central Asia (with the aim of cleaning soldiers’ shoes in the Indian Ocean), the Far East and active European politics. These directions set out the development of Russian international politics for the next three centuries, and are in some ways still important today. Taking into consideration the Baltic Sea region, Russian existence can be counted from the very beginning of the 17th century and the results of the Great Northern War (1700–1721). During the war, the Russian army had occupied all Swedish possessions on the eastern Baltic coast: Ingria, Estonia, Livonia and Finland. Under the treaty of Nystad (1721) all those lands, excluding Finland, were transferred to Russia. In Ingria in 1703, St. Petersburg started being built, and in 1712 Russian capital was moved
here from Moscow. This way Russia had broken Swedish domination in the region and started to play an important role in Europe, with St. Petersbug as a sign of Russian Westernization.

Further development of the Russian state in the Baltic region is connected with the partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (1772, 1793, 1795). In 1772, Russia took over the Inflanty Voievodship (nowadays the region of Latgale in Latvia), in 1795 the Duchy of Courland and Semigalia, as well as the major part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (on the right bank of the Nemunas River, the left was taken by the Kingdom of Prussia). Early Modern Russia completed her Baltic expansion and this state lasted almost until the outbreak of the First World War. Only the lands on the left bank of the Nemunas after the Napoleonic wars were transferred to depend on Russia and the Kingdom of Poland.

During the Napoleonic wars (1808–1809 – Finnish War), Finland, under the treaty of Fredrikshamm (1809), was annexed by Russia as an autonomous Grand Duchy. However the tsar guaranteed an individual parliament, government (Senate), judiciary, administration, army, and customs for Finland, and those laws were periodically limited. Only after 1863 was autonomy fully realized, the Diet of Finland was re-established, and a separate monetary system was introduced. Attempts to limit its autonomy and Russify the land returned at the end of the 19th century, in 1899, after the February manifesto (introduction of Russian currency, language in administration, making the Orthodox Church the church of state, and subjection of the Finnish army to Russian military service).

The acquisition of Estonia and Livonia introduced a new class of Baltic German nobles to Russian courts, who during the following centuries, were occupying important positions in the Russian Empire having a direct impact on the tsar's court (Baltic German spouses of the tsars were almost a rule). Baltic provinces played an important role in Russian politics and economics, and above all had a special place in the administrative system of Russia. The governorate of Reval and Riga (in 1796 renamed into respectively the Governorate of Estonia and Livonia), as well as Courland, had special, autonomic status, were administered independently by the local Baltic German nobility through a local Landtag (German for Regional Council), and the German language retained its status as an official language. Its special political status resulted in a completely different state of civil law, class structure, land ownership (serfdom was abolished in 1819), and culture (founding of a German university in Dorpat).

Autonomy of the Baltic provinces had a huge impact on the development of the Estonian and Latvian national movements. Land reform allowed local peasants to get richer, whilst the Protestant religion and clergy of German origin paid great attention to work and education. As a result, in 19th century Russia, the Baltic provinces had the lowest level of illiteracy. However after 1876 Russification of the Baltic provinces started, nationalist policies resulted in changes to administration and education, but the situation cannot be compared to the situation in the Lithuanian or Belarusian provinces, where the politics of Russification were intensified after uprisings in 1831 and 1863.
At this time the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania was gradually merged into the political and administrative system of the Russian Empire: in 1840 the Statute of Lithuania, the codified legal system, was overruled; in 1839 the Union of Brest was liquidated, and worshipers of the Greek-Catholic Church in Russia were forced to convert to Orthodoxy (the Greek-Catholic Church remained active in the Austrian provinces and later became a strong back up for the Ukrainian national movement). Apart from legal changes, the University of Vilnius was closed in 1832, and in 1842 the Roman-Catholic Theological Academy was moved from Vilnius to St. Petersburg. For almost a century the lands of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania were left without any institution of higher education. Repressions were intensified again after the 1863 Uprising: a large number of insurgents were sent into the Asian parts of Russia and their properties were confiscated. Pressure over the Catholic Church was intensified. On the other hand, the Russian authorities finally abolished serfdom (it was one of the elements of politics against the nobility), which allowed peasants to enrich and educate their children. On this basis the Lithuanian national movement developed. After 1864, capitalism was introduced into Russia.

Russian politics were liberalized after the revolution of 1905, apart from decisions that were important for all the country, like introducing the elements of a constitutional monarchy, calling the first parliament in Russian history (Duma), the North-Western provinces were one of the most active during the revolutionary movement, starting from general strikes in the governorate (gubernya) centers. As a result, the politics of Russification were moderated, however in most cases it occurred that the process was only suspended for some time. In Finland it resulted in the creation of the modern Parliament of Finland, in the Estonian and Latvian provinces the peasant movement against the Baltic German nobility rose up. Although the achievements of Estonians and Latvians in the period of revolution were minimal, it showed the consolidation of the national movements, encouraging the founding of new national political parties of various political options. Somehow deeper were the changes made in the Lithuanian lands. In 1905, the Great Vilnius Assembly was called in Vilnius (about 2,000 participants, mostly peasants), and this first modern national congress for the first time officially stated their demands of political autonomy, and political parties started to form and develop. In 1904 the Lithuanian press ban (introduced from 1864 on Lithuanian publications in the Latin alphabet) was abolished, and a legal press was reinstated, starting with the first daily newspapers.

The revolution of 1905 was crucial for the Belarusian national movement, which, compared to other nations, was only starting at this moment. For the first time the Belarusian language was recognized as independent and was officially allowed in print. The first Belarusian newspaper (“Nasha Niva”) was established in Vilnius in 1906, and the editors of this newspaper later created the main national center of the Belarusian cultural movement.
During the First World War, Russia lost all of its influence on the Baltic Sea coast. After a successful offensive in 1914, the Russian Army was forced to move back east in 1915. From autumn, 1915 the western part of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania was occupied, and after the offensive in 1917, so too were the Estonian and Latvian gubernyas, and the Belarusian lands. A shorter or longer period of separation from direct Russian politics and the right of nations to self-determination, as guaranteed by Lenin after the October Revolution, intensified processes of independence.

First to declare its independence was Finland. The Parliament of Finland adopted the Declaration of Independence on the 6th of December, 1917, which was very quickly recognized by the Bolshevik’s as well as by other European countries like Germany, France, Sweden, Norway and others. However, the independence declared by the conservative Parliament was not accepted by the local socialists and lead to a civil war in the country in which the conservative “white” forces supported by Germany, Swedish and Polish volunteers after almost four months of fighting defeated the “red” forces supported by Bolshevik Russia. Despite the bitter civil war, and strong political division in society, Finland became and remained a capitalist democracy under the rule of law throughout the entire interwar period. Finnish-Soviet relations were finally regulated by the Treaty of Tartu signed on the 14th of October, 1920. Finland gained access to the Barents Sea, gaining the Petsamo region (nowadays Pechenga in Murmansk Oblast), losing the provinces of Repola and Porajärvi in East Karelia (in the early 1920s Finland supported anti-Russian guerillas in the region).

The Russian Civil War influenced the faith of independent Estonia and Latvia, but the situation in Lithuania was somehow different. Both the Latvian (1918–1920) and Estonian (1918–1920) wars of independence are regarded as a theater of the Russian Civil War. The Estonian and Latvian struggle for sovereignty was not only a fight against the Red Army, but against the German Baltische Landeswehr ("Baltic Land Defence") and Freicorps as well. Both wars ended with full success. The Treaty of Tartu finished the conflict between Estonia and Soviet Russia, signed on the 2nd of February, 1920, being the very first de jure recognition of the state. According to this treaty, the Bolsheviks recognized Estonia’s sovereignty (declared on the 21st of February, 1918) and renounced all territorial claims on Estonia. Latvia proclaimed its independence as the last country in the region, on the 18th of November, 1918, as well as being the last to sign a peace treaty with Soviet Russia in Riga on the 11th of August, 1920. For full international recognition Estonia and Latvia had to wait until the West accepted the Soviet regime in Russia, as they, supporting the “ancient regime”, did not accept any movements that would lead to the disintegration of the territory of the Russian state. Exceptions were made only for Finland and Poland, which had huge international support and were recognized immediately after declaring their independence.

The case of Lithuania was a bit different. The background for Lithuanian state-
hood was created under German occupation, when in September, 1917 the Lithuanian Council (“Taryba”) was chosen to represent Lithuanian issues in the occupied territory, and on the 16th of February, 1918 it declared its independence. The war on independence was held not only with Soviet Russia and the “white” Russian volunteer army, but the most important fighting and disputes over independence were those with Poland, regarding conflict over the Vilnius region. Polish-Lithuanian conflict was used by the Russian side who took advantage of the complicated situation, and signed on the 12th of June, 1920 a peace treaty in Moscow in which the Russians guaranteed the Lithuanian eastern and southern border on the river Nemunas with the cities of Grodno and Lida, along with Vilnius belonging to the Lithuanian state. However, despite the fact that these borders were never implemented and delimited, it created a positive image of Soviet Russia in Lithuanian society, making Lithuania the most Soviet Union-friendly country in the Baltic sphere.

In the context of the Baltic Sea region, we should note that until 1921 Lithuania had not always been regarded as a Baltic country, as only after the delimitation of its border with Latvia in March, 1921 did it gain access to the Baltic Sea in the region of the city of Palanga and the river Šventoji. Until this time, the term Baltic refers more to Estonia, Latvia and Finland (however, for example, United States diplomats included Lithuania in the Baltic sphere at the end of the world war).

In the inter-war period, Soviet Russia had tense relations with all of the Baltic Countries. The Bolsheviks tried to influence the politics of other countries through the Communist International (Komintern), which was trying to influence local politics and organize a worldwide revolution through local communist parties. However after 1920 the Communist Party was banned in Latvia and Lithuania, and after the civil war in Finland, the Finnish Communist Party was working only in Moscow, having no influence on the situation in the country. Meanwhile the Communist Party of Estonia was very strong, and on the 1st of December, 1924 it organized a coup d’etat, during which it started to control parts of the Estonian capital, but it did not manage to ask the Red Army for help. This unsuccessful revolution ended with mass repressions of the members of the Communist Party, making the party lose its support and membership falling down and remaining low until 1940.

Not only political Russian impact was important for the Baltic States in the inter-war period. The Baltic countries used to be one of the most economically developed territories in the Russian Empire and after independence lost huge Russian markets. This loss forced all the countries to reorientate their trade, and for all it was a successful re-orientation. The Baltic countries had a strong agriculture sector, and the main part of their export trade consisted of diary products that were well recognized in Western Europe. All of the countries, excluding Lithuania, had a growing industrial sector as well.

The basis for the next round of geopolitical changes in the region was developed on the 23rd of August, 1939 in Moscow where the Molotov-Ribbentropp
pact was signed, which included a secret protocol that divided the territories of Romania, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Finland into Nazi and Soviet “spheres of influence”, anticipating potential “territorial and political rearrangements” of these countries. According to the secret protocol, Estonia, Finland and Latvia should be in the Soviet zone, while Lithuania should stay under Nazi domination. Those decisions were revised after the attack on Poland in September 1939, when Lithuania was moved into the Soviet sphere, while the Nazi part of divided occupied Poland was exceeded.

Events in the Baltics unfolded quite fast; Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were given no choice but to sign a so-called Pact of defence and mutual assistance which permitted the Soviet Union to station troops in them (in the Lithuanian case it also concerned the transfer of part of the Vilnius region to Lithuania). After that the Soviet Union started its so-called Winter War with Finland. The Finnish defenses surprisingly held out for over three months while inflicting stiff losses on the Soviet forces. The Soviets settled for the Peace Treaty of Moscow (13th of March, 1940). Finland ceded the southeastern areas of Karelia, Salla, Rybachy peninsula, Hanko and islands in the Finnish gulf – Bay of Viipuri (10 % of Finnish territory, with 12 % of citizens). All those lands were regained by Finland in the Continuation War (until September, 1941), which started straight after the outbreak of the German-Soviet war in June 1941. The conflict ended with the Moscow Armistice on the 19th of September, 1944 in which Karelia, Salla, Petsamo, islands in the Finnish gulf were ceded, and Porkkala was leased for 50 years (regained in 1956) to the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic. All of these decisions were confirmed by the Paris Peace Treaty on the 10th of February, 1947. For Finland most important was retaining its independence, however during the Cold War Finland remained neutral, yet Soviet influence on Finnish politics was quite high (the process of „Finlandization”).

The territories of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania remained independent until June, 1940 when they, accused of kidnapping Soviet soldiers, and conspiring to establish a secret military union, thereby violating the mutual assistance pact, received an ultimatum (Lithuania on the 14th, Latvia and Estonia on the 16th of June) to create a government more capable of adhering to the Mutual Assistance Pact and allowing an unspecified but “sufficiently large” number of Soviet troops into the territory. The ultimatums were accepted, the Red Army occupied the Baltic states shortly thereafter, new governments were formed in each country made up of communists and people with close political views. Under Soviet inspiration, the new governments arranged elections for new “people's assemblies”. Voters were given a single list, with no opposition members. A month later, the new assemblies met, and passed by acclamation resolutions to join the Soviet Union. The Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union accepted the requests, and in early August all three countries were incorporated into the Soviet Union. Full Sovietization of the Baltic countries was stopped by the outbreak of the German-Soviet war on the 22nd of June, 1941.
When all three countries were fighting against Soviet occupation, they lost their independence, and “liberation” in 1944 resulted with a new wave of Sovietization. After the Second World War, Estonia and Latvia met with territorial losses: Estonian Petseri County and the eastern bank of the Narva river were transferred to the Russian SFSR in 1944 (not recognized by Estonia until today), the Latvian Pitalova (Jaunlatgale, Abrene) district was transferred to the Russian SFSR in January, 1945 (recognized by Latvia in 2007). Lithuania was the only country in the Baltic region that had come out of the Second World War with a bigger territory, covering most of the ethnic Lithuanian lands. Klaipeda and the Vilnius region again became a part of the Lithuanian Soviet state.

All three countries for a long time resisted occupation, organizing active guerrilla movements which lasted until the second part of the 1950s. Objection to Soviet rule resulted in mass deportations to the Asian part of the Soviet Union, the total number deported before 1956 has been estimated at over half a million: 124,000 in Estonia, 136,000 in Latvia and 245,000 in Lithuania. The Soviet administration was created mainly from local forces, old members of communist parties and Komintern agents, but also from imported ethnic Russians who were brought in to fill political, administrative and managerial posts. Very important was the dislocation of military forces that had an influence on the demographic situation as well.

At the same time massive colonization of the Baltic countries took place, a large amount of workers from other Soviet republics, mainly Russia, came to build up factories, the new authorities intended to transform the region from an agrarian one into an industrial region. In fact, this transformation was strengthened by the destruction of agriculture during collectivization. All these processes led to the integration of the Baltic economies into the Soviet economic sphere. New investments and the traditionally strong economical position of the Baltic provinces set up a relatively strong position for the region within the Soviet Union; as a result Estonia and Latvia received large-scale immigration of industrial workers for other parts of the Soviet Union and changed the demographic situation dramatically. This process in Lithuania was somehow smaller.

The Baltic States were the first that implemented the changes of the perestroika movement, which started in 1985 in the Soviet Union, and resulted in the awakening of nationalism, which is regarded as one of the most important factors that led the Soviet Union to collapse. The Baltics were the first that officially declared their struggle for restoration of independence. The Baltic Way that took place on the 23rd of August, 1989, became the biggest manifestation in the Soviet Union. In 1990 Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia in 1991 claimed de facto independence that was followed by international recognition. However, Soviet political and military forces tried to interfere, but their attempts were unsuccessful. As a result, the Soviet Union recognized the independence of the Baltic States and until the end of 1991, sovereignty of these countries was restored.
Russia, which officially continued the state tradition of the Soviet Union, started to withdraw its troops from all three Baltic States. The last Russian troops withdrew from the Baltic States in August, 1994 (in Lithuania they moved out before August, 1993), Russian military infrastructure was present for a few more years and officially ended in August, 1998, following the decommissioning of the last active Russian military radar in the Baltics.

Formally, Russian influence on the independent Baltic countries was and still is quite high and can be regarded within a few spheres. One of the main factors is the huge Russian community living in the Baltics, however the numbers of the Russian minority have dropped over 20 years of independence, but those numbers are still quite high. Economic links with Russia remain very strong and there is dependence on Russian resources (eg. 100 % of the gas in Lithuania comes from Russia), and the presence of Russian capital. As well as the Russian language, culture has kept up its strong position in societies. On the other hand, the Region has successfully integrated with “Western” structures like the European Union and NATO.

***

The Baltic Sea and its region has always played an important role for the Belarusian lands, however the land and Belarusians as its inhabitants have always been somewhere “in the middle”. Between the West and East, between North and South, between the Baltic and Black sea. This status was determined not only by geography, but for example, by religion between Catholicism and Orthodoxy, culture, and even politics and economics as nowadays Belarus is somewhere between communism and capitalism, between planned economics and a free market. It is lost in transition and looking for its own place between autocracy and global democracy.

Traditionally, Belarus has looked for its place either in the West or, more often, in the East. Southern or northern dimensions are not as popular. Ukrainians are far more similar when we take into consideration linguistics, religion, and even history and politics. Nowadays the Baltics seem to be more distant from Belarus than any other neighboring region, and the new Iron Curtain, strengthening the differences, seems to be firm and stable. On the other hand, there are the Baltic States, especially Lithuania and Latvia, who are trying to “normalize” and intensify relations with Belarus within the European Union.

The Baltic Region was important for Belarusian lands for ages, we cannot forget the theory of ethnogenesis of Belarusians in modern Belarusian historiography, in which the most important place is taken by the process of Balto-Slavic contacts, and the overlap of Baltic etno-cultural substrate on the Slavic background. Not only ethnogenesis, but also the formation of a modern national movement and state has had Baltic influences. The formation of a national movement of Belarusians was delayed (we can argue whether it is at all finished) comparing with
the Baltic (and not only) nations, and as a result drew inspiration from them. While there have been no higher education institution students from the Belarusian lands (as well as from Lithuanian), those that did exist had to study in various cities of the Russian Empire (Tartu, St. Petersburg, Moscow or Kiev) where they met the representatives of Baltic nations, who inspired their works on a national basis.

Undoubtedly, the greatest was the Lithuanian inspiration, with whom Belarusians shared centuries of common history in one country, enjoyed the same status in the Russian empire, endured the same repressions from the tsarist administration, and had the same experience of Russification and Polonization. When the Belarusian national movement started to grow at the beginning of the 20th century, Lithuanians were already quite well organized, as well as other neighbouring countries. Belarusian delay resulted in failure to create their own country after the First World War, Belarusian People’ Republic didn’t managed to organize the structures of a sovereign country and it was forced to exist in exile. The Belarusian lands were divided between Poland and Soviet Russia in 1921. The Soviets created the Belarusian Soviet Socialistic Republic, in the 1920s they introduced the policy of protection and advancement of the Belarusian language and culture on a local national basis, called Belarusization. But the process ended with the repressions of the 1930s, and till the end of the decade all the national elites were practically liquidated. The effect was more intensive Russification of the country and society. Results can be seen till today, when the modified 19th century ideology of “zapadno rusizm” is still alive in Belarusian politics and social life.

All these processes in the 20th century, however, created the independent Republic of Belarus, which covers almost all the territory inhabited by ethnic Belarusians, strengthening the Russian influence on politics, and at first on culture. After Russian rule Belarusian language is in danger of extinction. Belarusian choice to integrate with Russia and not with Western Europe was made at the end of the 20th century, that has nowadays left them behind the new “Iron Curtain”, as far as the eastern border of the European Union can be regarded, however the geographical position of the country, its historical links with the West and especially with the Baltic Sea region cannot be erased.

Questions and tasks:
1. How can we compare the diversity of Russian politics in various parts of the Baltic region?
2. Can Belarus be called as the fourth country of the Baltic States?
3. Describe and explain the differences in today’s development of Belarus and the three Baltic States.

Readings:


The aim of lecture:
To analyse nationalism as a concept and its theoretical models

The tasks of the lecture:
1. using the Modernist school’s argumentation, select one country (Lithuania, Latvia or Estonia) and find argumentation to prove that modern national identity in that country was created at a certain point.
2. using the Ethnocultural school’s argumentation, select one country (Lithuania, Latvia or Estonia) and find argumentation to prove that modern national identity in that country has logically developed from the country’s history, traditions, memories, sense of community, etc.
3. divide into two groups. One should represent the position of civic nationalism, the other – ethnic nationalism. Find as many arguments as possible to support your position and to persuade your opponents that your position is right. Do “ideal types” actually exist in reality, or is some kind of mixture more common.

Description:
Speaking about nationalism, the question is how do we understand the nation: as something that already exists and just needs to be described, or something that is created at some point in history? Usually two schools could be mentioned here – the Modernist school (Benedict Anderson, Ernest Gellner, Eric Hobsbawm) and the Ethnocultural school (Anthony Smith). The first argues that nationality is created so it belongs to the imagined, created world and it has some subjectivity; the second would argue that there are some objective characteristics that could be attributed to ethnocultural identity: common territory, history, memories and myths, common culture, economy, duties shared by the members of the group, etc. Another already mentioned scholar M. Hroch would argue that there is no “modern nation without national consciousness, awareness of membership of the nation, coupled with a view that this membership is an inherently valuable quality”\(^1\). Modernists would argue that nationalism is a political instrument for national revival leaders or the bourgeoisie or some other dominant group to “convert” masses

\(^{16}\) M. Hroch, Social preconditions..., p. 12.
to follow a new ideology. There is no such thing as a given way of classification of nations; all classifications are invented in order to prove one existence, difference or superiority, etc. According to Modernists, there is no relationship between modern and pre-modern periods of existence of the nation. But even if there are no direct relationships, representatives of this school could be asked: what about the past? Even whilst creating modern identities and mythologies (which is our case in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia) in the middle and second half of the 19th century, all three nationalities tended to explain the entire period of their existence – the starting point was the first inhabitants of the territory, not the situation in the 19th century. And vice versa, representatives of the Ethnocultural school could be asked: who could guarantee that the version of nation identity existence is the right, true and correct one? Especially when in the same territory we have several national groups, but usually one is dominant. Of course one would say Lithuanians would share the Lithuanian version, whilst Lithuanian Latvians would know of the Lithuanian version but might be more sympathetic to the Latvian identity and identify with it. But what should be done then in situations like the case of A. Mickiewicz which was mentioned earlier? And he was not the only one having several layers to his identity.

Some scholars would argue (M. Hroch could be one of them) that national identity is based on the feeling of unity, and unity could be achieved using different possibilities; one of them could be a market relationship which creates a sense of wellbeing of one or another group, and only after this or parallel to these beneficiary economic processes common values, narratives and educational systems were created, ideologically strengthening this feeling of unity. So in such a perspective nationalism could be directly connected with industrialization, not only with common values, a sense of history, myths and memories.

In both opponents’ camps education plays an important role. According to the Ethnocultural approach, the educational system should pass on the knowledge and sense of community to the new generation so that the same memories, narratives, and interpretations of the past and present might be shared. According to the Modernist approach, the educational system plays a somewhat different role as far as nations go, as in this approach, nations are seen as constructed and having nothing in common with previous periods. Education here first of all plays the role of creating a standardized society, especially if we agree with the position that economic and capitalist reasons were more important in creating the modern national identity. Based on new markets, technologies and social organization, the educational system should pass on to the new societies the same culture, and in this case culture is realized not as common memories, traditions, or narratives etc., but as an effective means of formulating and decoding messages, because in modern societies work became systematic and it required context-free communication, where messages are created in the same manner and are decoded in the same manner, primarily having target-orientated and effective communication.
Benedict Anderson argues that modern nationalisms are imagined communities. Created at some time by some group and after that, the community has to establish itself; he also pays attention to the educational system, as well as the circulation of newspapers or usage of other means of communication in order to achieve a sense of community and belonging faster. In such an approach education is needed not only for cultivating an individual's intelligence, but again as a guarantee that the educated person would be able to receive information, decode it and fulfill his duties, whether he/she be a simple factory worker producing goods or a politician making decisions for the community's future. Some left-orientated intellectuals, as for example Michel Foucault, would be a bit skeptical with such an approach arguing that those who are in power would not necessarily fulfill their duties properly because their position already allows them to impose their own views, to control how they are fulfilled and control the situation if they are not satisfied with how things are progressing. M. Foucault calls this a penitentiary system.

Having in mind this critique, and taking the example of Jewish nationalism, one must ask what kind of relationship exists between the state and the nation. Jews did not have their own state for centuries but Zionism appeared, Lithuanians and Poles had their tradition of statehood for several centuries, but at the end of the 18th century this statehood tradition was ruined and during the entire 19th century these states did not exist, but a national revival movement occurred just as in Latvia and Estonia, which barely had any statehood traditions at all.

Anthony Giddens claims that a nation could exist only when “a state has a unified administrative reach over the territory over which its sovereignty is claimed”. Otherwise there is no possibility to speak about a nation’s existence; opposing this position, Anthony Smith, for example, would argue that there are also other features which we have already mentioned, such as pre-modern ethnic and cultural ties, common memories, etc. So using A. Giddens’ approach we could settle on a very clear date when the Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, Polish nations started to exist: right after the end of World War I in 1918, when modern states were created. But as it was mentioned earlier, other scholars and even inhabitants of these states would strongly disagree with the above statement; some would say that we need to differentiate between nationality and patriotism, which could be defined as a commitment and attachment to a certain state.

The debate about the relationship between the state and the nation started in the 1940s with Hans Kohn, or to put it more precisely, H. Kohn created quite a useful classification defining two types of nationalism, but later on discussions moved into some kind of oppositional interpretation between the state and the nation. H. Kohn’s idea was to define a Western type of nationalism and an Eastern type of nationalism.

and was based on statehood traditions in the West and East. In the West, for example, France, England, Switzerland, and the Netherlands had a long statehood tradition, the states had clear political centers, a clear power and administrative structure, and the inhabitants usually considered themselves as citizens. At the same time, in Eastern Europe one state changed the other, one dynasty succeeded the other, the frontiers of the state changed so the “glue” for the nation here was more mystical, having some special ties, a mission from some past time, and members of the group were referred to as a people, not as citizens. The situation of the more developed middle class in the West than the East has already been presented, where in the West more people participated in the nation formation process, and mostly from the middle class, in the East a more important role in this process was ascribed to smaller groups, usually intellectuals, who then spread their visions to the rest of the population. From this situation two definitions and analytical concepts could be driven: civic nationalism and ethnic nationalism. Civic nationalism refers to nationhood in terms of citizenship and political participation. Ethnic nationalism refers to nationhood in terms of lineage.\textsuperscript{21}

Theoretically, different approaches could be taken into consideration but now it is time to go to the factual situation in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. One challenge has already been presented: in the region there were more than three national movements, at least two of them, the German and Jewish, did not have states: the Jewish state, as it was said, did not exist, processes of national revival took place even in Germany itself, but quite often individuals for centuries lived in one place and shared their culture, were largely not keen on emigrating, and their sentiment for their local place could be considered as one of the features of modern identity. Theoretically Germans had a place to go to. As a matter of fact, this kind of argument was used quite often in the inter-war period: if national minorities were not satisfied with the situation, they were free to go to their home-countries. This argument practically excluded emotional ties and long-living traditions from the understanding of a modern national identity.

Another challenge was that the power balance and decision making was concentrated in the West. In other words, in the world where civic nationalism was spread, it was up to international communities whether to accept a new nationality, and later on, to support their new country or not. Of course there were some sympathies and antipathies, and informal discussion behind the scenes, but the changing world suggested several quite challenging perspectives: firstly, because of the Spring of the Nations it was clear that more and more nationalities were demonstrating their national awareness and were raising questions about their future; secondly, tensions based on ethnic and national backgrounds became more intense; thirdly, it was insinuated that military conflict would occur, the question was how major, and what would be the result of this conflict.

The majority of the newly emerging national movements belonged to the ethnic nationalism group, but, as it was mentioned, decisions were made in the West, so these

new national movements on one hand had to adjust to the new conditions and requirements. On the other hand, the Western side had to accept this new reality. Practically very few national groups could prove the existence of a statehood tradition in their not so-distant past. One of these groups was the Poles and Lithuanians. The latter had already started forming new narratives of the past, where Poland and any kind of relationship with this state was interpreted as a decline of Lithuanian-ness, so the new narrative maintained that a Lithuanian state – the Grand Duchy of Lithuania – existed only until the Middle Ages, and later after some coalitions with Poland and the creation of the Commonwealth, the Lithuanian nobility was Polonized, cutting off their relations with the rest of the population, first of all, the peasants, etc.

Poles at the same time argued that their state existed until the end of the 18th century and then was divided among the neighboring countries. For the international community, the difference between statehood tradition from the 14th–15th centuries and the end of the 18th century was significant, where if in the first case it was already considered as the deep past and memories, in the second case, only a few generations had lived under occupation, so metaphorically speaking the skills of self-governance and administration were not in the deep past but in memories and narratives that were still alive. In this kind of situation, Poland was better positioned and could be placed somewhere in between civic and ethnic nationalism. As it was said, the dominant Lithuanian narrative cut off the possibility for Lithuanians to use this kind of argumentation, on the other hand, part of Polish society and politicians were not satisfied with or supportive of independent Lithuania – they preferred to have Lithuania as an integral part of Poland and were ready to negotiate over the status of the province.

Some other arguments should be found as proof of constituting a different group, and that means at least the possibility of cultivating one’s differences, or even creating one’s own country as the best way of protecting one’s identity, culture and offering the possibility for future development.

In this context, the situation in Germany was helpful for other national groups as well. Germany, being in the middle of Europe, and being a large and ambitious state at the same time did not have the possibility of creating an integral state using the civic nationalism approach. Historically it existed as a number of different autonomous larger or smaller states with their own different religions, laws, administrative traditions and structures. What united the state was language and, in some way, culture. Amongst the philosophers of the 18th century, two German thinkers Johann Gottfried von Herder and Johann Gottlieb Fichte developed the idealistic idea of the spirit of the nation. According to them, if there was a spirit of the nation, then one

---

22 Modern languages usually are products of modern identity and the result of centralization of the state. Till this period language as such exists, but it is combined by different dialects they might be more or less identical, sound similar, but quite often people from different regions have some problems understanding each other at the same time saying that they are speaking the same language and only centralized states with developed at least primary level of education would have the same language, grammar structure etc. In this context interesting is Jewish nationalism it was decided that state of Israel would use Hebrew language as the state language, but Hebrew language was not changing for several hundreds of years because it was used only for religious purposes, but not for daily communication, description of the world etc. So it is Hebrew language but with the great difference from Torah and Talmud Hebrew language.
could speak about the existence of the nation. If the nation exists, the mechanism goes further: it means it is unique, it has a right of self-cultivation, self-expression and creation of its own culture and identity. At least on the theoretical level; as to how this works in practice is a different question altogether.

Germany had ambitious plans for its future and this idea of the existence of the spirit of the nation could work for the country like a glue. But how could this mysterious spirit of the nation be defined. The German thinkers mentioned above had suggested several features, which could serve as evidence of the existence of the spirit of the nation. These were: common traditions, folklore, (religion also might be taken into consideration) and finally the most important feature – language. In the German case, three of the mentioned features, except religion, were recognizable and could be proven as existing differently from other nationalities. Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians followed this path of argumentation, basing their arguments on traditions, folklore, language, and in the Lithuanian case, religion (the dominant Catholic religion). It helped Lithuanians to show their differences from Russians, Jews, partly Germans, but not from one of the biggest opponents of that period – the Poles. But the importance of religion in Lithuania was not only the result of an attempt to underline differences, but also because the Catholic Church played an important role in the process of Lithuanian national awakening, so naturally one of the biggest actors in the process had to have a significant position.

The difference in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia was based on ethnolinguistic values, Poland actually had a combination of both types of nationalism, but still these values were more orientated towards exposing differences than searching for some common points. On the other hand, Polish identity was linked with memories of a state of which Lithuania also was a part, and at that period an equal partner. Now some Poles were thinking that Lithuania should be one of the provinces, but integrated into Poland. Some Poles and Lithuanians thought that it was possible to restore the former Commonwealth and have several layers of identity.

After the end of World War I when three multinational empires ceased to exist – tsarist Russia, Austro-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire, it became clear to the global community that some new states would appear, the question was, which ones could be accepted and acknowledged? Besides this, it was much more clear that even with the appearance of new states on the map, the question of national minorities would not disappear, even more so – it might become even more sharp. It was impossible for every nationality to have a separate state, not to mention disputable areas and territories.

The growing wave of anti-Semitism throughout the world from the middle of the 19th century was also one of the indicators that the nationalities questions would usually reappear in different contexts. From the middle of the 18th century, at least in Western Europe, it seemed that the Jewish integration process was successful: there were more and more mixed marriages, more children attending non-Jewish
schools, enrolling into universities, speaking the language that the majority of the society spoke. But then new ideas suggesting that it is impossible to change one's nationality, that one can only simulate forms of dominant life but in essence, one has not changed at all, and that it was only a question of time when the true face of one or another nationality would appear were raised. For xenophobes, this new wave of anti-Semitism was the sign that integration was only an artificial process and would lead nowhere, but that somehow cohabitation should be created.

The newly-emerged Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia were nationalizing countries (as well as a majority of others that emerged after WW I), seeking to have as much as possible a national state, one that should be expressed through culture, public life and, of course, language.

For regulation of future possible conflicts, a new international system was created: a new international organization, The League of the Nations, was established with its main headquarters in Geneva. The main idea of The League of the Nations was to moderate possible conflicts in the future, and those having a national background were among the most presumptive. This new institution was meant to prevent possible conflicts among member states, and a threat or conflict of a member state and some inner state was theoretically treated as a matter for the League. Those countries that were not among the founders and were not invited to join the League of Nations were free to join or to remain outside the circle. Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia joined the League; it was a matter of international recognition for these three new states.

On the other hand, there were also certain conditions. In implementing the principle of a nation's self-determination, the protection of minorities was also an important issue. Some agreements followed the international recognition of the new states; the template for these agreements of national minorities was the treaty with Poland. In the document, racial, religious and linguistic minorities were mentioned, pointing out that they should not be discriminated in any case or sphere. Also, minorities were granted the right of establishing, under their expenses, religious, charitable and social institutions, schools and other educational institutions, as well as the right to use their own language and to practice their religion freely.

Speaking about the education of national minority children, it was said that at a primary school level, the state should guarantee the same level of education as for the dominant group's children, but if it is necessary, the mother tongue of minorities should be used, with the possibility of teaching the dominant group's language as a different subject. In such a way, in some countries national minorities managed

---

23 Original members of the League of The Nations were: USA, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, British Empire, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, India, China, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hedjaz, Honduras, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serb-Croat-Slovene Sate, Siam, Czecho-Slovakia, Uruguay (some of them later left the organization). Also there were states invited to accede covenant: Argentine republic, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Persia, Salvador, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela.

24 Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia after negotiations and informal participation in the League's meetings officially became members of the organization in 1921 September 22.
to create prosperous cultural, religious and communal life. That happened with Lithuania’s Jewish minority and with the Baltic Germans in Latvia and Estonia. On the other hand, moving towards WW II, more and more ignorance towards national minorities appeared; formally, Jewish Cultural Autonomy in Lithuania was stopped in 1924/1925 (for example, until that time a Minister for Jewish Affairs had existed), and in 1934 Poland renounced its obligations to minorities. During the entire inter-war period there were smaller or bigger conflicts based on national background, the situation became more intense when the Nazis came to power in Germany in 1933 and in 1935 started promoting openly xenophobic politics.

In fact, the League of Nations did not have any effective means to control any conflicts. It registered violations of minorities’ rights, and tried to manage them, but its power extended only as far as negotiations or warnings that the implemented policies were not in accordance with the Versailles peace treaty and its appendant documents. But that was its only possibility; countries were free to choose and change their domestic policy regarding national minorities.

There were some appeals to the League of Nations: Vilnius and the Vilnius area had belonged to Poland from 1920 till 1939, thus the Lithuanian side did win some battles and its former ruler and now new neighbor, Soviet Russia, confirmed that Vilnius and its surroundings belonged to Lithuania. In 1920, general Lucjan Zeligowski declared “mutiny” and occupied the territory. Lithuanian forces were ready to fight back, but the League of Nations suggested moderating the conflict, but unsuccessfully. Several projects were rejected by Poles and Lithuanians, and the situation was unsolved until the beginning of WW II, and until 1938 there were no diplomatic relations between Poland and Lithuania – neighboring countries, moreover having several hundreds of years of common history and statehood.

In this chapter we have learned about forms of nationalism and the main authors interpreting the term. As well as the practical aspects of the Versailles system and the principle of nations self determination, what were the main ideas, and quarrels among dominant groups and larger national minorities. The majority of nations after WWI in Central and Eastern Europe were given a chance to create their independent states and prove their administration abilities.

Readings:
• Rimantas Miknys and Darius Staliūnas, The “Old” and “New” Lithuanians: Collective Identity Types in Lithuania at the Turn of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries // Forgotten pages in Baltic history, edited by Martyn Housden and David J. Smith, Rodopi Amsterdam – New York, NY 2011.
CHAPTER 5
FORMATION OF MODERN IDENTITY DURING THE INTER-WAR PERIOD

The aim of the lecture:
To give a general statistic overview of national composition in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia in the inter-war period, to present dominant narratives representing national minorities in public discourse, to highlight the main problems in communication between national minorities and dominant groups.

The tasks of the lecture:
1. Prepare a 5–7 minute long parliamentary speech encouraging to withdraw national minorities ministers from the Cabinet, or prepare a 5–7 minute long parliamentary speech encouraging supporting national minorities ministers in the Cabinet.
2. Find as many arguments as possible defending a homogeneous or heterogeneous model of society.

Description:
Processes of national awakening and nation building are double sided. On one hand it is the time of inclusion, on the other – of exclusion. Cognitive decisions could be done on an individual level, but then the question remains, would this individual decision be accepted in society, will it fit into the proposed formula of identity, etc.

All three countries had to deal with their past: Poles and Lithuanians with their Commonwealth heritage, Latvians and Estonians with the lands of the German past. There are quite a few examples of how on an individual level decisions were made: for example, the noble family of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Narutavičius family. Two brothers had spend their childhood and young days in the same family, had good relationships, later both turned to politics – one became one of the signatories of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, the other was elected president of Poland (he was fatally shot one week later by an assassin). So the paths to self-determination were open, in the Baltic German case, for example. Among other possibilities was the change of their status which came into consideration as well. German culture and Baltic German identity historically was dominant and now, after the end of WW I the situation had turned upside down: the seemingly less developed Latvian and Estonian cultures and identity started to take dominant positions. The question was how to accept such a change: to accept, to ignore, or to fight against it. Again, on an individual level,
decisions were made in all three of the mentioned perspectives, as the case of Paul Schiemann (1876–1944) will show after being analyzed here more thoroughly. He was a person from an old German family, a supporter of German culture, but at the same time he understood what was happening in Latvia (where he lived) and Estonia so he started to search possibilities how to combine these new forms of identity, and what kind of role culture and education should play, etc.

Individual decisions and stories of course matter, but the public space and opinions consist not only of singular individuals and their opinions, but also of collective individuals, such as various organizations, unions, political parties which started to play an important role until every country was effected by the coup d'etat and from a democratic regime it turned into an authoritarian one. The press had also an important impact on these processes. According to media theorists, the press plays several roles in society: it is an open forum were opinions can be exchanged (of course the statement is disputable when censorship exists), it is a mediator and synchronizer – people from different places, due to the press’ information, can have the same information and its interpretation, it is a legitimizer – once a certain event or behavior was described as positive, it is believable that the reader could identify with the behavior or process – if someone does this, why shouldn’t I do this as well? And of course, the press was a power tool for the spread of propaganda and stereotype circulation.

The general framework in the case of national minorities in the inter-war Baltic States shifted from more liberal attitude towards more one that was more conservative and ethnocentric. As it was said earlier, the creation of an independent Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia was a kind of experiment. This experiment was dual from the very beginning: on one hand Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians were willing to have independence and expressed this will, on the other hand, the chosen model of modern identity was based on ethnic values and language. At the same time, the international community tried to implement civic values and this was a collision. The form was democratic and civil society orientated, but the content was nationalistic. On the other hand, one may say that three Baltic States tried to take on the suggested forms of self-government and social organization, but the model did not work. But in almost all countries which were created after WW I, democracy and civil society values were not established.

The period from the declaration of independence until approximately the end of 1920s could be described as being the most liberal: democracy existed, all citizens were given the right to vote in elections, equality and a right of self-expression functioned, national minorities by some part of society were seen as potential partners. Later public discourse became more conservative; democracy was replaced by authoritarian regimes, ethnic values were more underlined. Being newly emerged and small countries, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia felt that national unity was one of the core values of their inter-war societies. All inhabitants who were willing at the beginning were granted citizenship, but discussions about ethnicity, language and their importance not only continued, but later became even more intensive.
In addition to this, the question of social justice arose. Usually the concept of human rights consists of five categories: civil, political, economic, social and cultural. After theoretical considerations by philosophers, humanists and scholars, practical decisions concerning the first two were done during the époque of Enlightenment and after the French revolution. Economic and social rights were the result of the Industrial Revolution, and cultural issues followed the others when ideas regarding the protection of minorities became more important and relevant. These mentioned five components are not considered as one being more important than the other, it is just that their practical implementation started in different periods, but these five categories consist of a unity. Civil and political rights were granted to all inhabitants of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, theoretically economic and social rights were also granted but they depended on the economic situation, etc., cultural rights were considered as well, but while organizing modern society and a new order after the declaration of independence, the question of social justice arose as well.

Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia still were agricultural countries with only some areas exhibiting industrial development, so land became one of the most important fortunes. Actually, when volunteers were asked to defend these new countries during period of fighting for independence, besides the ideal of freedom and equality they were also offered land ownership. Some land was national but quite a large percentage of the land belonged to major landowners in Latvia and Estonia, usually Baltic Germans. In Lithuania this group was the former nobility of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which in the new developing identity scheme were treated as Poles.

Nationalization took place and major landowners lost part of their property, the state claiming that it was for the sake of social justice. Partly it was true, as in such a way it balanced out the societies; on the other hand, some Baltic Germans and former nobility of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania claimed that their lands were nationalized but not in the name of creating social justice. On the contrary, they were harmed and treated in a socially unjust manner. Moreover, they had their property taken away because they belonged to national minorities. So the very beginning was marked by a certain number of problems. On the other hand, the leader of Soviet Russia Vladimir Iliych Lenin also declared and supported the idea of the right of self-determination for national minorities and oppressed nations, but the newly-formed independent states of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan were forcefully joined to the USSR after a civil war, claiming that this was for their benefit, otherwise they would be attacked by capitalists and their imperial ambitions. This case again showed that theoretical and positive ideas could be used as a pretext for occupational politics. No permanent manipulation, but a

25 Lithuania’s fights for Independence lasted from the end of 1918 till 1920 with Poland, the Bolsheviks and parts of the Russian army, which sympathized Germany, headed by general Pavel Bermont-Avalov. Latvia fought for Independence in the same period with the Bolsheviks, Germany and the squads of Pavel Bermont-Avalov; Estonia fought at the same period against the Bolsheviks and the West Russian Volunteer Army.
kind of inequality was felt among members of the League of the Nations, and priority was given to bigger states whereas the smaller ones were quite often simply told what to do. But of course, politics is about negotiations and compromises.

The first half of independence was marked by active politics, negotiations and compromises. On one hand, the three Baltic States faced some requirements from the international community; on the other hand, they quite quickly realized that the successful adoption of national minority policies would bring additional value in the processes of negotiation. So very quickly representatives of national minorities became members of international negotiations groups, official members of diplomatic missions, etc.\textsuperscript{26} On one hand this was a clear demonstration of non-segregational politics, on the other hand, cooperation between dominant groups and national minorities did not appear out of thin air. After liberal reforms in Tsarist Russia, which included elections to the Parliament, national minorities of Tsarist Russia used to cooperate among each other in order to achieve better results in domestic policy. The idea of cooperation remained, but Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians instead of being minorities (as it was during the tsarist period) now became dominant groups and now it was their task to manage the situation.

In order to protect national minorities and to create possibilities for development, a model of cultural autonomy was suggested. This concept meant that national groups would be given a chance to develop their culture in a broad sense – to have their own schools, cultural activities, to be able to freely express their faith, have publishing in their mother tongue. All three states tried to implement this model after 1918, partly because of that it was one of the preconditions to access the League of Nations and international recognition. On the other hand, until democratic elections were held some representatives of the national minorities were usually elected to the Parliaments, their numbers were not high but nevertheless national minorities were represented in

\textsuperscript{26} Here could be given just one example of Lithuanian diplomat Oskaras Milašius (1877/05/28–1939/03/02) originally his full name was Oscar Vladislas de Lubicz Milosz (he was a distant relative of famous Czesław Miłosz, Nobel Literature Prize winner, who called himself the last citizen of Grand Duchy of Lithuania and was born in noble family near by Kėdainiai in ethnic Lithuanian lands in 1911, before WW II graduated from Vilnius University, which under Polish occupation was called Stephen Bathory University, after WW II emigrated to the West, but Lithuania it's scenery is clearly seen in his poetry. In his essays Czesław Miłosz describes his experiences in his family manner almost in the middle of ethnic Lithuania, his Vilnius experiences etc. Czesław Miłosz met Oskaras Miščius in Paris, before WW II started) but when he engaged into Lithuanian activities he Lithuanized his last name according to Lithuanian spelling traditions: - lašius, instead of –losz. Oskaras Milašius was born in a noble family in nowadays Belorussia, his father considered himself citizen of Grand Duchy of Lithuania, but as far as he felt in love with Jewish women his relatives strongly resisted the marriage, nevertheless it took place and Oskaras Miščius was born. Parents willing to have good education for their son sent him to study in Paris, where he spent most of his life. After graduation Oskaras Miščius more and more got involved into poetry and mysticism, was well accepted in educated circles (was well acquainted with Oscar Wilde, others prominent figures of that time) – but when he heard that Lithuania just became independent he decided to work for this country, saying that this is the country of his ancestors. So already in 1920 he became Lithuanian attaché in Paris and in the League of Nations and served for Lithuanian diplomatic corps till 1938. Besides his diplomatic activities and great achievements Oskaras Miščius was one of the most devoted distributors of Lithuanian culture in Western Europe.
the supreme governance and legislation institution. For example, in Lithuania there were ministerial positions without an actual ministry to oversee, such as the Minister for Belarus Affairs and the Minister of Jewish affairs (existed 1918–1924). The reason was that the Jewish community was the biggest national minority in the state and that the Belarusians were numerous in Vilnius and the Vilnius region and they could act as a standoff for the Polish minority in the area. In Estonia, two government minister posts were reserved for Russian and Baltic German representatives (1918–1925).

Later the situation changed. There were several reasons for these changes. One of them has already been mentioned – the international system did not function as it was thought and the League of the Nations was not capable of guaranteeing all the obligations to be followed by each member state. Actually, the League of Nations operated on a petitioning system. When a national minority addressed the organization naming what points it felt discriminated on, its petition would be discussed and the verdict presented. So the only result would be a statement whether the national minority had been mistreated or not – there were no further sanctions or mechanisms to ensure that the member state would change its position.

The second reason was that approximately at this moment a period of stabilization started: the ultimate goal, the declaration of independence, and its establishment had been achieved so more attention was given to domestic policy. Usually societies fluctuate and quite often they are dissatisfied with the situation and those who are in power try to explain one or another failure, resulting in a hunt for scapegoats. In situations like this, national minorities are quite often attributed with this role, trying to underline that they are not “one of us”, “they” are aliens. And then the only question is to what extent is this feature to be underlined, and what arguments are to be used: why should we tolerate ministers of national minorities? Why are only these groups represented in the Cabinet? We are we trying to create an equal society and why are exceptions the way to achieve that?

Actually, this was part of the reasoning for canceling the Minister for Jewish Affairs in Lithuania in 1924. Estonia followed a slightly different path, but the result was the same: in 1925 the Law on Cultural Autonomy started to function, but in return for declaring this law some compromises had to be brought in; the compromise was the elimination of two ministers’ posts for national minorities in the Cabinet. Eventually only the Baltic Germans and Jews were able to use the benefits of this law, neither the Russian national minority, nor the Swedes were instrumental in achieving some results using tools granted by the Law on Cultural Autonomy. On the other hand, it should be underlined that there were efforts to implement ideas and practices of cultural autonomy in all three countries and at the beginning they were quite successful. All three countries, but especially Latvia and Estonia, supported the education of national minorities in their mother tongue from the state budget. The cultural life of national minori-
ties developed, in some cases it was even quite impressive, but again dominant
groups and national minorities were not so interested in each other besides daily,
routine contacts and communication. Very few personalities or groups had a
deeper knowledge of each other. Of course Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian
cultures were dominant and national minorities knew quite a lot about them,
the question was were they satisfied with the achievements of these cultures and
were they ready to identify with them. The dominant groups were concentrated
on the creation of their cultures and did not pay enough attention to national mi-
norities. And again, the question of language arose once more: minorities were
willing to preserve their language (but usually they were at least bilingual), whilst
dominant groups insisted minorities’ learn the dominant language and use it at
least in public spaces.

In this perspective the press played an important role, the main functions of
the press were already briefly presented. In this long perspective from the middle
of the 19th century until 1940, first of all we must speak about the growth of the
press taking into account not only a growth in publishing from dominant groups
but of national minorities (in their mother tongues) as well. Publishing started
from the few newspapers, which usually were stopped after several issues, first of
all because of financial problems. But later on publishing grew, both in numbers
and in diversity, so the press became more important and more influential, hav-
ing in mind also that literacy was also increasing (it did not reach a total percent-
age until WW II, but it was constantly growing). But in edition to this, one must
remember that censorship also functioned and in such a way that those who
were in power had additional tools to control and to form public opinion. On the
other hand, the opposition from time to time managed to issue several items of
one or another newspaper or journal. But the biggest magazines and newspapers
supported those who were in power. Press discourse, as well as the already de-
scribed general politics, shifted from a more liberal to a more conservative stance
with the onset of WW II. Depending on publishers’ ideological orientations, they
were more or less supportive of diversity and the presence of national minorities;
on the other hand, a majority of publishers spoke about a nation's unity: the same
question remained – unity on what basis? The liberal-orientated press said that
first of all human dignity and equality was the basis for unity, not different social
positions, religion or ethnicity. The social-democratic-orientated press claimed
that first of all human solidarity and social justice were the basis for cohabitation.
The conservative-orientated press did not ignore these questions, but at the same
time underlined the importance of society’s structure: what constituted the ba-
sis and what were the supplements? According to modern national conservative
thinking, the basis was nationality and the language of the dominant group (for
example, common narratives would be: it is our homeland, fought for with our
ancestors blood, etc.), others were supplements that had to adjust to the domi-
nant group.
It is not a secret that radical thinking and nationalism became more and more popular with the approach of WW II. There were several reasons for the radicalization: first of all, a world economic crisis, which affected the economy directly, but indirectly created a feeling that democracies were not good forms of self government. The opponents of democracy claimed that it was a dangerous regime because it was not stable (any election might bring in a different coalition and everything would have to start from the beginning); some argued that Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians were too young as nations to grant the freedom of choice to the citizens during the elections as to who would gain power (for example, one of the reasons for the coup d'état in Lithuania in December, 1926 was the statement that the coalition in the last Parliament was too dangerous for the future of the state and nation because its majority consisted of Socialists, Socialdemocrats and representatives of the minorities). The feeling that democracies were not able to deal with economic problems was strengthened contrasting the situation in Italy and especially in Germany (these states were also affected by the economic crisis, but at the same time they started major public works campaigns – sewage drainage, railroad and road building, etc.) and in such a way achieved better population occupation and economic effects.

As well, it is important to notice that the Fascists and especially the National Socialist German Worker’s Party (Nazis) underlined the importance of belonging to the same national group (even before they grabbed power during the democratic elections in Germany in 1933, the Nazis had already developed their theory on the inequality of races, the superiority of the Aryan race, etc., and after they assumed power they started to implement their politics on the basis of these theories). In this perspective, the formula to success looked quite simple: a strong authoritarian leader who stressed on nationality, which would usually be called the master of the state; clear values (based on cultural, ethnic and linguistic principles); and optimistic future-orientated discourses. No diversity, plurality or polylogue. Some said at the very beginning that this was a sure-fire way to destruction, and finally to self-destruction as well.

Despite some suggestions to follow Germany’s “success” story or encouragement to have more radical politics in the economic and social (bearing in mind differences between different national groups) sectors, there were those who opposed the dominant ideas and tried to suggest alternative ways of cohabitation. One of them was Paul Schiemann, a Baltic German, journalist and politician actively involved in the creation of a possible relationship development between national minorities and dominant groups. P. Schiemann clearly saw conflict in belonging to a state and belonging to a nation – this double-sided feeling was quite common in the region, P. Schiemann himself had faced this dual situation, he felt a part of German society but the state he was in was Latvia… One of his ideas was that common goals are much more important than national differences, unfortunately not so many people thought similarly. For example in 1925,
in Latvia, there were some suggestions of common denominators of nationality, among them were: Latvian sounding names of grandparents, or genealogical studies etc.

P. Schiemann was one of the first who noticed the weak spots of the Versailles system. This system was based on states’ cooperation or control, as well as the cooperation of groups of individuals, but not of individuals themselves. What P. Schiemann argued for was the individual approach: individuals are free to determine their identity, it may have one layer or be more complex and only one person could decide which group or groups he or she belonged to. In his far-reaching vision, P. Schiemann had an idea of national minorities merging into dominant groups, but of course this would take time. On the other hand, he was against the quick assimilation or evaluation of minorities’ rights. At the Nationalities’ Congress in Geneva in 1927, he argued about the necessity of inclusion of national minorities into the state’s life, but underlined the idea that a minority that is more concerned with its own life, not the state’s life, should reconsider its priorities. But again, the state should realize that granting rights to minorities would not weaken the state, but on the contrary, strengthen it. Finally, the minority should be loyal to the state and support the general line of its policies.

But how could this model be created? In P. Schiemann’s mind, one of the possibilities was education. But at this point he underlined one important aspect – primary education should be separated according to nationalities (if members of national minorities are not eager to let their children attend state primary schools) and just later secondary education and onwards should be based without a national distinction. This idea could be interpreted as P. Schiemann’s effort to preserve national culture (the first places of socialization are family, kindergarten and primary schools) and later combine it with the dominant one, in such a way creating a link between these two identities and formatting loyalty to the state: the minority could not betray the state in favor of the nation or national solidarity. Most of these ideas P. Schiemann expressed openly, on the other hand they remained more on a theoretical background, because the implementation of them would take quite a lot of time. On the other hand, not so many individuals were able to construct themselves in P. Schiemann’s way – to have a complex identity is possible, but when the question arises as to what side to support, in this case Latvian or German, only more problems could occur. Baltic Germans would say that they lived in the region for 700 years and usually were among those who made the decisions and governed. And now they had to change this routine, and that of course might be problematic.

P. Schiemann also dealt with these kinds of issues, as it was explained, he tried to find a way of equal cohabitation among different cultures, plus he also respected the new political situation – a new national group was in political power, shaping the public sphere and setting goals for future development. A large number of Baltic Germans found themselves in a contrasting situation – which way
should they choose. On the other hand, P. Schiemann believed German culture was mostly developed in the region and that which was considered the best, i.e., rule of the law, individual responsibility, tolerance, creativity, etc., belonged to the German culture. But it must be said that later, when some Baltic Germans became too involved in Nazi ideology and admiration of the regime, P. Schiemann expressed that he had over-emphasized the superiority of German culture and that any kind of gradation and strong hierarchical schemes could lead to regimes such as Nazism, which P. Schiemann opposed very strongly. He believed that every culture is unique and should be developed in its own way, as well, there should be competition among cultures because competition was seen as an engine for future development and improvement. But these processes should be natural with no or just the bare minimum of state control, whereas the evil of Nazism was that the state had taken control over all processes.

So all in all, P. Schiemann had developed a unique theory of cultures, nations and the cohabitation of minorities. On one hand, his theory was a little romantic, as if the world and people were ideal and all meanings, norms and values were understood the same; on the other hand, there were also some weak points (but every theory or model has weak points) which P. Shiemann tried to rethink or simply and bravely in the first place admitted that he had made a mistake and instead of a better understanding between peoples, misunderstandings had resulted or the creation of dominance. But the most important thing is that in Latvia, P. Schiemann’s ideas and works were almost unknown to society. In the three Baltic States, it was commonly the case that national minorities had an interesting and prosperous cultural, philosophical, and theoretical life, but usually very few people from the dominant groups were aware of this or were interested in the “others”. This applied for the Litvak culture, where one of the problems again was language. Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians insisted that their languages should be used in the country’s public life, but the national minorities usually used their own languages – P. Schiemann for example wrote in German, Litvaks used Yiddish, or Hebrew for theology works, and sometimes Russian.

On the other hand, one could say that at some point at least in intellectual circles ideas were somehow similar. For example, the Lithuanian philosopher and educator/professor Stasys Šalkauskis developed his own model of world recognition and education for the young generation. First of all, Stasys Šalkauskis asserted that society was not active enough in civic and political life (he was strongly critical of the 1926 coup d’etat, emphasizing that it would put an end to societal development in the political sphere), which was why social education should be developed, fostering social activities and political culture – proper relations between individuals, their relations with institutions and the responsibility of institutions. The second step, according to Stasys Šalkauskis, was national education, which had three levels – national, patriotic and nationwide. The first was necessary for knowledge of language, one’s own history, customs and tradi-
tions. According to the philosopher, this was every nationalities obligation – in other words, he did not support the common position that national minorities should submerge themselves into the Lithuanian identity. Patriotic education was necessary to integrate these different national educations; common values, future cooperation and projects, nationwide education – all were needed to improve patriotic education, to create a community with certain differences, but at the same time maintaining common goals, landmarks and values. The last step in education, according to Stasys Šalkauskis, was international education – at this stage one would learn that educated nations have common goals, values and strong cultures could complement and enrich each other.

It seems that the idea was the same – to cherish your own culture and identity, then to become acquainted with surrounding cultures, taking from them the positive experiences and examples and later starting to create a worldwide culture. But again, S. Šalkauskis expressed his ideas towards the end of the 1930s when it was more and more obvious that military conflict was almost on the doorstep, and that Europe had turned down a totally different path.

In this chapter we learned about national composition and the politics regarding national minorities in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, as well as national minorities’ positions and images attributed to them by the dominant groups. Some theoretical ideas of the region concerning the development of national identities, cultures and education were presented as well. As usual, the question remains the same: how would theory work in practice, and how are ideal plans modified when facing reality, especially when this reality faces the horizon of war.

Readings:

CHAPTER 6
FORMATION OF MODERN IDENTITY AND CIVIL SOCIETY IN THE NAZI AND SOVIET EPOCH

The aim of the lecture:
To explain how the foreign occupations changed the national composition of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. What were the reactions to the occupations? And what kind of national policy was taken by the Soviets and Nazis?

The tasks of the lecture:
Read the description of the lecture before turning to the tasks, which have been outlined below.
1. Consider the inter-war situation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and their societies from the perspective of the treatment of national minorities. Could it be treated as a sign of civil society or just a reflection of the demands of the international community?
2. What kind of conclusions could be made from the quotation given in description of the lecture about deportations? Why were these groups in particular mentioned? What was the main purpose of this given fragmented document created by the People’s Commissar for the Interior in Lithuania Aleksandras Guzevičius?
3. Sergei Maksudov and William Taubman expressed the idea that the USSR rested on ideology, dictatorship and nationalism, and before, during the tsarist occupation, the three pillars of tsarist Russia were Orthodoxy, autocracy and narodnost (national spirit). How could you explain this statement? What is the meaning of nationalism in the quotation? Is it possible to compare the tsarist and Soviet occupations? Why?

Description:
The years 1940–1945 were the harshest and bloodiest in the modern history of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. First of all came the loss of independence in June, 1940, followed by years of occupation: they were marked by killing, imprisoning, sentences of exile to Siberia, fear and uncertainty. The question of nationality also reached its highest point, common saying is that brother fought against brother, meaning that within national groups there were those who suffered under the occupation, and those who collaborated and even benefited from it (with the exception of the Jews during the Nazi occupation period – the entire Jewish popu-

lation, according to the Nazis plans, should be destroyed and of course there were no Jewish collaborators with the Nazis). National minorities found themselves in an even more difficult situation: the dominant groups thought that the national minorities held more pro-occupation positions (for example, a common stereotype was that Jews welcomed the Red Army in 1940, and naturally, Russians were in favor of these processes etc.) so conflict was programmed automatically. At the same time, a similar “brother against brother” dilemma was experienced by the national minorities: inside their circles there were also occupant collaborators and those who had suffered.

The first Soviet occupation in 1940–1941 rapidly affected Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia: the political order was changed, communal life was affected, every aspect of life became centralized and came under strict surveillance. It changed relations between nationalities, as it was mentioned, the dominant groups felt somehow betrayed by the national minorities. According to an auto-stereotype prevailing in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia in the inter-war period, it was claimed that the latter were friendly countries, and while discussing the situation of the national minorities or even insisting on adjusting to the demands of the dominant group, it was said that the national minorities had a calm and cozy life. It depended on the state, but generally speaking, the statement was quite correct – there were no obvious signs of discrimination of national minorities. On the other hand, in the public sphere there were more radical ideas expressed and some encouragement to take more “effective” political decisions in order to solve the issue of national minorities.

The Soviets came up with the idea of an international revolution, and as it was said when V. I. Lenin was still heading the Bolsheviks, he envisaged the idea of a dictatorship of the Proletariat. In 1940 a dictatorship of the Proletariat was not accentuated so much, but nevertheless, one of the main messages passed on through Soviet propaganda networks was support for those who were oppressed, but even more important was to have the right background – to be from the Proletariat, or from small and unwealthy peasant families. Of course, first of all the idea of supporting oppressed people was presented to society.

Viewing the results of the occupations in hindsight, usually the situation is pictured as negative – the Soviets came, the Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians resisted, but there were those who supported the new regime. Usually they are called collaborators, traitors and pictured only in a dark light, but on a personal level, their stories are much more complex. Usually it is too dangerous to present these processes using only several colors, but some generalizing is also necessary, and finally, there were local communists devoted to the ideas of this regime. But at the very beginning only a few things were clear – the states had lost their independence, new rule was in the process of formation, and only those who were in power knew what kind of organizational and administrative structure would be established.
But very soon, the picture started to become clearer. Soviet rule was anti-religious. In this case again, dominant groups, such as Catholics and Protestants, felt like they were being oppressed – churches were closed down, property was confiscated, but even national – religious communities, such as Jews, Orthodox believers, etc. suffered from these processes. This direction of politics did not touch every part of society. A much greater effect was triggered by the changing of the administrative systems of the states, and first of all in terms of the personnel employed.

It was mentioned that officially, in the inter-war Baltic States there were no official restrictions for national minorities to take any posts in the administration, but from the 1920s there were almost no high ranking officials from the national minorities, with some exceptions in local governance and municipalities. Some administrative staff was brought in from other places from the USSR, some locals joined the apparatus as well (among them there were also members of the national minorities, but they did not constitute a majority). Another fact worth being mentioned was language. Scholars agree that language or the so-called ethno-linguistic identity model was dominant in inter-war Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The dominant groups insisted on public use of these languages, after occupation the Soviets brought in the Russian language, which surprised the dominant groups as well, as Russians used to be one of the minorities which also demanded to use the dominant group’s language, but now the situation was different. It might be mentioned that some inhabitants already from the 19th century’s tsarist occupation had negative attitude towards the public use of the Russian language because even back then it was the language of the occupants. These might be several explanations as to why there were feelings that national minorities had “betrayed” dominant groups in the Baltic States. That’s why the feeling that only dominant groups suffered most from the Soviet occupation was quite strong and spread among members of these groups.

Day by day, the feeling that the new rulers would change everything grew stronger and stronger, and ideas of resistance started to spread. Probably the best case of this movement would be the Lithuanian Activists’ Front (LAF) inspired by Colonel Kazys Škirpa, a Lithuanian diplomat in Berlin until the state lost its independence. But the most important thing is that the LAF was a strongly chauvinistic organization. Its aim was to fight the Soviets when military conflict between the Soviets and Nazis would break out, but the first provision of this Lithuanian clandestine organization pointed out that only ethnic Lithuanians could become members of this organization, which meant that members of national minorities were not welcome. On the other hand, threats to the population of the Baltic States became more and more evident. Not only because of property nationalization, dismissal from previous employment, but also because of arrests and imprisonments. The worst days came in June 1941 when the first sentences to Siberia were organized in all three Baltic countries. According to R. J. Misušnas and R. Taagepera, in late November, 1940, the People’s Commissar for the Interior in Lithuania Aleksandras Guzevičius issued a list of persons whom should be deported:
1. members of leftist anti-Soviet parties;
2. members of nationalist anti-Soviet parties;
3. gendarmes and jail guards;
4. tsarist and White Army officers;
5. officers of the Lithuanian and Polish armies;
6. white Russian volunteers;
7. those who had been expelled from the party or the Komsomol;
8. all political émigrés and unstable elements;
9. all foreign citizens and individuals with foreign connections;
10. all those with personal foreign ties, e.g., philatelists, Esperantists etc.;
11. high-ranking civil servants;
12. Red Cross officials and refugees from Poland;
13. clergymen;
14. former noblemen, estate owners, industrialists and merchants.

The deportations took place in 1940 between the 14th and 18th of June. From Latvia 15,081 individuals were deported, from Estonia – 10,205, from Lithuania – 34,260; in this way Estonia lost about 4 % of its population, Latvia and Lithuania – from 1.5 to 2 %. As it was mentioned before, the deportations touched not only Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians, but national minorities as well, for example, the Latvian Jewish minority in 1939 numbered approximately 93,000 and up to 5,000 suffered during the deportations; in June, 1941 about 18,000 of Latvian Jews were drafted to the Red Army or exiled to the USSR. In Estonia there were less than 5,000 Jews in 1939, but after the Soviet retreat in the summer of 1941, only around 1,000 remained. In Lithuania, 5.1 % of the total number of arrested people in 1940–1941 were Jews; those sentenced to exile in Siberia constituted 13.5 %. As it was mentioned, the Soviets did not underline nationality so much, but focused instead on “enemies of the people” and “fighting” them, but the first Soviet occupation had an impact on the national composition of the Baltic States, not to mention the fact that new “reliable” persons were sent from other places in the USSR to take on important activities, and of course, more soldiers were positioned in the independent Baltic states.

The first mass deportations took place only a week before the Nazis invaded the region. Local societies were shocked by the mass deportations and certainly hoped for a change. In this case, we should also have the pluralistic perspective in mind (but one should always remember that every single individual would act differently in a comparable situation), where while not every single detail could be presented, the general scheme could be presented. Of course there were Nazi admirers

29 Ibidem, p. 41.
31 Robert van Voren, Undigested past. The Holocaust in Lithuania, Rodopi, Amsterdam – New York, 2011, p. 27.
who thought that now everything would be fine, there were also those who were strictly against this ideology, saying that it was evil and would create a lot of harm. A majority of citizens most probably took a neutral position – we’ll live and we’ll see. Several explanations could be given for this kind of position – the first has already been mentioned: societies were shocked by the mass deportations and it became clear that the Soviets were far more dangerous than they might have appeared at the beginning (it is necessary to remember that those who believed in the ideals of Communism tried to retreat into the USSR). Secondly, Germans were perceived as a cultivated nation (in some memoirs and statements this is expressed very clearly), some compared this period to WW I when the Germans also acted in a more civilized manner, on the other hand there were also some stereotypes putting into opposition civilized Germany and barbaric Russia (Nazis used these a lot, claiming that they were bringing culture to the people and that every conscious person should be joining them in fighting the barbarians). The fact that this stereotype worked again might be seen from testimonies of the first contact with the Germans, which brought a totally different perception – the Wermacht soldiers are described as tidy, well dressed, and self confident, whilst the Red Army troops are dirty, untidy and disorganized (interestingly enough, even some Holocaust survivors’ memoirs, despite knowing about the anti-Semitic Nazi policy, Jewish discrimination and persecution, at the beginning some people could hardly believe that these things are real, again underlining that such a civilized nation could not act in such a beastly way). And last but not least, some who believed that everything would settle down ignored the logics of Nazi ideology or simply did not understand it.

The Nazis underlined the importance of ethnicity or using their term race. Gaining power in Germany in 1933, they started to implement their policy – Aryans are the dominant race, all rights should belong to them and national minorities should be given only as many rights as Aryans would think they need. Some public discussions in inter-war Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia sounded similar – the ethnically dominant groups are the founders and masters of the state and national minorities were just guests and the latter should be given only as many rights as the former would think necessary. Somehow the part about the inequality of races was forgotten and idea was simplified: the Nazis were coming, and they understood that the locals cherished the same values about dominant groups, etc., which would make them partners or at least be given autonomy as loyalists.

For these reasons, approximately the first two years under Nazi occupation were not so troubled. But Nazi occupation was significant for the Jewish communities in the Baltic States and other places where Nazis came: immediately after invasion Jewish killings started, some local inhabitants got actively involved into these actions, later organized and systematic killing processes took place (first establishing ghettos, later deporting people to mass extermination camps); this scheme was mostly developed in Lithuania, followed by Latvia. As
it was mentioned earlier, Lithuania had the largest Jewish population, Latvia’s was smaller, and Estonia had only about 5,000. The result of the Nazi occupation for the Jewish community was catastrophic; according to R. J. Misiunas and R. Taagepera, about 250,000 Baltic Jews perished in the Holocaust and only about 10,000 survived\textsuperscript{32}.

Those who at the beginning were in favor of the Nazis, upon seeing their bigger and bigger demands and ignorance of any requests of the local inhabitants, became skeptical, and underground organizations started to function, issuing press releases and encouraging locals to boycott the Nazis’ demands as much as possible, and hoping for a better future. But his time the hopes were tied to the Western nations, which were fighting the Nazis. But would the West help the Baltic people fight against the Western ally, the USSR, or would they negotiate with it for independence? The end of WW II brought another Soviet occupation. While during the Nazi occupation about 25,000 ethnic Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians were killed on their home soil, around 10,000 were killed in Nazi concentration camps elsewhere\textsuperscript{33}.

In 1944–1945 the Soviets came back as glorious vanquishers, moreover, their international positions became even stronger; according to Soviet interpretation, they were the true victors against Nazism as their troops entered Berlin first. In some strange manner, the former Molotov-Ribbentrop pact was again fulfilled but this time with only one actor – the USSR. Poland did not become a republic of the USSR, but its satellite; Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia for the second time within less than a decade became Soviet republics. The second Soviet occupation brought a different national composition: the Jewish community was destroyed, the dominant groups and other national minorities also had loses during WW II. The Baltic German community was reduced because some of them had left their homeland and moved to DP camps in order to avoid Soviet occupation, others were sent to other distant places in the USSR, for example Kazakhstan (the Soviet authorities thought that Baltic Germans might be dangerous, Nazi sympathizers, etc.) As a matter of fact, several thousand Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians also fled to DP camps and later to Western countries to avoid Soviet occupation and repressions, and some Poles, making use of the exchange program between Poland and the USSR chose to settle in Poland instead of living in the USSR.

The first years of Soviet occupation (especially until Stalin’s death in 1953) were marked by harsh Sovietization: the Russian language and Bolshevik culture was made to predominate, another goal was to as soon as possible change the identity and mentality of the Baltic people in order to make them Soviet citizens. These processes were followed by another two: nationalities politics and industrialization. It was mentioned that during the first Soviet and Nazi occupation, the three Baltic States had lost their citizens of different nationalities including both domi-


\textsuperscript{33} Ibidem, p. 62.
nant groups and national minorities. Ethnic Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians were not only murdered by the occupants, but tried to flee their countries before the second Soviet occupation. Ethnic loses were higher in Estonia and Latvia in comparison with Lithuania.

Those who stayed tried to find a way of living during the occupation; some resorted to partisan activities. The largest guerilla war after WW II to be based in Central – Eastern Europe was launched; organized activities took place for almost a decade, some partisans hid for even a longer time. One of the motives of the guerilla war was that the West would stand up for Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and would set these countries free. Looking from an ethnic perspective, more Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians died after the war than during the war. The guerilla war was not the only cause, sentences of deportation to Siberia continued into the second Soviet occupation. The three Baltic nations were not a special target for Bolsheviks (one’s social not national background was of more importance), but as it was already mentioned, after the war there were almost no Jews or Poles left.

A parallel and later ongoing process was industrialization. In this sense, Lithuania was lagging behind Latvia and Estonia, but industrialization meant not only growing industry, but the need for so-called “specialists” who usually came from other parts of the USSR. They were not necessarily ethnic Russians, but usually used the Russian language and were called Russians by the local inhabitants. Industrialization itself was a triple-sided process. On one hand the USSR needed industrial development, on the other hand it was a tool of Russification – usually the “specialists” were members of the Communist party or other ideological organizations and loyal to Moscow; thirdly, the Baltic states had the image of the most western republics of the USSR and it was a point of attraction for ordinary Soviet citizens – why not live in a better climatic zone and have a relatively higher standard of life, etc., in comparison with some other parts of the USSR. So besides the ideological program there was also natural movement of the labor force. This aspect touched the inhabitants of the Baltic States – some of them left their countries searching for a better life and career opportunities in other places in the USSR.

This was the time when a Russian speaking population started to grow in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia (also, we should not forget the Red Army troops), but statistical data indicating a growing Russian population in the Baltic States had a different impact. Latvia and Estonia followed one model, Lithuania – another. New industrial objects in Latvia and Estonia were established in already existing industrial centers or around bigger towns and capitals – Riga and Tallinn. This model led to a situation where the Russian speaking population year by year was concentrating in the same area, for example in 1979 there were 38.3 %

ethnic Latvians in Riga\textsuperscript{35}. The Lithuanian Communist Party leader Antanas Sniečkus proposed the decentralized model: industrial objects were built all over the Lithuanian territory, not concentrated around several cities that did not affect Lithuania's industrial development, for example, in the early 60s the largest power station at the time was built in Vievis which used raw materials not only from Lithuania but other countries as well, and at the same time the electricity produced was not consumed only in Lithuania, but transported to Belarus or Kaliningrad. In 1974 preparation works started for the construction of the Ignalina nuclear power station, the only nuclear power plant in the Baltic States (at that time, the most powerful in the world) but instead of 4 reactors, only 2 were in operation (the first in 1983, the second in 1987). But for our purposes, what is more important to notice is that this model avoided a concentration of the Russian speaking population in some concentrated regions.

Even though the national composition was changed, Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians, as well as other national groups, now again in the position of being a minority, tried to preserve their identities which was developed until the beginning of WW II.

The cultivation of identities first of all was concentrated in the cultural sphere where various ethnographic movements became popular. As a reaction to industrialization, ideas about ecology became popular as well. These movements were primarily based on the same worldview and ideas setting apart ethnicity or religion, on the other hand, the Church (and especially in Lithuania) played quite an important role. Practicing Catholicism in Lithuania was a form of resistance as well as a means of identity preservation.

Step by step various movements turned into social activities – the organization of various festivals, camps, mass meetings. These processes started to rapidly develop in the beginning of the 1970s, before that in the early 60s in the whole of the USSR, dissident movements started their activities. Usually it would be an organized group of people trying to draw the world’s attention to human rights or the lack thereof in the USSR. And that meant freedom of self-expression, religious practices, culture and language development issues, etc. In this case the general principles of human rights were the most important, in other words, a principle which is declared in democratic constitutions – that one’s rights should be guaranteed despite ethnicity, race, skin color, religion, gender, etc., which became more important than any kind of differences. For example in 1972 seventeen Latvian communists reached the West and published an open letter strongly criticizing the communist regime, pointing out that it had nothing in common with the fathers of the ideology – Marx, Engels or Lenin\textsuperscript{36}. In the same year, 1972, in Kaunas a young man named Romas Kalanta self-immolated in front of the city municipality, leaving a note that the system was to blame for his death. This event provoked mass demonstrations
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of young people. The officials and militia fought these demonstrations and declared that R. Kalanta was mentally ill, and that the decadent Western culture (hippy movement, rock music etc.) was to blame for this disorder.

In 1975, the USSR signed the Helsinki declaration of human rights. In 1976 a Helsinki group was established in Lithuania with the same purpose, to register violations of human rights and inform the “free world” – the group’s activity was not concentrated to one particular ethnic group or state – it gave coverage of all of the USSR, of course mostly aiming on the situation in Lithuania. But these formal or informal dissident groups created close ties and networks informing each other about the situation in different republics of the USSR. The Jewish minority was very active in the dissident movement in Lithuania and Latvia but differently than in the inter-war period; as it was mentioned, these activities were not based on some national interests, of course they were not forgotten or ignored either, but at the same time universal principles and ideas seemed more important.

All these cultural, social, and civic monitoring activities led to the formation of so-called Popular Fronts in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia in 1988. These organizations were legal, and created as a response to Gorbachev’s ideas of Glasnost and Perestroika. The Fronts had a different composition to the organizations established before – here members included both communists and non-communists, and there was no strict opposition between “us” and “them”, the main ideas were concentrated around the possibilities of life improvement and setting up new goals and agendas.

In this lecture we learned about the policies of the Soviets and Nazis in the Baltic countries in 1940–1988, how these policies affected national composition of the region, and what the impacts of the long lasting second Soviet occupation were. We also covered the reactions of the local population during different periods of occupations, and how attitudes and identities changed or remained frozen for some time.

Readings:

• Joachim Tauber, The view from the top: German soldiers in Lithuania in the two World wars. // Forgotten pages in Baltic history, edited by Martyn Housden and David J. Smith, Rodopi Amsterdam – New York, NY 2011.
CHAPTER 7
THE NATIONAL POLICY OF POLAND TOWARDS MINORITIES

The aim of the lecture:
The main idea of the lecture is to discuss the national policy of modern Poland towards minorities. The status of national and religious minorities in Poland will be analyzed according to the stages of development of the Polish state: the Second Republic of Poland 1918–1939, the People’s Republic of Poland37 1944–1989, and the Third Republic of Poland after 1989.

The tasks of the lecture:
1. To characterize the ethnic composition of the Polish state.
2. To analyze the situation of ethnic and religion minorities in Poland from 1918 till nowadays.
3. To characterize the development of Polish politics towards national minorities in the 20th and 21st centuries.
4. To explain political and cultural transformation of Polish society after 1989, according to the question of national/religious minorities.
5. To discuss the legal position of national, ethnic and religious groups in present-day Poland.

Keywords: Poland, Lithuanians, Belarusians, Ukrainians, Jews, Germans, Roma, Karaites, Lemkos, Tatar, Catholic Church, Orthodox Church, Greek Catholic Church.

Description:
As a result of the First World War, after 123 years of partitions, Poland regained independence in 1918. The process of creating the Polish state lasted almost 5 years, only in 1923 did the League of Nations finally officially recognize the eastern border of the Polish state that was settled after military or diplomatic conflicts with Soviet Russia (Treaty of Riga, 1921 March 18th), Latvia (1920), and Lithuania (the resolution of the parliament of Middle Lithuania, 1922, February 20th, never recognized by the Republic of Lithuania). National minorities played a crucial role in the social and political life of Poland, as the number of non-Polish citizens equaled approximately one-third of the population. Polish people were in significant domination only in the central voivodeships (province – the highest level of administrative division in Poland), but still towns of

37 Polska Rzeczpospolita Ludowa – official name of Polish country during the period of 1952–1989, during 1944–1952 official name Republic of Poland (Rzeczpospolita Polska) was used.
central Poland (as well as towns in the Eastern part) had a very high percentage of Jewish people. The eastern part of Poland was dominated by the inhabitants of non Polish origin. Ukrainians made up at least two thirds of the inhabitants of the south-eastern voivodeships like Wołyń or Stanisławów. A high percentage of national minorities were in Tarnopol and Lwów (Ukrainians), Polesie, Nowogródek, Wilna (Belarusians) voivodeships.

The basic rights of minorities were guaranteed by two articles of the Constitution (1921)\(^{38}\).

**Article 109.**
Every citizen has the right of preserving his nationality and developing his mother-tongue and national characteristics.
Special statutes of the state will guarantee to minorities in the Polish State the full and free development of their national characteristics, with the assistance of autonomous minority unions, endowed with the character of public law organizations, within the limits of unions of general self-government.
The state will have, in regard to their activity, the right of control and of supplementing their financial means in case of need.

**Article 110.**
Polish citizens belonging to national, religious, or linguistic minorities have the same right as other citizens of founding, supervising, and administering at their own expense, charitable, religious, and social institutions, schools and other educational institutions, and of using freely therein their language, and observing the rules of their religion.

The next Constitution of Poland, adopted in 1935 did not include any articles regarding the laws of national minorities. It was a result of consequent politics of Polonization, in which linguistic assimilation of other Slavic nationalities (Belarusians and Ukrainians) and colonization was considered as a main factor of unifying the state after the partitions, however official politics regarded the state assimilation, citizens were judged by their loyalty to the state, not by their nationality. Politics of administration has met resistance from the minority groups, the strongest from Ukrainians. Policy of polonization was directed mainly to the quite big masses of inhabitants who had no ‘national self-identification’, and called themselves ‘locals’ (tutejszy), using various mixes of Slavonic languages (eg. Ukrainian and Belarusian in Polesie region), declaring their nationality often by their confession (eg. Orthodox Russian confession, Catholics Polish confession).

The question of national minorities was crucial not only in the internal politics of Inter-war Poland, but played an important role in international relations. Poland was forced to sign the Little Treaty of Versailles, which guaranteed the international control of this question by the League of Nations. As well, the borders of

Poland were at most artificial, splitting compactly inhabited lands into different countries. In that case national minorities played a huge role in relations with Lithuania, Germany, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union (Belarusians).

For centuries, Poland was an important place of Jewish settlement. At first the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was a country with a high tolerance of heretics, moreover, after the partitions Polish lands were included in the Jewish Pale of Settlement. As a result in parts of Poland under the Russian regime, at the beginning of the 20th century there were up to 15 % of Jews. During the interwar period the Polish administration was in general friendly towards the Jews. However escalating anti-Semitism after 1935 led to the introduction of some anti-Jewish rules at universities (bench ghettos, numerus clausus), and the number of anti-Jewish riots grew.

WW II completely changed the political, social and territorial composition of the Polish state. During the German and Soviet occupation large numbers of citizens were expelled by both occupants. About 90 % of Polish Jewry died during the Holocaust, the total number of ethnic Poles who died during the occupation is estimated at nearly 2 million people. As a result of the Potsdam conference (1945) new borders of Poland were settled: the eastern border was moved about 200 km westwards to the Curzon line, the Polish-German border was moved westwards to the Oder-Niesse line, as well, the German region of East Prussia was divided between Poland and the Soviet Union. Territorial changes resulted in a huge movement of the population. German inhabitants (about 5 million) of territories transferred to Poland were expelled, in their place about 1.2 million inhabitants from eastern Poland were “repatriated” (the term “repatriation” was widely used, in fact it was a process of expatriation). In exchange, part of the Ukrainians (480,000) and Belarusians (30,000) moved from Poland to the USSR. The rest of the Ukrainians and Lemkos were dispersed on the Northern parts of Poland as a result of Action Vistula in 1947.

All those processes lead to the creation of a monoethical state in which the question of national minorities has not been widely discussed in society. However, Polish authorities had given some rights to national minorities after the “thaw” in 1956, several central minority organizations were established under the name “Social-Cultural Society” (with the appropriate adjective Belarusian, Lithuanian, Russian, Ukrainian...) controlled and financed by the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and a legal press started to be issued. Those processes somehow were slowed down in 1970s under the regime of Edward Gierek. In fact, Polish authorities tended to assimilate national minorities. In the public sphere, only the anti-Semitic/anti-Zionist campaign in 1968 can be regarded as a strong expression of the communist Poland authorities on the national question. As a result, about 15,000 Polish Jews were forced to leave the country, and diplomatic relations with Israel were suspended. From the beginning of the 1980s and the period of Solidarity, minority organizations started to be more active, trying to act legally.
The question of national minorities was revived after the collapse of the communist regime in 1989, the collapse of the Iron Curtain allowed intensive contacts with countries as well as with other members of the Polish diaspora in the West. The Committee for Ethnic and National Minorities was appointed by the Sejm in August 1989 and the Committee for National Minorities was appointed by the Polish government on 7 September 1990. However, to work out new laws on national minorities, Polish authorities needed over a dozen years. The political and social activeness of minorities started to grow. From the early 1990s national minorities had been guaranteed some allowances in the election system: the election threshold of 5 % does not apply to the election committees created by electors belonging to registered organizations of national minorities. However during the seven elections that took place in Poland after 1989 only the committee of the German minority succeed, taking at least one seat in the Sejm 2007 and 2011), while in 1991 they took 7 places receiving 132,000 votes. Far more important for national minorities were always the local elections, especially after introducing in 1999 a three-level administrative subdivision, in which at every level there was a self-elected local government.

The elementary rights of national minorities are defined in Article 35 of the Constitution (1997): 39
1. The Republic of Poland shall ensure Polish citizens belonging to national or ethnic minorities the freedom to maintain and develop their own language, to maintain customs and traditions, and to develop their own culture.
2. National and ethnic minorities shall have the right to establish educational and cultural institutions, institutions designed to protect religious identity, as well as to participate in the resolution of matters connected with their cultural identity.

Poland has ratified The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities in 2001. The legal question of national minorities for a long time had not been implemented in Polish law, one of the reasons was a lack of actual statistical data (see statistics), only from 2002 did actual data on the ethnic composition of Poland become available, and somehow completely changed the image of this composition.

The rights of national minorities in Polish law were described in The Law on Ethnic and National Minorities and Regional Languages (2005). According to this document, a group to be recognized as an ethnic or national minority must reside in Poland for at least 100 years. The difference between ethnic and national minority was distinguished by the identification with the nation organized in its own country. The law defines two categories of recognized minorities in Poland: 9 national minorities (Armenians, Belarusians, Czechs, Germans, Jews, Lithuanians, Russians, Slovaks, Ukrainians), 4 ethnic minorities (Karaites, Lemkos, 39 The Constitution of the Republic of Poland, (http://libr.sejm.gov.pl/tek01/txt/kpol/eng/kon1.html).
Roma and Tatars), and recognizes the Kashubian language as a regional language. However, the biggest national minority in Poland according to 2011 census are Silesians (847,000), who are not recognized by Polish (or Czech) law as a minority, only as an ethnic group of the Polish (or Czech) nation.

Apart from defining the national minority, the law states, that one is free to decide if one wants to be treated as a member of a minority, and no one is obliged to reveal his national affinity, origin, language or religion. The means of assimilation are means leading to change the ethnic or national composition of territories inhabited by minorities are prohibited, unless it’s the choice of the minority. No one can be obliged to prove his national affinity. The law allows usage of minority languages as an auxiliary language in municipalities, and states that that along with Polish names, names in the auxiliary language can be used for inhabited places, physiographic objects and streets.

Poland ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages on 12 February 2009 for: minorities languages: Armenian, Belorussian, Czech, German, Hebrew, Karaim, Kashub, Lemko, Lithuanian, Romani, Russian, Slovak, Tatar and Ukrainian and Yiddish; regional language: Kashubian; national minorities languages: Armenian, Belorussian, Czech, German, Hebrew, Lithuanian, Russian, Slovak, Ukrainian and Yiddish; ethnic minorities languages: Karaim, Lemko, Romani and Tatar; and non-territorial languages: Armenian, Hebrew, Karaim, Romani and Yiddish.

The Law introduced main regulations for language, education and culture of national minority, as well as as the status of regional language. People of national minorities got the law to use the original writing of their names and surnames in the registers. The language of minority/regional language can be used as an auxiliary language in municipalities in which the minority consists of at least 20% of inhabitants, and the municipality officially inscribes it in the Central Register. Members of a minority can use their language in writing and verbally in contacts with municipality authorities, as well as in the court of first resort. As well, in those municipalities additional geographical names in minority language can be introduced. Such additional names can be introduced in other inhabited places in municipalities that do not meet the 20% requirement, if at least 50% of inhabitants will express this will during the consultations. As well, the municipality is not obliged to introduce the double names to all the places. Names in minority language can exist on its own, and shall be always used after official Polish name. Those names cannot refer to the names introduced during the Nazi and Soviet occupation, as well as by the Third Reich authorities after 1933.

According to the census of 2011, there are 51 municipalities in which at least 20% of citizens belong to a national minority or use the regional language, while according to the 2002 census there were 51 such municipalities as well, but partially, those are different municipalities (due to the methodology and demographic processes). The 20% rule applies to 4 languages:
- Belarusian – 9 municipalities in Podlaskie voivodeship (in 2002 – 12) – 2 in county of Bielsk Podlaski (Bielsk Podlaski (rural), Orla); 7 in county of Hajnówka (Czyże, Dubicze Cerkiewne, Hajnówka (city), Hajnówka (rural), Kleszczele, Narew, Narewka);

- Lithuanian – 1 municipality of Puńsk in Sejny county in Podlaskie voivodeship;

- German – 22 municipalities (in 2002 – 28) – 3 in Kędzierzyn-Koźle county (Cizek, Polska Cerekiew, Reńska Wieś); 1 Kluczbork county (Lasowice Wielkie); 2 in Krapkowice county (Strzelecki, Walce); 2 in Olesno county (Radłów, Zębowice); 5 in Opole county (Murów, Popielów, Prószków, Tarnów Opolski, Turawa); 2 in Prudnik county (Biała, Głogówek); 4 in Strzelce Opolskie county (Jemielnica, Leśnica, Kolonowskie, Ujazd) of Opole voivodship and 3 municipalities in county Racibórz (Krzanowice, Pietrowice Wielkie, Rudnik) in Silesian voivodeship

- Kashubian – 19 municipalities in Pomorskie voivodeship (2002 – 10) – 3 in Bytów county (Czarna Dąbrówka, Lipnica, Parchowo); 8 in Kartuzy county (Chmielno, Kartuzy, Przodkowo, Sierakowice, Somonino, Stężyca, Sułęczyno, Żukowo), 2 in Kościerzyna county (Dziemiany, Lipusz), 3 in Puck county (Jastarnia, Krokowa, Puck (rural)); 3 in Wejherowo county (Linia, Luzino, Szemud).

In 31 municipalities (2012) the auxiliary language in public administration was introduced: Belarusian in 5 municipalities, Lithuanian in 1, Kashubian in 3, German in 22. In 6 municipalities that introduced the auxiliary German language (Bierawa, Chrząstowice, Dobrodzień, Dobrzeń Wielki, Izbicko i Komprachcice), the minority, according to the 2011 census, consists of less than 20 % of inhabitants. Additional names were introduced partially or fully in 44 municipalities (2013): Belarusian in 27 inhabited places of Orla municipality; Lithuanian in 30 inhabited places of Puńsk municipality; Lemko in 9 inhabited places of Gorlice and Uście Gorlickie municipalities; as well 336 German and 398 Kashubian names were introduced.

Unification of the educational system in independent Poland after gaining independence in 1918 was one of hardest tasks for the authorities. Education of national minorities during the inter-war period was regulated in 1924 by Stanisław Grabski, Minister of Religious Beliefs and Public Education, and a system of utraquist (bilingual) schools was introduced. According to this system public schools of national minorities should switch to bilingual teaching, which as a result led to progressive polonization and assimilation. This policy worked quite well on the Belarusian local minority, while it was highly opposed by Ukrainians, who developed quite a well organized system of private schools. This system was also opposed by Jews, but under religious principles (refusal to go to school on Saturdays, mixing classes with Jewish children was opposed also by Christian parents). After 1935 the course on Polonization was intensified and utraquist schools were gradually replaced by Polish schools.
After WW II the educational system was rebuilt but the polonizational tendencies were quite high. In fact, during the rule of the communist regime in Poland, the question of education was not regulated on a state basis. Until 1991 only Belarusian, Lithuanian, Slovak and Ukrainian schools existed. Policies differed according to the minority, local authorities, and the general tendencies. After 1956 they were positive – there was the opening of new schools to raise the new intellectual elites of particular national minorities, even new programs of studies were introduced (eg. Belarusian Philology at the University of Warsaw in 1956), and negative in the 1970s when minority languages lost the status of a language of instruction and were taught as an additional subject. After 1989 the rights of national minorities were regulated by the Law on Education (1991 with changes); Article 13 guarantees in public schools of all levels classes in minority languages, as well as the history and culture of the native country. Under regulations introduced in 1992, schools have also been established with classes in the Lemko, German, Kashubian and other languages. The system transformations led to changes in educational regulations, as well as bilateral agreements with neighbouring countries, resulted in a substantial growth of the number of educational establishments at all levels for national minorities and a rise in the number of their students (from 5,193 in 1990 to 33,513 in 2006). The highest growth was noticed in the number of schools with the German, Kashubian and Roma languages.

The dominant confession in Poland is the Roman-Catholic Church. As well, Polishness is often associated with the Catholic Church. The Church played a huge role in the period of “Solidarity” in 1980s and transformations, and a great impact on Polish society was left by the pontificate of John Paul II (Karol Wojtyła, 1978–2005). Since then, the Roman-Catholic Church has been important not only in Polish society, but in politics as well. Apart from the Roman-Catholic, few other Catholic churches in Poland exist: Byzantine-Ukrainian, Armenian, Polish Catholic, etc. About 33.4 mln. people (86.7 % of the population, 2012) belong to all of these churches. The second largest confessional group with about 500,000 worshipers is Eastern Orthodoxy: Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church and Pomorian Old-Orthodox Church. Then, various Protestant churches (ca. 140,000) and Jehovah’s witnesses (ca. 120,000). Altogether there are 191 religious communities officially legalized in Poland.

Statistical data:
In the 20th–21st century in independent Poland, 9 Censuses have been held (2 of them in Second Republic of Poland: 1921, 1932, 5 in the People’s Republic of Poland: 1950, 1960, 1970, 1978, 1988, and 2 in the Third Republic of Poland (2002, 2011). The national question was measured only three times, in 1921, and in two

---

40 Schools with Roma language were introduced in 2003, after launching a long-term “Government Programme for the Roma Community in Poland”, coordinated by Ministry of Education and Ministry of Internal Affairs.

41 Confession wasn’t the question of census, in case of the Catholic church the number of baptized is being given.
censuses of the 21st century. In 1931 linguistic criteria replaced the question of nationality, and the question of the mother tongue was measured. Not only the methodology was questionable, but also the results. The workers of the Polish Statistical Office stated afterwards that the results of the Census were tempered by the administration and authorities, and the results were never fully published. From 2011 the population has had the opportunity to express its complex national-ethnic identity, indicating nationality, and additionally the national or ethnic group that they feel they belong to. As a result, double national consciousness was measured.


**Scheme N. 1: Ethnic composition of Poland**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1931</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>double</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>17789287</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>21993444</td>
<td>68.91</td>
<td>36983720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>3898428</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>4441622</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>30957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>2048878</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>273257</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarussian</td>
<td>1035693</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>989852</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>48737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>76992</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>740992</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>152897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>24044</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>83116</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>5846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>48920</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>138713</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>6103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>30628</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>38097</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovaks</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatars</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaites</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silesian</td>
<td>173153</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>375655</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>846719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashubian</td>
<td>5062</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>16377</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>235247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>12855</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>9899</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>17049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemko</td>
<td>5846</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>5612</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>10531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locals</td>
<td>38943</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>707088</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25694700</td>
<td>31915779</td>
<td>38230080</td>
<td>3851824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Readings:**


• Poland (and other related entries) http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkPath=pages\P\O\Poland.htm

CHAPTER 8
NATIONAL POLICY OF BALTIC STATES TOWARDS MINORITIES

The aim of the lecture:
The task of the lecture is to discuss the national policy of the three Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania) on the minorities. The status of national and religious minorities will be presented and analyzed by looking at its development from independence in 1918, to today.

The tasks of the lecture:
1. To analyze the situation of ethnic and religious minorities in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.
2. To compare the politics of the three Baltic countries on national minorities during the inter-war period.
3. To analyze demographic changes in the Baltic countries during the Soviet occupation.
4. To analyze the present ethnic and confessional structure of the Baltic countries.
5. To compare the politics on national minorities in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

Keywords: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poles, Russians.

Description:
The three Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, for someone from outside of the region, seem to be quite similar. All of them declared their independence in 1918, became part of the Soviet Union in 1940, regained independence after its collapse, and entered the European Union in 2004 (as well as NATO). However there is an external point where all the similarities end, as the internal situation is far more complicated: linguistics, history, economics, religion, demographics are the factors that distinguish each of the three Baltic countries and determine their politics on national minorities. All of these factors had a huge effect on constructing societies in these countries, its ethnic, national and religious structure, as well as its politics, both foreign and internal.

The question of national minorities was more or less active since the very first days of the creation of independent countries after WW I, as the countries were inhabited by a large percentage of national minorities who had to be integrated into the political, social and cultural life of the new-born states. According to statistical data, the dominant nationality made up 88 % of the population in Estonia
(in 1922), 73% in Latvia (1925), and 89% in Lithuania (1923, without the Klaipėda region). The three countries developed their politics on national minorities based on local laws, created by the local parliaments, and were pressured to accept the international obligations (as those from the Little Treaty of Versailles) as part of the terms for their admission into the League of Nations.

The models created by Estonia and Latvia were unique and showed the most progressive attitude towards minorities in Europe. This approach enabled them to create a civil society and integrate minorities towards the idea of an independent state, however these processes ended for both countries in 1934 straight after the coup d'état of Konstantin Päts in Estonia and Kārlis Ulmanis in Latvia.

In Estonia, which was one of the ethnically most homogeneous states in Central and Eastern Europe, minority rights were granted in the Declaration of Independence (21st of February 1918), which defined the territory of the country: “The independent Republic of Estonia shall include Harjumaa, Läänemaa, Järvamaa, Virumaa, with the city of Narva and its surroundings, Tartumaa, Võrumaa, Viljandimaa, and Pärnumaa with the Baltic islands of Saaremaa, Hiiumaa, Muhumaa, and others where Estonians have settled for centuries in large majorities. The final determination of the boundaries of the Republic in the areas bordering on Latvia and Russia will be carried out by plebiscite after the conclusion of the present World War” and “All ethnic minorities, the Russians, Germans, Swedes, Jews, and others residing within the borders of the republic, shall be guaranteed the right to their cultural autonomy.” According to the constitution of 1920, national minorities had following rights:

“Par. 12. (...) The minority nationalities are guaranteed education in their mother tongue. Education is carried out under the control of the Government.
Par. 21. The members of minority nationalities within the confines of Estonia may form corresponding autonomous institutions for the promotion of the interests of their national culture and welfare in so far as these do not run contrary to the interests of the State.
Par. 22. In those parts where the majority of the inhabitants are not Estonian but local minority nationals, the business language in the local self-government institutions can be in the language of these minority nationals, whilst everybody has the right to use the State language in such institutions. The local self-government institutions in which the language of the minority is used must in their intercourse with State institutions employ the State language, as also with other local self-government institutions where the language of this minority nationality is not used.
Par. 23. Citizens of German, Russian, and Swedish nationality have the right to address themselves to the State Central institutions in the writing of their own language. The use of the language of these nationals in Court, as also in the institution of self-government, will be decided in detail by special law.”

In 1925 the Law on Cultural Autonomy was passed by the government. The law aimed to create a legal framework by which associations of minorities (with at
least 3,000 persons living in the country) could establish local administrations. These, in turn, were to serve as partners at the state level to organize mother-tongue instruction and the development of national cultures, using state subsidiary funds and stipends. Nevertheless only two minority groups took advantage of cultural autonomy: the Germans and Jews, however this law applied to Russians and Swedes as well (Swedes consisted mostly of poor fishermen living on the Estonian islands, Russians living compactly in the eastern part could use the laws given in the constitution).

A very interesting model of cultural autonomy was developed by Latvia, which had never adopted a complex law on national minorities, but was recognized as one of the most minority-friendly countries in the 1920s. In fact, the level of autonomy was higher than in Estonia, as it was not subjected to formal regulations. The basis for this was implemented in the law of 1919 which granted minorities their own school administration within the Ministry of Education. The “autonomic” departments were settled for the Belarusian, German, Jewish, Polish and Russian minority. The national minorities used the guaranteed opportunities to found national schools, societies, organizations, cultural institutions and to publish press media in their mother tongue. After 1934 the position of the national minorities in Latvia became worse, and their de-facto autonomy was markedly curtailed, with an effort to “Latvianise” the educational system.

The creation of territorial states in the Latvian and Estonian cases were relatively uncomplicated, as the ethnic borders were quite distinct, what cannot be said about Lithuania’s borders, which especially in the eastern part were complicated due to the huge territory inhabited by people of an unclear national consciousness. As well, the conflict over Vilnius that was lost to Poland influenced the position of the minorities in inter-war Lithuania.

Back in 1905, organizers of the Great Vilnius Seimas declared that the Kovno, Grodno, Vilna, and Suwałki Governorates and parts of Courland Governorate were historically Lithuanian and that the Poles, Jews, Russians, and other groups in those areas were merely invaders, who had arrived in the recent past, while Belarusians were called Slavized Lithuanians. This resulted in a specific definition of ethnicity, and a programme in which national affinity is an object whilst the subjective declaration of the individual is not counted. Regarding the inhabitants of the Lithuanian-Polish-Belarusian borderland, their national self-consciousness was very low, often limited to the term of „locality“. In this case Lithuanians hoped to „re-Lithuaniz“ them both in terms of linguistics and society.

After declaring independence in 1918, Lithuania for a long time could not settle on unitary law on the national minorities. Yet at the end of 1918, the ministries of Belarusian and Jewish affairs were formed, that worked until 1924 without a defined legal status. Ministries were organized only for those minorities that accepted and supported Lithuanian sovereignty and independence. Whereas the Jewish ministry was working and realizing the real principles of cultural au-
tonomy, the Belarusian ministry, mainly because of the fact that finally the lands inhabited by Belarusians were left behind the borders of Lithuania, hardly played any political role. Meanwhile, other numerous minorities had no representation at all.

The laws of national minorities were described by two articles in Chapter VII of the Constitution, signed in 1922: Art. 73. National minorities that make up a significant part of the citizenry have the right to autonomously manage their national culture issues – education, charity and aid, and to realize those issues through lawfully elected representative bodies. Art. 74. National minorities have the right (...) to tax their members for national culture issues, and may receive an equitable part of funds that the country and local governments allocate for education and charity, if those issues are not met by common state institutions. In fact, the situation of the national minorities in inter-war Lithuania was submitted to international and internal politics, depending on the ruling power. After the nationalists came to power in 1926, the laws of national minorities were limited, and steps towards Lithuanization were taken.

The authoritarian regimes in 1940 switched over to the communist system, whose regime had deeply changed the demographics of the region. During WW II the Baltic States lost approximately 20 % of their populations, a value which is among the highest in Europe. Thousands of residents were either deported or killed by Nazis or Communists and thousands sought refuge in the West. During this time almost all the Germans (about 130,000 people) and Jews (about 254,000 people) disappeared from the Baltic region; in 1939 the former were „repatriated“ into Germany, the latter were almost exterminated during the Holocaust. Another important factor that changed the demographic structure were Soviet repressions that sent a significant part of inhabitants to the far-east or north of the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, a steady, continuous flow of newcomers, mostly Russians, into the Baltic countries took place.

The result of this process can be shown in figures. Ethnic Estonians constituted 88 percent of the population before the war, but in 1970 the figure dropped to 60 percent. Ethnic Latvians constituted 75 percent, but the figure dropped to 57 percent in 1970, and further down to 50.7 percent in 1989. The drop in Lithuania was far more subtle, a result of different politics regarding urbanization of the country, as after 1945 Lithuania ceded those territories that were in a large part inhabited by non-Lithuanians.

Under Soviet occupation most nationalities, except Russians, were subjected to assimilation, as minority schools, newspapers, museums and cultural centers were closed by the Soviet regime. An exception was made to Poles in Eastern Lithuania where Soviet authorities, on the basis of the maxim “divide and rule”, wanted to confront local Poles with newcomers from other parts of Lithuania. The Polish language was allowed in the public sphere, but strong ideological pressure was applied at the same time. That fact strengthened the Polonization
of local Belarusians (especially those of the Catholic confession), while in neighboring Latvia they were subjected to the process of Russification (along with Latvian Poles).

After regaining their independence, in the Baltic countries the crucial point was the question of the citizenship because of the high amount of newcomers and their low integration with the majority of the nation. Lithuania granted automatic citizenship to those persons who could prove their own, their parents’ or grandparent’s birth within Lithuanian borders. Permanent residents that were not covered by these criteria were granted citizenship by signing a loyalty oath. As language proficiency was not a requirement a decision had to be made within 2 years of 1989, and as a result almost 90 % of the optants were granted Lithuanian citizenship. The Estonian and Latvian policy was more severe, requiring naturalization of post-war immigrants. It was somehow influenced by Russia’s citizenship law and the desire to prevent dual citizenship.

Estonia, according to this law, granted citizenship (1995) on the basis of an “ethnic model”, the principle of _jus sanguinis_, and eligibility by descent, by place of birth or by marriage. There is an option for naturalization provided the following criteria are met: One must reside in Estonia legally for at least eight years, with a permanent residence in the country for the last five years; to be familiar with the Estonian language; to pass a test of one’s knowledge of the Estonian Constitution; and to take an oath of loyalty. A similar law exists in Latvia and requires the applicant to be a permanent resident of Latvia for at least 5 years, Latvian language competency; an exam on Latvia’s Constitution and history and knowledge of the Latvian national anthem.

In Estonia, all those people that did not gain citizenship remained stateless. Stateless persons (in 2013, about 90,000 people – 6.7 %) who reside legally in Estonia can apply for an alien’s passport. An Estonian alien’s passport allows visa-free travel within the Schengen treaty countries for a maximum of 90 days in a 6 month period. Meanwhile, Latvia introduced the term of non-citizens, who, by definition in Latvian law, are not stateless, and gained residence in Latvia without permit, have access to the Latvian consular service, and can enjoy visa-free travel in the Schengen zone. According to the Population register only 83.5 % of Latvian residents have citizenship, as 13.5 % were non-citizens, or about 300,000 people. And this number dropped down from about 700,000 at the beginning of independence. Non-citizen status refers mainly to the Slavic minorities from the former Soviet Union: Russians, Belarusians and Ukrainians, about half of the members of these national minorities do not have Latvian citizenship.

The question of citizenship seems to be the most crucial regarding the question of national minorities in the Baltic countries. All three countries signed and ratified The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, while no one had signed the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages.

In Estonia minorities are guaranteed opportunities for the preservation of their language and cultural distinctiveness, and the organisation of education and so-
cial activities in their mother tongue. The rights are defined by the Constitution: “§ 49. Everyone has the right to preserve his or her national identity. § 50. National minorities have the right, in the interests of national culture, to establish self-governing agencies under conditions and pursuant to procedure provided by the National Minorities Cultural Autonomy Act.” The Constitution also regulates the usage of minority languages in schools (the institution chooses the language of instruction), administration (should be guaranteed in the localities where at least one-half of the permanent residents belong to a national minority).

The Cultural Autonomy for Ethnic Minorities Act defines the legal status and rights of national minorities living in Estonia. Ingrian Finns were the first national minority to establish cultural autonomy in Estonia. The election of the Ingrian Finnish cultural council was held in 2004. In 2007 Estonian Swedes established their cultural autonomy.

The Latvian system of minority rights is guaranteed by Article 114 of the Latvian constitution: “Persons belonging to ethnic minorities have the right to preserve and develop their language and their ethnic and cultural identity.” And detailed by the Law About the Unrestricted Development and Right to Cultural Autonomy of Latvia’s Nationalities and Ethnic Groups (Adopted in 1991, with amendments of 1994) providing that government institutions 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, through allocating funds from the national budget for such purposes.

Nowadays the most unclear position of national minorities is in Lithuania, as the Constitution does not refer to the rights of national minorities. The Law on national minorities adopted back in 1989 expired in 2010. So the acts that in some way regulate minority issues are the Law on Education, and the Law on State Language.

Readings:


CHAPTER 9
POLITICS OF FINLAND AND SWEDEN
TOWARDS MINORITIES

The aims of the lecture:
The main aim of the lecture is to discuss the national policy of two Scandinavian states belonging to the Baltic Sea region (Sweden and Finland) on the minorities. The status of national and religious minorities will be presented and analyzed throughout the 20th–21st centuries.

The tasks of the lecture:
1. To analyze the ethnic development of Finnish and Swedish lands from the 19th century to today.
2. To characterize the situation of the ethnic and religious structure of Finland and Sweden.
3. To analyze the politics on national minorities in those countries.

Keywords: Alands, Finland, Saami, Sweden.

Description:
Both Sweden and Finland were for centuries rather homogenous regions, and their demographic structure in the national and linguistic case has not changed. The Swedish language had a very strong position in the Finnish provinces, as Lutheran Protestantism was a dominant religion in both countries. Some changes can be noticed in the 19th century, when Finland became a part of the Russian Empire. This limited migration from the Finnish provinces to Sweden, which earlier had been quite intensive. Only in the early 19th century did the population in the region start to grow, with massive emigration to America in the second part of the century. At this time Sweden started a period of modernization, people moved from the countryside to towns and cities, which was associated with a rather rapid industrialization of the country. As a consequence of this and factors such as generalized education and development of mass media, the traditional dialects began to give way to the standard Swedish language. An important factor in the growth of the country was the fact of intensive re-emigration, where many now wealthier migrants came back to Sweden, often re-settling in their native regions.

Similar tendencies can be seen in the development of the Finnish lands, but all the processes here went a bit slower. Economical progress, connected with the development of infrastructure, and a change from forestry to industry was
possible after liberalization of the economy in the 1860s. The limitation of autonomy of the Grand Duchy of Finland opened up the huge Russian market to local companies and guaranteed vast growth. Emigration to America was not so intensive as from the other parts of Russia (comparing with the lands of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) or Sweden, but was still a significant demographic process. Attempts of Russification, however not as intensive, were hardly resisted by the Finns and activated the Finnish national movement, which worked in parallel on emancipating Finns from the domination of Swedish culture. In Finland, at the end of the 20th century there were only about 10,000 Russians, compared to the population of the whole province, which was estimated at 2.7 million inhabitants.

The main difference between Finland and Sweden in the case of demographics is migration. Finland, until the late 20th century (the end of the Cold War) was not a target for migrants, while in the Swedish case, the country was opened up to newcomers from the beginning of the 20th century, which was associated with the rapid industrialization of the country. Net-migration was directed to Sweden at the end of the 1920s. After that, Sweden as a neutral country, was marked with increased immigration during WW II: people evacuated from the neighbouring countries (eg. Danish Jews, Finnish children of war), and communities from the Baltic States were also quite sizable.

After 1945 Sweden took a significant amount of political refugees from Eastern Europe. Shortage of a labour force welcomed further newcomers (mostly from the Balkans). Modern immigration is connected with refugee migration and family reunion from countries that have recently been involved in military conflicts (eg. The former Yugoslavian nations after the Balkan wars; Assyrians and Kurds after the Iraqi war). From the end of the 20th century, the birth rate declined as immigration increased further, as with the context of permanent unrest in the Middle East, it results in steady population growth. Sweden does not collect any statistics on ethnicity, only one’s national background is recorded, so there are no exact numbers on the ethnic composition of society. According to data from 2011, almost 27 % of Swedish inhabitants have a foreign background (they are born outside Sweden, born to a parent (or parents) born abroad).

The question of national minorities had not been regulated neither in Finnish nor Swedish law until the end of the 20th century. Both countries ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages: Sweden – 9th of February 2000 (for Finnish, Meänkieli, Saami, Romani, Yiddish), Finland – 9th of November 1994 (for Saami and Swedish). Both countries ratified the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities.

In Finland no official statistics are kept on ethnicity either, but statistics are available on language and citizenship. The Finnish and Swedish languages are defined as the languages of the state. All municipalities where both of the two official languages are spoken by either at least 8 % of the population or at least
3,000 people are considered bilingual. Swedish (5.4 % of the population) is an official municipal language in municipalities with significant Swedish-speaking populations, mainly on the coast of the Finnish Gulf and the northern coast of the Gulf of Bothnia (region of Vaasa). Swedish is also spoken in the Alands, an autonomous region of Finland. In four municipalities of Lapland three Saami dialects are official: Northern Saami, Inari Saami, Skolt Saami). The three northernmost municipalities Enontekiö (Northern Saami), Inari (all 3 dialects) and Utsjoki (Northern Saami) and part of Sodankylä (Inari Saami) are officially considered the Saami area. Today about 140,000 foreign-born people reside in Finland, which corresponds to 2.7 % of the population. However, as of 2011, there are 244,827 persons with a foreign first language (other than Finnish, Swedish or Saami), who account for 4.5 % of the population. The officially recognized national minorities in Finland are the communities historically living in Finland: Swedes, Russians, Saami, Roma (Kale), Jews and Tatars. However Finland has not developed a special law on minorities, but language and cultural rights are guaranteed and defined by Section 17 of the Constitution of Finland (1999):

“Right to one’s language and culture:
The national languages of Finland are Finnish and Swedish. The right of everyone to use his or her own language, either Finnish or Swedish, before courts of law and other authorities, and to receive official documents in that language, shall be guaranteed by an Act. The public authorities shall provide for the cultural and societal needs of the Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking populations of the country on an equal basis. The Sami, as an indigenous people, as well as the Roma and other groups, have the right to maintain and develop their own language and culture. Provisions on the right of the Sami to use the Sami language before the authorities are laid down by an Act. The rights of persons using sign language and of persons in need of interpretation or translation aid owing to disability shall be guaranteed by an Act.”

The Law on National Minorities was recently developed in Sweden. The rights were guaranted by the The Instrument of Government (1974): article 2:

“(…) The public institutions shall promote the opportunity for all to attain participation and equality in society and for the rights of the child to be safeguarded. The public institutions shall combat discrimination of persons on grounds of gender, colour, national or ethnic origin, linguistic or religious affiliation, functional disability, sexual orientation, age or other circumstance affecting the individual. The opportunities of the Sami people and ethnic, linguistic and religious minorities to preserve and develop a cultural and social life of their own shall be promoted.”

New Act on National Minorities and National Minority Languages came into force on the 1st of January 2010. There are five recognized national minorities in Sweden – Jews,
Roma, Saami, Swedish Finns and Tornedalers, all of whom are covered by the minority Law. Common to these minority groups is that they have been living in Sweden for a long period, are a group with a distinct affinity, and have their own religious, language or cultural affiliation. One of the main objectives of minority policy is to provide support for historical minority languages in order to keep them alive. As well, in 1999 the Minority Language Committee of Sweden declared 5 long-established minority languages of the country: Yiddish, Romany Chib, Saami (all varieties), Finnish and Meänkieli (Tornedal Finnish). Three of the national minority languages – Sami, Finnish and Meänkieli – are historically associated with certain geographic areas of the country. For this reason these languages are covered by special regional measures. Legislation entitles individual citizens to use those languages in transactions with administrative authorities and courts of law in administrative areas where these languages have traditionally flourished and continue to be used to a sufficient extent. The legislation requires municipalities in the administrative areas to offer parents the option of placing their children in preschools where some or all of the activities are conducted in the minority language. The same applies to elderly care services.

Act of 2009 expanded the administrative areas where the minority languages are used. For Finnish language from 5 municipalities to 23, for Saami languages from 4 to 17 (Arjeplog, Arvidsjaur, Berg, Gällivare, Härjedalen, Jokkmokk, Kiruna, Lycksele, Malå, Sorsele, Storuman, Strömsund, Umeå, Vilhelmina, Åre, Älvdalen, Östersund). For Meänkieli area wasn’t expanded and consist of the administrative areas of Gällivare, Haparanda, Kiruna, Pajala and Övertorneå. The new law cleared the responsibility of government in implementation of minority rights, strengthened the influence of minorities, and guaranteed allocation of funds for various activities of minorities, especially regarding language.

Both Finland and Sweden (as well as Norway) implemented special political status of Saami people, finally recognizing this Arctic people as a minority. This process started in the 1970s, and till today Norway is the most advanced in implementing both local and international law on Saami people. Sweden recognized the existence of the “Saami nation” in 1989, Finland only in 1995. However Finland was first to settle the Saami Parliament. The act establishing the Finnish Saami Parliament, which was given a consultative role, was passed on 9th of November 1973, while in 1993 The Sametingslag was established as the Swedish Saami Parliament.

Questions and tasks:
Using the presented Saami acts (see Internet sources of this chapter) and other literature, compare the legal status and the protection of the Saami minority in the region.

Readings:
• H. Meinander, A history of Finland, New York, 2011.
• K. Myntti, P. Nuolijärvi, The Case of Finland In Quest of Minority Protection, in: In-

Internet sources:

Statistical data:
For Finland the demographic changes according to the language spoken are shown for the period of 1990–2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>4675223</td>
<td>4788497</td>
<td>4,866,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>296738</td>
<td>291657</td>
<td>290977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saami</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>4892</td>
<td>12042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>10176</td>
<td>38364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3884</td>
<td>28205</td>
<td>62554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>3588</td>
<td>6,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3293</td>
<td>7,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>3115</td>
<td>9280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6454</td>
<td>14769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>2435</td>
<td>6097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>6926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5024844</td>
<td>5281967</td>
<td>5,699,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Finland's PX-Web databases (pxweb.stat.fi)

Sweden does not keep statistics on ethnicity or language spoken, only data about one’s foreign background is kept. Various information can be found on sites on Swedish Statistics (www.scb.se).
Aim of the lecture:
To discuss the constructed nature of the Baltic Sea Region as a concept, analyzing the conditions for multiculturalism in Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania and integration as a process in the Nordic territories.

Description of the lecture:
Historically, multiculturalism has been a value which was actually understood as one of the core issues by political communities in the region. And if we take a look at the wider processes, I mean the history of the Baltic area throughout the 14th–18th centuries, sketches of multiculturalism which are not related to immigrant and segregation issues do appear. The medieval Lithuanian political elite took the decision to convert to Orthodoxy, so adapting to a new culture and representing the Slavic territories as a part of one political nation. Later these early changes led to the formation of the political nation of the GDL into a unit consisting of three branches: Lithuanians, Poles and Ruthenians. Germans appeared in these territories stimulating resistance and State formations in the Region. So, during the medieval ages the territory became multicultural, based on “ethnic” and religious background. I would stress that during this period of history, because of geographical conditions, the cultural aspect become the central issue for the birth of multicultural society.

According to Rein Raud “the Estonian identity was born in an existing multicultural environment”\textsuperscript{42}. This validates the fact that Estonian, as well as Latvian transformation into a modern nation, was impacted by the multicultural environment.

Two legalistic discourses in Estonia and Latvia are well described by Vello Pettai:
1. „the Estonian and Latvian Popular Fronts were on the whole sober in their recognition of the Russian-speakers as a more-or-less permanent part of their societies and as such entitled to a substantive degree of participation in the political, as well as ethno-political, development of the two republics.“
2. „the claim that in 1940 the Soviet Union had in reality illegally occupied and annexed Estonia and Latvia and that as a result the two states, along with Lithuania, were now entitled to the restoration of their sovereignty“\textsuperscript{43}.

\textsuperscript{42} Rein Raud, Estonia and Estonians, p. 258.
\textsuperscript{43} Can liberal pluralism be exported? p. 265.
Firstly, the well-established second legalistic discourse opens the door for the concept used by Timofey Agarin of “nationalising states”, which motivates us to look for other forms that might unite but not separate communities in the region. Secondly, when multiculturalism is defined as a doctrine of immigrant integration, it becomes too narrow and raises further discussions.

Because of tsarist rule, national state building, Soviet domination, ethno-linguistic policy and many other processes, discussions about existing multiculturalism in the three Baltic States remain few and far between.

**Culture – Loyalty – Political community**

„Multiculturalism as practised in Australia, Canada or Sweden, is essentially intended for mixed populations created by international migration. These are typically found in major cities living together but having different origins, religions, languages and other aspects of distinct cultures.“

But Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian multicultural experiences until WW II had never been created by international migration. At the same time, it is in fact today problematic to use definitions for a multiculturally orientated area.

In concluding I would say that I do agree with Rein Raud’s remark that “multiculturalism is founded upon a rather different concept of identity – the separation of political identity from cultural identity. In these circumstances, it can be presumed that a citizen of a country is loyal to the political structures of his or her homeland, but this loyalty is not tied to the fact of belonging to the majority culture. From the point of view of the historical experiences of Estonia, this is comparable to the urban model from the era of the Hanseatic League, which is also reminiscent of the European Union in terms of its mobile workforce and the freedom of economic exchange. It is, in all likelihood, precisely this model which is best suited to ensuring the integration of the non-Estonians and to creating a cultural environment where people from regions other than the more traditional areas of immigration would also fit in well.“

**Does the retreat from multiculturalism in the Baltic States create conditions for integration processes in the Baltic Sea Region?**

There are numerous books written about multiculturalism, immigrants, integration and segregation. These four keywords were and are closely related to each other. At the same time different fields of the research for the analysis of multiculturalism might be taken: (Post)colonial studies, cultural/social-psychological/comparative perspectives. The main contemporary academic discourse related to multiculturalism might be called “Retreat from multiculturalism”. Bo Bengtson, Per Strömblad and Helen Bay in the introduction of the book “Diversity, Inclusion and Citizenship in Scandinavia” underline that:

---

44 Multiculturalism and Integration A Harmonious Relationship, p. xiii.

In the political-philosophical debate related to citizenship and immigration, there has long been a battle over the rights of minority groups. Will Kymlicka (1995), argues that group-specific rights for minorities are not only consistent with liberalism, but on certain occasions a prerequisite for well-functioning, diverse, liberal democracy. Bryan Barry (2001), a strong opponent, believes that multiculturalism undermines liberal rights (as, he would argue, individuals have rights but groups do not), fragments society, and steers attention away from economic inequalities. “My concern is with views that support the politicization of group identities, where the basis of the common identity is claimed to be cultural.” The theoretical debate has stimulated empirical research on the extension of multiculturalism in Europe (Brubaker 2001; Joppke 2004; Entzinger 2003; Koopmans et al. 2005), as policies increasingly tend to emphasize immigrants’ obligations to adapt to their new country (Wright 2008). Koopmans (2010) has investigated how integration policies and welfare state regimes have affected the socio-economic integration of immigrants in eight European countries (Germany, France, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Sweden, Austria and Belgium). He concludes that a combination of generous welfare state and multicultural policies has hampered integration in the labour market and promoted segregation, arguing that multicultural policies in a welfare state context lead to welfare dependency and thereby to social and economic marginalisation.

"The whole world is multicultural and many states – democratic or authoritarian– make some provision for cultural variety and the needs of minorities. Despite this, multiculturalism under that name has been highly controversial and is currently said to be in retreat, even where it has been officially adopted. In Australia national public policy has moved away from ‘multiculturalism’ to ‘integration’ while most State and Territory governments continue their programmes unchanged. In Europe there has been a positive 'backlash’ (Vertovec, S and Wessendorf, S (eds) (2010). The Multiculturalism Backlash, Routledge, London.)

There are several reasons for this (multiculturalism) resistance:
- the collision between liberal democracy and Islamic fundamentalism as evidenced by terrorist attacks in various cities in the new century;
- resistance to continuing, increasing and frequently uncontrolled immigration from poorer societies, especially from Africa, the Middle East, South Asia and Latin America;
- economic and social problems which social democracy has failed to solve;
- poverty and social dislocation in some concentrations of immigrants and refugees;
- a perception that the distinct civilizations and cultures built on a European basis are losing their pre-eminence;
- rapidly changing social structures and belief systems which creates anxiety.

47 Diversity, Inclusion and Citizenship in Scandinavia, edited by Bo Bengtsson, Per Strömblad and Helen Bay, p. 4.
48 Multiculturalism and Integration, A Harmonious Relationship, p. xvi.
49 Multiculturalism and Integration, A Harmonious Relationship, p. xvi–xvii.
Definitions:
This lecture understands the Baltic Sea Region as a social, political, economic, and cultural entity under constant (re-)construction. Instruments, actors, geography, and cultures form the fields of research for this class.

In many cases the definition of multiculturalism might give a clear picture of how it is understood by the researcher. The Baltic case to my mind opens two different ways of interpretation: the Australian and the Canadian variety.

"The Australian definition of 1978 stressed the delivery of services to non-English-speaking background migrants (NESB):

- migrants have the right to maintain their culture and racial identity... provided that ethnic identity is not stressed at the expense of society at large;
- the development of a multicultural society will benefit all Australians;
- the most significant and appropriate bodies to be involved in the preservation and fostering of cultures are the ethnic organisations themselves.

Four guiding principles were laid down 2 (2 Galbally, F (chair) (1978), Migrant Services and Programs, AGPS, Canberra: 4):

1. all members of our society must have equal opportunity to realise their full potential and must have equal access to programs and services;
2. every person should be able to maintain his or her culture without prejudice or disadvantage;
3. needs of migrants should, in general be met by programs and services available to the whole community but special services and programs are necessary at present;
4. services and programs should be designed and operated in full consultation with clients, and self-help should be encouraged as much as possible with a view to helping migrants to become self-reliant quickly."

50 This type of definition goes closer with Latvian and Estonian cases while they since 1990 have not treated recognition of the Russian-speakers as a more-or-less permanent part of their societies.

When the Ministry of Multiculturalism was established in Canada in 1972, the programme of multiculturalism was officially implemented, which caused more dynamic cultural and political actions of ethnic groups.

The Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988 (3) concentrated on four areas:

1. combating racism and discrimination;
2. ensuring that the Government of Canada represents the country’s diverse population;
3. promoting shared citizenship – making sure that all Canadians feel part of Canada;
4. cross-cultural understanding51."


50 Multiculturalism and Integration, A Harmonious Relationship, p. xvii–xviii.
51 Multiculturalism and Integration, A Harmonious Relationship, p. xvii–xviii.
These two classic definitions of multiculturalism start from different premises and move in different directions. Canada has been a bicultural (Anglophone/Francophone) society for three centuries. Australia had just ended an immigration policy (White Australia) which preserved its monocultural character. Both agreed that their societies were moving from a monocultural (Australia) or bicultural (Canada) form to a multicultural one. At this pioneering stage Canadians were more willing to accept this than were many Australians.

Those two above given definitions of multiculturalism are concentrated on cultural but not political discourse, while the implementation of ideas first of all is related to promotion and development of cultural diversity and loyalty which becomes the main issue for the formation of strong and well developed heterogeneous political community based on the same value system.

Questions to be raised:
1. Why have Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians become the object of multiculturalism?
2. Why is multiculturalism and not integration one of the most important instruments in the constructed process(es) of the Region, as far as Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania are concerned?
3. Why is integration and not multiculturalism one of the most important instruments in the constructed process(es) of the Region, as far as the Nordic territories are concerned?
4. Should Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania choose and develop multiculturalism or integration as one part of their respective narratives of identity?
5. What are the possible instruments that access and affect the multicultural dimension(s) of these societies?
6. How do actors implement policies of multiculturalism and integration using geographical conditions and consolidating different cultures?
7. Can multiculturalism become one of the most important instruments in the constructed process(es) of the Region?

Readings:

52 Multiculturalism and Integration, A Harmonious Relationship, p. xviii–xix.
Aim of the lecture:
To analyse the Russian national minority in light of the new regionalism dimen-
sion and discussions based on the pragmatic and the “national” approach to the
question of the Russian-speaking population in the Baltic States since 1990.

Keywords: Baltic States, Russian minority, Ethnic composition, Identity,
General background, Regionalism.

Description of the lecture:
If we take a look at the situation retrospectively - the histories of the three peoples
during the 20th century, their emergence as independent nation-states after WW
I, their mutual experiences during the inter-war period, and their fate during
WW II and its aftermath have served, however, to affirm a common identity
which in some ways has superseded the cultural differentiation of the past. Even
today the phrase that - Baltic political and social forms of cooperation may very
well be much more typical of the emigrant and refugee communities in the West-
ern countries than inside the ancestral homelands – will be closer to the truth.
Leonidas Donskis reminds us of the Lithuanian example where „the Soviet re-
gime seems to have transformed Lithuania into a kind of low-trust nation, where
a lack of faith in existing institutions threatens the fragile foundations of civil
society, yet where people – oddly enough – place enormous trust in the media
and TV in particular”53.

An observation made by the Royal Institute Affairs in 1938 is cited by Tönu Par-
mimg “The grouping together of the three Baltic States is to some extent arbitrary,
since, although they share much in common, and although for geographical, his-
torical, and social reasons many of their problems are the same, they form what
are essentially three separate and distinct national groups. Historically, their dif-
ferences are at least as striking as their similarities”54.

“The political essence of the definition of a “Baltic region” was reinforced from
within by the fact that the three countries strove to cooperate, albeit largely un-
successfully, in 1919, when they pursued peace negotiations with Soviet Russia.


A firmer notion of “Baltic entente” developed during the 1920s and 1930s by way of diplomatic consultations and actions at the League of Nations, a cooperation which led to the issuance of the periodical Baltic Review/Revue Baltique in 1940. But more than any other factor, it was the commonality of fate externally imposed in August 1939 which provided the core of the definition of “Baltic” in the sense we use it today publicly, politically and academically⁵⁵.

It also would seem, though, that the conceptual problematic of what constitutes “Baltic” are more serious from the viewpoint of academic circles than practice. Because the formation of the region started from strengthening political co-operative structures, the net of social contacts to my opinion is cracked. And still at first glance, it only seems that “Baltic regionalism” of today is a question of measures and regulations which have come mainly from above and from other places, but we have to remember economical factors and historical traumatic memories which unite quite well all the region. Sylvain Giguère noticed that “governments and their partners from business and civil society have identified common interests transnationally, established forums for co-operation and set goals to be achieved collectively”⁵⁶, but the implementation process of common goals seems to be too slow even in the infrastructure field, which is at the top of the priorities list.

“With regard to the “Baltic area”, we can maintain that the big part of the present-day Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, and Russian people have taken essentially little satisfaction in each other’s presence. The Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians have until quite recently, despite minimal distancing, lived more next to each other than with each other”⁵⁷. That is another reason why implementation is struggling along. Hain Rebas wrote this text in 1988, more than twenty years ago, nonetheless we should acknowledge that despite having broader “Baltic” (“Baltic Sea Region”) definition and all around the Baltic Sea sovereign countries, not so many have changed as we would wish to think.

In former times and still today, the stance of the “Baltic People” here I mean Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, as well as Livonians, Swedes, Baltic-Germans, and Jews toward each other could be regarded as fairly neutral, although not altogether alien, and in a few cases even hostile. A neutral position also depended on the issue that “all the initiatives taken since the end of the East-West divide share a common objective: to promote the economic growth and competitiveness of the region”⁵⁸. At the same time keeping distance on the net of social contacts aspect.

“Estonia has often struck outside observers as an ideal candidate for consociationalism or at least ethnic federalism, primarily for three reasons. First, the pop-

⁵⁵ Ibid, p. 141.


⁵⁸ Sylvain Giguère, “Integration, Growth and Governance...”, p. 20.
ulation is comprised of two main ethnic groups, Estonians and Russian-speakers. Second, in 1989 (shortly before the restoration of independence from the Soviet Union) the proportion between the two groups was roughly 62 per cent to 35 per cent (out of a total population of 1.5 million). This implied that the groups could form some kind of bi-national partnership. Third, approximately 35 per cent of the Russian-speaking population was concentrated in the north-eastern county of Ida-Virumaa, implying that even if full-scale consociationalism were not possible, some kind of separate status might be given to this region. Yet, two of the main characteristics of consociationalism are that the ethnic groups in question are historically indigenous populations and that there are relatively limited barriers to social communication and interaction (Bogaards 2000; Andeweg 2000). Neither of these conditions obtained in Estonia during the late 1980s and early 1990s. The Russian-speaking population was largely a product of the Soviet rule in Estonia beginning in 1940. In 1945, the Russian-speaking population constituted only some 3 per cent of the population. In the following years, this proportion began to rise dramatically, as communist cadres were brought in from the rest of the Soviet Union and large-scale labour migration to Estonia was encouraged. Already by 1959, Russian-speakers represented over 22 per cent of the population, increasing to 35 per cent by 1989 (Taagepera 1993).

This rapid growth of the minority population was in no way tempered by efforts at inter-ethnic or social integration. Instead, the Soviet system privileged the use of Russian in most political and economic affairs, although it also allowed Estonian to be used. This led to extremely low levels of Estonian language knowledge among Russian-speakers and a high degree of social separation. The situation was compounded by considerable residential and economic segmentation (Kala 1992). In a word, Estonia’s ethnopolitical situation was laden with disjunctions, all of which were of recent creation. Moreover, they were associated with a totalitarian regime, which had wreaked havoc on the ethnic Estonian population through mass deportations in 1941 and 1949, on top of stifling Sovietization throughout the post-war era59. “

“During the late 1980s and early 1990s, Lithuania developed a minority rights regime which offers cultural rights to traditional minorities. Most important policy decisions regarding the minority rights regime took place before Lithuania applied for European Union (EU) membership and the EU did not play a decisive role in this process. Lithuania’s minority rights legislation, however, did not produce the cultural change necessary for the successful implementation of minority rights. Preserving the dominant ethnic identity (which is still perceived as endangered) remains one of the priorities in Lithuania’s social and political life”.

In contrast to the other Baltic states (Estonia and Latvia), Lithuania is one of the more ethnically homogenous post-Soviet states. According to the 2001 census, 6.74 per cent of Lithuania’s residents identified themselves as Polish, 6.31 per cent as Rus-

sian, 1.23 per cent as Belarusian, and 1.2 per cent as Jewish. Approximately 2,571 (or 0.07 per cent of respondents) identified themselves as Roma, although the exact number may be slightly different (Department of Statistics 2001; Vaitiekus 1998: 14). In general, the ethnic self-identifications in the census correspond with the language spoken at home.

The country has a ‘unipolar ethnic structure’ (Bangura 2006: v) in which the Lithuanian majority is dominant, although this characteristic does not apply to south-eastern Lithuania which has a significant number of ethnic Poles and ethnic Russians. It is not surprising, therefore, that questions about minority rights and ethnic relations have been especially pertinent in that part of the country. In south-eastern Lithuania, half of the population is Lithuanian and a third Polish. Ethnic Poles constitute a majority (79 per cent) in the region of Salcininkai (10.4 per cent of the population there is Lithuanian and 5 per cent Russian) and the region around the capital, Vilnius (which comprises 61.3 per cent Poles, 22.4 per cent Lithuanians, and 8.4 per cent Russians). The town Visaginas is a unique place in so far as a nuclear power plant was built there in the 1970s that attracted a large number of labour migrants from all over the Soviet Union. As a result, Lithuanians constitute a minority in Visaginas (15 per cent) (Department of Statistics 2001)60.

“In what is now Latvia, minorities have been living for centuries. This includes proto-Russian (Krivichi) settlements in the south-east, Russian old believers from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as well as Baltic Germans beginning in the days of the Hanseatic League, not to mention the Finno-Ugric Livs along the Baltic Sea coast (see Kolstø 1995). Prior to the Second World War and the Soviet annexation of Latvia in 1944, the Russian-speaking community constituted approximately 11 per cent of the population (as cited in Smith 1996: 7). Once Latvia had forcibly become part of the Soviet Union, Soviet authorities used mass migration of Slavs into Latvia to promote stabilization, industrialization, and Russification. By the end of the Soviet period, the percentage of Russian-speakers had more than tripled to 40 per cent (with Russians constituting 34 per cent), leaving Latvia with more Slavs numerically and proportionally than either Estonia or Lithuania. Following independence, Latvia had not only a Slavic community that intended to remain in the country, but a lingering Soviet/Russian military presence. By August 1994, after considerable international pressure, over 28,000 military personal had left Latvia (Galbreath 2005: 195–196). According to the Latvian Statistical Bureau, Russians constituted 28.3 per cent of the population in 2007, with smaller communities of Belarusians, Ukrainians, Poles and Lithuanians61.

**Readings:**


Questions to be raised:
1. What is the relationship between the pragmatic and the “national” approaches to the question of the Russian-speaking population in the Baltic States since 1990?
2. What are the possible instruments for Russian national minority consolidation in Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania?
3. What kind of differences might you highlight in between transformations of Russian national minorities in Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania since 1990?
4. Did regionalization impact on the status of the Russian national minority in the Baltic States?
5. What are the results of adaptation of the Russian minority in Lithuania in 2013?

Tasks:
Define the pragmatic and the “national” approach to the question of the Russian-speaking population in the Baltic States since 1990.

Statistical Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Census of 1934 (%)</th>
<th>Census of 1989 (%)</th>
<th>Census of 2000 (%)</th>
<th>Data of 2010 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Estonians</td>
<td>992 520</td>
<td>963 281</td>
<td>930 219</td>
<td>921 92 68.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Russians</td>
<td>92 656</td>
<td>474 834</td>
<td>351 178</td>
<td>341 700 25.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ukrainians</td>
<td>92 008</td>
<td>48 271</td>
<td>29 012</td>
<td>28 140 2.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Belarussians</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>27 711</td>
<td>17 241</td>
<td>16 080 1.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Finns and Ingrians</td>
<td>1 088 0.1</td>
<td>16 622</td>
<td>12 195</td>
<td>10 720 0.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tatars</td>
<td>166 0.015</td>
<td>4 058</td>
<td>2 582</td>
<td>2 680 0.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Latvians</td>
<td>5 435 0.5</td>
<td>3 008 0.019</td>
<td>2 193</td>
<td>2 010 0.15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Poles</td>
<td>1 608 0.14</td>
<td>4 613</td>
<td>1 615</td>
<td>1 740 0.16 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Jews</td>
<td>4 434 0.4</td>
<td>2 145</td>
<td>2 145</td>
<td>1 876 0.14 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lithuanians</td>
<td>253 0.022</td>
<td>2 116</td>
<td>2 116</td>
<td>2 010 0.15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Germans</td>
<td>16 346 1.5</td>
<td>1 870</td>
<td>1 870</td>
<td>1 876 0.14 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Armenians</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>1 669</td>
<td>1 444</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Azerbajani</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>1 238</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Swedes</td>
<td>7 641 0.7</td>
<td>2 97</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nationalities or nationality unknown</td>
<td>4 174 0.37</td>
<td>10 891 0.696</td>
<td>14 347 1.047</td>
<td>9 112 0.68 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>1 126 413 100</td>
<td>1 565 662 100</td>
<td>1 370 052 100</td>
<td>1 340 100 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Statistical office of Estonia
Data included of the year 2010
### Scheme N. 2: Latvia's population by ethnic composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvians</td>
<td>1,472,612</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>1,387,757</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,370,703</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>1,285,136</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>206,499</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>905,515</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>703,245</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>45,798</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarusians</td>
<td>26,867</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>119,702</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97,150</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>44,472</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainians</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>92,101</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63,644</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>24,479</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poles</td>
<td>48,949</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>60,416</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59,505</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>24,709</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanians</td>
<td>22,913</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>34,630</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33,430</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>24,709</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>93,479</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>22,897</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,385</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>3,839</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7,044</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,205</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>62,144</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3,783</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonians</td>
<td>7,014</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3,312</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvians</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>92,101</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63,644</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>24,479</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>206,499</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>905,515</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>703,245</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>45,798</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarusians</td>
<td>26,867</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>119,702</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97,150</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>44,472</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainians</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>92,101</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63,644</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>24,479</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poles</td>
<td>48,949</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>60,416</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59,505</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>24,709</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanians</td>
<td>22,913</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>34,630</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33,430</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>24,709</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>93,479</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>22,897</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,385</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>3,839</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7,044</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,205</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>62,144</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3,783</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonians</td>
<td>7,014</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3,312</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3,398</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>29,275</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26,640</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,950,502</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,666,567</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,377,383</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,070,371</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia 2013.

### Scheme N. 3: Lithuania's population by ethnic composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>1923 Total</th>
<th>1929 Total</th>
<th>2001 Total</th>
<th>2012 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,028.9</td>
<td>3,674.8</td>
<td>3,484.0</td>
<td>3,199.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanians</td>
<td>1,702.2</td>
<td>2,924.3</td>
<td>2,907.3</td>
<td>2,679.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>344.5</td>
<td>219.8</td>
<td>171.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poles</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>258.0</td>
<td>235.0</td>
<td>210.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarusians</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>154.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvians</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatars</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER 12
THE PARTICIPATION OF MINORITIES IN POLITICAL PROCESSES IN THE BALTIC REGION

Aim of the lecture:
To discuss the theory and practice behind political participation of minorities in the Baltic Region in comparison with the situation in the Nordic territories.

Description of the lecture*:
Since 2004, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland have gained more instruments and confidence in the search of solutions related to abiding Baltic Sea issues. This is one of those rare occasions looking at the history of the Baltic Sea area when so much depends not just on foreign policy directions, governmental institutions, or international organisations but on the readiness of societies to implement signed documents and strategies. With the entry into the European Union, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian and Polish societies became well involved in the creation of the common Baltic area. Baltic area studies programmes have appeared more commonly in universities, old and forgotten but at the same time very important infrastructure projects have been renewed; in addition, better cooperation in strengthening NGO sectors, possibilities to soak up knowledge about the main functions, principles and values in the EU have influence on the appearance and perception of a new regional Baltic/Northern identity. The European Union has a strong legislative influence on the laws and regulations in the Region. And it provides significant financial resources, roughly €15 billion annually, to projects implemented around the Baltic Sea (Baltic Development Forum 2009).

Kieniewicz\textsuperscript{62} emphasises a certain freedom in the choice of life values, which in turn “shape perceptions,” becoming partially at least systematised or institutionalised, and thence can transcend such institutions to be considered more general norms, the adherents to which are often unmindful of their spiritual, religious or cultural context. Subsequently, with an ongoing hypostatisation, and given the appropriate vectors of power relations, these norms can inform a wide range of politically motivated programmes and policies, to become in some instances prescribed universally, or at least, at the level of “European” values. The values are said to be chosen when people apply them in practice, which means they live by them and they shape their perception of the world through them. Yet culture (as mindset, habitus, life-style) is not thereby itself generally demoted with respect to the present political, since the new contexts for value choice are still expressed

\textsuperscript{62} Jan Kieniewicz, Borderlands and civilizational encounter, in Memoria y Civilización: anuario de historia de la Universidad de Navarra, 2005, N. 8, Pamplona, p. 21–49.
through it. Thus Kieniewicz does not undermine the importance of cultural embeddedness of the political; indeed, such appropriation and contextualisation are of absolute significance. When people make choices, they implement the values into their life but they express them through their culture.

**Did the Russians need a political party in Lithuania in 1988–1993?**
The question is raised by Vesna Popovski in her book „National minorities and citizenship rights in Lithuania, 1988–93“ published in 2000. Vesna Popovski, then Lecturer in the Politics of Ethnicity School of Slavonic and East European Studies at University College London wrote „Most ‘Russians of Lithuania’ argued that they did not want a political party because it would be identified as pro-communist or pro-Russian, especially in the light of Edinstvo.

A minority of the ‘Russians of Lithuania’ argued that for the last 50 years they ‘were building socialism and making Homo Sovieticus’ and did not think of themselves as Russians. Therefore, they argued that it was important for the Russians to have their own party and MPs. Among them were people who also thought that the political party should be based on the three largest Russian organisations in Lithuania, the Russian Cultural Centre (Ruskii Kulturnii Centr), the Russian Society (Rusko Obshchestvo) and the Russian Community (Ruskaia Obshchina). Frolov, the co-president of the last organisation, argued that it was very important for Russians to organise themselves along political lines. ‘This is a very important time for Russians because it is difficult to take the role of a national minority. We have to make a basis for the future life of Russians and we also have to start from scratch. If we fail today there will be no Russian life here in five to ten years.’ However, he was not able to suggest why and how to organise a political party. The above quoted explanation could easily apply to a cultural organisation.

Furthermore, I should add that I never encountered anybody from the other two organisations who mentioned the need to form a political party. ‘Lithuanian Russians’, on the other hand, argued that there was no reason to form a political party, primarily because Russians differed among themselves. They did not share Frolov’s opinion that Russians should unite to survive because they lived in difficult times. ‘We need more people to take care of our culture, especially among those who work in the governmental bodies. They can be either Russians or Lithuanians.’ They wanted representatives but at the same time they would argue that this was not a good enough reason to form a political party. Their reasoning came from the understanding that Russians primarily faced a psychological challenge; they had to learn to be a national minority, to integrate into a new state and civil society and answer for themselves the question of what kind of Russians they were.

Therefore, forming a political party would only slow down the process of integration and divide national communities, instead of making people realise that they should see themselves as citizens of Lithuania with Russian origins.“
The next question of Vesna Popovski is: **Could the Russians be a national minority?**

She starts with a question which seems simple just at the beginning:

„Finally, the issue of being a national minority needs to be addressed. I would not agree with Kasatkina’s argument that at this early stage of national (re)awakening Russians were not at all a national minority but a ‘subethnos’ because they were not ‘ready to take responsibility for the cultural and political life of their own community’. From my own experience (as argued above), there was a constantly increasing sense of responsibility among Russians for their own cultural, political and religious life. The majority of them were confused about being a national minority. (The exception were ‘Lithuanian Russians’ who accepted they were a national minority and did not question their status as a minority at all.) How could a member of the Russian nation (the largest nation in the former Soviet Union) be a minority?

Two issues were important here. What it meant to be, first, Russian and, second, a Russian minority. The publicly dominant Lithuanian attitude towards Russians as well as differences within the Russian community also ‘pushed’ Russians to question the nature of their national identity. This was a very difficult question for many of them to answer, as they often came from mixed marriages, were born in different places and had often moved frequently. It was difficult for the majority of Russians to face the consequences of the Soviet nationality policies on their own identity. This first step of facing ‘who I am’ was still on the agenda when I was in Lithuania. The second step would be to develop an awareness that s/he is a Russian in Lithuania and to try to learn about both Russian and Lithuanian history and culture. These issues were also connected with the issue of seeing themselves as members of a national minority.

As Frolov argued, it was difficult for Russians to accept the role of a national minority. Ironically, Russia’s stance of not helping its fellow nationals actually helped especially ‘Russians of Lithuania.’ ‘New Russia’ could not be their otechestvo (fatherland) because it did not address them at all as already pointed out. Furthermore, the new Russian state supported Lithuanian independence and, at the beginning, openly argued that it could not and should not take care of Russians who were Lithuanian citizens. They saw Russia as their ethnicland, where their roots were, where their language came from as well as their culture. Russia was on the other side of the border, and that could not be changed easily. All these issues, together with a slow awareness of the political history of the region, taught them to recognise that they were a national minority. Some ‘Russians of Lithuania’ stated that they were ready to live in Lithuania as a minority but claimed that Lithuanians were not ready to treat them equally. They also stated that they felt that the barriers were increasing and that they lived next to the Lithuanians or ‘Lithuanian Russians’ but did not mix socially with them. They shared the same geographical space but lived in a separate social space. Their worlds were moving apart. The rest of the ‘Russians of Lithuania’ in 1992 and 1993 were still not able to see themselves as a minority. They
saw themselves as a part of the nation celebrated by the Soviet Union, a nation which brought victory to Eastern Europe in the Second World War. They believed that equality should entail a lack of distinction between majorities and minorities. ‘Soviet Russians’ were not able to accept the role of a national minority primarily because they thought that they had outlived ethnic divisions. They saw national issues as being in opposition to internationalism in the same way that they saw capitalism as being opposed to communism and separatism to unity. Nationalism was dangerous because it was fighting communism and demanding the formation of a nation-state. Therefore it belonged to ‘the dustbin of history’, which would give them a clear political role in fighting ‘bourgeois nationalism’ in Lithuania.\(^63\)


**Keywords:** LLRA, Russian minority, Polish minority, political participation, FHRUL, Political Integration, VEE(VBE), EÜR, Baltic States.

**Questions to be raised:**
1. How are minority interests represented in the Baltic States?
2. What are the differences of minorities’ cooperation with the state in the Baltic countries?
3. Should minorities in the Baltic States politically be focused on ethnic issues and parties oriented towards ethnic groups?
4. How are political programs towards minorities and their implementation in the Baltic and Nordic territories dealt with?

**Tasks:**
1. Prepare for presentation and discuss the LLRA political program
2. Prepare to analyse minorities issues and current FHRUL politics in Latvia
3. Find practical examples of participation of minorities in Estonian politics
4. On the background of Vesna Popovski’s text, compare the Lithuanian case to the minority situation in the Nordic territories.

**Readings:**

**Aland islands** – archipelago at the entrance to the Gulf of Bothnia in the Baltic Sea, lying between the Swedish and Finnish mainland, consisting of about 6,700 (ca. 60 inhabited) islands and skerries. In 1809 the archipelago was ceded to Russia, becoming a part of the autonomous Grand Duchy of Finland, after 1856 it was demilitarized. After WW I the archipelago was a point of dispute between Sweden and Finland, which ended in the League of Nations, which decided to retain Finnish sovereignty over the islands, guaranteeing the autonomy of the province. Yet the province is mainly Swedish-speaking (89.1% in 2012).

**Anti-Semitism** – prejudices and hostility towards Jews leading to their discrimination and segregation.

**Authoritarianism** – political regime build on discipline and unity of the nation.

**Baltic Germans** – were mostly ethnically German inhabitants of the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea, which today form the countries of Estonia and Latvia. They formed the social, commercial, political and cultural élite in that region for several centuries and took high positions in the military and civilian life of the Russian Empire.

**Baltic sea region** – the Baltic Sea including all sub-basins with their drainage basins, and Council’s of the Baltic Sea States definition – 9 coastal states + all Nordic states including Norway and Iceland (HELCOM definition)

**Boyko** – small ethnic sub-group of Ukrainian highlanders inhabiting the central part of the Carpathian Mountains.

**Civil society** – 1. the space of uncoerced human association and also the set of relational networks - formed for the sake of family, faith, interest and ideology – that fill this space (Michael Walzer). 2. a defense against excessive state power and atomized individualism, which otherwise threatens to create conditions for authoritarianism. (The concise encyclopedia of sociology / edited by George Ritzer and J. Michael Ryan).

**Community** – 1. a group of people with diverse characteristics who are linked by social ties, share common perspectives, and engage in joint action in geographical locations or settings (Kathleen M. MacQueen). 2. David McMillan and David Chavis suggest a state of community exists when four elements co-exist: membership, influence, integration and fulfillment of needs, and shared emotional connections. They argue that communities can be defined either in relational terms or territorial terms as long as these four elements are present together (Encyclopedia of Sociology / Edgar F. Borgatta).
Cultural autonomy – concept developed by Austro-Marxian school at the end of the 19th century, according to which national groups will be given a chance to develop their culture in a broad sense, and those national rights should be realized personally, not territorially.

Curzon line – demarcation line between Poland and Soviet Russia that was proposed by British foreign secretary Lord George Curzon during the Polish-Soviet war of 1919–20 as a possible armistice line and became (with a few alterations) the Soviet-Polish border after World War II.

Dominant minority – a group of people (usually it refers to the ethnic group) which is not numerous, but has significant role in state’s politics, economy or culture.

Ethnic minority – there is no legal definition in international law, and the term is variously defined in different legal systems, usually it does not differ from the definition of national minority (eg. In Polish legal system the only difference is that national minority identify themselves with a nation organized in its own state, while ethnic minority doesn’t have it’s own state).

Finlandization – the process in which one powerful country strongly influences the policies of a smaller neighboring country. Term refers to the politics of Finland after Second World war in which non-Communist Finland was maintaining neutrality with the Soviet Union with a consequent susceptibility to its influence.

Greek Catholic Church – Church that derived from Orthodox Church within the borders of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1595, after the Union of Brest when the orthodox clergy enter into communion with and place itself under the authority of the Pope of Rome. The Union was cancelled by Russian authorities in 1839, but preserved on the former Commonwealth lands under Austro-Hungarian rule among Ukrainians.

Integration – the action or process of integrating and the intermixing of people who were previously segregated.

Karaites – ethnic group of Turkic origin, adherents of Karaism (Karaite Judaism) who settled in the lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 15th century.

Kashubians – ethnic group of Slavic origin living in Polish Pomerania. Kashubian language, belongs to western Slavic group, sometimes regarded as a separate language, sometimes as a dialect of Polish language.

Lemko – small ethnic sub-group inhabiting the western part of Carpathian Mountains, sometimes connected with Ruthenians or Ukrainians, using uncodified language sometimes described as a dialect of Ukrainian languae.

Little Treaty of Versailles – (sometimes called Polish Minority Treaty) signed 1919, June 28 in which Poland has declared its support for protection of laws of ethnic and religious minorities. According to the Treaty minorities could direct their complaints to the League of Nations Council. Poland renounced the treaty in 1934. Similar treaties were signed by Czechoslovakia, Greece, Romania and Kingdom of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs.
Litvak – (pl., Litvakes), Yiddish term for a Jew of historical, or “greater,” Lithuania. The Litvaks’ territory of origin is significantly larger than the borders of both the independent Lithuanian Republic of the interwar period (1918–1940) which did not include the center of Litvak culture, Vilna ( Vilnius) and the contemporary state of Lithuania. From a Jewish cultural and historical perspective, Lite (Yiddish for Lithuania; Heb., Lita) includes large swaths of northeastern Poland (notably the Białystok and Suwałki regions), northern and western Belarus (notably the Grodno Minsk, Slutsk, Pinsk, Brisk [Brest Litovsk], Shklov, Mogilev Gomel and Vitebsk regions), southern Latvia (notably the Dvinsk [Daugavpils] region), and northeastern Prussia (notably the region of the Baltic port city Memel [Klaipėda]). (definition taken from: http://www.yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Litvak)

Meänkieli – literary „our language”, name used for the Finnish dialects spoken in the northernmost part of Sweden, along the valley of river Thorne, which in the lower part forms the boarder between Sweden and Finland. The dialect belongs to Western Finnish dialect of Peräpohjola dialects, but is distinguished from standard Finnish by the absence of developments made on the language throughout the 20th century, and usage of many loanwords from Swedish.

Memmelland – northern part of East Prussia on the right bank of river Ne munas (German: Memmel), that was derived from Germany under the Treaty of Versailles (1919), in 1923 after Lithuanian uprising annexed by Lithuania with wide cultural and political autonomy guaranteed. In 1939 annexed by Germany. Since 1945 integral part of Lithuanian state.

Multiculturalism – program and policy related to combating racism and discrimination, ensuring that the Government of Country represents the country’s diverse population; promoting shared citizenship; and cross-cultural understanding. (The Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988)

Nationalism – The term “nationalism” is generally used to describe two phenomena: (1) the attitude that the members of a nation have when they care about their national identity, and (2) the actions that the members of a nation take when seeking to achieve (or sustain) self-determination. (1) raises questions about the concept of a nation (or national identity), which is often defined in terms of common origin, ethnicity, or cultural ties, and while an individual’s membership in a nation is often regarded as involuntary, it is sometimes regarded as voluntary. (2) raises questions about whether self-determination must be understood as involving having full statehood with complete authority over domestic and international affairs, or whether something less is required. (definition taken from: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nationalism/)

National minority – the term that doesn’t have a legal definition in international law, and is variously defined in different legal systems, in common, it can be defined as a group of people within a national state: is numerically smaller than the rest of population of the state; which culture, language and distinct from the
majority of the population; whose members have a will to preserve than distinctions; which have a long-term presence on the territory where it is living.

**Numerus clausus** (latin – closed number) – method to limit the number of students who may study at a university, often formulated in religious or racial quotas.

**Old believers** – number of groups that separated from Russian Orthodox Church after reforms introduced by Patrirach Nikon initiated between 1654 and 1666. Old Believers continue liturgical practices, traditions, rites and prerogatives which the Russian Orthodox Church maintained before the implementation of these reforms, while Nikon desired to implement practices of contemporary Greek Orthodox Church.

**Operation Vistula** (pol. Akcja „Wisła“) – the codename for the forced resettlement of Ukrainian minority in Poland, that was held by the Polish authorities in 1947. About 200,000 civilians of Ukrainian nationality (as well as Boykos and Lemkos), were resettled to the former German lands in North-East (Middle Pomerania) and North-West (Northern Masuria) Poland. The main purpose of this action was murder of gen. Karol Świerczewski (1947, March 28), held by Ukrainian Insurgent Army.

**Pale of Settlement** – existing in 1791–1917 region of Imperial Russia in which permanent residency by Jews was allowed and beyond which Jewish permanent residency was generally prohibited. Territorially this region covered Kingdom of Poland, Bessarabia, Lithuanian, Ukrainian and Belarusian gubernyas. As well new settlement of Jews was closed in zone about 50 km from the western boarder of Russia.

**Ruthenians** – ethnonym used for East Slavic People form the territories of former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, before the national movements of the late 19th and early 20th century, the name was widely used for modern Belarusians and Ukrainians. Nowadays connected with various Slavonic ethnic groups living in the Polish-Ukrainian-Slovakian borderland.

**Saami** – the indigenous Finno-Ugric people inhabiting Sápmi cultural region in the Arctics (nowadays it’s consist of far northern parts of Norway, Sweden, Finland, the Kola Peninsula of Russia). For a long time Saami were people were under great persecution, only from 1970s they started to be recognized and given minority rights. The Saami are the only indigenous people of Scandinavia recognized and protected under the international conventions and local law.

**Silesians** – the inhabitants of Silesia, the region on the borderland of cultural influences of Germany, Poland and Czech Republic, who created a specific folk culture and language. Since the mid-19th century various Silesia independence movements are active, claiming to be the representatives of a separate Silesian nation.

**Tatars** (Tartars) – ethnic group of Turkic origin, living in Eastern Europe and Northern Asia. Most of Tatars live in Russian regions of Tatarstan, Bashkortostan and Volga. From 14th century started the settlement of Tatars in Grand Duchy of Lithuania, being known as the Lipka Tatars. Nowadays Tatar communities live in Polish-Lithuanian-Belarusian borderland.
**Trasianka** – Russian-Belarusian mixed language (sometimes counted as a creole language/pidgin), that developed since 1920s/30s (however its evidences can be found in 19th century literature) in the process of contacts between Russian-speaking administration Belarusian-speaking village, as well during the process of movement of Belarusian-speaking villagers to cities. Most research states that trasianka developed on Belarusian basis, preserving Belarusian phonetics, combining Belarusian and Russian grammar using mostly Russian vocabulary. Ukrainian version of such a hybrid language is called Surzhyk.

**Tutejszy (Local)** – was a self-identification of rural population in mixed-lingual areas of Eastern Europe (nowadays Poland, Ukraine, Belarus, Lithuania) in particular, in Polesie region (Ukrainian-Belarusian-Polish borderland).

**Utraquist school** (latin-uterque) – billilingual school in which subjects are taught both in state language and language of minority.

**Xenophobia** – irrational fear of that what is new, strange or unknown.

**Yiddish** – the High German language used by Jews of Ashkenazi origin, till World War II one of the major languages in Eastern Europe.

**Zionism** – national Jewish movement aiming to restore (create) Jewish state in Holy Land.
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