



UNRISD

UNITED NATIONS RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

**ETHNIC STRUCTURE, INEQUALITY AND
GOVERNANCE OF THE PUBLIC SECTOR IN LITHUANIA**

**NATALIJA KASATKINA
&
VIDA BERESNEVICIUTE**

JANUARY 2004

CONTENT

1. Introduction: Argument, Conceptual Framework and Methodology	3
2. Ethnic Cleavages	7
2.1. Trends in Ethnic Composition	7
2.2. Migration Trends in Soviet Period	11
2.3. Migration Trends after the Restoration of Independence	13
2.4. Ethnic Cleavages in Regions and Towns	16
2.5. Socio-Economic, Social and Cultural Cleavages: Ethnic Relations, Trends in Education and Employment	18
2.5.1 Social Relations: Social Adaptation of Ethnic Groups	18
2.5.2 Educational Attainment	22
2.5.3 Trends in Employment	25
3. Impact of the Soviet Period on Ethnic Structure	30
4. Ethnic Cleavages and Inequalities in the Public Sector	33
4.1 Legal Framework for Protecting Minority Rights	33
4.2 Electoral Rules	36
4.3 Political Parties and Organisations of Ethnic Minorities	37
4.4 Ethnic Structure of the Parliament (Seimas)	38
4.5 Ethnic Structure in Governmental Bodies (Cabinet)	46
4.6 Civil Service at Municipal Level	50
5. Institutional and Policy Reforms for Managing Diversity and Inequalities	56
5.1 The Department of National Minorities and Lithuanians Living Abroad	56
5.2 The Conception of Ethnic Policy	58
5.3 Recommendatory Considerations	59
5.3.1 Educational Issues	59
5.3.2 Political and Civic Participation of Ethnic Minority Groups	60
6. Generalisations and Conclusions	62
Resources and Bibliographic References	66
Annex	68

1. Introduction: Argument, Conceptual Framework and Methodology

Ongoing changes in contemporary society make its members adapt themselves to mutability of conditions, new challenges, look for new adaptation strategies, concentrate all skills in order to take advantage of current opportunities. Social, political, economic changes that took place ten years ago have influenced the situation of all ethnic groups (including both majority and minority groups) when choosing their strategies of acting in social sphere, adapting themselves to new requirements (citizenship, civic loyalty, knowledge of the state language, value changes, participation in the newly formed bodies, e.g. the private or non-governmental sector) in a more active or passive way or avoiding adaptation (emigration, segregation, life in closed communities).

Overall, in Lithuania issues of national minorities are not urgent and sensitive within the whole context, including both public opinion and governmental policy. Discourses of silence, invisibilisation or even exclusion (e.g. issues of ethnic pureness, negative attitudes) dominate. The declared universal equality creates symbolic boundaries and obstacles for minority groups acting in society. One of illustrations of this could be an analysis of mass media in which principles of being noticeable/unnoticeable or visible/invisible are dominant. The research of the main dailies of Lithuania has disclosed that texts on ethnic groups quite often portray them as groups that are not integrated into the society's life, as criminal, socially unprotected or "exotic" groups and the problems of the members of these groups are presented by emphasising their nationality or politicising them (Beresneviciute, Nausiediene, 2002). The urgency of the issue is determined by political matters and is therefore frequently politicised. To put it in another way, unnoticeable means that on the one hand, there is no public discourse on the issue or the discourse of silence exists, or, on the other hand, examples of stigmatisation (especially in the case of Roma/Gypsies people) are presented. To illustrate a notion of visible/invisible, a metaphor of a "good citizen" could be used to define a person who behaves under rules and regulations and is visible in that way, but s/he causes no problems and therefore becomes invisible, and the other way out. In its own turn, politicised ethnicity tends to encourage xenophobia, blocking the evolution of citizenship that is essential for the growth of democratic institutions.

When discussing the issues of ethnicity and national minorities in Lithuania, a discourse of civil loyalty and political loyalty has been dominating, the content of which is usually politicised, especially in the framework of public opinion and public discussions. Therefore, the issues of political integration of national minorities are mainly discussed and developed (legal instruments, laws, etc.) and less attention is paid to the issues of social integration. These considerations provide primary insights into the hypothetical cleavages of ethnic minorities in different spheres of society. Also, they reveal expectations of both minority and majority groups.

In the context of the UNRISD project *Ethnic Structure, Inequality and Governance of the Public Sector*, the case of Lithuania will be studied in respect of public reforms that have been implemented during the last decade and their impact on political and civic participation of majority and minority groups will be discussed. The general objective of the project is to analyze and assess distribution and management of power in multi-ethnic settings: ethnic structure, inequality and governance of the public sector.

Political, social and civic participation of minority groups is determined by several factors. On the one hand, it depends on legal and institutional mechanisms and instruments, and, on the other hand, on the "quality" and development of civil society, i.e. on its identities and abilities to harmonise competitive regional ethnic, religious and other identities and to tolerate differences and on the will and readiness to participate in political, social and civil processes in achieving common goals and accountability of the

government. Civil and political participation, besides other things, aims at ensuring equal representation of interests in public life. An important issue is related to the criteria (parameters) applied in measuring participation and in this research project it would be ethnicity, which affects identities of states and the allocation of public resources.

Ethnic groups are, however, structured differently in national political economies because of their history, markets and resource endowments and, in some cases, overtly discriminatory public policies. In Eastern Europe, the ethnic understanding of a nation has deep roots, whereas the civic concept is likely to have very few adherents. In Lithuania, like in other countries of this region (e.g., Serbia, Hungary, Latvia), statehood or the process of nation-building has been constructed rather on the ground of experience of the independent state and resistance to oppression, ethnocentric inheritance by developing common ethnic romantic historic descent (ancestry), common culture of language, religion, traditions and customs, than on the ground of institutes of civil society that ensure development of representative democracy.

Nationalistic movements of Eastern Europe were grounded on culture and headed by scientists and poets who strongly focused on the past and national traditions of their country. Western nationalisms were distinct in their civic nature, grounded on rationalism and values of individual freedom (Kohn, 1946). In Lithuania, from the 19th century to the times of *Sajudis*, a movement of the early 1990s, most nationalistic movements were of cultural rather than political nature, in which cultural activists (scientists, intelligentsia) took the leaders' role.

On the other hand, ethnic nationalism, in contrast to civic nationalism, which usually appears in well-institutionalised democracies, appears in an institutional vacuum and through lack of civic experience, when alternative structures are not readily available, and places the titular nation in the centre of the project of nation-building providing with certain prerogatives, implicitly and explicitly (e.g., language). In the perspective of cultural nationalism, state authorities tend to create maximum correspondence between the ethnic and political "nation" (the symbols and traditions of the titular nation become equated with the symbols and traditions of the state, thereby they become the norm for the entire population). Although after the restoration of Lithuania's Independence along with the ethnic model, the newly established structures embodied elements of the civic model, the model of a civic state, i.e. the state for its citizen, irrespective of their ethnicity, has been developed (e.g., the Law on Citizenship in 1989). On the other hand, ethnic diversity, as well as the ethnic structure, does not shape political behaviour deterministically. Ethnicity is constantly adapting.

Studies of ethnicity issues in Lithuania are based on traditions widely prevalent in Eastern Europe, i.e. focusing on studies of the ethnocultural identity by revealing the main features of this identity. These traditions could be treated as an organic constituent of Eastern European cultural nationalism, as the present ethnic majorities, which had been under the status of minorities on the strength of empires, have gone through the stage of the nation-building process. Hence, applying a mirror image, minorities are ascribed a paradigm of cultural nationalism that is the best conceived and supported by the majority. Studies of culture (language, historical consciousness, values and religion) persist as a core of minority surveys. Once again, it is an essential constituent dimension of a collective identity of a minority, still focus on other elements, such as social and civic expression and participation, should not be excluded from these studies.

Taking into account the broader context of Eastern Europe, a question could be raised how much the European and the broader international context would influence and change the situation, how the agenda of international organisations would cover the issues of ethnic minorities and what impact to national policies could be.

In the context of the typology of ethnic structures, Lithuania has a unipolar structure, in which one ethnic group, Lithuanians, accounts for an overwhelming majority of the population and comprises more than 4/5 of the whole population. The typology is developed to aid understanding of ethnic behaviour and the choices of citizens and policy-makers in governing the public sector.

A broader context of statehood, aged history of independence and its development have their impact on a relatively young history of Lithuania's democratic state and its political environment. Premises and hypotheses concerning the present ethnic cleavages are based on two major arguments. The first argument is related to the ideology of cultural nationalism, i.e. that cultural nationalism overshadows the impact of social-economic factors and thereby tends to complicate the elaboration of the influence of those factors on economic inequalities. The second argument is related to the general historic trends of the ethnic composition of the state and the impact of the Soviet period, during which ethnic groups were formed as a result of the flows of labour migrants (specialists and qualified workers). Later on, tendencies of emigration of those persons with higher qualifications were pertinent to the first years of the independent state. On the basis of the aforementioned arguments that cover the trends of society's development, we maintain that political competition is still ethnically fragmented in the unipolar setting of the state.

Other premises are based on several assumptions. The unfolding process of assimilation, development of democratic values and equal opportunities press for identification of ethnic cleavages. However, the lower levels of minorities' participation in the higher levels of political and governmental institutions, as well as social differences, which are not striking among certain ethnic groups even though certain groups dominate in some sectors, enable us to hypothesize on unequal distribution of power in the public sector. Minorities and the majority organize themselves separately for political power, but they do collaborate in the processes of election and formation of political bodies. Although there are a few examples that could be defined as conflicting, political bodies are still not open to ethnic diversity.

It is possible to maintain that the political field of the state is dominated by a monoethnic minority of the majority rather than by an inclusive minority based on the interests and perspectives of different minority (including ethnic) groups. These statements will be treated as hypotheses for the analysis of the Lithuanian context, raising a question what behaviour is prevalent in Lithuania. If ethnic boundaries are definable, what characteristics are the most significant, who the key players are and play the central roles in politics: representatives of majority or minorities, etc.

The tendencies towards politicisation of ethnic issues or ethnic politicisation, to put it in another way, correspond to the existing political parties based on ethnic affiliations in Lithuania. Taking into account the aspect of politicisation, the research project will focus on issues that contribute to fragmentation: equality of opportunities or the sense of inclusion in the formation of the public agenda, governmental bodies.

Besides the main focuses of the research project on ethnic inequalities and cleavages in the public sector, a particular situation of the country should be taken into account and discussed in a broader context. In this paper, concepts "ethnic group" and "national (ethnic) minority" are used as synonyms. The authors of this report, however, do see a difference between these concepts defining the ethnic group as part of society, whose members identify themselves (or agree to be identified by others) with the culture and/or real or implied ethnic origin common to that part of society. An ethnic (national) minority

consists of legal permanent residents of a state, who differ from the society's majority in their distinctive culture (language, religion, customs).

The research report consists of four main parts related to the ethnic composition of Lithuania and its impact on different policy issues that will be covered in the perspective of the unipolar ethnic structure of Lithuania. The first section deals with the general situation in relation to the ethnic composition and its changes in the last decades. It covers issues of migration processes, focusing on peculiarities of both the Soviet period and the independent state. It includes a discussion of distribution of ethnic minorities throughout the country and a short overview of peculiarities of ethnic minorities of Lithuania. Also, a short overview of four administrative units to be analyzed further is presented. As a separate chapter, this section includes elaboration of social and cultural cleavages of ethnic minorities that are disclosed within the discussion about the aspects of social adaptation focusing on the issues of social relations of minority groups, educational attainments and differences among ethnic groups. When analyzing social disadvantages, emphasis is placed on the matters and trends of employment, labour market segmentation, unemployment rates and some aspects of the ethnic structure in the private sector. A separate chapter covers a short overview of the Soviet period focusing on its impact on the ethnic structure of the state.

The following section of the report deals with ethnic cleavages in the public sector. The legal mechanism and framework of ethnic minority issues, mostly related to the protection of minority rights, will be shortly reviewed at the beginning. This part of the section reflects an official attitude of governmental institutions towards the rights and opportunities of ethnic groups. With reference to the issues of ethnic cleavages in politics, the main emphasis will be placed on election rules and the following key public institutions, both on the national and local levels: parliament (the Seimas) and political parties, executive bodies of the government, civil service and electoral, administrative bodies on the local level of municipalities. The analysis will further elaborate on the issues regarding representation or uneven distribution of offices and posts and on how this could be viewed and treated; and conclusions on possible determinants of the situation and their relation to the public at large will be made.

The final chapter is related to the public policy on civic and political participation of ethnic minority groups. The latter will cover major institutions and documents related to the ethnic policy and its strategic perspectives. Also, taking into account the main findings of the report, recommendatory notes are presented, which mainly focus on the measures aimed at increasing and encouraging visible participation of minorities.

Although different research studies related to the ethnic dimension of Lithuania's society have been carried out at different times, there is no sufficiently comprehensive and full-scale research data on ethnicity in Lithuania. Separate research studies, the majority of them being quantitative, provide with fragmented perspectives of the issues analyzed. In this case, efforts were made to collect and relate a variety of sources of information and data presenting the most relevant pieces related to the issues considered. A secondary analysis of the research that had been carried out, studies and documents dominates in the report. Also, fragmented research of the qualitative nature was carried out individually in order to decrease the existing gaps in volumes of data and to increase possibilities for interpretation of the results of the research.

In the entire document, descriptive data, factual description and analysis is combined with analytical procedures and interpretations.

The report includes an annex, where tables and diagrams appropriate to the text and analysis are presented. Also, a list of bibliographic references is included.

2. Ethnic Cleavages

2.1 Trends in Ethnic Composition

Lithuania has a unipolar ethnic structure. One ethnic group dominates the ethnic structure of Lithuania and accounts for an overwhelming majority of the population. For more than one century Lithuanians have comprised four fifths of the whole population, in 2001 the portion of Lithuanians reached 83 per cent of the whole population. At present, representatives of 115 nationalities live in Lithuania. Lithuania has always been a multinational state. An impressive variety of nations have lived together in Lithuania for many centuries. Ancestors of the Roma people and Karaites, as well as of part of the Russian, Polish, Jewish and German ethnic groups lived in the territory of Lithuania more than five hundred years ago, however, they are not considered to be indigenous people, since they had settled in or had moved to the territory of Lithuania in the early Middle Ages. In 1996 and 1997, the 600th Anniversary of the Settlement of Karaites and Tatars in the Great Duchy of Lithuania was widely celebrated and relevant activities and events organised.

The current ethnic composition of Lithuania has suffered great changes due to historical development. The main role in the process of formation of ethnic communities in Lithuania, in changes of numbers and settling is ascribed to migration. The first waves of migration or mass emigration began in the 19th century (after the abolition of slavery). Due to World Wars I and II and their aftermath, there was decrease in Lithuania's population in the first half of the 20th century.

During World War I, mass emigration from Lithuania stopped and did not reach the previous level during the first post-war years. The main reason of that was a very strict immigration law, passed by the USA Congress, establishing an immigration quota for Lithuanians, therefore, the USA lost their leading position as the main country of destination for people from Lithuania. Emigration to other countries continued, but its scope was much smaller and immigration even exceeding the outflows from Lithuania.

The population of the interwar period could be illustrated by the data of the 1923 census, although the data did not include the Vilnius Region, which was occupied in 1920 by neighbouring Poland, the occupation lasted until 1939. During the period of occupation, many Poles moved to Vilnius. The data of the 1923 census showed that the majority of the state was comprised of Lithuanians (84 per cent of the whole population). The second minority was the Jews (7.6%), then followed by the Poles (3.2%) and Russians (2.5%). (See Table No. 2.1, 2.2).

According to the 1931 census of Polish population, Poles in Vilnius amounted to 65.9 per cent (128,600), Jews 28% (54,600) and Lithuanians only 0.8% (1,579). Assumptions are made that during this census the number of Lithuanians living in Vilnius was considerably reduced because of such circumstances as the policy of the occupational regime, intensive polonisation, the principle of language knowledge determining the nationality, participation of the Polish clergy in the census activities (Stankuniene, 1995). In 1939, Vilnius became part of Lithuania again and since 1940 it is the capital of Lithuania. At the beginning of 1940, Lithuanians comprised 19.2% of the Vilnius population (Poles 39.3%, Jews 34.2%).

Considerable changes in the number of population began in 1940 when the Soviet Union occupied and annexed Lithuania. All in all, in 1940-1958 Lithuania lost about one million people (who were killed, deported or left the country for various reasons). The pre-war level of the population was reached only in 1969. In the Soviet period, about 150,000

Russians and people of Russian-speaking nationalities were moved to or began to settle in Lithuania themselves. Historical changes in the number of the Lithuanian population are presented in *Tables No. 2.1, 2.2*.

*Lithuanian Population by Nationality, 1923-2001 (thousand) **

Table No. 2.1

Nationality	1923	1959	1970	1979	1989	2001
TOTAL	2,021.8	2,711.4	3,128.2	3,391.5	3,674.8	3,483.9
Lithuanians	1,701.9	2,150.8	2,506.8	2,712.2	2,924.3	2,907.3
Russians	50.5	231.0	268.0	303.5	344.5	219.8
Poles	65.6	230.1	240.2	247.0	258.0	234.9
Belorussians	4.4	30.3	45.4	57.6	63.2	42.9
Ukrainians	0.0	17.7	25.1	32.0	44.8	22.5
Jews	153.7	24.7	23.6	14.7	12.4	4.0
Latvians	14.9	6.3	5.1	4.4	4.4	2.9
Tatars	1.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.4	3.2
Roma	0.3	1.2	1.9	2.3	2.7	2.5
Germans	29.2	11.7	1.9	2.6	2.1	3.2
Armenians	-	-	-	-	-	1.5
Other	7.5	16.3	8.6	13.8	16.9	6.1
Not indicated	-	-	-	-	-	32.9

*Data for 1923-1989 from: *Population Censuses in Lithuania. Statistics Lithuania, Vilnius 1999.*

*Data for 2001 from: *Population by Sex, Age, Ethnicity and Religion. Statistics Lithuania, Vilnius 2002.*

*Lithuanian Population by Nationality, 1923-2001 (per cent) **

Table No. 2.2

Nationalities	1923	1959	1969	1979	1989	2001
Lithuanians	84.1	79.3	80.1	80.0	79.6	83.45
Russians	2.5	8.5	8.6	8.9	9.4	6.31
Poles	3.2	8.5	7.7	7.3	7.0	6.74
Belarussians	0.2	1.1	1.5	1.7	1.7	1.23
Ukrainians	0.0	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.2	0.65
Jews	7.6	0.9	0.8	0.4	0.3	0.12
Latvians	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.08
Tatars	0.04	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.09
Roma	-	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.07
Germans	1.4	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.09
Armenians	-	-	-	-	-	0.04
Other	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.18
Not indicated	-	-	-	-	-	0.94

**Population Censuses in Lithuania. Statistics Lithuania, Vilnius, 1999.*

*Data for 2001 from: *Population by Sex, Age, Ethnicity and Religion. Statistics Lithuania, Vilnius 2002.*

The 2001 Population and Housing Census recorded nationality (ethnic origin) as

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_21400

