

PROBLEMS IN THE DEFINITION OF DIASPORA IN THE CONTEXT OF LATVIA'S DIASPORA LAW

Mg. art. **Māra Simons**

Latvian Academy of Culture, Latvia

Abstract

Latvia's Diaspora Law entered into force on 1 January 2019, regulating Latvia's relationship with its diaspora abroad. The process of creation of the law was not a smooth and easy as the main problem and debate arose from arriving to a common definition of the term "diaspora". There were two main broad approaches offered: wide and inclusive definition would allow for self-identification, but narrow one would exclude non-citizens seeing them as potential threat to the Latvian state. Two different views of the definitions reveal two distinctive views about identities and tell the story of Latvia that is caught between the past and the future.

Keywords: *diaspora, law, identity, Latvia.*

Introduction

There are many ways to define *diaspora*. Definitions differ between researchers and different legislative systems. Diaspora of Latvia or as it is also commonly referred to as Latvian diaspora is a valuable case study of different dilemmas the legislation system faced in the process of creating the Diaspora Law. Views expressed publicly by different members of the Latvian Parliament (*Saeima*), ministries, members of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) directly connected to diaspora, mirror not only their different political views, but their understanding about national and cultural identities, and feeling of belonging and home.

In order to understand the initial necessity for the creation of a Diaspora Law, one can look into some population statistics, which confirms the increasing emigration processes which has been happening since Latvia gained back its independence in 1991, but even more so after entering European Union in 2004 and the financial crisis in 2008–2009.

According to public information on the website of the Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia [Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia no date given], there were 1.9 million

people living in Latvia at the beginning of 2019. In 1990 there were 2.6 million. The population of Latvia has decreased by nearly 10% between 2010 and 2019 [United Nations 2019]. According to United Nations prognoses it is going to decrease by approximately another 25% between 2019 and 2050, taking the third place in the World with the most rapidly decreasing population after Lithuania and Bulgaria [United Nations 2019].

Re-emigration has been a catch phrase in Latvia for a while now. In 2016, the Latvian Institute organised a campaign named *I want you back* in order to bring back citizens to Latvia [Eng.lsm.lv 2016]. There have been some other activities towards the diaspora of Latvia, involving financial support for different cultural activities and education, but it is impossible to claim that campaigns and activities have brought back desired number of people to Latvia [Helmane 2018]. In order to gather all those activities under the one *roof* – the Diaspora Law was initiated so that all activities and support mechanisms would be more purposeful and organised.

The Diaspora Law entered into force on 1 January 2019. The question about the definition of the diaspora of Latvia still lingers unresolved even though the final and the present version, which invites everybody, who has a tie with Latvia, be a part of Latvia's diaspora, is valid now.

This article analyses the struggles to define diaspora and identity in general, and Latvia's diaspora particularly as the arguments around the definition in the Diaspora Law have been the most crucial in the creation of the law. A specific research question was posed – why has it been so difficult to agree upon a common definition of diaspora in the Diaspora Law in Latvia? The intention is to investigate and analyse the underlying factors, which caused prolonged discussions about the definition of diaspora. In order to do so, content analysis of different newspapers, internet sources and documentation and audio recordings¹ from meetings of the Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs have been used to analyse the views of members of the Parliament, ministries and representatives of NGOs. Two separate sections have been dedicated to the theoretical frame in order to look into term *diaspora* and formation of the diasporic identity. The main theoretical basis has been used from such authors as James Clifford [Clifford 1994], who talks about diaspora developing in a transnational network, William Safran [Safran 1991], who defines diasporic characteristics, Martin Sökefeld [Sökefeld 2006], who analyses diaspora as imagined transnational community, Stuart Hall [Hall 1994], who talks about divided identities and the creation of the national identity, and Martin Ehala [Ehala 2018], analysing a way of performing in different identities.

¹ Audio recordings from the Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs meetings on 5 September, 21 September, 26 September, 19 October 2018, were obtained via downloading on USB device in the Archive of Parliament.

Defining diaspora

The term *diaspora* has been derived from Greek, meaning dispersal or scattering of seeds [Carment, Sadjed 2017: 2]. First the term was used only in describing the Jewish diaspora, with Greek, Armenian, African and Irish diasporas subsequently being included starting from the 1960s and 1970s [Cohen 2008: 20].

Safran defined diaspora without naming any certain nationality, but instead finding common characteristic signs. He wrote that diaspora are expatriate minority communities that have dispersed from an original *center* to at least two *peripheral* places; that maintain a *memory, vision or myth about their original homeland*; that believe they are not – and perhaps cannot be – fully accepted by their host country; that see the ancestral home as a place of eventual return, when the time is right; that are committed to the maintenance or restoration of this homeland; and of which the group's consciousness and solidarity are *importantly defined* by this continuing relationship with the homeland [Safran 1991: 83–84].

Clifford suggests looking on diaspora's borders rather than locating its essentials features as it is important to understand what it defines itself against. According to Clifford diasporas are developed in transnational networks and built from diverse attachments, therefore they cannot be in practice nationalist [Clifford 1994].

The term *diaspora* has been used more and more in different contexts, becoming a term of self-identification among different groups who migrated, or whose ancestors migrated from one place to another [Carment, Sadjed 2017]. Roger Brubaker remarks [Brubaker 2005] that the term *diaspora* has become a catchword in the social and cultural sciences. The proliferation and popularization of a concept frequently results in a loss of precise meaning and analytic power and this has happened to diaspora. He suggests, rather than speak of *a diaspora* or *the diaspora* as entity, a bounded group, and ethnodemographic or ethnocultural fact, it may be more fruitful, and certainly more precise, to speak of diasporic stances, projects, claims, idioms, practices, and so on.

Although the meaning of diaspora is broad and definitions disputed, there appears to be a relatively common core understanding of what it is about. For example, nobody would question that diaspora has to do with *dislocation*, with having left particular places and living elsewhere, or with simply being *out of place*. Therefore, it can be suggested that there can be no diaspora community without a consciousness of diaspora, in other words, without an idea of shared identity, of common belonging to that group [Sökefeld 2006: 267].

The puzzle of definition of term *diaspora* has been analyzed by Jonathan Boyarin and Daniel Boyarin. They claim that diasporic cultural identity teaches us that cultures are not preserved by being protected from *mixing* but probably can only continue to exist as a product of such mixing. According to them cultures, as well

as identities, are constantly being remade [Boyarin and Boyarin 1993: 721]. That might explain why it is so difficult to maintain one certain idea and definition about the content of the term *diaspora* as diasporic groups can be fluid as entity or consist of some or many members who are experiencing constant fluidity between different identities.

The idea of fluidity between different identities somewhat contradicts the claim of the idea of shared identity and consciousness of the group as the significant element of the diaspora, but it makes sense if one explains diaspora as transnational community or even *imagined transnational community*, as imaginations of community that unite segment of people that live in territorially separated locations. Sökefeld refers to the formation of diasporas as a special case of ethnicity [Sökefeld 2006]. This approach is considering diversity and fluidity and characterizing nowadays approach to the research of diaspora.

Diasporic identity

Diaspora consciousness is tightly connected to the collective and individual identity. The term *identity* like *diaspora* has risked losing acuity as it becomes a vague byword for individual or group characteristics [Brubaker, Cooper 2000]. Fluidity and change can be fully applied to the term *identity* and its content. Stuart Hall calls it *de-centered identities* [Hall 1994], because people are not sure about their identity, as they may carry sometimes diverse, unresolved and contradictory identities. Hall writes that the subject previously, experienced as having a unified and stable identity, is becoming fragmented; composed, not a single, but of several, sometimes contradictory or unresolved, identities [Hall 1994].

Martin Ehala suggests that individuals are socialized from the birth to match some of the signs of identities [Ehala 2018]. They socialize themselves further to claim some identities that they see as desirable. As a linguist he likes to compare identity with a language, saying, that performing an identity is like speaking a language. If one performs an identity authentically, he is like a native speaker; if not quite authentically, he is like a speaker of a foreign language. One can seldom become authentic in an identity which is adopted later in the life than in the childhood years.

One can also wonder if it is possible to perform authentically in a few identities. There are more and more people in the world who grow up surrounded by a few languages, and most likely – by a couple of cultures and identities too. Are they able to perform on the same level in all the identities? Ehala writes that one may have a strong emotional attachment to a particular identity, which has a very low level of manifestation, for example, a young exile Estonian, born in a mixed-race family and speaking Estonian poorly would display very few features of Estonian collective identity, yet because of his or her family upbringing he or she may still have a strong

emotional attachment to Estonian identity. The trouble with this situation is that despite emotional attachment, many fellow Estonians would not categorize the person as a *true* Estonian and therefore wouldn't accept him/her as an authentic group member. The same may be experienced by many immigrants who try hard to become full members of society but, as they are still easily recognized as not authentic, they are not accepted [Ehala 2018]. It is quite often that authenticity lacks in both – host and home country, even though in some cases where refusal, based on the lack of authenticity occurs in both – host and home countries, one might feel at home in neither of them.

Markers of identity can sometimes be invisible, intangible and unconscious [Story, Walker 2017]. That would explain why the exclusion can happen in certain cases without an obvious reason or explanation. Most often the markers of identity are quite obvious – like language, material culture, patterns of behaviour, and those markers are usually following in diasporic communities, even though with some possible revision and recreation in some cases [Story, Walker 2017].

Jerzy J. Smolicz suggested [Smolicz 1980] that there is no neutral cultural space. He argued that each ethnic group has a set of core values, that are absolutely central to the group's self-definition and therefore also to its existence. Core values are closely connected to ethnocentrism. Ehala argues that widely popular aversion to ethnocentrism overlooks the fact that it is not only unavoidable, but in reasonable quantities it is healthy aspect of every form of belonging. Sharing core values makes people with the same identity trust each other and it is the glue that makes social capital possible [Ehala 2018: 10–11].

Hall admits as well that in the modern world, the national cultures into which we are born are one of the principal sources of cultural identity. These identities are not literally imprinted in our genes. However, we do think of them as if they are part of our essential natures [Hall 1994].

Besides ethnocentrism ethno-symbolism is another term to consider thinking about construction of the national identity either collectively or individually. According to Ehala ethno-symbolism is when national identities are constructed from the elements of myths, collective memories, symbols, traditions and hopes for the future. It is not the actual common ancestry or actual territory that counts, but a myth about common ancestry and the concept of a historical homeland [Ehala 2018]. Some parts in ethno-symbolism are historical, some – *rediscovered*.

As well as mentioned by Hall there is narrative of the nation, as it is told and retold in national histories, literatures, the media and popular culture [Hall 1994]. It can be a real or invented. There is the emphasis on origins, continuity, tradition and timelessness. Invented traditions are set of practices, even a ritual or have a symbolic nature which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviours by repetition

[Hall 1994]. Characteristics of ethno-symbolism are visible, for example, in the post-soviet space, when, in order to rebuild the state, it was somewhat crucial to recreate the unity through previously lost symbols like flags, national anthems, national days together with some newly created symbols.

As an example, for such brand-new symbolism and invented tradition could serve The White Tablecloth Day in Latvia on May 4, celebrating the Restoration of Independence [Collier 2016]. The idea came from the Latvian Institute a couple of years before Latvia's centenary, encouraging people to gather with families, friends and neighbours around the table with white tablecloth in order to celebrate the restoration of the independence.

Attempts to define diaspora in Latvia's Diaspora Law

Argument about the exact definition of diaspora and its borders in the Latvian context has been on-going in the process of the law creation and even after it came into force in January 2019. Who can be considered to belong to the Latvian diaspora? Are they just ethnic Latvians? Are there ethnic Latvians at all? Are they all people who consider themselves to belong to the Latvian diaspora? Or those *others*, who speak another language as their mother tongue should be denied? All those questions arise in regards to Latvia's historical situation as a post-soviet state and all the controversies and arguments between Latvians and non-Latvians who reside in Latvia. After the renewal of the independence the division between those who speak Latvian and those, whose mother tongue was not Latvian, was wide. Many people happened to live in completely different information spaces – one was the Latvian side and mass media in Latvian and another one was Russian and mass media in Russian either from Latvia or Russia [Golubovs 2003]. It was a *two-community* society, living parallelly one to each other. Political debates about citizenship and naturalization process of non-citizens were harsh. There has been much more widespread awareness of citizenship in Latvia than may be the case in other societies, and citizenship, due to the historical situation in Latvia and the Soviet occupation, has been unusually emotional issue for many in Latvia [Kehris-Brands no date given]. The situation has somewhat changed nowadays as many non-Latvians speak Latvian and have gained citizenship, which was not the case just after the renewal of the independence. Problems with different information spaces still remain though, but for possibly different reasons, for example, reliability of sources either from Western media or Russian media [Gulbe 2018].

After long discussions and arguments in the Parliament of Latvia – the 12th *Saeima* voted on 1 November 2018, for the final edition of the law which includes a wider definition of diaspora, saying that diaspora are Latvian citizens permanently residing outside Latvia, Latvians and others with ties to Latvia, as well

as their family members [Diaspora Law 2018]. Debaters refer to this as the wide and inclusive definitions of diaspora as it allows self-identification with Latvia's or Latvian diaspora as it is referred to in different cases.

Supporters of the wide definitions were Ministry of the Foreign Affairs, majority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, lawyer, former judge of the European Court of Justice and then Latvia's president to be Egils Levits, diasporic NGOs.

World Federation of Free Latvians (*Pasaules Brīvo latviešu apvienība* – PBLA), which acts as a parent organization of a few smaller NGOs was supporting the wider definition in their congress [PBLA.lv 2018], but the chairman of the board of PBLA Kristine Saulīte expressed a few doubts in the process of the law making and afterwards about the wide definition. She thinks that definition is too wide, and one can put almost everything under such an inclusive definition. According to Saulīte Diaspora law cannot fix all problems of Latvia including situation with non-citizens [Timofejeva 2018]. Saulīte says that she does not like the term *diaspora*:

It does not encourage the feeling that we are one nation. It does not matter where we are, we are all united in belonging to Latvia and being Latvians. We do not need to distinct – diaspora, Latvians here and there. We all contribute to Latvia. We need each other [Brikmane 2019].

Saulīte suggests that diaspora does not need to be defined as something special, deserving extra attention and benefits. She thinks that inhabitants of Latvia are the ones who need to be lifted up and their income level too, therefore PBLA did not support the idea that pensions which are earned abroad are submitted to the laws of that country who issues it, and therefore non-taxable minimum can be much higher than in Latvia, for example. Diaspora Law was created and discussed in the pre-election time, so it was a tempting to try to earn some votes from the voters abroad, says Saulīte [Brikmane 2019].

In the Foreign Affairs Committee, representatives from Legal Bureau of Parliament, Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of the Culture and Latvian Association of Local and Regional Governments were against the wide definition.

Rihards Kols, member of the Parliament from National Alliance, who voted for the final version of the Diaspora Law, including the wide definition, made sure to express his wish to change and narrow down the definition as soon as possible. He considers that there is a problem in that part of the definition of Latvian diaspora, which mentions others, who have a lasting social connection with Latvia. Kols says that the connection or tie according to the wide definition can be subjective, when somebody chooses to be part of the diaspora, for example, just on the grounds that one likes Latvia's basketball team or Latvian nature. Even more – the objective tie

can be for the person who has received refugee travel document, or the person with permit to live in Latvia, the person who has been in the prison in Latvia or theoretically – all military personnel who in Soviet times were in Latvia. Kols does not want to conceive the above mentioned as *our diaspora* [Timofejeva 2018].

According to Kols it is important to define clearly what is diaspora, so that all support measures are received by those who should receive them and not by those who do not. It is not about discriminating or to exclude somebody, but existing definition is leading to absurd situations [Timofejeva 2018].

Kols has published the letter from PBLA on his Facebook page¹ to the President of Latvia and the other highest officials inviting to change the definition of diaspora in the law. PBLA writes that Diaspora Law was prepared in the light of coming up parliament elections and therefore PBLA had to put an effort to remain neutral and to listen to both sides of the definition supporters. PBLA thinks that non-citizens and possibly disloyal people to Latvia should not be included in the definition of the diaspora. PBLA supports the definition formulated by the Legal Bureau of Parliament, which defines diaspora as citizens of Latvia residing outside Latvia, Livs (Livonians) and persons whose ascending relatives are Latvians or Livs.²

The Parliament of Latvia rejected a call to see amendments to the Diaspora Law that narrow the definition of diaspora on 13 December 2018 [Lsm.lv 2018]. It might remain untouched until the next Parliament will be elected as it does not seem to be having enough supporters in the Parliament for the time being in the 13th *Saeima*.

Discussions regarding wide or narrow definitions remind of two different discursive approaches towards ethnic identity as defining diaspora in the Diaspora Law is to define the identity of a group of people as well as identity of the individual. Anthony Smith [Smith 2000] mentions approach of primordialists, who consider that ethnic identity derives almost naturally from experiences of belonging in primordial communities like the family or other congregations. Primordialism considers identity as largely stable and continuous in given cultural traditions. Sökefeld writes that constructionism, the theoretically dominant perspective today, argues in contrast that ethnic identity is the result of processes of attribution [Sökefeld 2006]. Those supporting the wide definition of the diaspora in the Latvia's Diaspora Law, have been backing up their ideas coming from constructionism as well as transnationalism, which excludes a binary approach and allows identifications, for example, with two different national groups [Jurkāne-Hobein, Kļave 2015]. The wide definition of the diaspora welcomes non-Latvians and non-citizens to be part

¹ Rihards Kols Facebook page (11.12.2018). Available: <https://www.facebook.com/960297957323800/posts/2137352772951640/> (viewed 05.05.2020.)

² Ibid.

of the diaspora, as the case of another, newly created, imagined and special ethnicity, where all that matters are ties with Latvia, no matter how fluid they might be at times.

The narrow definition, on the other hand, has the approach which is close to primordialism, even though not excluding non-Latvians from the definition of the diaspora if they hold the citizenship of Latvia. In this regard one can think about the narrow definition as somewhat including as it does not exclude Latvia's citizens with another ethnicity. They are included, at least *on paper*, in this *imagined community* which is national identity according to such authors as Sökefeld [2006] and Anderson [1983]. Another question remains if they would be acknowledged as authentic while *performing* in this identity [Ehala 2018].

According to supporters of the wide definition, justifications for the wide definition are based in the international and national law. Active supporter in the public discussion about the definition of the diaspora Elina Pinto, the current chair of presidium of European Latvian Association (*Eiropas Latviešu apvienība* – ELA) and former adviser to the Latvia's President on Modern State and Sustainability, mentions that Levits says that term *genuine link* is used in international law and therefore is a valid term in a Diaspora Law and in the definitions of diaspora [Pinto 2018]. The term has been named as invalid by Legal Bureau of Parliament. The representative of the Legal Bureau of Parliament in meetings of the Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs¹ repeatedly expressed that there is need for a tool, which would recognize the tie with Latvia in order to be acknowledged as a part of diaspora, because the wide definition, without this tool, is not legally correct. The representative from the Foreign Ministry² expressed that it was surprising that Legal Bureau of the Parliament thought that they were superior in the interpretation of the legal terms over the judge of the European Court of Justice Egils Levits. It was called an arrogant attitude from the Legal Bureau of Parliament.

The tie, genuine link or belonging to diaspora, according to Pinto [Pinto 2018], is characterized as a person's lasting social connection, which is determined by evaluating the objective activity of the person in achieving the goals of the Diaspora law and his or her subjective attitude or desire to be associated with Latvia.

Pinto's explanation resonates with Joanna Story and Iain Walker [Story, Walker 2017], who write that the cultures are neither bounded nor unchanging, so too *identity* has become a term to describe a set of characteristics to which individuals

¹ Audio recordings from the Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs meetings on 5 September, 21 September, 26 September, 19 October 2018, were obtained via downloading on USB device in the Archive of Parliament.

² Ibid.

and groups may differentially subscribe but which are neither fixed (either per se or in their relations with the individuals or groups they are intended to characterize) not subscribed to universally.

Another aspect to be kept in mind is that the Diaspora Law was prepared in the time Latvia was celebrating centenary, so symbolical value was attached to the Law automatically. Pinto from ELA speaks about it too, saying that Diaspora Law in the light of Latvia's centenary had to be the uniting force for all Latvia's people in Latvia and abroad [Pinto 2018]. The final definition, according to her, adds additional and wider meaning to the commonly known *Latvians* and *Latvian citizens*. Pinto says that most of people who participate in different activities in diaspora are Latvians or Latvian citizens, but there are people who are not fitting in the official frame, even though they are devoted and in a meaningful way related to Latvia. They can be, for example, children of non-citizens from Latvia, who study Latvian abroad and plan to return to Latvia to gain the citizenship or partners of gay people who are not seen legally as partners in the light of Latvian laws. There are former citizens of Latvia – Lithuanians, Poles, Russians – who had to refuse Latvian citizenship after gaining their residence country's citizenship, when double citizenship was not allowed yet, and many other cases [Pinto 2018].

The representative from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the meeting of the Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs¹ stressed that Latvians have never been just Latvians but community and mixture of different nationalities including Poles, Jews, Russians, Estonians etc. This is the reason why it is not possible to define diaspora narrowly.

Nowadays diaspora most likely cannot be exclusively nationalistic due to identity shifts and various family constellations. Diasporic culture has developed in transnational networks and built from diverse attachments, encoding practises of accommodation with, as well resistance to, host countries and their norms [Clifford 1994]. It is not only about the transnationalism which stops diasporas from being nationalistic. Hall says that modern nations are all cultural hybrids, because there is no nation in Western Europe, which are composed of only one people, one culture or ethnicity [Hall 1994]. The same can be said about the population of Latvia, which historically has been diverse, with ethnic minorities representing approximately a quarter of the citizens in the pre-war period [Kehris-Brands no date given].

Another argument from the supporters of the narrow diaspora definition was related with concern that there would be people who would try to demand rights to

¹ Audio recordings from the Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs meetings on 5 September, 21 September, 26 September, 19 October 2018, were obtained via downloading on USB device in the Archive of Parliament.

reside in Latvia and to obtain some practical opportunities and privileges or possibly affect the political situation. According to Pinto, the Diaspora Law does not define any kind of new rights regarding residency, citizenship or election rights. There are still other laws which regulate those areas such as Immigration Law, Citizenship Law and Parliament Election Law. Therefore, it should not be seen as threat in any way, thinks Pinto [Pinto 2018].

Excluding definition might be seen as a threat instead as it would alienate non-citizens of Latvia from the diaspora. Instead of building walls, it is better to destroy them, suggests Pinto [Zvirbulis 2018].

Conclusions

Arguments arising around the definition of diaspora illustrate complexity of the global times we are living in. Fluidity and postmodernity have influenced previously known concepts and definitions, leaving free space for new content and translation.

Problems to define diaspora in the Diaspora Law in Latvia have discovered two different aspects about concepts concerning identity: 1) transnational and fluid, when letting self-identification occur, 2) ethno-centred, keeping at bay all possible unknown external intrusion as outsiders are seen as a threat.

The supporters of the narrow definition seem to be trying to maintain the core values, which Ehala [2018] considers as being crucial for the formation of a healthy identity. Supporters of the wide definition, on the other hand, are aware of the global tendencies that affect the modern Latvian family, for example, global movement and migration and different family constellations which arise from it and were unthinkable around 20 years ago. Therefore, the wide and inclusive definition might fit better in the nowadays world situation as it does not exclude anybody who wants to be connected and related to Latvia and its culture, but for different reasons does not hold the rights to be a citizen of Latvia. The wide definition does not exclude the possibility to maintain core values which are characteristic to Latvian culture or recreated (imagined) as Latvian, therefore identity markers are there, just opened for a wider audience to take part in and self-identify with. The wide definition benefits re-emigration plans, opening possibilities of bringing back more people to the shrinking population of Latvia, as including all possible people with ties with Latvia, the Latvian officials sending out signals of welcome to them as potential returnees and others who possibly have never lived in Latvia. It might be a very symbolic gesture, but it is an important one for state policy.

Opponents of the wide definition have suggested that this gesture of invitation for everyone to join in might be a threat to the identity and even – the Latvian state. It is possible to recognize the archetype of fear, which Latvian mentality have been

carrying around for a while as stateless and threatened nation. This would answer the research question, why it has been so difficult to define diaspora in the Diaspora Law. There is a wish to move forward and let others in, but at the same time it is not so easy as baggage of the past seems to be still too heavy to handle.

Even with the feeling of threat, supporters of the narrow definition were somewhat opened to the idea to include the wider understanding in their draft of the definition, the citizens of Latvia, who do not identify themselves as ethnic Latvians. But the obvious problem with the narrow definition still remains as there are people abroad who identify themselves as having Latvian ancestry but are not citizens and have problems to prove their ancestry. Excluding this group might not be in the interests of the supporters of the narrow definition of diaspora.

Sources

- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Boyarin, D., Boyarin, J. (1993). Diaspora: Generational ground of Jewish identity. *Critical Inquiry*, No. 19 (4), pp. 693–725.
- Brikmane, E. (2019). Brīvība vieno, nevis šķēļ. Available: <https://lvportals.lv/viedokli/303665-briviba-vieno-nevis-skel-2019> (viewed 05.05.2020.)
- Brubaker, R. (2005). The “Diaspora” Diaspora. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, No. 28, pp. 1–19.
- Brubaker, R., Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond “Identity”. *Theory and Society*, No. 29, pp. 1–47.
- Carment, D., Sadjed, A. (2017). Introduction: Coming to terms with diaspora cooperation. In: Carment, D., Sadjed, A., (eds). *Diaspora as Cultures of Cooperation. Global and Local Perspectives*. London: Palgrave, pp. 1–26.
- Central Statistical Bureau (no date given). Population number, its changes and density. Available: <https://www.csb.gov.lv/en/statistics/statistics-by-theme/population/number-and-change/key-indicator/population-number-its-changes-and-density> (viewed 05.05.2020.)
- Clifford, J. (1994). Diasporas. *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 9 (3), pp. 302–338.
- Cohen, R. (2008). *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Collier, M. (2016). Viewpoint: Table Manners. Available: <https://eng.lsm.lv/article/features/features/viewpoint-table-manners.a180962/> (viewed 05.05.2020.)
- Diaspora Law (2018). Available: <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/302998-diasporas-likums> (viewed 05.05.2020.)
- Ehala, M. (2018). *Signs of Identity. The Anatomy of Belonging*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Eng.lsm.lv. (2016). "I want you back!" Latvia tells Latvians abroad. Available: <https://eng.lsm.lv/article/society/society/i-want-you-back-latvia-tells-latvians-abroad.a192949/> (viewed 05.05.2020.)
- Golubovs, A. (2003). Kas un kā sadala informatīvo telpu? Available: <http://providus.lv/article/kas-un-ka-sadala-informativo-telpu> (viewed 05.05.2020.)
- Gulbe, E. (2018). Mārtiņš Kaprāns: Latvijas informācijas telpa nav sašķelta, drīzāk raiba. Available: <https://lvportals.lv/viedokli/293082-martins-kaprans-latvijas-informacijas-telpa-nav-saskelta-drizak-raiba-2018> (viewed 05.05.2020.)
- Hall, S. (1994). Cultural identity and diaspora. In: Williams, P., Chrisman, L. (eds). *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp. 222–237.
- Hall, S. (1994). The question of cultural identity. In: Hall, S., Held, D., McGrew, T. (eds). *Modernity and Its Futures*. Cambridge: Polity Press in association with the Open University, pp. 273–314.
- Helmane, I. (2018). Lai emigrantu atgriešanās būtu vieglāka. Available: <https://lvportals.lv/norises/294800-lai-emigrantu-atgriesanas-butu-vieglaka-2018> (viewed 20.05.2020.)
- Jurkāne-Hobein, I, Kļave, E., (2019). Manoeuvring in between: mapping out the transnational identity of Russian speaking Latvians in Sweden and Great Britain. In: Kaša, R., Mierīņa I. (eds). *The Emigrant Communities of Latvia. National Identity, Transnational Belonging, and Diaspora Politics*. Cham: Springer Open, pp. 163–182.
- Kehris-Brands, I. (no date given). Citizenship and multiculturalism in Latvia: Public and political discourses. In: *A European Approach to Multicultural Citizenship: Legal, Political and Education Challenges*. EMILIE. Contract No. CIT5-CT-2005-028205. Work Package 2: D3 Report.
- Lsm.lv. (2018). Saeima noraida rosinājumu skatīt grozījumus par diasporas definīciju. Available: <https://www.lsm.lv/raksts/zinas/latvija/saeima-noraida-rosinajumu-skatit-grozijumus-par-diasporas-definiciju.a302820/> (viewed 05.05.2020.)
- PBLA.lv (2018). PBLA valdes sēdē pieņemtās rezolūcijas. Available: <https://www.pbla.lv/pbla-2018-gada-valdes-sede-pienemtaz-rezolucijas/> (viewed 05.05.2020.)
- Pinto, E. (2018). Diasporas definīcija – kāpēc tā ir viltus problēma? Available: <https://lvportals.lv/viedokli/300011-diasporas-definicija-kapec-ta-ir-viltus-problema-2018> (viewed 05.05.2020.)
- Safran, W. (1991). Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, No. 1 (1), pp. 83–99.
- Smith, A. D. (2000). *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates About Ethnicity and Nationalism*. Hanover: University Press of New England.

- Smolicz, J. J. (1980). Language as a core value of culture. *RELC Journal*, No. 11 (1), pp. 1–13.
- Sökefeld, M. (2006). Mobilizing in transnational space: a social movement approach to the formation of diaspora. *Global Networks*, No. 6 (3), pp. 265–284.
- Story, J., Walker, I. (2017). Introduction. The impact of diasporas: markers of identity. In: Story, J., Walker, I. (eds). *The Impact of Diasporas. Markers of Identity*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 1–7.
- Timofejeva, K. (2018). Rihards Kols: Pašreizējā Diasporas definīcija ir problemātiska. Available: (<https://jauns.lv/raksts/zinas/302436-rihards-kols-pasreizeja-diasporas-definicija-ir-problematiska> (viewed 05.05.2020.))
- United Nations. Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2019). Population Division. 2019. World population prospects 2019. Highlights. Available: https://population.un.org/wpp/Publications/Files/WPP2019_Highlights.pdf (viewed 05.05.2020.)
- Zvirbulis, G. (2018) Vai aizbraukušie nepilsoņi ir mūsu problēma? Available: <http://www.la.lv/vai-aizbraukusie-nepilsoni-ir-musu-diaspora> (viewed 05.05.2020.)