

E-mail Transcripts and Conversation Summary: Latvian LGBTQ organizations on hate speech against LGBTIQ people in Latvia

Transcriber & Creator: Juris Martins

Title: Regarding hate speech against LGBTIQ people in Latvia

Time Period: 03.05.2026. - 09.04.2026.

Language: Latvian (Original); English (Translation)

Participant Overview:

- Ro Vilcāne — board member of Latvian Transgender Association “*Transformācija*”.
- Ieva Feldmane — chairperson and member of the board of the Latvian bisexual (B+) community movement “*Neons*”.
- Kaspars Zālītis — Board member of the Association of LGBT and their friends “*Mozaīka*” with experience in working on hate speech and hate crime issues.

Certain information has been redacted in this file for privacy by marking it with “[REDACTED]”.

Additional Information:

All times are presented in the 24-hour format.

Contents

Original Transcripts in Latvian	3
Latvian Transgender Association “ <i>Transformācija</i> ”	3
Latvian Bisexual (B+) community movement “ <i>Neons</i> ”	5
Conversation Summary (Original in Latvian).....	8
Association of LGBT and their friends “ <i>Mozaīka</i> ”	8
English Translation.....	11
Latvian Transgender Association “ <i>Transformācija</i> ”	11
Latvian Bisexual (B+) community movement “ <i>Neons</i> ”	13
Association of LGBT and their friends “ <i>Mozaīka</i> ”	16

Original Transcripts in Latvian

Latvian Transgender Association “*Transformācija*”

The following is an email transcript between Juris Martins (researcher) and the association “*Transformācija*” and its representative, Ro Vilcāne.

From: Juris Martins <juris.martins03@gmail.com>
To: transformacija.lta@gmail.com
Date: March 5, 2026 11:27
Subject: Saistībā ar naida runu pret LGBTIK cilvēkiem Latvijā

Labdien!

Par mani: Esmu Rīgas Juridiskās augstskolas 3. kursa students (bakalaura programmā “Tiesības un diplomātija”) un praktikants “United Efforts Network for Progressive Development”. Prakses ietvarā es rakstu akadēmiski juridisko rakstu par naida runu pret LGBTIK cilvēkiem Latvijā, konkrētāk, kā Krimināllikuma 150.pants sniedz mazāku aizsardzību LGBTIK cilvēkiem (pretstatā Krimināllikuma 78.pantam) un kāpēc esošais juridiskais ietvars būtu jāmaina.

Vēlos uzdot sekojošos jautājumus:

1. 2021.gadā “Lesbiešu, geju, biseksuāļu, transpersonu un viņu draugu apvienība “Mozaīka”” publicēja savu pozīciju “Par sociālā naida runas izmeklēšanas un Krimināllikuma 150.panta piemērošanas problemātiku” (saite norādīta lejā). Vai Latvijas Transpersonu apvienība “Transformācija” pievienojas šim Latvijā esošās situācijas novērtējumam?
2. Kā Latvijas Transpersonu apvienība “Transformācija” pašlaik novērtē situāciju Latvijā saistībā ar naida runu pret LGBTIK, konkrētāk, pret transpersonām un nebinārām personām?

Atsauce: Par sociālā naida runas izmeklēšanas un Krimināllikuma 150.panta piemērošanas problemātiku (2021.gada 6.maijs), LGBT un viņu draugu apvienība Mozaīka,

Saite: [https://titania.saeima.lv/LIVS13/saeimalivs13.nsf/0/b0d8fe5d00ee9a19c22586da002b7bb2/\\$FILE/2021.05.06.naidaruna.pdf](https://titania.saeima.lv/LIVS13/saeimalivs13.nsf/0/b0d8fe5d00ee9a19c22586da002b7bb2/$FILE/2021.05.06.naidaruna.pdf)

Būšu pateicīgs saņemt atbildes!

Ar cieņu
Juris Martins

Best regards,
Juris Martins

Mob. (+371) [REDACTED]

Phone number: (+371) [REDACTED]

E-pasts: juris.martins03@gmail.com

E-mail: juris.martins03@gmail.com

LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/jurismartins

LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/jurismartins

After communication with a representative of “*Transformācija*”, it was agreed that the representative would send a reply from their private email.

From: Ro Vilcāne <[REDACTED]@inbox.lv>
To: Juris Martins <juris.martins03@gmail.com>

Date: March 23, 2026 15:01

Subject: Re: Fwd: Saistībā ar naida runu pret LGBTIK cilvēkiem Latvijā

Labdien!

Tāpat:

1) Latvijas Transpersonu apvienības "Transformācija" skatījumā situācija pēdējo 5 gadu laikā, diemžēl, nav būtiski mainījiesies.

2) Saskaņā ar mūsu pieredzi, tiesībsargājošo institūciju darbinieki nesaprot vai izliekas nesaprotam atšķirību starp naida runu un draudiem. Attiecīgi, vēršoties policijā ar iesniegumu par naida runu pret transtersonām/ nebināriem cilvēkiem, lietas ierosināšana tiek atteikta pamatojoties uz to, ka: a)draudi nav izteikti konkrētam cilvēkam; b)nav iemesla uzskatīt, ka tie tiks īstenoti; c)nav konkrēti saprotams, kāds apdraudējums domāts (situācijā, kad draudi izteikti, izmantojot GIF/ emoji, nevis vārdus); d)nav skaidrs, pie kā vispār vēršas naida runas autors, kad, piemēram, zem ziņas par transpersonu protesta akciju pie Saeimas, komentārā rakstīts: "Nošaut!" (proti, nav rakstīts: "Nošaut transpersonas!"); e)nav izteikti draudi kā tādi, kad līdzīgā situācijā komentāros transpersonām tie ieteikts izdarīt pašnāvību/ eitanizēties. Situācijā, kad naida runa vērsta pret konkrētu cilvēku viņa/ viņas dzimtes identitātes dēļ, varbūtība, ka lieta tiks uzsākta, ir lielāka, lai gan arī reti 1. instancē, bez pārsūdzēšanas prokuratūrā.

Mūsu secinājumi ir tādi, ka: 1)Valsts policijā trūkst izpratnes, ko nozīmē termins "naida runa", kāds ir tās nestais apdraudējums kopienām, pret kurām tā vērsta; 2)pieeja šāda veida sūdzību izskatīšanai ir ļoti formāla un drīzāk izskatās pēc pamatojuma meklēšanas bezdarbībai, nevis palīdzības sniegšanas.

Cienā, Ro Vilcāne

From: Ro Vilcāne <[REDACTED]@inbox.lv>

To: Juris Martins <juris.martins03@gmail.com>

Date: March 23, 2026 20:55

Subject: Re: Fwd: Saistībā ar naida runu pret LGBTIK cilvēkiem Latvijā

Latvijas Transpersonu apvienība "Transformācija" piekrīt, ka materiāls tiks publicēts, atspoguļojot to kā apvienības pozīciju.

Valdes locekle Ro Vilcāne

Latvian Bisexual (B+) community movement “Neons”

The following is an email transcript between Juris Martins (researcher) and the movement “Neons” and its representative, Ieva Feldmane.

<p>From: Juris Martins <juris.martins03@gmail.com> To: kustiba@neons.lv Date: March 3, 2026 17:43 Subject: Saistībā ar naida runu pret LGBTIK cilvēkiem Latvijā</p>	
<p>Labdien!</p> <p>Par mani: Esmu Rīgas Juridiskās augstskolas 3. kursa students (bakalaura programmā “Tiesības un diplomātija”) un praktikants “United Efforts Network for Progressive Development”. Prakses ietvarā es rakstu akadēmiski juridisko rakstu par naida runu pret LGBTIK cilvēkiem Latvijā, konkrētāk, kā Krimināllikuma 150.pantā sniedz mazāku aizsardzību LGBTIK cilvēkiem (pretstatā Krimināllikuma 78.pantam) un kāpēc esošais juridiskais ietvars būtu jāmaina.</p> <p>Vēlos uzdot sekojošos jautājumus:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2021.gadā “Lesbiešu, geju, biseksuāļu, transpersonu un viņu draugu apvienība “Mozaīka”” publicēja savu pozīciju “Par sociālā naida runas izmeklēšanas un Krimināllikuma 150.panta piemērošanas problemātiku” (saite norādīta lejā). Vai kustība “Neons” pievienojas šim Latvijā esošās situācijas novērtējumam?Kā kustība “Neons” pašlaik novērtē situāciju Latvijā saistībā ar naida runu pret LGBTIK? <p>Atsauce: Par sociālā naida runas izmeklēšanas un Krimināllikuma 150.panta piemērošanas problemātiku (2021.gada 6.maijs), LGBT un viņu draugu apvienība Mozaīka, Saite: https://titania.saeima.lv/LIVS13/saeimalivs13.nsf/0/b0d8fe5d00ee9a19c22586da002b7bb2/\$FILE/2021.05.06.naidaruna.pdf</p> <p>Būšu pateicīgs saņemt atbildes!</p>	
<p>Ar cieņu Juris Martins</p> <p>Mob. (+371) [REDACTED]</p> <p>E-pasts: juris.martins03@gmail.com LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/jurismartins</p>	<p>Best regards, Juris Martins</p> <p>Phone number: (+371) [REDACTED]</p> <p>E-mail: juris.martins03@gmail.com LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/jurismartins</p>
<p>From: Ieva Feldmane <[REDACTED]@neons.lv> To: kustiba@neons.lv; juris.martins03@gmail.com Date: March 24, 2026 12:35 PM</p>	

Sveiks,

1. Vai kustība “Neons” pievienojas “Mozaīkas” 2021. gada pozīcijai?

Kustība **Neons kopumā pievienojas** Mozaīka 2021. gada pozīcijā paustajam vērtējumam, ka esošais regulējums par naida runu Latvijā ir nepilnīgs un nevienlīdzīgs.

Mēs piekrītam, ka atšķirīgā pieeja starp Krimināllikuma 78. pants un Krimināllikuma 150. pants rada situāciju, kur:

- aizsardzība pret naida runu nav vienlīdzīga visām sabiedrības grupām,
- LGBTIK personas praksē saņem vājāku tiesisko aizsardzību,
- tiesību normu piemērošana ir ierobežota un fragmentāra.

Mūsu skatījumā tas neatbilst vienlīdzības principam un mūsdienu cilvēktiesību standartiem.

2. Kā kustība Neons pašlaik novērtē situāciju Latvijā saistībā ar naida runu pret LGBTIK?

Kustība Neons uzskata, ka situācija Latvijā attiecībā uz naida runu pret LGBTIK personām pēdējos gados **nav būtiski uzlabojusies un atsevišķos aspektos pasliktinās.**

Saskaņā ar pētījumiem par naida runu Latvijā (2023), kā arī kopienas pieredzi:

- naida runa joprojām ir **plaši izplatīta, īpaši tiešsaistē,**
- tā bieži netiek atpazīta vai konsekvēti izmeklēta,
- un cietušo uzticēšanās ziņošanas mehānismiem ir ierobežota.

Papildus tam novērojama **sabiedrības polarizācija**, kur LGBTIK jautājumi tiek izmantoti publiskajā un politiskajā komunikācijā, nereti vienkāršojot vai sagrozot realitāti, tādējādi pastiprinot aizspriedumus un normalizējot naidīgu retoriku.

Vienlaikus būtiska problēma ir **nepietiekama sabiedrības izglītošana** par seksuālo, romantisko orientāciju un dzimumidentitāti, kas veicina stereotipus un kavē savstarpēju izpratni.

No kopienas perspektīvas:

- verbāla naida izpausmes rada **reālu nedrošības sajūtu,**
- tās ietekmē cilvēku **labbūti, piederības sajūtu un uzticēšanos valstij,**
- un var ietekmēt **lēmumus par dzīvi Latvijā,** īpaši jauniešu un ģimeņu vidū.

Biseksuālu cilvēku kontekstā jāuzsver, ka naida runa bieži izpaužas **mazāk atpazīstamās formās** (piemēram, trivializācija un stereotipi), kas apgrūtina tās identificēšanu un mazināšanu. Vienlaikus **biseksuāli cilvēki bieži ir arī viendzimuma attiecībās un tieši saskaras ar pret LGBTIK vērstu naida runu,** savukārt tie, kuri ir dažādu dzimumu attiecībās tāpat izjūt nedrošību - naidīga retorika rada **personiska apdraudējuma un nepieņemšanas sajūtu neatkarīgi no attiecību formas.**

Naida runa veicina arī **slēpšanos (“palikšanu skapī”)**, īpaši biseksuālu vīriešu vidū, kur stigmatizācija saglabājas augsta. Tas ir saistīts ar **negatīvām sekām uz mentālo un fizisko veselību,** tostarp paaugstinātu stresu, trauksmi un sociālo izolāciju.

Svarīgi uzsvērt arī, ka daļa biseksuālu un panseksuālu cilvēku ir **nebināri vai transpersonas,** un šīs grupas pēdējos gados īpaši bieži kļūst par **mērķi intensīvām naida kampaņām un dezinformācijai,** tostarp politiskajā diskursā. Tas ne tikai tieši ietekmē šīs kopienas, bet arī kopumā veicina naida runas normalizāciju sabiedrībā.

Tāpēc būtiski, lai **pētījumos, politikas veidošanā un sabiedriskajā komunikācijā tiktu iekļauta biseksuāla, trans un nebināra perspektīva**, akcentējot šo pieredzi daudzveidību un veicinot sabiedrības izpratni.

Kopumā Neons uzskata, ka:

- bez mērķtiecīgas rīcības gan tiesiskajā regulējumā, gan izglītībā,
- kā arī atbildīgākas publiskās komunikācijas,

būtisks uzlabojums situācijā nav sagaidāms.

https://cilvektiesibas.org.lv/media/attachments/08/05/2024/Naida_runa_petijums_2023final.pdf

Lai veicas!

Ieva Feldmane
[REDACTED]

From: Ieva Feldmane <[REDACTED]@neons.lv>
To: kustiba@neons.lv; juris.martins03@gmail.com
Date: March 24, 2026 12:40
Subject: Fwd: Saistībā ar naida runu pret LGBTIK cilvēkiem Latvijā

P.S. piekrītam, ka atbilde tiks atspoguļota, kā organizācijas pozīcija "Jurista vārdā".

Conversation Summary (Original in Latvian)

Association of LGBT and their friends “Mozaīka”

The following is an original conversation summary from Juris Martins (researcher) with Kaspars Zālītis, board member of the Association of LGBT and their friends “Mozaīka” with experience in working on hate speech and hate crime issues.

Saruna ar Kasparu Zālīti, LGBT un viņu draugu apvienība “Mozaīka” valdes locekli, kopsavilkums. Respondentam ir ilggadēja pieredze jautājumos, kas saistīti ar naida runu un naida noziegumiem. Kaspars Zālītis sniedza informāciju un puda viedokli par attiecīgo tematiku, vienlaikus apliecinot savu piekrišanu, ka viņa izteikumi var tikt publiskoti. Tāpat tika norādīts, ka konkrētie izteikumi šajā kontekstā var tikt interpretēti arī kā organizācijas “Mozaīka” oficiālās pozīcijas atspoguļojums.

Datums: 2026.gada 9.aprīlis (09/04/2026).

Izmantotās abreviatūras:

- KZ – Kaspars Zālītis;
- VDD – Valsts drošības dienests;
- VP – Valsts policija;
- KL – Latvijas Republikas Krimināllikums;
- NVO – nevalstiskā organizācija.

Papildus skaidrojumi:

- KL 150.pants – “Sociālā naida un nesaticības izraisīšana” (skatīt [šeit](#)).
- KL 78.pants – “Nacionālā, etniskā un rasu naida izraisīšana” (skatīt [šeit](#)).
- KL 48.pants – “Atbildību pastiprinošie apstākļi” (skatīt [šeit](#)).

Sarunas apkopojums:

KZ: LGBT un viņu draugu apvienība “Mozaīka” (turpmāk – Mozaīka) bija iesaistīta KL 150.panta grozījumu izstrādes procesā, kuru mērķis bija paplašināt normā ietvertu aizsargājamo sabiedrības grupu loku. Toreiz, vairāki politiķi, piemēram, Nacionālā Apvienības pārstāvji, nevēlējās, lai tiktu iekļauts LGBT, kā aizsargājama sabiedrības grupa. Rezultātā sanāca, ka normatīvajā tekstā tika iekļauts vispārinošs formulējums “un citas (u.c.)”, kas paplašina interpretācijas iespējas attiecībā uz aizsargājamajām grupām.

KZ: Esošajā KL 150.panta ietvarā, vēršoties VP ar iesniegumu, kā “būtisko kaitējumu” izmanto aspektu par Latvijas Satversmes tiesību ierobežošanu.

KZ: Pēc Mozaīkas iesniegumiem saistībā ar naida runu, ir tiktas tiesātas 3 personas.

KZ: Problēma, ka cietušajām personām netiek pietiekami pilnvērtīgi un saprotami izskaidrotas viņu tiesības. Līdz ar to praksē veidojas situācijas, kurās personas, meklējot palīdzību, ir spiestas vērsties pie Mozaīka, kas sniedz konsultatīvu un atbalsta funkciju.

KZ min piemēru par "Līvaja lietu"¹, kur huligānisma pantam (kas patiesība ir "smags pants") pievienoja klāt vēl KL 150.pantu un KL 48.pantu (Atbildību pastiprinošie apstākļi). Rezultāta, var teikt beigās bija "smagāka" vēršanās pret uzbrucējiem.

KZ norādīja, ka policijas darbinieku attieksme un kompetence jautājumos, kas saistīti ar LGBTIK kopienu un naida noziegumiem, ir daudzveidīga: a) Ir policistu ir labi sagatavoti un zinoši; b) Ir policisti, kas apzinās problēmas būtību un ir atvērti papildināt savas zināšanas; c) Savukārt ir arī policisti kam raksturīga ignorance vai vienaldzīga attieksme pret attiecīgo problemātiku.

KZ: Nepieciešama mainīt esošo KL ietvaru. Savukārt, nav pārlicēbas, ka LGBTIK kopienas personas būtu jāiekļauj tieši KL 78.pantā. Nepieciešama diskusija par šo aspektu.

KZ: Ir nepieciešams papildināt KL 150.panta aizsargājamās grupas un izņemt "būtiskā kaitējumu" nosacījumu.

KZ: Esošajā normatīvo aktu ietvarā nav nošķirts, kas ir naida runa un kas ir naida noziegums.

KZ: Pastāv risks, ja apvieno KL 150.pantu ar KL 78.pantu, tad kompetence izmeklēt attiecīgos noziegumus varētu pāriet no VDD aiziet uz VP, kas nebūtu labs iznākums, ņemot vērā specializētās zināšanas un pieredzi, kā arī resursus, kas ir VDD, bet trūkst VP.

KZ: Būtu vēlams, ka VDD nodotu savu pieredzi KL 78.panta noziegumu konstatēšanā un izmeklēšanā VP, kura to varētu izmantot saistībā ar KL 150.panta noziegumiem.

KZ: VP praksē ieviestais 'liaison officer' modelis bijis salīdzinoši efektīvs, nodrošinot ciešāku sadarbību un kontaktu starp NVO un VP, bet 'liaison officer' bija ļoti plašs atbildības jomu spektrs. Kādreiz bija ciešāks kontakts, tagad mazāks.

KZ min piemēru no Beļģijas, kur policijā ir atsevišķas vienības, kuru kompetence ir naida noziegumu apkarošana.

KZ: KL 150.panta papildināšana ar jauniem aizsargājamām grupām paredzētiem formulējumiem pati par sevi nav garantija efektīvai aizsardzībai. Nepieciešama arī normatīvā regulējuma praktiska ieviešana un īstenošana, lai paredzētās normas reāli nodrošinātu cietušo personu tiesību aizsardzību un atbalstu.

KZ: Pašlaik esošie rādītāji, ka ir maz ziņojumi, nav apstiprinājums, ka nav problēma.

KZ: Starp Mozaīku un VP ir dialogs un VP vadība nopietni uztver gadījumus, kur ir notikusi vēršanās pret LGBTIK personām.

KZ: Mozaīkas pieredzē ir bijušas situācijas, kur VP darbinieki ir atteikuši lietas izskatīšanu, pamatojoties, ka attiecīgā persona, kas veica naida runu, atsakās no atbildības atzīšanas, piemēram, minot, ka bija alkohola reibumā.

KZ: Savulaik, Mozaīka panāca, ka KL 48.pants tika papildināts un atbildību pastiprinošiem tiek atzīts arī, noziedzīgs nodarījums, kas izdarīts sociālā naida dēļ, kas sasaista to ar KL 150.pantu. Tomēr praksē KL 48.pants reti tiek vai pat praktiski netiek piesaukts.

¹ 2023.gada maijā Daugavpilī par piederību LGBTIK kopienai piekauti divi cilvēki. [Sākotnēji kriminālprocess tika izbeigts bez vainīgo personu saukšanas pie atbildības](#). Tomēr pēc lēmuma pārsūdzēšanas process tika atjaunots, kā rezultātā vainīgās personas tika sauktas pie kriminālatbildības un [notiesātas, piemērojot brīvības atņemšanas sodu](#).

KZ apstiprina, ka sekojošais ir Mozaīkas redzējums:

Mozaīka uzskata, ka no KL 150.panta ir jāizslēdz “būtiskā kaitējuma” nosacījums; KL 150.pantā ir jāpapildina aktuālās aizsargājamās grupas; Vienlaikus normatīvā regulējuma praktiska ieviešana un īstenošana; Papildus nepieciešams skaidri nodefinēt, kas ir naida runa un kas ir naida noziegums.

KZ: Ne visiem naida runas gadījumiem vajadzētu tikt traktētiem, kā kriminālnoziedzumiem. Dažus gadījumus varētu izskatīt, kā administratīvos pārkāpumus un attiecīgi noteikt administratīvo sodu. Piemēram, situācija, kur jaunietis, kas vienreiz, iespējams, savas atbildības neapzināšanas dēļ, veic pārkāpumu. Savukārt, ka ir atkārtots pārkāpums pastiprināt atbildību, kā tas mēdz Administratīvajā likumā. Administratīvais sods var kalpot, kā prevencija.

KZ: VDD ne vienmēr piemēro KL 78.pantu, bet gan mēdz veikt “preventīvos pasākumus”, kur VDD aicina personu ierasties uz tikšanos vai atnāk personai “ciemots”. Ja cilvēks nav radikāls savās pārliecībās, tad šāda tikšanas attur no turpmākiem pārkāpumiem. Vienlaikus, iespējams VP nav pietiekami resursi, lai veiktu šādus pasākumus,

KZ apstiprina, ka sekojošais ir Mozaīkas redzējums:

Pēc Mozaīkas redzējuma, Latvijā pieaug naida runa un naida noziegumi, bet vērsts norādīt, ka Latvija šinī aspektā nav unikāla, jo tādas tendences ir novērojamas arī citās valstīs, un šī tendence nav vienīgi pret LGBTIK personām. Lielākā problēma ir tas, ka cilvēki nezina kā un kur vērsties, kā arī Latvijas kontekstā cilvēkiem racionālu un neracionālu iemeslu dēļ ir bail vērsties pie vērsties pie tiesībsargājošajām iestādēm.

KZ: Mozaīka ir vienmēr uz sadarbību vērsti ar tiesībsargājošajām iestādēm.

English Translation

Latvian Transgender Association “*Transformācija*”

The following is an English translation (done by *Tilde*²) of an email transcript between Juris Martins (researcher) and the association “*Transformācija*” and its representative, Ro Vilcāne.

From: Juris Martins <juris.martins03@gmail.com>
To: transformacija.lta@gmail.com
Date: March 5, 2026 11:27
Subject: On hate speech against LGBTIQ people in Latvia

Good afternoon!

About me: I am a 3rd year student at the Riga Graduate School of Law (Bachelor's program “Law and Diplomacy”) and an intern at “United Efforts Network for Progressive Development”. As part of my internship, I am writing an academic legal article on hate speech against LGBTIQ people in Latvia, more specifically, how Article 150 of the Criminal Law provides less protection to LGBTIQ people (as opposed to Article 78 of the Criminal Law) and why the current legal framework should be changed.

I would like to ask the following questions:

1. In 2021, the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and their Friends Association “Mozaīka” published its position “On the investigation of social hatred speech and the application of Article 150 of the Criminal Law” (link below). Does the Latvian Transgender Association “*Transformācija*” agree with this assessment of the situation in Latvia?
2. How does the Latvian Transgender Association “*Transformācija*” currently assess the situation in Latvia regarding hate speech against LGBTIQ, more specifically against transgender and non-binary people?

Reference: On the Problems of Investigating Hate Speech and Applying Section 150 of the Criminal Law (6 May 2021), LGBT and their Friends Association Mozaīka, Link: [https://titania.saeima.lv/LIVS13/saeimalivs13.nsf/0/b0d8fe5d00ee9a19c22586da002b7bb2/\\$FILE/2021.05.06.naidaruna.pdf](https://titania.saeima.lv/LIVS13/saeimalivs13.nsf/0/b0d8fe5d00ee9a19c22586da002b7bb2/$FILE/2021.05.06.naidaruna.pdf)

I'd be grateful for a response.

After communication with a representative of “*Transformācija*”, it was agreed that the representative would send a reply from their private email.

From: Ro Vilcāne <[REDACTED]@inbox.lv>
To: Juris Martins <juris.martins03@gmail.com>
Date: March 23, 2026 15:01

² Tilde.ai. Machine Translation Solutions. Provides AI-powered translation tools supporting multiple European languages with improved accuracy and natural language output. Available at: <https://tilde.ai/lv/machine-translation/>

Subject: Re: Fwd: On hate speech against LGBTIQ people in Latvia

Good afternoon!

So:

1) In the view of the Latvian Transgender Association "Transformation", the situation has not changed significantly in the last 5 years.

2) According to our experience, law enforcement officers do not understand or pretend not to understand the difference between hate speech and threats. Accordingly, when applying to the police with a complaint about hate speech against transgender/non-binary people, the case is refused on the grounds that: a) the threats were not made to a specific person; b) there is no reason to believe that they will be implemented; c) it is not clear what kind of threat is meant (in a situation where threats are made using GIFs/emojis, not words); d) it is not clear who the author of the hate speech is addressing when, for example, under a news item about a protest by transgender people in front of the Saeima, a comment says: "Shoot!" (that is, it does not say: "Shoot transgender people!"); e) there are no threats as such when, in a similar situation, comments are made to transgender people to commit suicide/euthanize themselves. In a situation where hate speech is directed against a specific person because of his/her gender identity, the likelihood that the case will be initiated is greater, although rarely at 1st instance, without appeal to the prosecutor's office.

Our conclusions are that: 1) the State Police lack understanding of what the term "hate speech" means, what the threat it poses to the communities it targets is; 2) the approach to handling such complaints is very formal and looks more like a justification for inaction than a help.

Sincerely, Ro Vilcāne

From: Ro Vilcāne <[REDACTED]@inbox.lv>

To: Juris Martins <juris.martins03@gmail.com>

Date: March 23, 2026 20:55

Subject: Re: Fwd: On hate speech against LGBTIQ people in Latvia

The Latvian Transgender Association "Transformation" agrees that the material will be published, reflecting it as the position of the association.

Board member Ro Vilcane

Latvian Bisexual (B+) community movement “Neons”

The following is an English translation (done by *Tilde*³) of an email transcript between Juris Martins (researcher) and the movement “Neons” and its representative, Ieva Feldmane.

From: Juris Martins <juris.martins03@gmail.com>
To: kustiba@neons.lv
Date: March 3, 2026 17:43
Subject: On hate speech against LGBTIQ people in Latvia

Good afternoon!

About me: I am a 3rd year student at the Riga Graduate School of Law (Bachelor’s programme “Law and Diplomacy”) and an intern at “United Efforts Network for Progressive Development”. As part of my internship, I am writing an academic legal article on hate speech against LGBTIQ people in Latvia, more specifically, how Article 150 of the Criminal Law provides less protection to LGBTIQ people (as opposed to Article 78 of the Criminal Law) and why the current legal framework should be changed.

I would like to ask the following questions:

1. In 2021, the Association of Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, Transgender People and their Friends “Mozaika” published its position “On the investigation of social hatred speech and the application of Article 150 of the Criminal Law” (link provided below). Does the “Neons” movement agree with this assessment of the situation in Latvia?
2. How does Neons currently assess the situation in Latvia regarding hate speech against LGBTIQ?

Reference: On the Problems of Investigating Hate Speech and Applying Section 150 of the Criminal Law (6 May 2021), LGBT and Friends Association Mozaika, Link: [https://titania.saeima.lv/LIVS13/saeimalivs13.nsf/0/b0d8fe5d00ee9a19c22586da002b7bb2/\\$FILE/2021.05.06.naidaruna.pdf](https://titania.saeima.lv/LIVS13/saeimalivs13.nsf/0/b0d8fe5d00ee9a19c22586da002b7bb2/$FILE/2021.05.06.naidaruna.pdf)

I'd be grateful for a response.

From: Ieva Feldmane <[REDACTED]@neons.lv>
To: kustiba@neons.lv; juris.martins03@gmail.com
Date: March 24, 2026 12:35 PM
Subject: Re: On hate speech against LGBTIQ people in Latvia

Hi,

1. Does the Neon movement join the 2021 position of Mozaika?

Movement Neons in general agrees with the assessment of Mozaika in the position of 2021 that the current regulation on hate speech in Latvia is incomplete and unequal.

³ Tilde.ai. Machine Translation Solutions. Provides AI-powered translation tools supporting multiple European languages with improved accuracy and natural language output. Available at: <https://tilde.ai/lv/machine-translation/>

We agree that the different approach between Section 78 and Section 150 of the Criminal Law creates a situation where:

- protection against hate speech is not equal for all groups in society,
- LGBTIQ persons receive weaker legal protection in practice,
- The application of the legal provisions is limited and fragmented.

In our view, this is not in line with the principle of equality and modern human rights standards.

2. How does Neons currently assess the situation in Latvia regarding hate speech against LGBTIQ?

Movement Neons believes that the situation in Latvia regarding hate speech against LGBTIQ persons has not significantly improved in recent years and in some aspects is getting worse.

According to the research on hate speech in Latvia (2023), as well as community experience:

- hate speech is still widespread, especially online,
- it is often not recognised or consistently investigated,
- and victims' confidence in reporting mechanisms is limited.

In addition, there is a polarisation of society, where LGBTIQ issues are used in public and political communication, often simplifying or distorting reality, thus reinforcing prejudices and normalising hateful rhetoric.

At the same time, insufficient education of the public about sexual, romantic orientation and gender identity is a significant problem, which promotes stereotypes and hinders mutual understanding.

From the community perspective:

- verbal expressions of hatred create a real sense of insecurity,
- It affects people's well-being, sense of belonging and trust in the state,
- and can influence decisions about life in Latvia, especially among young people and families.

In the context of bisexual people, it should be emphasised that hate speech often takes less recognisable forms (e.g. trivialisation and stereotypes), which makes it more difficult to identify and address. At the same time, bisexual people are often in same-sex relationships and are directly exposed to anti-LGBTIQ hate speech, while those who are in different-sex relationships also feel insecure - hostile rhetoric creates a sense of personal threat and rejection regardless of the form of the relationship.

Hate speech also contributes to hiding ('staying in the closet'), especially among bisexual men, where stigma remains high. This is linked to negative mental and physical health consequences, including increased stress, anxiety and social isolation.

It is also important to emphasise that some bisexual and pansexual people are non-binary or transgender, and these groups have been particularly targeted by intense hate campaigns and disinformation, including in political discourse, in recent years. This not only directly affects these communities, but also contributes to the normalisation of hate speech in society as a whole.

Therefore, it is essential that research, policy-making, and public communication incorporate bisexual, trans, and non-binary perspectives, highlighting the diversity of these experiences and promoting public understanding.

Overall, Neon believes that:

- without purposeful action in both the legal framework and education,
- and more responsible public communication,

no significant improvement in the situation is expected.

https://cilvektiesibas.org.lv/media/attachments/08/05/2024/Naida_runa_petijums_2023final.pdf

Good luck!

Ieva Feldmane

From: Ieva Feldmane <[REDACTED]@neons.lv>
To: kustiba@neons.lv; juris.martins03@gmail.com
Date: March 24, 2026 12:40
Subject: Fwd: On hate speech against LGBTIQ people in Latvia

P.S. We agree that the answer will be reflected as the position of the organization in Jurista Vārds.

Association of LGBT and their friends “Mozaīka”

The following is an English version conversation summary (done by Tilde.ai⁴) from Juris Martins (researcher) with Kaspars Zālītis, a board member of the Association of LGBT and their friends “Mozaīka,” with experience working on hate speech and hate crime issues.

Summary of the interview with Kaspars Zālītis, member of the board of the LGBT and their friends association “Mozaīka”. The respondent has long-term experience in issues related to hate speech and hate crimes. Kaspars Zālītis provided information and expressed his opinion on the relevant topics, while confirming his consent to the publication of his statements. It was also indicated that the specific statements in this context may also be interpreted as a reflection of the official position of the organization “Mozaīka”.

Date: 9 April 2026 (09/04/2026).

Abbreviations used:

- KZ – Kaspars Zālītis;
- VDD – State Security Service;
- VP – State Police;
- KL – Criminal Law of the Republic of Latvia;
- NGO – non-governmental organisation.

Additional explanations:

- Article 150 of the Criminal Law – “Incitement to social hatred and discord” (see here).
- Article 78 of the Criminal Law – “Incitement to national, ethnic and racial hatred” (see here).
- Article 48 of the Criminal Law – “Aggravating circumstances” (see here).

Summary of the conversation:

KZ: LGBT and their friends association “Mozaika” (hereinafter – Mozaika) was involved in the process of drafting amendments to Article 150 of the Criminal Law, which aimed to expand the range of protected groups of society included in the norm. At that time, several politicians, such as representatives of the National Association, did not want LGBT to be included as a protected group of society. As a result, a generalizing formulation “and others (u.c.)” was included in the normative text, which expands the possibilities of interpretation regarding the protected groups.

KZ: Within the current framework of Article 150 of the Criminal Law, when addressing the State Police with a submission, the aspect of restricting the rights of the Constitution of Latvia is used as “substantial harm”.

⁴ Tilde.ai. Machine Translation Solutions. Provides AI-powered translation tools supporting multiple European languages with improved accuracy and natural language output. Available at: <https://tilde.ai/lv/machine-translation/>

KZ: After the complaints of Mozaika about hate speech, 3 people have been prosecuted.

KZ: The problem is that the victims are not sufficiently and comprehensively informed about their rights, so in practice, situations arise where people, looking for help, are forced to turn to Mozaika, which provides a consultative and support function.

KZ gives an example of the "Livajs case"⁵ where the article on hooliganism (which is actually a "serious article") was added to the Criminal Code Article 150 and Criminal Code Article 48 (Aggravating circumstances). As a result, we can say that in the end there was a "heavier" approach to the attackers.

KZ indicated that the attitude and competence of police officers in matters related to the LGBTIQ community and hate crimes is diverse: a) There are police officers who are well prepared and knowledgeable; b) There are police officers who are aware of the problem and are open to expanding their knowledge; c) However, there are also police officers who are characterized by ignorance or indifference towards the problem.

KZ: It is necessary to change the existing framework of the Criminal Code. However, there is no certainty that LGBTIQ community persons should be included in Article 78 of the Criminal Code. A discussion on this aspect is needed.

KZ: It is necessary to supplement the groups protected by Article 150 of the Criminal Law and to remove the condition of "substantial harm".

KZ: The current legal framework does not distinguish between hate speech and hate crime.

KZ: There is a risk that if you combine Article 150 with Article 78, the competence to investigate the relevant crimes could shift from the State Security Service to the State Police, which would not be a good outcome, given the specialized knowledge and experience, as well as the resources that the State Security Service has but the State Police does not.

KZ: It would be desirable that the State Security Service transfer its experience in detecting and investigating crimes under Section 78 of the Criminal Law to the State Police, which could use it in connection with crimes under Section 150 of the Criminal Law.

KZ: The liaison officer model implemented by the Police has been relatively effective in practice, ensuring closer cooperation and contact between NGOs and the Police, but the liaison officer had a very wide range of responsibilities. There was closer contact before, now it is less.

KZ gives the example of Belgium, where the police have separate units that are responsible for combating hate crimes.

⁵ In May 2023, two people were beaten in Daugavpils for belonging to the LGBTIQ community. Initially, the criminal proceedings were terminated without bringing the perpetrators to justice. However, after the decision was appealed, the proceedings were reopened, resulting in the perpetrators being brought to criminal responsibility and sentenced to imprisonment.

KZ: The addition of new formulations for protected groups to Article 150 of the Criminal Code is not in itself a guarantee of effective protection. The practical implementation and enforcement of the regulatory framework is also necessary in order for the intended provisions to actually ensure the protection and support of victims.

KZ: The current indicators that there are few reports is not an affirmation that there is no problem.

KZ: There is a dialogue between Mozaika and the police, and the police leadership takes seriously cases where LGBTIQ people have been targeted.

KZ: In the experience of Mozaika, there have been situations where police officers have refused to investigate a case on the grounds that the person who made the hate speech denies responsibility, for example, by saying that they were drunk.

KZ: In the past, Mozaika managed to have Article 48 of the Criminal Code amended so that a crime committed out of social hatred is also considered an aggravating circumstance, which links it to Article 150 of the Criminal Code. However, in practice, Article 48 of the Criminal Code is rarely or even practically never invoked.

KZ confirms that the following is the vision of Mozaika:

Mozaika believes that the condition of “substantial harm” should be excluded from Article 150 of the Criminal Law; the current protected groups should be supplemented in Article 150 of the Criminal Law; at the same time, the practical implementation and enforcement of the regulatory framework; in addition, it is necessary to clearly define what hate speech and hate crime are.

KZ: Not all hate speech cases should be treated as criminal offences. Some cases could be treated as administrative offences and the corresponding administrative penalty could be imposed. For example, a situation where a young person, perhaps because of his or her lack of awareness of responsibility, commits an offence once. However, if there is a repeated offence, increase the responsibility, as is the case in the Administrative Law. An administrative penalty can serve as prevention.

KZ: The State Security Service does not always apply Article 78 of the Criminal Law, but sometimes carries out "preventive measures", where the State Security Service invites a person to come for a meeting or comes to visit the person. If a person is not radical in his or her beliefs, such a meeting deters him or her from further violations. At the same time, it is possible that the State Police do not have enough resources to carry out such measures.

KZ confirms that the following is the vision of Mozaika:

According to Mozaika, hate speech and hate crimes are on the rise in Latvia, but it should be pointed out that Latvia is not unique in this respect, as such trends can be observed in other countries as well, and this trend is not only against LGBTIQ persons. The biggest problem is that people do not know how and where to turn, and in the context of Latvia, people are afraid to turn to law enforcement agencies for rational and irrational reasons.

KZ: Mozaika is always cooperative with law enforcement.