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Abstract

The origins of globalization processes have to be looked for in the distant past, and in each of the previous historical periods, the course of these processes – intensiveness and extensiveness –, as well as their aftereffects are different. For the construction of Europe’s future identities (including that of Latvia’s), when the tendencies of the spread of cosmopolitan value-orientation are obvious, the principles behind creating the nation’s identities in the past become essential. The periods of the development of Latvia’s history and national identity show the orientation towards individual and national or, on the contrary, towards universal and cosmopolitan.

This paper is aimed at summarizing and analysing the interpretations of the concepts “cosmopolite” and “cosmopolitan identity” as given in the Latvian periodicals during 1) the time of the development of national self-confidence in the second half of the nineteenth century, 2) the period of Europeanization and cultural openness at the turn of the century, 3) the 20–30s of the twentieth century.

When the movement of national renaisssance (“the New Latvians” / in Latvian “Jaunlatvieši”) began, the “intrusion of the foul cosmopolitism” (A. Kronvalds) was looked upon as a threat to the national culture. Whereas the cosmopolitan-global dominant, universalism and universal human values prevail in the attitude of the Latvian intellectuals’ movement “the New Current” (in Latvian “Jaunā Strāva”) of the end of the nineteenth century. After the proclamation of Latvian national independence, but especially under the influence of the ideology of positivism in the 1930s, the idea of cosmopolitism is juxtaposed with the idea of national unity. Taking into consideration the fact that there exists a correlation between individualization and cosmopolitanism (G. Simmel), cosmopolitism has been studied also within the context of “cosmopolitan art” – Modernism and Symbolism, where a symbol as a means of a universal language (Esperanto) is used to reveal an individualized world perception. The cultural-historical method, content analysis and structural-semiotic method have been used in the research.
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1. INTRODUCTION

- [...] viss šis greznums un krāšņums ir ticis cilvēkam, kurš šeit pat nedzīvo.
  - Bet kur tad viņš dzīvo? Kur?
- Viņš [...] ir kosmopolīts … Šodien Maskavā, rīt Venēcijā, parīt Londonā un tā tālāk. Laimīgais! Nevienu tā neapskaužu kā viņu.”
  (Verbickaja 1910)

[- [...] all this luxury and splendour have fallen to a man who does not even live here.
  - But where does he live after all? Where?
- He […] is a cosmopolite … Today he is in Moscow, tomorrow – in Venice, the day after tomorrow in London and so on. The lucky one! I envy nobody else as much as him.]
The concept “identity” in Latvian research literature has been discussed within different contexts and relations, especially during the recent decade when in the framework of the research supported by the State Research programme “National Identity” (Language, History of Latvia, Culture and Human Security) and “Latvian Studies (Letonica): History, Language and Culture”, as well as in other local, national and international research, Latvian national and cultural identity has been investigated on a regular basis.

Today we live in the world displaying increasingly stronger tendencies of cosmopolitanism. Among the range of multiform and broad contexts, the context of globalization is one of the most significant ones, which is considered to be an integral creator of the present and future identities of Latvia and its population. However, this context has been important for constructing the identities of the past as well, when since the second half of the nineteenth century, in Latvia the ideas of cosmopolitanism, transnationalism, and internationalism encountered the developmental tendencies of national identity. This research is aimed at giving an insight into the content understanding of the concept “cosmopolitanism” viewed historically, focusing on the analysis of Latvian periodical publications of the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth century and following years till 1940.

2. UNDERSTANDINGS OF “COSMOPOLITANISM”

The noun “cosmopolitan” (also “a cosmopolite”), etymologically derived from the Greek kosmos (world) and polites (a citizen), signifies a person who feels at home in all parts of the world, i.e. a person who is nowhere a stranger and, thus, is a citizen of the world. The adjective “cosmopolitan” implies the meaning of “belonging to all parts of the world”, “not limited to any country or its inhabitants”, “free from national or local prejudices or attachments”, “feeling at home in all parts of the world”, thus it stands for “international”, “multicultural”, “worldwide”, “global”, “universal”. Cosmopolitanism is defined as a system of opinions that rejects national divisions and advocates world citizenship (Rozenvalde 2004, 266). The notion of “cosmopolitanism” indicating the state of being a cosmopolitan has its roots with the Stoics who argued that people’s identities as humans are more fundamental than their local identities (Klas & Burbule 2011, 205). In the classical society, a human regarded himself a part of the universe, and consequently the individual’s interests coincided with the interests of the society.

The ancient idea of cosmopolitanism has drastically changed nowadays: it has become a specific conception and a behavioural pattern, represented by cosmopolitans or citizens of the world (Beroš 2016, 198). The initial perception of cosmopolitanism as “mere detachment from the political systems of nation states and as the notion of ‘openness to the world’” has transformed into perceiving it as “legal and political framework, as an ethical ideal and vision of justice, as well as a type of identity choice made by individuals” (Beroš 2016, 197). This emphasis on universalism and universal values resonates with Immanuel Kant’s (1724–1804) perception of cosmopolitanism that was developed in his works, e.g. the essay “Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim” [Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht] (1784), namely, cosmopolitanism was explained as a desired final stage of human history that is characterized by the designation “perfection”, i.e. as political and moral perfection of humanity (Kant 1963; Oksenberg Rorty & Schmidt 2009). Human’s wish to simultaneously individualize and socialize reveals the ambiguous character of human’s nature, nevertheless, the move from the particular to the universal, according to Kant, reveals a movement to cosmopolitanism. Like the ambiguity of human nature, the term “cosmopolitanism” is also ambiguous and complex.

Cosmopolitan view on the world and cosmopolitan identity can change not only individual identity and self-awareness, but by extension, “it has the potential to transform the cultures and societies in which individuals participate” (Spisak 2009, 86). Cosmopolitanism therefore implies the idea of constructing both an identity for oneself and an identity for the nation “that is different from, and arguable opposed to, the idea of belonging to or devotion to or immersion in a particular culture” (Waldron 2010, 163).
3. THE PERCEPTION OF COSMOPOLITANISM IN LATVIAN PERIODICALS TILL 1940

3.1. The time of the development of national self-confidence in the second half of the nineteenth century

The historical conditions determined that other nations (the Germans, Swedes, Poles, Russians) had ruled over the territory of Latvia for many centuries. The period from 1850s till 1880s is known as the First Latvian National Awakening and the period of activity of the New Latvians [Jaunlatvieši]. It is characterized by the processes of the formation of Latvian national consciousness, seeking for the Latvian identity, and establishing the basic principles of Latvianess. The nineteenth century in Europe, and with some decades’ bias also in Latvia, is the time of nationalism and patriotism, and therefore cosmopolitanism on the whole is perceived either sarcastically and ironically, or regarded as a threat to formation and preservation of the national culture. One of the quotations given in different variations of translation cited most frequently in the periodicals of that time is referred to Russian writer Ivan Turgenev (1818–1883): “[…] cosmopolitanism is nonsense and a cosmopolitan is a zero, even more insignificant than a zero, outside the nationality there is neither art, nor truth, nor life” (‘Ivans Turgenevs…’ 1883; GrK 1894; Turgenevs 1916). Cosmopolitanism is being interpreted as an erroneous theory of logic, since “man and his mind are national” (“Rīta Blāzmā’ 1901). Many times periodicals mention “the world citizens” – the Englishmen, Germans and Jews – as cosmopolitans, who are described to believe that “for a free individual the whole world could be a fatherland” (“Par jažu iziezīšanu…” 1873). Foreign writers who produce their works in Latvian while residing in Latvia [meant: the Baltic Germans] are called in periodicals “whole world citizens”; although they write in Latvian, the language they use is quite artificial and not drawn from the nation’s memory [from folklore, proverbs and sayings] (“Grāmatu galds’ 1899). However, in this time the treatment of all Baltic Germans as being unequivocal cosmopolitans does not exist. For instance, the first translator of the Bible into Latvian, Johann Ernst Glück (1652–1705), unlike Gotthard Friedrich Stender (1714–1796), who is the Baltic German theologian and founder of the Latvian secular writing, is considered a cosmopolitan, since, as it is explained in 1893, Glück is related to the Latvians only by chance, but actually he did not feel true love for the Latvian people (Pavasar 1914). One may come across also the opinion that a Latvian himself is a cosmopolitan by nature, because under the influence of different historical conditions many features untypical for the Latvian national character have been borrowed from the representatives of different nations (“Siku’m…” 1889).

In Latvian periodicals of the second half of the nineteenth century, cosmopolitanism is viewed as a deadly sin, a sickness that can be treated, a negative individual feature of a human nature – egoism, a negative individual feature of a human nature – cowardice, the state of being lost or having lost ones path, a positive individual feature of a human nature – tolerance.

Cosmopolitanism is also seen in a wider context as an ambiguous phenomenon related to travelling and staying, also to studying, in an international environment. Travelling, which involves “tramping from place to place and in a motley crowd rubbing among people of other nations”, as well as “imperceptibly absorbing alien spirit”, is regarded as a reason why an individual becomes a cosmopolitan, because “one after another we alienate from our people, and the primeval voice of our blood gradually dies away” (Lesinš 1936). In regard to receiving education, the stress is laid on the assumption that a teacher must not be a cosmopolitan, but the patriot of his country only, since cosmopolitanism is seen as the result of poor education, therefore education, as emphasized at that time, has to be received in one’s own country in the atmosphere of national patriotism and only in Latvian. Nevertheless, a different opinion is also encountered, namely, that education received outside the territory of Latvia might be valuable and beneficial for the individual and his country, especially taking into consideration the personal experience of the native intellectuals – New Latvians.

The development of Latvian nationalism was influenced by the New Latvians who having received education in the universities of Russian Empire during the 1840s and 1850s, “created a national identity for themselves in order to claim an equal position among intellectual elites of other nations” (Zake 2007, 307). One of the most outstanding cosmopolitans in Latvia, as seen in periodicals, is the leader of the First Latvian National Awakening and one of the most prominent members of the New Latvians movement, as well as the initiator of collecting Latvian non-material cultural heritage Krišjānis Valdemārs (1825–1891), who since the beginning of his studies had lived outside Latvia and in his
person linked together Latvian-German-Estonian-Russian identities (language, living space, political views, contribution etc.). In 1857, by opposing “national” against “cosmopolitan”, Kr. Valdemārs, who called himself a patriot and cosmopolitan (PR 1925), underlined that “[i]n every country, national differences (differences of opinion) make the most sensible ones avoid one-sided endeavours, pay attention to what is good for all, and hold cosmopolitan opinions” (Goba 1930).

As testified by his contemporaries, the cosmopolitanism of Kr. Valdemārs derives from Socrates’ understanding of cosmopolitanism, where the emphasis is laid on the development of general human values which thereby could enhance the development of every nation (Velme 1922). As considered, one of the features of cosmopolitanism is also receiving a highly qualified education, which was impossible in Latvia at that time, and therefore a lot of young people studied outside the territory of Latvia. If many participants of the First Latvian National Awakening struggled for the preservation and strengthening of the Latvian language, then Kr. Valdemārs was of the opinion that the knowledge of and studies in other languages are the opportunity for the Latvians to broaden the horizons of their development on individual as well as on national level.

The ideas of cosmopolitanism have been discussed in the newspaper “Dienas Lapa”, which indicates to the fact that cosmopolitanism appeared to have been attractive for the representatives of “the New Current” [Jaunā Strāva] and was seen as related to internationalism and socialism advocated by them based on Marxist theory. Simultaneously, the periodicals of that time express the opinion that socialists are not patriots but sooner cosmopolitans, for whom Latvian national interests are not essential. Several decades later, the appraisal of the activity of members of “the New Current” given in the Latvian periodicals concludes that initially there have been two irreconcilable personalities among them (cosmopolitan Pēteris Stučka and “uncanonized fighter for the development” Rainis), whose conception of social nationalism and opinions about the national issue developed and were formulated at the beginning of the twentieth century (Sch, 1917).

At the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth century, the views are expressed that there should not be sharp boundaries between cosmopolitanism and nationalism, namely, a person might be a cosmopolitan and simultaneously also love his fatherland, and, consequently, there is no need to be either an extreme cosmopolitan for whom the fatherland is any place where he does well or a narrow patriot, but rather a true resident of his country, for whom individual as well as public interests are important. Just during the next century, a new connotation starts being gradually attached to the conception of cosmopolitanism, where simultaneously longing for new horizons and longing for one’s fatherland are synthesized, which provides for the balance of human’s soul.

3.2. The period of Europeanization and cultural openness at the turn of the century

During the unsettled time of patriotism after the 1905 revolution, the periodicals underline the fact that in Latvia, there are still two currents fighting and making attempts to avoid exaggerations and extremities: individualists “for whom their own ‘ego’ is the most important”, and cosmopolitans who “spread into the broad ‘we’” (‘Zinību komisijas...’ 1907). One of the most essential issues and causes of disagreements still remains the question of the Latvian language and education in Latvian: nationalists emphasize that all who do not know Latvian are actually cosmopolitans (‘No iekšzemēm’ 1907), but cosmopolitans, in turn, speak about the importance of knowing foreign languages, therefore intellectuals of the younger generation actively support the idea about cosmopolitanism as a phenomenon entailing openness and Europeanization.

In later years, avoidance of extremities is strongly criticized by the periodicals, since behind “the prudent nationalism” there is, to some extent, cosmopolitanism (Bīne 1934). The essay “Cosmopolitanism and Nation” [Kosmopolītisms un tauta] (1912) maintains that human happiness does not have to be sought for in the world, but rather in the opportunity to freely express one’s own and nation’s national will; thereby cosmopolitanism is interpreted as an empty and removed from reality phenomenon – “a fancy bubble” which roots in empty slogans. One of these slogans – “equal rights to all nations” – does not correspond to the reality of life, since one nation oppresses another. The essay emphasizes the destructive nature of cosmopolitanism, attributing it especially to small peoples and nations which are passing through the stage of self-identification and development (J 1912). In articles dealing with social-political
events, however, the evaluation of cosmopolitanism is more neutral, thus, for example, national-wise the policy of Latvian “cosmopolitans” is sometimes considered even more correct and seminal than that of nationalists (Ligotņu 1906).

Unilateral cosmopolitanism is also heavily criticized as being a “spiritual barefootedness”, because wherever a cosmopolitan might go, he can’t find a place to feel himself at home, on the contrary, he finds home nowhere and feels himself an alien (Lapinš 1915). In this case the cosmopolitan is equaled to the nomad who cannot find home anywhere, when, in fact, “the cosmopolitan ‘puts down roots’ in any city of the world and feels at home everywhere he ‘goes’” (Kačāne 2015, 10). In the periodicals, cosmopolitans are the Jesuits who roam around the world under the wing of church, socialists who like national traitors ignore national festivities and national enthusiasm, the Jews and the Latvians themselves. Such Latvians are called Latvians only “by flesh”, but by spirit are considered similar to false Germans “[kārklu vācēsi] as they “have got intoxicated among the splendor of foreign nations’ spirit” (Klaustiņš 1914). The deniers of fatherland and national spirit, ironically called “cuckoos” (1909, Dzintenes Vēstnesis) or “men of everything” and “overwise cosmopolitans” (1908, Latviešu Avīzes) are considered as an irresponsible and merry human type, as world tramps who crave for orgies, Bohemian way of life and sensual art.

Despite such a polyphony of opinions and regarding cosmopolitanism as an essential phenomenon of the modern epoch, periodicals show a marked tendency to look on a harmonic fusion of “cosmopolitanism” (as the ideal of the future) and “nationalism” (as a phenomenon of stagnation, by analogy with “better fed than taught”) as a norm (1915, Lietuvēns, no. 10.). The idea about the synthesis of externally incompatible phenomena is promoted by examples of world understanding of cultural icons given in the periodicals, for instance, the mystical thinker Dante for the Italians is “a prophet of national consciousness”, while for other nations he is “civilitatis humanae”, the grand cosmopolitan, the one who sees the metaphysical beginning in a man, who has perceived and assimilated cultures of all times (Rudzītis 1921). Although transformations of cosmopolitanism in different periods are mentioned, the impact of the German culture is especially underlined. Among the great minds who call themselves “world citizens”, the names of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe un Friedrich Schiller are mentioned. “Our Ansis Liventāls [1803–1878], too, was enthusiastic about such ideas, and in his “Latviešu dziesmiņa” [Latvian Song] had included a whole programme of cosmopolitanism” (J 1912).

The theme about the transformation of national consciousness and “world citizen” consciousness gradually appears also in literary works by several authors: the cosmopolitic hero is to be found in the modern fairy tale “Zemnieka dēls” [A Farmer’s Son] (1902) by Andrievs Niedra (1871–1942) who is shown as man having a real modernist’s soul, who is treacherous against his own people and a cosmopolitan. In literary works, cosmopolitan identity is outlined also within the framework of the theme of travelling around the world, when the protagonist are depicted as world citizens who cannot even remember the names and faces of people encountered during their journeys (Filopens-Openheims 1913).

One of the most extensive mentions of cosmopolitanism on the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth century in Latvia, and especially in the first decade of the new era, falls within the context of the reception of Fin de Siècle Modernism and modern art. It was not only a crucial turning point in Western-European history, but a defining moment in the history of Latvia too. In paralell to many activities in social and political arena, such as building the idea about and striving for the foundation of a national state, the 1905 revolution, WWI, actions of the national resistance movement, Latvian cultural consciousness oriented itself towards the cultural heritage and latest tendencies of Europe, constituting the paralell existance of nationalism and cosmopolitanism. “[A]t the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth century (especially from the 1890-s), for the first time in the history of its development, Latvian literature purposefully focuses on the general processes and values of European literature which become an integral driving force of Latvian literature” (Kacane 2019, 84). This re-orientation testified to the Europeanization of the Latvian culture as well as to cosmopolitanism tendencies: “Our cultural man has become cosmopolite: he is touched by the joys and pains of the whole world, and the intellectual and material gains of the whole world play into his hands” (DJK 1918). Thus, a “cosmopolite” is a cultural
outsider, stranger or “non-member” who may initiate cross-cultural dialogue (Hooft van & Vandekerckhove 2010).

Within the framework of the reception of the most outstanding representatives of Symbolism and Modernism (the reception of Charles Baudelaire, Henrik Ibsen, Oscar Wilde a.o.) as well as other authors with very different aesthetic and political agendas, the spirit of their “organic cosmopolitanism” revealed the anti-traditional nature of Modernism. Modernism was seen as the removal of limits, unlimited subjectivism and the destruction of classical art, ethics, religion and politic. Within the frame of the criticism of Modernism, when it was interpreted as immoral, antinational and unpatriotic, its cosmopolitanism as one of the features characterizing Modernism was also mentioned. However, the cosmopolitanism of Modernism, especially that of decadence, which has a negative marking, was opposed with a positively marked universalism comprising the greatest cultural achievements of the whole world. For part of Latvian intellectuals of the turn of the century, particularly for symbolists and early modernists, cosmopolitanism was connected with the use of a symbol as a generally recognized and universal sign (modern “Esperanto”) as well as with the idea about the autonomy of art, where the “art without limits” expressed the values of cosmopolitan Symbolism and international Modernism. The cosmopolitan identities of West European modernists showed that there existed an international type of writers – a cosmopolitan, a world citizen – and testified to the possibility of human consciousness and spirit to belong to the world in general. The cosmopolitan ideal seemed appealing as a utopian path, characterized by tolerance, not only artistic, but also individual freedom, therefore socially and politically marginalized groups were attracted to it by attempting to re-define the understanding of gender and other identities.

3.3. In the period of independent Latvia in the 1920s–1930s

The 1920s is the time when, after long years of depression, the power of national spirit is unleashed. The periodicals strongly accentuate that the Latvians must not be internationalists and cosmopolitans, since “our power and future are in nationalism” (K 1922), and it is only nationalism that is able to defend the independence of statehood obtained in 1918. But, as Jānis Sudrabkalns writes, in other places of Europe, the processes of “denationalization” or internationalization are observed, when “people walk from one nation, from one language to another just like from one room into another” (Sudrabkalns 1929).

At this period of time, the general interpretation of cosmopolitanism agrees with the understanding of cosmopolitanism mentioned in the Latvian periodicals of previous decades, i.e. cosmopolitanism is described as a phenomenon of world metropolises, also a mix of cosmopolitan races, as communism, and as the opposition of nationalism and universalism, namely, cosmopolitanism is “[…] the product of the end of the era of classicism decadence, Hellenism and Rome imperial state, a strong opposite to the national and universal principle. In the Hellenistic time, it is the formation of Alexandria, Carthage, Rome, of the present banks, tradesmen and world centre money-lenders, New York, London, Paris and Berlin. The motto of this cosmopolitanism is: my native land is the place where I do well” (Klaustīņš 1925, 277).

The discussion on cosmopolitanism in Latvian periodicals takes place within the frame of the binary opposition “the Latvianness / nationalism – cosmopolitanism” and is initiated before the proclamation of the Republic of Latvia, when cosmopolitanism is regarded as the destroyer of the original beauty of national culture. During WWI, Rainis (1865–1929), who through his political views and diverse philosophic, literary and publicistic writings tried to boost Latvian national self-confidence and help his people, sharply criticized cosmopolitanism and in his letter from exile wrote that cosmopolitanism is “[u]topia and obsoleteness” (Rainis 1933). At calling the Latvians to found their own state, he emphasized the fact that “the situation of having no nations at all is only a far-away goal, but not the means towards this goal. The cosmopolite is a crowd, an unorganized mass where nations are linked together. Cosmopolite is slivers and chaff, it is not timber and grains” (Rainis 1933), this is what on June 22, 1916, Rainis wrote to A. Krauze – the founder of Latvian committee in Switzerland (Comit’e letton ne Suisse, 1915), who via this committee made great efforts to unite the communities of Latvian emigrants in Switzerland and inform West European society about the destiny of the Latvian people and simultaneously defend the idea about Latvia’s autonomy. In 1933, this letter is published in the edition “Atpūta” as the first publication. Already long before the foundation of Latvian state, emigration was
regarded as the reason why the Latvians became cosmopolitans and ideologists of “ubi bene, ibi patria” (from Latin, “Homeland is where it [life] is good”). Therefore in 1917, Rainis formulated the necessity of establishing a national state, but simultaneously also criticized the idea of cosmopolitanism. This idea was quoted in discussed in the 1920s and 1930s: “Mankind is organized into nations, but not into crowds; it is not possible to cope with the existence of nations by denying it. Upon giving up our own nation, we would not jump into the future state without nations, but rather into a different nation of oppressors” (Švābe 1925).

After gaining the independence of Latvian statehood, anti-nationalists and “internationalists of the new times” are called cosmopolitans; they are seen as the people who are deniers of home and “homeless persons in principle” [“principiālie bezmājinieki”] (Reiznieks 1929), who themselves freely give up their native land and do not recognize their home.

During the time of national positivism, cosmopolitanism is characterized as a widespread phenomenon in Europe and is assessed as a threat to Latvian national values. At this time, the role of Kr. Valdemārs, well-known as being the initiator of Latvian National Awakening and beginner of the national spirit movement, is re-evaluated. A different facet of his personality is brought into fore-front, namely, his cosmopolitanism, which is being interpreted as the marginalization of national interests and lack of patriotism, and his indifferent attitude to the issues of the Latvian language is criticized especially (Goba 1930). To justify the reproach relating to Russification and to stress the importance of knowledge of languages as the instrument for human’s and nation’s perfection and development, Kr. Valdemārs’ ideas are conveyed as follows:

“It will seem strange to some patriot […] that once in some conversation Valdemārs has said the following words: ‘If I could take off from the Latvians their language like their coat and put on the language of some big nation on them, I would do it willingly and would put on the English coat, i.e. language, on them, because the Latvians, then, would not have to waste so much time on learning this language, and they would be able to use this time to acquire more useful knowledge. But since no man can do this, then their own language has to be developed and used to raise the Latvian culture’”. (Velme 1922, 1240).

Propagation of departure, emigration and Russification, which are all also ascribed to cosmopolites, range among those aspects that are seen as entailing risk to the existence of Latvian state, consequently, the home-coming of those intellectuals who had emigrated earlier is evaluated as a negative factor: “Oh, this Russification and emigration! – like a weight hung on a swimmer’s neck, it is just like that. Speculations, corruption, revelry, nihilism, materialism, cosmopolitanism! – these are things that they have brought for us from Russia” (Goba 1930).

When the authoritarian regime was established in 1934, within the framework of national ideological system the stress is laid on patriotism, national unity, values and virtues of national culture. This is the reason why since the foundation of Latvian state, but particularly in the 1930s, cosmopolitanism is regarded as a direct threat to Latvianness. The periodicals emphasize the fact that in the second half of the nineteenth century, cosmopolitanism as a threat to the development of national self-confidence (emigration and assimilation) was not sufficiently analysed as yet and “[…] to a cosmopolitan it did not seem a sin […]” (Goba, 1930, 855). But in a newly founded Latvian state people who cast doubt on their own state and are enthusiastic about the alien and modern tendencies are seen as a destructive phenomenon.

However, periodicals publish also contrary opinions, thus testifying to the controversy concerning the influence of cosmopolitanism on the space of Latvia: “An individual becomes great when he sets super-individual goals for himself; a nation becomes great when it sets super-national goals for itself. Such is Kr. Valdemārs, and therefore he is a grand person. This is a patriot in the greatest sense” (P.R. 1925). In the same way, to defend cosmopolitanism, periodicals express opinions that cosmopolitanism and patriotism are not contradictory concepts, i.e. by developing the spiritual values of Latvian nation it is possible to enhance the general human culture (Velme JD 1925, 3). Just like humaneness (humane or progressive nationalism) is very important for the national question, cosmopolitanism, too, has a bearing on nationalism, namely, it is the way to nation’s international education and international identification.
With reference to the brochure “Nationale Bestrebungen” (Part 1 in Latvian “Tautiskie centieni” [National Aspirations] in the journal “Austrums” in 1887) written by Atis Kronvalds in 1872, it is stated that there exists no rift between nationalism and cosmopolitanism, because “all European nations have common culture that has not developed in ‘seclusion’, but in the broadest cooperation among nations [quotation emphasis by the author]. All nations learn and borrow one from another, and thus create the greatest impact on each other” (Šillers 1925). This standpoint coincides with the opinion expressed in the periodicals of the end of the 1920s and the 1930s about Rainis as being simultaneously a nationalist and a cosmopolitan, i.e. an irreal person, symbol of the whole epoch who embodies the synthesis of individual, general human and cross-national qualities and who promotes Latvia’s aspiration towards becoming the nation of Europe’s culture. (Švābe 1925). Cosmopolitanism is interpreted as love for humanity and as the ideal goal of the future, which can be achieved only through developing national self-confidence (Ērmanis 1922), but without “disassociating oneself” from the national. Thus, “belonging to cosmopolitanism doesn’t exclude close ties with the national culture and ancestral customs, as these are the main factors that determine the stage of development of cosmopolitanism in each separate individual” (Kačāne 2015, 10). Therefore, not just single- or double-belonging, but also global belonging enriches human’s identity.

The ideas of cosmopolitanism are promoted also by translations of foreign authors’ works and re-evaluation of their personalities and their creative work. The second generation of modernists (A. Čaks, A. Eglītis, E. Ādamsons a.o.) base their beliefs on the ideas generated by their artistic predecessors who were influenced by F. Nietzsche’s and other writers-cosmopolitans’ theoretical assumptions and literary works. Although Modernism, being a subjective world outlook, relates to individualism, in-depth articles on the relatedness between Modernism and cosmopolitanism are published emphasizing that “Modernists want to be neither the Germans nor the French or any other nation, which sounds commonplace, but, as Nietzsche says, at least true and honest Europeans. They become cosmopolitans, go astray into ancient exotic cultures, especially into those of Japanese and Chinese, whose impressionist art is close and kindred to them” (Klaustiņš 1933). As considered, irony is one of the most important features of cosmopolitanism, and it gets revealed both in untypical personalities of West European cosmopolite writers and the ironical protagonists of their literary works, for example, in 1928, Oļģerts Liepiņš writes about the protagonist in H. Ibsen’s play “Peer Gynt”: “He [Peer Gynt] strives for the extravagant, by his viewpoints he is a cosmopolite. He is ironical” (Liepiņš 1928).

The list of cosmopolites’ or “universal people’s” desires mentioned in the press includes “English coat”, “German tongue”, French manners”, “Slavic scope” (Lapiņš 1935). Thus, a Latvian-cosmopolite, exposed to the influences of the world around him, is treated as a “self-made” man and is described with irony in Latvian writers’ works of this genre in the 1930s, as for example, Jūlijs Pūkalējs in A. Eglītis’ work “Vāravs”.

In this time, cosmopolitanism is also ironically interpreted as being a neurosis of the epoch experiencing perpetual haste: being under the influence of crowd, anxiety, fragmentariness and perpetual kaleidoscope, a cosmopolitan is a “nervous person” who is “fighting amongst shops, societies, sport […] he likes enthusiasm in the same way as a heavy drinker likes alcohol, because he is a drug addict of enthusiasm” (Lapiņš 1936). Thus, a cosmopolite is a wanderer, the opposite of the man who has a settled existence.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Cosmopolitanism is a philosophical, political and sociological concept, the ambivalent connotations of which range from the pejorative and degrading to the commendatory and ideal. Partly promoted by the development of modern transport and communication technologies, cosmopolitanism offers a radical alternative to the ideology of nationalism and is included in the framework of the binary opposition “us” and “them”, “nationalists – anti-nationalists”. Nevertheless, a public debate in Latvian periodicals until 1940, reveals that cosmopolitan and anti-cosmopolitan positions often existed within the same discourse, moreover, in the first half of the twentieth century opinions appear claiming that
cosmopolitanism and patriotism are not contradictory concepts, thus testifying to the emergence of the hybrid, transnational, and transcultural self.

In all the above mentioned periods, the issue of the Latvian language is being discussed revealing its great significance for the national identity: within the context of cosmopolitanism a national language is considered less significant than one universal language, thereby triggering a counter reaction against cosmopolitanism among the supporters of national ideology. On the other hand, knowing foreign languages enhanced the demonstration of Latvian national pride and patriotism in an international environment and eventually contributed to the growth of cosmopolitanism in Latvia. For the Latvians, cosmopolitanism involved opportunities of not only the international mobility, but also of gaining experience, self-discovery and finding their own path through other cultures, thus promoting personal and national self-identification.

Significant investment in the circulation of the idea of cosmopolitanism was made by cultural cosmopolitanism or cosmopolitan art – the modern artists’ and writers’ personas, as well as their works aiming at transforming the culture from traditional to anti-traditional, from national to modern and cosmopolitan. In Latvia, self-reflexive analysis of oneself led to the self-reflexive exploration of the national consciousness and eventually, to the examination and development of the national identity.

Further research on political, institutional, civic and literary aspects of cosmopolitanism is required to provide more nuanced and historically-accurate understanding on the debate of cosmopolitanism.
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